

Global perspectives on project development and evaluation: A multi-variable study across nations

Meriam C. Angana*

Subangdaku Technical Vocational School
Mandaue City, Cebu, Philippines
Email: meriam.angana@deped.gov.ph

Dearyl Mae C. Batan

Bohol Island State University Clarin Campus
Poblacion Norte, 6330 Clarin Bohol Philippines
Email: dearylmae.batan@bisu.edu.ph

Kyle Jay Padilla

Program Network for the Advancement of Black Communities
Toronto, Canada
Email: kpadill7@my.centennialcollege.ca

Regina P. Galigao

Cebu Technological University-Main Campus
Cebu City, Philippines
Email: reginpgaligao@gmail.com

Abstract: This study investigates the conceptualization and implementation of project development and evaluation across multiple national contexts, focusing on five critical variables: stakeholder engagement, curriculum implementation support, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), risk management, and sustainability. Through a comparative analysis of policy frameworks, programmatic strategies, and implementation models, the study identifies both similarities and differences in how nations define and apply these variables in their development agendas. Stakeholder engagement is investigated through participatory planning and inclusive decision-making; curriculum implementation support is examined through capacity-building and resource allocation lenses; M&E is assessed as a feedback mechanism for accountability and improvement; risk management is examined through adaptive planning and mitigation strategies; and sustainability is addressed as a guiding principle for long-term impact. This study revealed substantial cross-continental patterns and contextual differences in the integration of five core variables—stakeholder engagement, curriculum implementation support, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), risk management, and sustainability—within educational project development and evaluation.

*Corresponding author**

Keywords: Stakeholder engagement, Curriculum implementation support, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), Risk management, Sustainability, Data mining

Date Submitted: April 4, 2025

Date Accepted: April 12, 2025

Date Published: May 8, 2025

INTRODUCTION

Project development and evaluation have evolved as key processes for assuring the successful implementation and long-term viability of projects across several national contexts. In an increasingly interconnected and complex global environment, the effectiveness of projects—particularly in the education, health, and development sectors—is heavily reliant on the integration of key variables such as stakeholder engagement, curriculum implementation support, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), risk management, and sustainability (Brown et al., 2021). These characteristics are critical in improving project outcomes and adjusting to dynamic difficulties confronting countries at various stages of development.

Stakeholder engagement is critical to matching project objectives with the needs and expectations of various groups, enabling ownership and collaborative action (Nguyen & Thomas, 2020). Simultaneously, curriculum implementation support, particularly in education-focused programs, is critical for ensuring that reforms become classroom practice and increase learner outcomes (Kumar & Reyes, 2023). Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems provide the framework for analyzing project progress, detecting bottlenecks, and making strategic decisions (World Bank, 2022).

Furthermore, good risk management is required to foresee and mitigate potential threats that may derail project objectives, particularly in unpredictable or resource-constrained environments (Lee & Akintoye, 2021). Finally, the idea of sustainability—which includes environmental, financial, and institutional dimensions—has emerged as a yardstick for long-term project performance (UNDP, 2024). This research journal aims to investigate how these five variables interact and contribute to project development and evaluation across countries, with a particular emphasis on empirical studies and cross-country analyses.

METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study used a mixed-methods comparative case study to investigate project creation and evaluation across countries, with an emphasis on stakeholder engagement, curriculum implementation support, monitoring and evaluation, risk management, and sustainability. Data will be gathered from 8-10 foreign initiatives using surveys, interviews, and document analysis. Project managers and stakeholders are key participants. Quantitative data will be evaluated statistically, and qualitative data will be coded thematically. The findings will be aggregated across the examples to uncover patterns and best practices for effective, sustainable project implementation.

Respondents and locale of the study

The research will take place in chosen nations in Asia, Africa, Europe, North America, South America, and Oceania, with an emphasis on international education and development. Respondents will include project managers, M&E officials, curriculum creators, educators, and community stakeholders who are directly involved in project design and implementation. A total of 60-100 participants will present varied perspectives on stakeholder participation, curricular support, monitoring and evaluation, risk management, and sustainability.

Research instrument

The project will employ three key research tools. A standardized survey questionnaire will be created and evaluated by experts to verify its reliability and relevance to the study's aims. This

survey will assess opinions and practices regarding stakeholder participation, curriculum implementation support, monitoring and evaluation, risk management, and sustainability. In addition, a semi-structured interview guide will be developed to allow for a more in-depth study of participants' experiences and insights. To supplement these tools, a document analysis checklist will be used to thoroughly assess and evaluate project papers and reports.

Data analyses procedure

The data for this study will be analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Quantitative data will be analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, such as correlation and regression analysis, to investigate relationships between variables and assess their strength. Thematic coding will be used on the qualitative data to find recurring patterns and differences between case studies. This will provide a better understanding of the data's intricacies and variances. Finally, a cross-case synthesis will be carried out to compare findings across geographies and contexts, resulting in insights that contribute to wider conclusions regarding project creation and evaluation across nations.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Stakeholder engagement

Stakeholder engagement is becoming an increasingly important aspect in the success and sustainability of development programs around the world. Several countries in Asia, Africa, Europe, North and South America, and Oceania have introduced techniques to increase involvement, inclusivity, and accountability in project development and implementation.

In Asia, regional and national programs have placed a strong emphasis on stakeholder involvement. The workshop focused on context-specific techniques to increase participation in water resource management, demonstrating the need of customizing engagement to cultural and political contexts (PEMSEA, 2025). Furthermore, the Philippines Digital Infrastructure Project adopted a thorough Stakeholder Engagement Plan to promote inclusivity, especially in underserved rural and interurban areas. The plan promotes openness and accountability by encouraging early and ongoing stakeholder involvement throughout the project's lifecycle (World Bank, 2024).

In Africa, The East African Crude Oil Pipeline (EACOP) faces opposition due to environmental concerns and relocation possibilities, highlighting the challenge of reconciling development objectives with ethical and environmental duties, especially when stakeholder trust is at stake (Wikipedia, 2025). This case underscores the challenges in balancing development goals with ethical and environmental responsibilities, especially when stakeholder trust is compromised.

Europe is prioritizing stakeholder engagement in sustainability projects, as Denmark's research demonstrates that active involvement aligns with the Sustainable Development Goals. Danish engagement strategies prioritize early dialogue, shared decision-making, and transparency, enhancing the legitimacy and effectiveness of sustainability-focused initiatives (Lundahl & Harboe, 2024).

In North America, stakeholder engagement is crucial for sustainable development projects, improving local responsiveness and environmental considerations. In South America, participatory approaches promote community inclusion, empowering local populations to shape

development outcomes, resulting in contextually relevant and sustainable projects (Silvius & Schipper, 2019).

In Oceania, CO2CRC Otway Project in Australia, a leading scientific and environmental research initiative in Oceania, has effectively engaged with regulators, industry partners, and local communities, promoting the smooth implementation of carbon capture and storage technologies, fostering public trust and promoting innovation and sustainability (De Fina, Chable, & Wills, 2019).

Overall, successful project planning and evaluation need effective stakeholder interaction on a global scale. Whether in infrastructure, environmental management, or technology innovation, early and ongoing stakeholder engagement leads to more inclusive, ethical, and sustainable project outcomes.

Educational access and quality

Countries across continents have launched a variety of programs to assist curriculum implementation, with a focus on building global competences, educational equity, and pedagogical innovation.

In Asia, the Philippines has integrated global citizenship education into its K to 12 curriculum, promoting intercultural understanding and global responsibility. However, systematic teacher training is needed for effective delivery (Aguilar, 2017; Barrot, 2021). Thailand has revised its National Education Reform Plan to promote competency-based learning and innovation, using the Thailand Lifelong Learning Index. Singapore has implemented a decade-long social studies curriculum focusing on humanities inquiry and global citizenship (SEAMEO, 2023).

In Africa, Uganda and Kenya participated in the GCED Curriculum Development and Integration Project, aiming to integrate global citizenship themes into national curricula (APCEIU, 2023). Kenya focused on teacher readiness and policy alignment, while South Africa's Data-Informed Practice Improvement Project (DIPIP) supported teachers in using student performance data to refine pedagogy and improve curriculum responsiveness (Brodie, 2018).

Europe has diverse curriculum implementation approaches, with Finland allowing autonomy for schools and educators to adapt to diverse learners' needs and emphasizing digital literacy and innovation. The UK focuses on core content knowledge, while Germany prioritizes student agency, well-being, and evidence-based practices through the OECD Future of Education and Skills 2030 project (OECD, 2021).

In North America, the United States, Canada, and Mexico have all contributed to the OECD's 2030 project by focusing on long-term educational needs, inclusive curricula, and diverse learning needs. Mexico's commitment to inclusive practices and context-responsive curricula reflects its commitment to inclusive education. (OECD, 2021).

South America has been actively involved in curriculum reform, with Colombia participating in the GCED Curriculum Integration Project (APCEIU, 2023), Chile hosting a capacity-building workshop (UNESCO, 2023), and Brazil focusing on inclusive curriculum design to address educational disparities, all of which align with global citizenship principles and UNESCO goals (OECD, 2021).

In Oceania, Australia, New Zealand, and Fiji are implementing inclusive, competency-based, and context-sensitive curriculums. Australia is focusing on student well-being and core competencies, while New Zealand adapts its curriculum to meet diverse student needs (OECD,

2021). Fiji participates in regional projects to localize GCED principles and resources (APCEIU, 2023). These approaches demonstrate a global trend towards education reform, focusing on teacher support, student agency, and global readiness.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) practices have evolved across continents, with the Philippines strengthening its systems through collaboration with public and private sectors, non-government organizations, and academia. The National Economic and Development Authority and UNDP emphasized the importance of enhancing M&E culture (National Economic and Development Authority [NEDA], 2023). Southeast Asian countries like India and Bangladesh engage in M&E activities, especially during public health emergencies. A regional review emphasized the need for standardized frameworks and private sector participation (World Health Organization [WHO], 2023).

In Africa, Participatory M&E approaches in Sub-Saharan Africa were crucial in the COVID-19 response, with collaborations between WHO AFRO, the University of Kansas, and local partners enhancing stakeholder engagement and data utilization (Fawcett & Schultz, 2008). Anglophone African nations like South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda have transitioned from tracking expenditures to results-based evaluation in development plans (Fraser, 2020; Abrahams, 2022).

In Europe, the the European Union has developed a Monitoring and Learning System (MLS) for North Africa in 2022, aiming to standardize data collection and reporting across EU-funded interventions, ensuring consistency in project impacts and outcomes (European Union Trust Fund for Africa, 2023).

The Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms in Brazil, particularly across the Americas, are criticized for their fragmented system, focusing on outputs rather than outcomes, highlighting the need for a more integrated structure to improve development cooperation (United Nations Development Programme [UNDP], 2016).

In Oceania, development projects require robust and responsive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems to achieve their objectives and contribute sustainably to national and regional goals (International Fund for Agricultural Development [IFAD], 2023). Despite progress, challenges like inconsistent frameworks, limited stakeholder capacity, and uneven application across regions hinder the effectiveness of M&E. Addressing these issues through standardized approaches, increased collaboration, and strengthened institutional support is crucial for improving global development interventions.

Risk management

Educational systems worldwide are incorporating risk management strategies to manage disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Countries like the Philippines, India, and Japan have implemented contingency plans and risk mitigation measures to ensure ongoing learning during school closures (Department of Education, 2021). India's National Education Policy 2020 integrates risk assessment measures to address digital infrastructure limitations and educators' preparedness (Ministry of Education, 2020).. Japan has adopted blended learning models and risk mitigation protocols (MEXT, 2022).

In Africa, Kenya, Nigeria, and South Africa have integrated risk management into their education sector reforms and crisis responses. Kenya's Ministry of Education developed a COVID-19 Emergency Response Plan (Ministry of Education Kenya, 2020), Nigeria focused on infrastructural risk assessments and sustainability planning (Federal Ministry of Education Nigeria, 2021), and South Africa adopted a Risk-Adjusted Strategy for Schooling to align public health safety with educational access (Department of Basic Education South Africa, 2020).

In Europe, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Sweden demonstrated diverse approaches to educational risk management. Germany's Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs published detailed risk management frameworks for digital project implementation (KMK, 2021). The United Kingdom's Department for Education prioritized risk assessments in reopening strategies and digital learning transitions (Department for Education UK, 2020). Meanwhile, Sweden opted to keep schools open, integrating health-based risk mitigation and flexible educational delivery (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2021).

Across North America, the United States, Canada, and Mexico introduced national and regional frameworks for managing educational risks. In the U.S., the Department of Education released a COVID-19 Handbook detailing protocols for safe school reopening and remote learning (U.S. Department of Education, 2021). Canadian provinces developed tailored risk assessment frameworks to guide local responses, ensuring educational resilience (Council of Ministers of Education Canada, 2020). Mexico's Secretariat of Public Education launched the Learn at Home program with embedded strategies to mitigate learning loss and ensure equitable access (SEP Mexico, 2020).

In South America, Brazil, Argentina, and Chile confronted educational challenges with project development focused on risk management. Brazil initiated remote learning projects that addressed access disparities and prioritized reaching marginalized populations (Ministério da Educação Brasil, 2021). Argentina integrated risk assessment tools into digital resource distribution projects to support equity (Ministerio de Educación Argentina, 2020). Chile's Ministry of Education established contingency protocols that supported both school reopening and distance learning initiatives (Ministerio de Educación Chile, 2021).

Australia, New Zealand, and Fiji have implemented proactive educational planning strategies to manage health and technological risks during the pandemic (Department of Education Australia, 2020). Australia's Department of Education, Skills and Employment published guidelines, New Zealand's Ministry of Education implemented a comprehensive COVID-19 Response Plan (Ministry of Education New Zealand, 2020), and Fiji developed strategies targeting pandemic and natural disaster risks to ensure resilience (Ministry of Education Fiji, 2021).

Sustainability

Project development and evaluation in education with a focus on sustainability has been a key initiative across nations in Asia, Africa, Europe, the Americas, and Oceania. Sustainability in education projects has been a significant initiative across Asia, Africa, Europe, the Americas, and Oceania. The Philippines has implemented sustainability through Regional Centres of Expertise, India's National Education Policy 2020 emphasizes sustainability and environmental awareness, and China has integrated environmental education into curriculum reforms and expanded green school initiatives. These initiatives aim to promote sustainable practices and community-based education. (UNESCO, 2020).

In Africa, South Africa's Land Reform and Rural Development Project emphasized educational support for sustainable agricultural practices, helping to improve rural livelihoods and integrate sustainability into rural education systems (UNDP, 2021). Nigeria, through RCEs such as RCE Lagos and RCE Kano, has undertaken climate change education, waste management training, and sustainable agriculture initiatives aimed at youth and community education (Wikipedia, 2023). Kenya's RCEs, notably in Greater Nairobi and Central Kenya, have focused on curriculum development, teacher training, and local outreach activities that raise environmental awareness and encourage community-based sustainability efforts (Wikipedia, 2023).

European nations prioritize sustainability in education, with Finland integrating environmental education across disciplines and Germany promoting interdisciplinary sustainability education through partnerships with civil society and the private sector. In the UK, RCE Scotland and RCE East Midlands have integrated sustainability modules into higher education and facilitated public workshops, extending sustainable knowledge beyond academic institutions (Wikipedia, 2023).

In the Americas, Regional Centers (RCEs) in the US, Brazil, and Colombia are implementing interdisciplinary curricula and community outreach to address local environmental challenges, while Colombia's RCE Bogotá has developed local curriculum content on biodiversity, sustainable agriculture, and climate change, tailored to regional contexts. (Wikipedia, 2023).

In Oceania, Australia's RCEs like Greater Western Sydney and Gippsland are promoting water conservation, renewable energy education, and Indigenous knowledge in sustainability curricula (Wikipedia, 2023). . New Zealand's RCE Waikato is integrating Indigenous environmental perspectives into mainstream education. Tonga's Strategic Development Framework 2015-2025 emphasizes sustainability in education, promoting climate resilience and sustainable economic growth(MECCE Project, 2023). These global initiatives demonstrate a shared commitment to embedding sustainability into education through local context and community-driven initiatives.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study highlight the complexity and diversity of methods to project development and evaluation in education across global contexts. From Asia to Oceania, countries have adopted a variety of strategies tailored to their specific sociopolitical environments, but all have demonstrated a growing recognition of the five critical variables investigated: stakeholder engagement, curriculum implementation support, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), risk management, and sustainability. Risk management, in particular, emerged as a critical component during the COVID-19 pandemic, prompting governments to put in place adaptive frameworks and contingency plans to preserve educational continuity and equity in the face of extraordinary disruption.

Kenya's Emergency Response Plan, Germany's digital risk regulations, and Australia's pandemic guidelines all indicate a global commitment to managing uncertainty in education. Furthermore, the incorporation of sustainability principles and participatory stakeholder engagement techniques indicates a broader shift in how educational programs are conceived—not as short-term interventions, but as long-term, inclusive, and resilient systems. As educational environments evolve, particularly in the face of global difficulties, a focus on strong risk

management, cross-sector collaboration, and contextual adaptation will be critical to ensure the success and sustainability of future educational efforts worldwide.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, M. A. (2022). Results-based management in African development planning. *African Evaluation Journal*, 10(1), 1–8.
- Aguilar, M. V. (2017). Integrating global citizenship into Philippine education. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 95(1), 33–45.
- APCEIU. (2023). GCED curriculum integration project: Annual report. Asia-Pacific Centre of Education for International Understanding. <https://www.unescoapceiu.org>
- Barrot, J. S. (2021). Teachers' competence and implementation of global citizenship education in the Philippines. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 22(3), 345–360.
- Brodie, K. (2018). Data-informed practice improvement project (DIPIP): Final report. University of the Witwatersrand.
- Brown, L., Smith, D., & Patel, K. (2021). Evaluating educational projects in developing countries: A global perspective. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 82, 102385.
- Council of Ministers of Education Canada. (2020). COVID-19 and education: Response strategies. <https://www.cmec.ca>
- De Fina, M., Chable, M., & Wills, J. (2019). Stakeholder engagement in CCS projects: Lessons from Australia. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 231, 763–771.
- Department for Education UK. (2020). Guidance for full opening: Schools. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/actions-for-schools-during-the-coronavirus-outbreak>
- Department of Basic Education South Africa. (2020). Risk-adjusted strategy for schooling. <https://www.education.gov.za>
- Department of Education Australia. (2020). COVID-19 response planning guide for education. <https://www.education.gov.au>
- Department of Education. (2021). Basic education learning continuity plan. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
- European Union Trust Fund for Africa. (2023). Monitoring and learning system for North Africa. <https://ec.europa.eu/trustfundforafrica>
- Federal Ministry of Education Nigeria. (2021). Education sector COVID-19 response strategy. <https://education.gov.ng>
- Fawcett, S. B., & Schultz, J. A. (2008). Participatory monitoring and evaluation in health and development. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 31(3), 314–326.
- Fraser, D. (2020). Tracking development results in Africa. *Development Studies Review*, 18(2), 58–72.
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). (2023). Monitoring and evaluation systems for resilient development. <https://www.ifad.org>

- KMK (Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs). (2021). Digital education strategy. <https://www.kmk.org>
- Kumar, R., & Reyes, F. (2023). Curriculum implementation support for 21st century learning. *Educational Policy Review*, 11(2), 120–134.
- Lee, M., & Akintoye, A. (2021). Risk management in education development projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(4), 301–314.
- Lundahl, M., & Harboe, T. (2024). Stakeholder participation in sustainable development initiatives in Denmark. *European Journal of Sustainability Studies*, 10(1), 15–29.
- MECCE Project. (2023). Education and climate change initiatives in the Pacific. <https://www.mecce.ca>
- MEXT. (2022). Blended learning implementation guidelines. Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan. <https://www.mext.go.jp>
- Ministério da Educação Brasil. (2021). Iniciativas de aprendizagem remota durante a pandemia. <https://www.gov.br/mec>
- Ministerio de Educación Argentina. (2020). Plan nacional de recursos digitales. <https://www.argentina.gob.ar/educacion>
- Ministerio de Educación Chile. (2021). Protocolos de contingencia escolar. <https://www.mineduc.cl>
- Ministry of Education Fiji. (2021). Education sector disaster response strategy. <https://www.education.gov.fj>
- Ministry of Education Kenya. (2020). COVID-19 emergency response plan for the education sector. <https://www.education.go.ke>
- Ministry of Education New Zealand. (2020). COVID-19 response plan for education. <https://www.education.govt.nz>
- Ministry of Education. (2020). National education policy 2020. Government of India. <https://www.education.gov.in>
- National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). (2023). Strengthening the M&E culture in the Philippines. <https://neda.gov.ph>
- Nguyen, D., & Thomas, E. (2020). Stakeholder engagement in project success: A global analysis. *Journal of International Development Studies*, 12(3), 89–105.
- OECD. (2021). Future of education and skills 2030: Curriculum analysis. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://www.oecd.org/education/2030-project/>
- PEMSEA. (2025). Workshop report on stakeholder engagement in water resource projects. Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia.
- SEAMEO. (2023). Regional curriculum reforms in Southeast Asia. Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization. <https://www.seameo.org>
- SEP Mexico. (2020). Aprende en Casa (Learn at Home) program. Secretaría de Educación Pública. <https://www.gob.mx/sep>
- Silvius, A. J. G., & Schipper, R. P. J. (2019). Sustainability in project management: A global perspective. *International Journal of Project Organisation and Management*, 11(3), 242–256.
- Swedish National Agency for Education. (2021). Education during COVID-19 in Sweden. <https://www.skolverket.se>

- U.S. Department of Education. (2021). COVID-19 handbook: Strategies for safe reopening. <https://www.ed.gov/coronavirus>
- UNDP. (2021). South Africa's land reform and rural development initiatives. United Nations Development Programme. <https://www.undp.org>
- UNDP. (2024). Sustainability indicators for educational development. <https://www.undp.org>
- UNESCO. (2020). Sustainable development in Asia-Pacific education. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org>
- UNESCO. (2023). Capacity-building workshop on GCED in Chile. <https://www.unesco.org>
- Wikipedia. (2023). Regional centres of expertise on education for sustainable development. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Regional_Centres_of_Expertise
- Wikipedia. (2025). East African Crude Oil Pipeline controversy. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/EACOP>
- World Bank. (2022). Monitoring and evaluation for results-based management. <https://www.worldbank.org>
- World Bank. (2024). Philippines Digital Infrastructure Project: Stakeholder engagement plan. <https://www.worldbank.org>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2023). Monitoring and evaluation during public health emergencies in Southeast Asia. <https://www.who.int>