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What is the problem that M&E aims to address?

- Culture of doing things the way they have always been done, as opposed to culture of continuous improvement
- Focus on activities without assessing the results or impact of the activities
- Insufficient measurement, collection and analysis of data to inform improvements
- Monitoring and reporting for compliance rather than for improvement
- Poor programme planning, weaknesses in setting of indicators and targets, weak logic models / theories of change
- Weaknesses with design of data measurement and collection processes
- Lack of reengineering of plans and business processes based on analysis of data
- Evidence-based planning and decision making not sufficiently valued

- Disappointing results - lack of positive change in key indicators, such as rural unemployment
- Implementation weaknesses
- Poor quality of service delivery
- Insufficient value for money
Addressing the problem

- M&E can assist with solving the problem but is not a silver bullet
  - M&E produces information, but unless managers act on the information, M&E has little impact
- M&E is just one tool in the management toolbox
  - Managers need to be proficient in all the key management areas (M&E, planning, financial management, supply chain management, operations management, human resource management and development, governance) in order for the performance of departments to improve
- NDP identifies other key problems which need to be resolved in order for performance to improve:
  - Unstable political-administrative interface and unclear roles of political and administrative heads
  - Weak recruitment processes, training and development
  - Inappropriate delegations
  - Lack of accountability to citizens
  - Lack of implementation of Batho Pele
  - Weak interdepartmental collaboration
## Focus of DPME to date

| M&E of national priorities | • Focus on outcomes and impacts of government work  
• Plans for the 12 priority outcomes (delivery agreements)  
• Monitoring progress against the plans  
• Evaluating to inform improvements to programmes, policies, plans |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Management performance M&E | • Focus on quality of management practices in individual departments  
• Moderated self assessment  
• Drive a process of continuous improvement in management practices  
• Link results to assessment of HoDs |
| M&E of front-line service delivery | • Focus on monitoring of experience of citizens when obtaining services  
• Presidential hotline  
• Unannounced visits to service delivery sites  
• Citizen-based monitoring |
| GWM&ES | • Develop capacity of national and provincial departments and municipalities to carry out M&E themselves  
• Develop a management culture of continuous improvement based on M&E  
• Address problems with data quality and information management  
• National Evaluation System |
OUTCOMES MONITORING - SUCCESSES

- For the first time, we have inter-departmental and intergovernmental plans (the delivery agreements) for key cross-cutting outcomes.

- Process of producing delivery agreements has resulted in a higher level of understanding of the challenges that other departments face, and how the work of the different departments affects each other.

- Quarterly progress reports provide Cabinet with strategic agenda.
  - Ensure that Cabinet regularly focuses on assessing progress with the achievement of the key priorities of government.

- Emphasis on measuring results is working as a catalyst for change in government.
  - Some departments are embracing the approach and focusing on measurable results and improving their data.
  - Good progress against key impact indicators in some sectors, e.g. reduction in crime rates, improvements in health indicators.
OUTCOMES MONITORING….CHALLENGES

- Some Delivery Agreements are too long and detailed with too many indicators – not strategic
- Theory of change not strong enough in some of the Delivery Agreements
- Management culture of public service
  - Lack of focus on measurement of impact – some quarterly reports focus exclusively on progress with activities and do not cover indicators of impact
  - Lack of culture of continuous improvement and lack of culture of coordination
- Information management systems to produce required data not fully in place in many departments, and required data sometimes not available
- Tendency to report on outcomes for compliance reasons, rather than to use reports to analyse progress against key indicators and identify ways of doing things better, to improve impact
- Some reports only focus on the positive – lack of synergy between reported progress and public experience of the quality of service
Our monitoring of the quality of management practices through MPAT assessments indicates general weaknesses in the following areas:

- Supply chain management and procurement
- Human resource management and development
- IT governance
- Service delivery improvement
- M&E

Aim of moderated MPAT self-assessments is to provide a tool for managers to use to improve their management practices:

- Assessments show that, in every management performance area, some departments are able to achieve the highest level 4 ratings
- This indicates that it is possible for all departments to get to that level
- Case studies of good practice are being made available
- Some departments are using the tool as intended and are implementing improvement plans to improve their management practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Non-compliance with legal/regulatory requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Partial compliance with legal/regulatory requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Full compliance with legal/regulatory requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Full compliance and doing things smartly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Performance Area: Monitoring and Evaluation

1.3.1 Indicator name: Use of monitoring and evaluation outputs

**Indicator definition:** Extent to which the department uses monitoring and evaluation information

**Question:** Which set of statements best reflects the department’s use of M&E outputs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Performance level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department does not have an M&amp;E Policy/Framework or capacity to generate information</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring reports are available but are not used regularly by top management and programme managers to track progress and inform improvement</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring reports are regularly used by top management and programme managers to track progress and inform improvement</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All above in Level 3 plus: Evaluations of major programmes are conducted periodically and the results are used to inform changes to programme plans, business processes, APP and strategic plan</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Score in M&E
(based on self-assessments by 103 national and provincial departments)
EVALUATION

- Evaluation is a useful tool for managers to use to carry out deep assessments of the design, efficiency, effectiveness, implementation or impact of programmes, and for identifying improvements
  - To be successful, evaluations must be owned by management and their agreed recommendations must be implemented and monitored – but some managers still see evaluations as punitive
- Cabinet has approved a National Evaluation Policy Framework and annual and three year national evaluation plans
  - 23 evaluations currently underway or being scoped
- So far, two provinces have put in place provincial evaluation plans
- Evaluations in the national evaluation plan are jointly implemented between national departments and DPME
- Management of departments need to propose key programmes for inclusion in national and provincial evaluation plans
- Standards, guidelines and evaluation training programmes have been put in place
MONITORING OF KEY INDICATORS BY FOSAD

- DPME is assisting FOSAD to monitor a range of key indicators of issues over which HoDs have control
  - Improvement targets have been set and regular progress reports are provided to national and provincial DGs

- Some HoDs have acted on this information and there has been progress in a number of areas, e.g.
  - Delivery of school textbooks by provinces (99% delivered on time by January 2013)
  - Reduction in the vacancy rate (18.7% in 4’th quarter 2011/12 to 8.6% in 4’th quarter 2012/13 – partly as a result of departments cleaning up their PERSAL data)
  - Reduction in the average time taken to fill funded vacancies (9 months in 2010 to 3.25 months in 2012)
  - Responsiveness to Presidential Hotline (improved from 39% case resolution rate in November 2009 to 89.5% in Feb 2013)
However, progress is still inadequate in a number of areas, e.g.

- Payment of suppliers within 30 days
  - For the month of December 2012:
    - National departments reported approximately 33,000 invoices worth almost R600 million as being paid after 30 days or being older than 30 days and still not paid
    - Provinces reported approximately 34,000 invoices worth R1.6 billion
  
- Most of the reasons for late payment (provided by departments themselves) relate to weaknesses in internal management

- Some departments have drastically reduced their late payments, indicating that it is possible for all departments to do so

- Putting in place service delivery standards and SDIPs (by Feb 2013 only 65% of departments had submitted for the 2012-2015 cycle)

- Rapid finalisation of disciplinary cases (average of 230 days in 2012)

- Finalisation of anti-corruption hotline cases (39% in Feb 2013)

- Reduction in qualified, adverse and disclaimer audits (44 dept’s in 2011/12)

- Meeting of service delivery standards in health facilities (In 2012 audit only 46% met standards for waiting times, 30% met standards for cleanliness, 46% met standards for availability of medicines)
FRONTLINE SERVICE DELIVERY MONITORING

- DPME and Offices of the Premier visit Home Affairs offices, SASSA offices, police stations, health facilities, drivers’ license testing centres, schools, courts and municipal customer care centres

- Found particular weaknesses with:
  - Cleanliness and day-to-day maintenance of service delivery sites
  - Non-functional complaints management systems
  - Poor or absent queue management and long waiting times

- Objective is to work with departments to use findings as an input into service delivery improvement planning
  - Results shared with management of the facility, regional, provincial and national management of sector departments
  - Poorly rated sites revisited to check if improvement plans are implemented
  - Some improvements at some sites but little improvement at many sites
  - Some managers are not acting on the monitoring information
CONCLUSIONS

- Monitoring sometimes seen as a policing or inspection function, runs risk of promoting malicious compliance rather than real use of M&E to inform improvement.

- But internal or self-monitoring and self-evaluation is an important management tool to enable improved performance.

- M&E should therefore be carried out by all managers, in addition to M&E by external bodies or by dedicated M&E units within departments.
  - Applies to operational issues as well as strategic issues - improvements in service delivery in Department of Home Affairs and SARS have largely been due to operational improvements based on collecting data about work processes, productivity, waiting times and turn-around times, analysing the data, and implementing improvements.

- Development of a management culture of evidence-based continuous improvement is the key challenge.
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