

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE WAYS IN WHICH THE FIVE CASE STUDY DEPARTMENTS OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WESTERN CAPE HAVE ORGANISED THEIR MONITORING AND EVALUATION FUNCTION

SIPHUMEZE CWAYI

A minor dissertation submitted in *partial fulfilment* of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy in Public Policy

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

2011

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature:

Date:

ABSTRACT

In South Africa, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is increasingly becoming important for effective government policy and programme decision making, resource allocation and the implementation of policies, programmes and projects that government decides on. This follows the realization by the South African government that it is not only enough to have good policies and programmes, but that these policies and programmes must yield results. This results focus is supported by Diabre (2002:1) who argues that ‘efficient or well-managed projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no discernible improvement in people’s lives’.

In support of this results orientation in government, the then South African President Thabo Mbeki in his 2004 State of the Nation Address asserted the importance of M&E in supporting the achievement of results. In pursuit of this government objective, the institutionalization of M&E in government departments became a reality. Later, the commitment to M&E was expressed through the development of a government-wide monitoring and evaluation policy framework aimed at providing guidance and informing all national, provincial and local government efforts to institutionalize M&E.

This study looks at five departments in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape as case studies and examines the ways in which they have organized their M&E function. For this purpose, the study describes the five case study departments’ institutional arrangements for the monitoring and evaluation function and reviews their internal M&E policies and strategic frameworks. The analysis of these institutional arrangements is informed by the literature consulted for this study. It is envisaged that lessons drawn from this study will further inform initiatives aimed at institutionalizing the M&E function in other government departments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	6
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	8
1.1 Introduction	8
1.2 Research Design and Methodology	9
1.2.1 Research Design	9
1.2.2 Research Methods	10
1.2.2.1 Data Collection Methods	10
1.3 Structure of the Research	11
1.4 Limitations of the Research	11
1.5 Summary	13
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	14
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Conceptual Framework	14
2.2.1 The Concepts of Monitoring and Evaluation	14
2.2.2 Relationship between Monitoring and Evaluation	20
Table 1: Differences between Monitoring and Evaluation	22
2.3 Origins of Monitoring and Evaluation and Relevant Policy Debates	22
2.3.1 Audit Tradition	23
2.3.2 Social Science Tradition	24
2.3.3 M&E in the Context of Policy Debates	25
2.4 Objectives of M&E	27
2.5 Alternative Approaches and Criteria for Institutionalizing a Monitoring and Evaluation Function	28
2.5.1 Introduction	28
2.5.2 Organizing the M&E Function	29
2.6 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Alternative Arrangements Discussed	35
2.6.1 Advantages	35
2.6.2 Disadvantages	37

2.7 Summary.....	38
CHAPTER THREE: MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN THE CONTEXT OF SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT	40
3.1 Introduction	40
3.2 Regulatory Instruments for M&E.....	41
3.2.1 The Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Framework	41
3.2.2 Treasury Regulation	44
3.3 Public Service Commission	46
3.4 Statistics South African and its Statistical Quality Framework (SASQAF)	47
3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation Related Reforms	48
3.5.1 Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF)	48
3.5.2 National Planning Framework (NPF)	49
3.6 Summary.....	50
CHAPTER 4: THE CASE STUDY: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WESTERN CAPE	51
4.1 Introduction	51
4.2 Post-apartheid History of Government Formation in the Western Cape	51
4.3 Major Reforms Aimed at Improving Effectiveness in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape	52
4.3.1 Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS)	53
4.3.2 Provincial-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System	54
4.4 Provincial Transversal Institutional Arrangements	56
4.4.1 Legislative Structures	56
4.4.2 Executive Structures and Autonomous Bodies.....	58
4.4.2.1 Office of the Auditor General (AG)	58
4.5 Specific M&E Institutional (Organizational) Arrangements in the Five Case Study Departments.....	61
4.5.1 Transversal Institutional Arrangements: Department of the Premier	61
4.6 Line Departments	64
4.6.1 Department of Social Development	65
4.6.2 Department of Local Government and Housing.....	67
4.6.3 Department of Economic Development and Tourism.....	70

4.6.4 Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport	72
4.7 Summary	74
CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS ON THE CASE STUDY	77
5.1 Introduction	77
5.2 Findings	77
5.2.1 Scope and Purpose	78
5.2.2 Institutional Positioning (level and location) and Stewardship or Championing of the M&E Function.....	82
5.2.3 Integration of the M&E with other Institutional Management Functions	84
5.3 Summary	84
CHAPTER 6: ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS FROM THE CASE STUDY AND CONCLUSION.....	86
6.1 Introduction	86
6.2 Analysis of Findings on how the five Case Study Departments have organized their M&E Function.....	86
6.2.1 Scope and Purpose	86
6.2.2 Institutional Positioning (location and level) and Stewardship of the M&E Function	88
6.2.3 Integration of the M&E with other Institutional Management Functions	90
6.3 Conclusion.....	91
6.4 Summary.....	93
REFERENCE	94

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AG	Auditor General
ANC	African National Congress
APP	Annual Performance Plan
AsgiSA	Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative – South Africa
DA	Democratic Alliance
DDG	Deputy Director General
DOPMS	Departmental Organizational Performance Management System
GDS	Growth and Development Strategy
GWM&E	Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation
HOD	Head of the Department
IGRA	Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act of 1997
IDP	Integrated Development Plan
LED	Local Economic Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millenium Development Goals
MEC	Member of the Executive Committee
MEDS	Macro-Economic and Development Strategy
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MTSF	Medium-term Strategic Framework
NFLED	National Framework for Local Economic Development
NFSD	National Framework for Economic Development
NNP	New National Party
NP	National Party
NIPF	National Industrial Policy Development
NPF	National Planning Framework
NPO	Non-Profit Organisation
NSDP	National Spatial Development Perspective
OCAT	Organisational Capacity Assessment Tool
PBS	Performance Budgeting System
PFMA	Public Financial Management Act

PGDS	Provincial Growth and Development Strategy
PSC	Public Service Commission
PWMES	Provincial-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System
QPR	Quarterly Performance Review
SMS	Senior Management Services
TPA	Transfer of Payment Agreement
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION, RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

The growing demand for target-driven service delivery in South Africa is largely based on government realizing that it is not enough to have good policies and programmes in place, but that these policies and programmes must yield results. Currently, the South African public services' focus is increasingly on achieving results and on the mechanisms through which these results can be achieved. Diabre (2002:1) argues that efficient or well-managed projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no discernible improvement in people's lives. This argument is very relevant in defining the thinking that has led to the entrenchment of the notion of accountable governance, performance management and the importance of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the form of target-driven service delivery. This thinking was expressed in the then President Thabo Mbeki's State of the Nation Address in 2004. In his address, the President noted that M&E is critical for the fulfillment of the 'People's Contract', which saw the ruling party returning to power for the third time (Public Service Commission, 2007:29).

In support of this government-wide objective, provinces are working to ensure that this results orientation is also the focus in their respective jurisdictions through building and strengthening of their M&E systems. This study looks at five departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape as case studies and examines how they have organized their M&E function. The purpose is to inform efforts to strengthen the institutionalization of M&E in government in order to have strong M&E systems which serve their purpose and objectives adequately. The study covers the period between 2003 and 2008 which is the period during which the Provincial Government of the Western Cape started institutionalizing M&E.

1.2 Research Design and Methodology

This section is aimed at providing an overview of the research methods used during the investigation that forms the basis of this study. The decision to choose these research methods was informed by the nature and purpose of the research project, the availability of information, and the evident constraints faced by the researcher.

1.2.1 Research Design

1.2.1.1 Problem Statement

There is a growing realization by the South African government that monitoring information and evaluation findings play a critical role in assisting efforts aimed at improving government performance. In the South African public service, this has led to the growing demand for building M&E systems or strengthening the existing ones. The challenge is how to organize an M&E function within the establishment of government departments.

The focus is on the specific challenges regarding the organization of an M&E function in order for the M&E system to produce monitoring information and evaluation findings that will enable the department to improve its performance. This study examines the ways in which the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape have organized their M&E functions within their structures.

1.2.1.2 Research Objective

This study presents an examination of the ways in which five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape have organized their M&E function. The aim of the study is to produce information on which lessons for further institutionalization of M&E in government departments can be drawn. In order to achieve

this, the study reviews the monitoring and evaluation literature of the case study departments.

1.2.1.3 Research Question

The study is guided by and attempts to respond to the following question:

How have the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape organized their M&E function?

1.2.2 Research Methods

1.2.2.1 Data Collection Methods

The study uses qualitative research methods to collect secondary information useful for the research topic. Secondary information sources in the form of departmental reports, and monitoring and evaluation documents were used as sources of information. Specific attention was paid to ensuring that the information used for the purpose of this study was collected and extracted from reliable sources. Documents on monitoring and evaluation developed by each case study department were used in order to draw conclusions in line with the objectives of the study. Furthermore, literature on monitoring and evaluation was consulted and scrutinised in line with the objectives of this study.

1.2.2.2 Sampling

While reasonable efforts were made to ensure that the sampling method used observes proper representation of the departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape, a combination of the following issues led to the selection of the five case study departments against others which could have been included in the case study:

- departments that have documented literature on M&E
- departments that created easy access to their information
- departments with a clearly defined M&E mandate
- departments that had operationalised M&E at the time of data collection.

1.3 Structure of the Research

This study is organised into six chapters. Chapter one covers the research design and methodology. Chapter two reviews the literature on monitoring and evaluation. It focuses on the clarification of concepts and traces the origins monitoring and evaluation. It further surveys the literature that provides insights on various ways of institutionalizing a monitoring and evaluation function in government. The literature forms the framework for the examination of the ways in which the five case study departments have organized their M&E function. Chapter three describes monitoring and evaluation practices within the South African government context. It presents a description of the M&E regulatory framework and other reforms with a specific relevance to monitoring and evaluation in government.

Chapter four introduces the case study. It discusses issues pertaining to how monitoring and evaluation has been institutionalized in the five case study departments. Information presented in this chapter is critical in answering the research question of this study.

Chapter five presents the findings emanating from the case study. This chapter culminates in an analysis of the findings in order to respond to the research question set for this study. Lastly, chapter six presents an analysis of the findings in order to respond to the research question. This chapter also draws conclusions from the discussion presented in this study.

1.4 Limitations of the Research

This study was conducted under evident constraints, and the limitations listed below were identified. While reasonable efforts were made to ensure that the sampling method used observes proper representation of the Western Cape Provincial Government, a combination of the following issues led to the selection of the five case study departments used for this study:

- departments who have documented literature on M&E

- departments who created easy access to their information
- departments with a defined M&E mandate
- departments who have operationalised M&E through engaging in various M&E activities.

The time at which the study was conducted also played a role. The study was conducted before the M&E systems, procedures and methodologies of the case study departments had attained a complete state of maturity. This is the reason why there is inadequate documentation of these M&E related procedures and methodologies from which this study would have benefited. It must also be noted that while the Western Cape Provincial Departments of Education and Community Safety had started to institutionalize M&E at the time of the study, they could not be part of the case study because they did not provide easy access to their documented M&E information. Even those departments that were finally selected to be part of the case study provided source documents that have inadequate information for review purposes. It is due to these limitations that the findings presented in the last chapter are provisional and tentative.

Furthermore, the body of available literature on monitoring and evaluation dealing with the situation in South Africa in particular does not have sufficient content relevant to the purpose of this study. This lack of academic or scholarly literature specific to the South African context led to over-reliance on international literature.

Lastly, the volatile political situation that prevailed in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape during the period of data-collection had significant implications for the already limited accessibility of quality data. The volatile political situation refers to the prevailing mistrust within the ANC as the ruling party, brought about by the party's administrative transition from the then President Mbeki administration to the envisaged Party President Jacob Zuma administration. These party politics manifested in the government machinery in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape and influenced the bureaucracy.

Therefore, consideration of these difficulties also influenced the decision to leave out some departments which would otherwise also have been considered for the case study.

1.5 Summary

This introductory chapter presents the technical research issues that guide this study. Issues pertaining to the research design and methodology are discussed. It also presents the limitations and the structure of the study.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature on monitoring and evaluation. The objective is to present a sound theoretical basis that serves as a guide in responding to the research question.

It is organised as follows: following this introduction, a section on the conceptual framework for the study is presented. This section presents a contextual clarification of monitoring and evaluation in line with the study. This is followed by a section that provides a brief overview of the origins of monitoring and evaluation as well as advantages and disadvantages, drawing on international literature. The last section presents a theoretical overview that serves as a guide for organising an M&E function in government departments. The contents of this section provide criteria for the analysis of the way the case study departments have organised their M&E function.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

It is necessary to define the meaning of monitoring and evaluation and other relevant terms before the main sections of this dissertation are dealt with. This will provide a clear contextual understanding of the meaning of the terminology used.

2.2.1 The Concepts of Monitoring and Evaluation

In a chapter on policy evaluation, Cloete, Wissink and de Coning (2006:246) argue that the purpose of improving the quality of policy outputs and outcomes will be to no avail if one is unable to assess whether the intended targets have been achieved or missed, and by what margin. This argument asserts that good performance feedback systems are needed

to support successful policy, programme and project implementation and performance in the public sector. This conception led to monitoring and evaluation gaining much recognition as a strategic instrument to improve management within the public sector. How then can monitoring and evaluation be defined? These terms are variously defined, and frequently appear together. However, for the purpose of this paper these two terms will be dealt with separately in order to clarify the meaning of each of term.

Monitoring: Various writers have presented differently worded definitions of the concept of monitoring. However, they ultimately point to a similar notion or phenomenon. The United Nations Development Programme (2002:15) defines monitoring as an ‘integral part of the day-to-day management of projects and programmes’. This definition was further refined. It was then defined as the collection and analysis of data to equip management in government departments and their programmes, as well as stakeholders and the public, with accurate data about progress and performance. In a similar definition, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2002:14) describe monitoring as ‘the day-to-day management task of collecting and reviewing information that reveals how an operation is proceeding and what aspects of it, if any, need correcting’. Similarly, UNICEF (1991:13) defines monitoring as the continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. A similar contribution by Arild (2001:15) refers to the concept as ‘the measure of the efficiency with which inputs and budgets are converted into outputs’.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2002:05) advances an argument that defines monitoring as a continuous management function that aims primarily at providing regular feedback and early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of intended programme results. It further suggests that monitoring tracks the actual performance against what was planned or expected according to pre-determined standards. According to this definition, monitoring generally involves collecting and analyzing data on programme processes and results, and

recommending corrective measures. This is similar to a definition suggested by Patton (2008:129) which notes that monitoring is primarily concerned with assessing the outcomes of a programme without any in-depth examination of the programme.

In an attempt to provide a working definition for monitoring, Scriven (1991:7) describes the following as constituting monitoring:

- it identifies what has changed and what is needed through an ongoing process
- it is a management tool that provides information needed to make decisions
- it makes it possible to identify of what is working well and what is not early on, so that successful actions can be replicated and solutions for difficulties sought before it is too late.

Considering all the contributions cited above, monitoring can be said to provide the following:

- it helps to ensure effective use of resources
- it provides an ongoing picture of activities
- it promotes ownership of the project activities
- it contributes to sustainability and builds capacity
- it results in individual and group learning
- it enables transfer of learning to other situations.

In the light of this conceptualization of monitoring, it can be argued that monitoring can provide answers to the questions ‘What?’, ‘Where?’, ‘When?’, and ‘How much?’ or ‘How many?’ Therefore, monitoring is important for assessing if something is being done, and if it is being done as intended; if it is being done where and when intended; and if it is being done as much as intended. In particular, monitoring information is useful for assessing adherence to and changes in policies, procedures, and progress towards achieving objectives.

Evaluation: The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (2000:6) refers to evaluation as the systematic and objective assessment of an ongoing or

completed operation, programme or policy, its design, implementation and results. It notes that the assessment is conducted with the purpose of determining the relevance, fulfillment of objectives, efficiency effectiveness, impact and sustainability of that particular policy or programme. In a similar argument, the UNDP (2002:10) contends that ‘evaluation, unlike monitoring, which should be carried out for all programmes and projects, is carried out more selectively for practical reasons to assess policy, programme or project success or failure’.

Alkin (1990:81) argues that evaluation refers to the action of methodically gathering, examining and reporting information that can lead to alteration of viewpoints or the betterment of the way in which a project or programme is implemented. He further asserts that ‘the word *systematic* stipulates that the evaluation must be planned and the plan should be aimed at obtaining information that will answer the specific questions of specified potential users’. This implies that there must be a clear understanding of what the evaluation is intended for, and of the process that is to be followed when it is conducted. The process involves agreement on questions to be addressed, identification of the appropriate information, collection and analysis of data, and drawing justifiable conclusions from the data.

Alkin (1990:81) further argues that ‘evaluation is the assignment of worth or value according to a set of criteria and standards, which can be either explicit or implicit’. This viewpoint means that evaluation is valuable in obtaining information that can be used to determine the merits or worth of a programme, practice or policy. This concept of evaluation is particularly important in policy decision making because it informs decisions on alternative policy directions based on the consideration of the merits and worth of all possible alternatives. This viewpoint is shared by Segone (2008b:121) when he notes that evaluation is about extracting a true value of an action in order to determine what benefits were made to the lives of those affected by the action.

In a description of key concepts and issues in programme evaluation and performance measurement, MacDavid and Hawthorn (2006:3) assert that evaluation is a planned and

controlled process that produces and examines information with the intended purpose of lessening the degree of doubt for stakeholders about a given policy or programme. This definition, like the others presented in this section, emphasizes that evaluation is a means to an end. It is a means in the sense that it is a process through which the evaluator reaches a point of decision making based on the evaluation findings. This means that evaluation findings inform decision making.

Weiss (1991:217) provides a simplified version of the arguments presented above. The author argues that evaluations are undertaken with the purpose of assisting decision makers to make wiser decisions through the provision of evidence that indicates the successes and limitations of the programme. This is a simplified summary of the inputs presented above.

Mostly, evaluation activities take either a formative or a summative approach. It is critical that these two approaches are defined for the conceptual understanding of the context of this study. Formative and summative evaluations are defined as follows:

Formative Evaluation

MacDavid and Hawthorn (2006:21) define formative evaluation as a form of evaluation concerned with the analysis of the implementation of a programme. They identify that formative evaluation provides information that enables managers and other stakeholders of the programme to improve the programme as it is implemented. Similarly, Rossi, Lipsey and Freeman (2004:63) argue that formative evaluation 'is an evaluation that is undertaken to provide information that will inform the efforts to be made in order to improve the programme'.

Another similar definition is provided by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) (2004:5). It asserts that a formative evaluation focuses on collecting data on programme operations so that necessary changes or modifications can be made to the programme in its early stages.

Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation refers to the evaluation activities conducted with the objective of providing a summarized judgement on critical aspects significant to the performance of the programme. The aim is to judge whether the goals or objectives set for a programme are achieved or not (Rossi et al, 2004:65). The main concern in this case is to assess whether the programme yields the intended benefits it is meant for. Findings of summative evaluation influence significant decisions about the continuation of the programme, allocation of resources, the need for restructuring or taking legal action depending on the findings (Rossi et al, 2004:36). It is of critical importance that findings are adequately plausible in order to inspire the necessary confidence needed in order for decision makers to take action.

Distinction between Evaluation and Research

This section attempts to provide an academic distinction between evaluation and research, in order to avoid ambiguity. Presentation of the distinction between evaluation and research is important because the focus on evaluation is new in South Africa, while in the past it has been on research as an enquiry.

In exploring the differences between research and evaluation, Scriven (2003:7) holds the view that research is extensive disciplined enquiry, while evaluation is disciplined determination of merit, worth or value. He argues that the evaluation process identifies what is to be evaluated, applies relevant values or standards, and conducts experiential enquiry through using techniques from the social sciences. Conclusions drawn are then put together with the standards into a full evaluation. Scriven further asserts that in contrast, research does not aim to achieve evaluative conclusions but bases its conclusions only on factual results. This further suggests that, unlike in evaluation, in research there is no effort made to institute standards or values and integrate them with factual results in order to draw evaluative conclusions. The fact that research is meant to be value free makes it different from evaluation.

In their presentation of differences between evaluation and research in terms of purpose, Smith and Brandon (2008:189) state that evaluation particularizes while research generalizes. While evaluation is designed to improve something, research is designed to prove something, and while evaluation provides a basis for decision making, research provides the basis for drawing conclusions.

In view of the argument presented above, it is evident that evaluation results may have a more direct effect on decisions taken about what was evaluated, and that research needs a greater accumulation of knowledge which might be realized through a series of research studies in order to determine a decision or a course of action. Therefore, the major differences between evaluation and research are found in the aspects of particularization and generalization, orientation on decisions and orientation on conclusions.

2.2.2 Relationship between Monitoring and Evaluation

Both monitoring and evaluation are management tools. In the case of monitoring, information for tracking progress according to previously agreed programme plans and schedules is gathered on an ongoing basis. Monitoring provides early indications of progress, or lack thereof, in the achievement of results (UNICEF, 1991:3). Thus the application of monitoring in any programme also helps to identify discrepancies between actual and planned implementation, leading to the identification of corrective actions. Therefore, monitoring provides early warnings when something is going wrong in the implementation of a programme or the execution of a programme's activities.

As described above, evaluation is defined as a selective exercise that attempts to systematically and objectively assess progress towards and the achievement of an outcome (UNDP, 2002:6). While monitoring is ongoing, evaluation is more episodic. It is facilitated by monitoring but utilises additional sources of information. This means that the information gathered through a monitoring process is used during evaluation. Many sources of information for evaluation are identified during project or programme reviews when there is a need to understand why inputs did not lead to planned outputs. Evaluation

focuses on specific questions related to effectiveness and impact in order to influence future programmes or services (UNICEF, 1991:3). This description is supported by Patton (2008:129) when he notes that findings from monitoring data can generate questions to be answered by evaluation through more in-depth enquiry, helping to focus and increase the utility of scarce evaluation resources.

In order to determine the effects of programme activities on the intended beneficiaries during implementation, evaluation, and especially process evaluation is vital. The identification of the effects of a programme for the beneficiaries can lead to the modification of programme activities.

Considering the above argument, it can be further argued that the relationship between monitoring and evaluation is a logical one, i.e. the information produced through a monitoring exercise is then utilized during evaluation. The results obtained from evaluations in turn form a basis for monitoring or help to identify areas in the programme which need closer monitoring and reporting. This enables programme managers to have a clear understanding of the programme. The argument presented above indicates how monitoring and evaluation complement each other.

While the above discussion explains the relationships between monitoring and evaluation, the following table outlines the differences between the two terms in order to give a clear understanding of what each one of them is and is not. The table was developed by the researcher.

Table 1: Differences between Monitoring and Evaluation

MONITORING	EVALUATION
Ongoing/regular collection of data	Periodic and time bound collection of data
Continuous comparison of actual results with targets	Exploration of intended and unintended results at specific times throughout the lifespan of an intervention and after the intervention
Alerts to problems and relevant changes that could be made in the monitoring process	Provides lessons about accomplishments, and provides recommendations at the end of the intervention
Predominantly an internal function	Could be internal, but often external
Reports on effectiveness, efficiency and process	Reports on effectiveness, efficiency, outcome, impact sustainability and relevance

2.3 Origins of Monitoring and Evaluation and Relevant Policy Debates

In government, the institutionalization and entrenchment of an evidence-based decision making process emanates from the growing realization that there is a need to improve government performance. There is globally a wealth of information associated with measuring and tracking developmental progress. The objective is to ensure that government provides value for money in the utilization of limited resources in rendering services to the people.

This section explores literature that traces the origins of monitoring and evaluation practices. Reference is made to two competing but mutually supportive traditions, namely the audit and social science traditions. It also presents policy related debates on M&E in order to further contextualize it's the understanding for this study.

2.3.1 Audit Tradition

This study traces the evolution of evaluation research from two traditions. The Development Assistance Committee (1998:16) argues that evaluation evolved from the audit and social science traditions. These two traditions have important similarities and differences as well as links. The audit tradition is characterized by an investigative orientation found in financial management and accounting (Development Assistance Committee, 1998:16). It seeks to provide answers to questions such as whether the programme did what was planned, and if the money was spent within the rules, regulations, and requirements. Concepts like internal controls, good management, governance, and verification are central to the audit tradition. Its major orientation is its emphasis on accountability and compliance. Fontaine and Monnier (2002:68) identify three different types of auditing that relate to evaluation:

- Standard audit is ‘an independent, objective assurance activity designed to add value and improve an organization’s operations. It helps an organization accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to assess and improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes’.
- Financial audit is ‘an audit that focuses on compliance with applicable statutes and regulations’.
- Performance audit is ‘an audit that is concerned with relevance, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness’.

The argument presented above about the origins of evaluation from an audit tradition provides similar though different kinds of information about compliance, accountability, impact, and results. Tracing the origins of evaluation from an auditing perspective reveals some overlaps in areas such as efficiency of operations and cost effectiveness. Evaluation is concerned with the analysis of policy and outputs, and auditing with internal financial controls and management systems. A factor worth noting that makes auditing and evaluation specifically related, is their common objective of aiming to help decision makers by providing them with systematic and credible information that can be useful in

the creation, management, oversight, change, and review of programmes. While there are these commonalities, there are also some marked differences, e.g. auditing focuses on outputs, while evaluation focuses on outcomes (Picciotto, 2005:7).

Smith (1995: 299) asserts that, performance auditing leads to the unintended consequences of limiting innovation and rigid systems of measurement. The other noted limitation in respect of evaluation audit is that performance audits focus more on ensuring financial compliance than on the notion of value for money. This means that financial audits are mostly concerned about whether financial controls were adhered to and are less about assessing the results attained through the utilization of funds.

2.3.2 Social Science Tradition

In an argument similar to the one advanced by the Development Assistance Committee (1998:16), Henry (1990:113) reasons that monitoring and evaluation emanated from two traditions, namely performance auditing and evaluation research. He further argues that social scientists initiated evaluation research in order to use scientific principles in the analysis of public policy initiatives. This is in line with the argument advanced by Smith (2004:1) which traces evaluation from the evident ideological battles throughout the world. Smith argues that there is a need for reasons to support beliefs, and there is a need for evidence to ground ideologies. He further suggests that, from the onset, evaluations were used as sources of evidence to understand the implications and guide the actions of ideology (Smith, 2004:2). The Dictionary of the Social Sciences (2002:350) asserts that evaluation relies on both scientific and social research methods, and that the scientific method refers to research methodologies that pursue verifiable knowledge through the analysis of empirical data. Scriven (1991:83) makes a similar observation when he notes that little evaluation can be done without using social sciences methods. However, it cannot be claimed that evaluation is the application of social science methods to solve social problems. It is much more than that.

On the relation between social sciences and evaluation, Scriven (1991:83) outlines a number of differences. He suggests that evaluation determines the merit, worth, or value of things. The evaluation process identifies relevant values or standards that apply to what is being evaluated, performs empirical investigation using techniques from the social sciences, and then integrates conclusions with the standards into an overall evaluation or set of evaluations. Social science research, by contrast, does not aim for or achieve evaluative conclusions. It is restricted to empirical (rather than evaluative) research, and bases its conclusions only on factual results, that are observed, measured, or calculated data. Social science research does not establish standards or values and then integrate them with factual results to reach evaluative conclusions. In fact, the dominant social science doctrine for many decades prided itself on being value free. Therefore, says Scriven, social science research excludes evaluation (Scriven, 1991: 83).

In the context of governance, as governments and organizations moved from questions about verification and compliance to questions about impact and results, social science techniques were incorporated into evaluation. Emphasizing the fact that evaluation relies on social science research, Rossi et al (2004:9) assert that evaluation uses a variety of scientific methods such as observation, development of hypotheses, and predictions based on hypothesis experimentations, and methods from the social sciences like sociology, anthropology, statistics, and political science. This view is further supported by Babbie, Mouton, Vorster and Prozesky (2001:369) when they argue that evaluation is that field of (applied) social science that uses the whole range of social science methods in assessing or evaluating social intervention programmes. Therefore, evaluation draws heavily on social science research from which it originated.

2.3.3 M&E in the Context of Policy Debates

The above discussion has shown that irrespective of its origins either from an audit or a social science tradition, monitoring and evaluation instrumental in policy debates. Regardless of origins, monitoring and evaluation make significant contributions to policy analysis. Various authors advance a number of issues suggesting that monitoring and

evaluation is fundamental to policy analysis. This section describes some of these contributions and puts them into context for this study. Debates raised in this section complement the assumption that institutionalizing M&E assists in improving government performance.

Introducing the concept of evidence-based policy making, Segone (2008a:8) asserts that monitoring and evaluation plays a vital role in influencing the policy making process. He argues that monitoring and evaluation supply exclusive information regarding the policies' programme' and the project's performance (Segone, 2008a:8). Davies (1999:153) states that monitoring and evaluation helps policy, programme and project planners to use the best available evidence upon which informed decisions can be made in the policy process. It is also worth noting that it is not always the case that the best available evidence is used in policy decisions. Segone (2008a:27) also holds the view that most governments are moving towards evidence-based policy making but are still at the stage of evidence-influenced policy where policy decisions are influenced by evidence which can be manipulated to suit the interests of politicians. He attributes this to the fact that a policy making process is inherently political, and that the process through which evidence translates into policy options often fails to meet the required quality standards. Segone (2008a:27) further notes that not all sources of evidence are adequately sound to form the basis of policy making.

There is therefore a relationship between evaluation and policy decision making, as policy decision makers may need information from evaluation processes for policy formation, in order to assess or justify the need for a new programme. Decision makers may also need information from evaluation processes for policy execution in order to ensure that the programme is implemented in the most cost effective way. Information may also be needed for accountability in public decision making to determine the effectiveness of a programme and the need for its continuation, modification or termination.

2.4 Objectives of M&E

While there may be different contexts and purposes for the implementation of M&E and for the utilization of its outputs, Bedi, Coudouel, Cox, Goldstein and Thornton (2006:10) present the following common objectives for M&E:

- to support government decision making on policies, budgetary priorities, and the continuous updating and improvement of government programmes
- to support the accountability of government to the public for its policy choices and their impact to promote evidence-based dialogue between government and the public on development policies and priorities
- to supports the reporting requirements of government for its own accountability and for program management purposes.

All these objectives can be met when monitoring information and evaluation findings provide decision makers with an understanding of the benefits to the lives of those affected by the action that is monitored or evaluated. This is only possible if monitoring information and evaluation findings are considered when decisions are made.

The UNDP (2002:6) argues that the objective of monitoring and evaluation is to enhance an organization's development learning. Learning from the past contributes to more informed decision making about what has worked and needs to be kept and improved on, and about what has not worked that needs to be considered differently depending on what the learning has revealed. Better decisions lead to greater accountability, and more accountability leads to better transparency. Transparency, in turn, leads to better participation by the broader masses of stakeholders. Monitoring and evaluation also provide information that can be used to enhance advocacy for policies, programmes and resources. Ultimately, they all improve performance and responsiveness of government policies and programmes for those whom they are targeting (UNDP, 2002:6).

Mackay (2008:170) notes that M&E can measure the performance of government policies, programmes and projects. He remarks that in measuring government performance, M&E enable the identification of what works, what does not and why.

Therefore, they support policy making, enhance transparency and support accountability by revealing the extent to which government has attained its desired objectives.

However, despite the positive gains that can be obtained from M&E, building an M&E culture in government has certain demands. The institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation calls for the development of institutional capability. Reinforcing public institutional competence is not straightforward, not even in the best democracies. The reinforcement of public institutional competence has major implications on technical training and administrative reform. One of the major implications is the cost of building capacity and the openness to change of those who are earmarked to benefit from the capacity development initiatives. This requires proper change management processes which are also not achieved very easily or without resistance. In the event of formidable resistance to change, the situation is likely to derail the noble intentions of introducing monitoring and evaluation with all its benefits.

2.5 Alternative Approaches and Criteria for Institutionalizing a Monitoring and Evaluation Function

2.5.1 Introduction

This section surveys the literature that describes the options presented by various authors on how institutions and organizations have structured or can organize their M&E functions. It provides a synthesis of various writers' recommendations on the issues pertinent in organizing an M&E function. The sources of the literature surveyed take the form of both real-world application documents, and scholarly publications.

Therefore, the literature surveyed in this section provides a synthesis of applied, general and authoritative information that serves as a guide on organizing an M&E function. The general guiding literature is taken from South African government M&E policy framework documents as well as academic literature contributed by various authors on the topic. This will form the basis for the examination of the ways in which the five case

study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape have organized their M&E function.

2.5.2 Organizing the M&E Function

Simister (2009:1) argues that the M&E function must be such that it enables the institution to collect, analyze, summarize and use information. In order for an institution to be able to do this, it must define its monitoring and evaluation policies, practices and processes. An M&E function is intended to facilitate a clear sequence of events based on critical reflection and managerial action, in response to an analysis of the relationships between the deployment of inputs; the generation of service delivery outputs; and their associated outcomes and impacts (Presidency: 2001:9). Simister (2009:1) refers to this as the design of the M&E function and provides a description of the methodology for designing an M&E function. The methodology he describes identifies a number of stages but fails to cover the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation function. In terms of this methodology, the following criteria have been identified as being relevant for the context of this study.

2.5.2.1 Defining the Scope and Purpose

Defining the scope and purpose of the M&E function entails establishing what the M&E function is and what it is meant for (Simister, 2009:2). Defining the scope means giving a clear view of what a monitoring and evaluation function is within the context of a particular organization, i.e. whether the M&E function's scope will be limited to gather information and summarize progress, or whether it will be carried out against a pre-defined set of objectives and indicators. Furthermore, an understanding of whether the scope of the M&E function will include elements such as baseline studies, reporting, learning mechanisms and data storage is also needed (Simister, 2009:2). In emphasizing the importance of the need for defining the scope and purpose of the M&E function, the Public Service Commission (2007:4) argues that it is crucial for government departments to clearly specify appropriate performance areas that need to be monitored. It further

states that clarity in this regard also assists in the decision making on allocation of resources to these performance areas for proper monitoring during implementation (Public Service Commission, 2007:4).

Sometimes the scope can be broadened to include planning with monitoring and evaluation in one function. It is critical to clarify the boundaries when defining the scope of the M&E function. This means that the scope of the M&E function must cover all its defined areas but should not transcend its boundaries in order for it to be effective and efficient. The definition of the scope helps to define the scale of the task (Simister, 2009:2).

The Public Service Commission emphasizes the notion of including M&E in the planning process, thus ensuring that the scope of M&E also includes supporting the planning process (2008:9). It argues that the scope of M&E should include a mediation role in the political and administrative processes where the judgments and power of key decision makers play a primary role. It further suggests that an M&E mediation role can be achieved through the production of valid evidence in order to ensure objectivity in the policy decision making process (Public Service Commission, 2008:10). More practically, the Public Service Commission (2008:11) promotes that measuring progress against the objectives, outputs, indicators and targets in the plans, in form of monthly and quarterly reports, must be within the scope of the M&E function in government departments.

Once the scope has been outlined, a clear identification of the purpose of the monitoring and evaluation function must be provided. Some institutions set their monitoring and evaluation function to allow them each to be accountable to different stakeholders, and to initiate learning in order to improve performance in current or future projects or programmes (Simister, 2009:2).

Alkin (1990:86) argues that there are a number of purposes for which the M&E function can be used in institutions. He makes specific reference to evaluation and maintains that the purpose of evaluation is to elaborate practice. Evaluation discovers knowledge,

principles and techniques which, if applied, will improve practice. Elaborating on the argument about the purpose of evaluation, Alkin (1990:87) states that evaluation informs the public about what the practitioners are doing, thus making the practitioners more accountable to the external audience.

In a study that presents a comparative analysis of the ways in which Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay governments have organized their monitoring and evaluation functions, Zaltsman (2006:3) identifies five broad categories of purpose of M&E functions in these countries. These categories are: informing national planning; supporting sector policy and program design, and fine-tuning; informing the budget allocation process; encouraging continuous management improvement; and enhancing transparency and accountability. Argentina's M&E function was built with the purpose of informing the budget allocation process, encouraging management improvement, and enhancing transparency and accountability. The M&E functions in Chile, Colombia and Costa Rica emerged in the context of reform initiatives that were especially concerned with reinforcing the government's capacity to undertake effective national planning, and to align government policies and national strategic priorities (Zaltsman, 2006:4).

The scope and purpose identified in the South African Policy Framework for the Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System are similar to the description provided above. In this document, the scope is identified as provision of accurate and reliable information on the state and performance of public bodies (2007b:9). It is envisaged that through establishing the required standards for data collection, collation and analysis, provision of accurate and reliable information on the state and performance of public bodies can be achieved.

In its description of the two concepts 'monitoring' and 'evaluation', the above Policy Framework alludes to the functional purpose of each of these two concepts. These functional purposes, captured in the description of monitoring and evaluation within the context of South Africa, address the issue of the purpose of an M&E function. Monitoring must provide managers, decision makers and other stakeholders with regular

feedback on progress in project implementation and with results, and serve as early indicators of problems that need to be corrected (Presidency, 2007b:1). Evaluation must provide credible and useful information to answer specific questions in order to guide decision making by staff, managers and policy makers. Evaluation can further allow for the assessment of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of programmes. It can also assist in the realization of the aim of making government a learning institution (Presidency, 2007b:2).

The argument presented above is also expressed in a similar fashion by Segone (2008b: 17), when he asserts that monitoring and evaluation should produce evidence that is instrumental in improving relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of policy reform. Likewise, Mackay (2008:170) supports the concept presented above regarding the purpose of monitoring and evaluation when he argues that monitoring information and evaluation findings can be useful to government in that they support policy making (especially performance-based budgeting) and planning, enhance transparency and support accountability by revealing the extent to which government has attained its desired objectives.

While the Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Framework document outlines monitoring and evaluation at a country wide level, it presents useful general insights into how a monitoring and evaluation function or system can be organized. These can also be followed at provincial, local and departmental level, or by any public institution.

The above contributions by various authors reveal certain commonalities on the possible purposes of an M&E function. Although their arguments originate from different viewpoints, there are marked commonalities on issues raised regarding the purpose of an M&E function and its organization.

2.5.2.2 Institutional Positioning (level and location) and Championship or Stewardship of the M&E Function

It is also important to consider where the M&E function will be placed in an institution (Simister, 2009:5). This must take into account the levels at which plans are made and information is collected, analyzed, summarized, shared and used. This consideration must also take note of the fact that information collected at one level can be analyzed, summarized and used at a variety of different levels. Depending on the complexity of an institution, the levels identified can include global, national, district and project level programmes (Simister, 2009:5). It must be noted that each of these levels has its own cycle of planning, monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes. It is also important that the location of the M&E function promotes the free flow of information and that the function must command the necessary support from the institution.

Mackay (2008:176) emphasizes the importance of stewardship to drive the design, development and management of an M&E function. He argues that it helps to have an institutional lead of the M&E function closer to the center of government or the center of a particular institution. He further asserts that an M&E function benefits from being driven by a powerful senior official who is able to lead and drive the institutionalization of M&E, who is able to persuade colleagues about its priority, and who can devote significant resources to the M&E function. Therefore, the location and the caliber of the champion of an M&E system within an institution play a pivotal role in its success.

Mackay (2008:178) argues that in order to champion a well performing M&E function, it is important to have well trained officials in the M&E unit. He further suggests that while it is important to have M&E staff well trained on M&E tools, methods, approaches and concepts, it is equally important to ensure that M&E staff is able to oversee and manage evaluations and understand the strengths and limitations of various types of M&E.

The argument presented above regarding the institutional positioning and championship of the M&E accentuate that institutional arrangements and capacity building must be

considered carefully when establishing an M&E system or function in a government institution.

2.5.2.3 Integration of the M&E Function with other Management Functions of an Institution

Zaltsman (2006:18) notes that one of the greatest challenges that M&E system designers face originates in the fact that these systems are usually created with the objective to address the information needs of a variety of stakeholders. The South African Policy Framework for the Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System proposes a working solution to this challenge. The document notes that the institutionalizing of an M&E function must include a clear outline of how M&E processes will relate to planning, budgeting, programme implementation, project management, financial management and the reporting processes of an institution (2007:18). The Public Service Commission promotes locating M&E function closer to the planning process in order to ensure that the evidence produced through M&E processes informs the planning process (Public Service Commission, 2008:10). This institutional arrangement of placing M&E in the proximity of the planning function enables proper planning and integration of M&E, both critical management functions of any government department.

The need for the integration of the M&E function with other management functions is also supported by Mackay (2008:175). He notes that achieving real demand for M&E is not easy but that this can be influenced through making sure that the system produces useful information which supports planning, budgeting and other decisions. The findings of the M&E function must provide useful information to improve government performance in terms of accountability and service delivery. Furthermore, institutional arrangements must promote proper integration of the M&E function with other fundamental functions of the institution. It is envisaged that if there is proper integration which allows for the utilization of monitoring information and & evaluation findings in other key management functions of the institution, there will be a greater demand for M&E.

Another important aspect that needs to be considered in order to foster integration of the M&E function with other management functions of the institution is the structure of both the institution and the M&E unit. On the institution's structure, Sivagnanasothy (2007:5) maintains that when the M&E institutions and the planning institutions function in isolation and when there are no effective formalized feedback arrangements to integrate M&E lessons into the planning and design of new projects and programmes, these institutional gaps defeat the very purpose of monitoring and evaluation. He further suggests that it is necessary to establish strong links between the M&E function and policy formulation, planning, budgeting and resource allocation functions. This is of critical importance in ensuring that M&E outputs feed into the planning and resource allocation decision making process. It further suggests that monitoring information and evaluation findings are critical in the policy development and decision making process.

Therefore, these arguments advocate that the structure of an institution must be such that all these interrelated functions are considered carefully when organizing an M&E function. This calls for institutional arrangements that locate monitoring and evaluation closer to other strategic functions of the organization like policy formulation, planning, budgeting and resource allocation in order to establish proper links and alignment for maximum benefits.

2.6 Advantages and Disadvantages of the Alternative Arrangements Discussed

2.6.1 Advantages

The above discussion emphasizes that it is important to determine the scope of the M&E function. Identification of the scope of the M&E function assists in understanding the boundaries of the function or the system against other institutional management functions. Understanding the boundaries (in terms of where the M&E function begins and ends) of the M&E function assists in the pursuit of integrating the M&E function with other related and mutually supportive institutional management functions. As noted by Simister (2009:2), the scope of M&E function can be broadened to include planning

together with monitoring and evaluation under one function. This is particularly important in promoting the uptake of M&E findings into the planning and resource allocation decision making process. The greater the uptake of informative M&E findings is in any planning or decision making process in government, the better the realization of improved relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of policy and programme reform will be.

Determining the purpose of the M&E function helps to identify its efficiency against the expectations of a policy or programme. The advantage of ensuring that the purpose of the M&E function is clearly understood limits the possibility of the function being contaminated by other institutional processes which are outside the competence of the M&E staff. This further assist in the effective utilization of the resources allocated to the M&E function. The more the function is clearly focused on its purpose, the more efficient it can be in producing its outputs timeously. As argued above, M&E outputs must support the planning process; it is therefore critical that these outputs are produced on time in order to continue supporting all the phases of the planning processes. This can be achieved when the critical M&E outputs or findings are produced and used in the planning process within reasonable time.

The institutional positioning (level and location) and championing of the M&E function influences the utilization of M&E information. Mackay (2008:176) asserts that stewardship to drive the design, development and management of the M&E system is critical for the success of the M&E system. He further suggests that a powerful champion in the form of a high-ranking official is needed who is able to lead the institutionalization of M&E, persuade colleagues about its priority and devote significant resources to create an M&E system. Therefore, if such a champion is found early in the institutionalization of M&E, the advantage is that M&E is likely to be instrumental in the effort to improve governance in the institution. It is equally important that if the M&E function is located in the office of an official who commands respect, the system is likely to yield the necessary support needed to integrate with other management functions in the institution.

Mackay (2008:176) makes reference to the success of the M&E systems in countries like Chile, Colombia and Australia in illustrating the importance of the location and stewardship of the M&E system function.

Institutionalising M&E can improve accountability and effectiveness. Alkin (1990:87) notes that evaluation informs the public about what the practitioners are doing, thus making the practitioners more accountable to the external audience; this can serve to stimulate better performance and accountability. If civil society is informed about what is happening in government, it is likely to participate more in government business, and this can influence accountability in government officials. When officials know that they are accountable, they are likely to improve their performance.

2.6.2 Disadvantages

Mackay (2008:177) maintains that utilization of M&E findings is the measure of success of an M&E function. He further argues that poor utilization of M&E findings is detrimental to M&E systems. Poor utilization can be a result of officials within the organization who do not support the vision of an M&E. Mackay (2008:179) suggests that the main opponent to M&E is a public sector environment where it is difficult for managers to perform to high standards and perform consistently. He argues that this can be overcome by means of incentivizing the intensive use of M&E information. Although Mackay does not identify the type of incentives that should be made available to promote the intensive use of M&E information. However, it is likely that there will be cost implications and a need for more resources and time, beyond what is required to set up an M&E system, to create interest for M&E and to build a demand for it. This can be a costly exercise given the need for the institution to support other management functions besides M&E.

Mackay (2008:178) comments that another notable disadvantage of institutionalizing an M&E function is that it takes time to recruit qualified staff, to create and strengthen data

systems, to plan, manage and conduct evaluations, and to build systems for sharing M&E information among other functions within the institution. Training of staff to use M&E information in their day-to-day work also takes time. This means that the effect of M&E on improving governance will only be felt after a period of time, as it takes a long time for staff to be able to use M&E information in programme operations, policy analysis or advice.

Institutionalization of M&E demands that M&E information is made public. Alkin (1990:87) notes that evaluation informs the public about what the practitioners are doing, thus making the practitioners more accountable to the external audience; this can be dangerous to poor performing institutions. It can lead to public contestation of government institutions and, if not managed properly, it can exacerbate the delays in instituting the necessary improvements aimed at turning around issues of governance. If adverse M&E information is published, this can be detrimental to the political landscape if not managed properly. Where there is no political will to look positively to the M&E information, M&E can be the foundation of bad politicking which does not augur well for ensuring a government that learns. Some information may be politically sensitive and overly embarrassing to government. When this happens, it is likely to lead to a situation whereby funding for programmes that do not perform well can be withheld. While this is good for the cost benefit analysis, services rendered under the withheld programmes can be affected tremendously, and beneficiaries of those services bear the brunt.

2.7 Summary

In this chapter, literature on M&E was reviewed. A discussion was presented that explores the concepts of monitoring and evaluation in terms of their significance for the context of this study. The focus was on presenting the differences and the relationship between monitoring and evaluation, and the origins and policy related debates on monitoring and evaluation. The chapter further provided a discussion on other institutional issues to be considered when organizing an M&E function. These include consideration of scope and purpose, institutional positioning and stewardship of the

M&E, and integration of M&E with other management functions. The chapter further described the advantages and disadvantages of institutionalizing an M&E function.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER THREE: MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN THE CONTEXT OF SOUTH AFRICAN GOVERNMENT

3.1 Introduction

In his State of the Nation Address of 2004, the then South African President Thabo Mbeki identified M&E as pivotal to the fulfillment of the 'People's Contract', which saw the ruling party return to power for the third time (Public Service Commission, 2007:29). The statement above is viewed to be in line with the government's aim of fundamentally transforming South Africa into a developmental state. Furthermore, the realization by the South African that an effective state is essential to achieving sustainable socio-economic development informed the need to institutionalize tools and instruments through which government performance can be measured. Mackay (2002:1) notes that M&E has the potential to support this realization and support sound governance in three ways. These are, firstly, to inform government resource allocation decisions in the annual budget process and in the planning for government programmes; secondly, to support the design and ongoing management of government policies, programmes, projects and service delivery; and thirdly, to enhance transparency and accountability. These uses of M&E stress its importance for evidence-based policy making, management, and accountability (Mackay, 2002:1). It is worth noting that while the ideal scenario is for M&E to be instituted in government, M&E information nevertheless has to be utilized for government to be effective, and this, in turn, requires strong incentives for utilization (Mackay, 2002:1).

In South Africa, the growing demand for a target-driven service delivery is largely based on the realization by the government that it is not enough to have good policies and programmes, but that these policies and programmes must yield results. Currently, the South African public service's main focus is on results, and the mechanisms to achieve these results. Diabre (2002:1) argues that efficient or well-managed projects and outputs will lose their relevance if they yield no discernible improvement in people's lives. This argument is very relevant in defining the thinking that has led to the entrenchment of the

notion of accountable governance, performance management and the importance of monitoring and evaluation in the form of target driven service delivery in South Africa. In support of this government-wide objective, provinces are working to ensure that this orientation towards results is also the order of the day in their respective jurisdictions through building and strengthening of their M&E systems.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss M&E as it applies within the context of the South African government. The chapter also leads to the discussion of how the monitoring and evaluation function has been organized by the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape. The aim is to draw country-wide broad issues related to M&E before presenting those issues that are specific to the Provincial Government of the Western Cape.

The chapter is organized as follows: following this introduction, the next section describes the regulatory framework of M&E in South Africa. This is followed by a short discussion on the reforms that have specific relevance to monitoring and evaluation. The last section provides a summary of the chapter.

3.2 Regulatory Instruments for M&E

3.2.1 The Government-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

During President Mbeki's second term of office, the South African government realized the need to improve governance and enhance the effectiveness of public service institutions (Presidency, 2005:6). This realization found expression in the approval by Cabinet of a process aimed at developing a government-wide monitoring and evaluation system. A Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation Policy Framework (GWM&E) was then developed. The policy framework applies to national, provincial and local spheres of government and covers three data areas: (1) programme performance, (2) evaluations, and (3) social, economic and demographic data (Presidency, 2007a:3).

The rationale for the government-wide monitoring and evaluation system is to provide all government agencies, departments and local government with easy access to regular and reliable information by revealing which of their practices and strategies worked well and which needed to be changed or improved. Such information will contribute towards the management of the processes of all these government institutions. The Proposal and Implementation Plan for the GWM&E by the Presidency (2005:6) asserts that the founding objectives of the system are the collection and collation, the analysis and dissemination, and the application of information on the progress and impact of programmes and initiatives in order to:

- ensure compliance with statutory and other requirements
- ensure transparency and accountability
- promote service delivery improvement
- promote the emergence of a learning culture in the public sector.

This system was developed to focus on the following issues:

- essential elements of results-based monitoring and evaluation
- strengthened role of the monitoring function within the three spheres of government
- the presentation of a more integrated approach to the monitoring and evaluation in government
- the introduction of simplified, streamlined and harmonized procedures in line with the Government's results-oriented framework for monitoring and evaluation
- the provision of guidance on the assessment of results within the context of the Government's Programme of Action and its priorities
- emphasizing that monitoring and evaluation are important management functions aimed at ensuring quality of interventions and supporting decision-making, accountability, learning and capacity development.

The South African Government had, by institutionalizing this government-wide monitoring and evaluation system, anticipated the achievement of the following results:

- accurate and reliable information on progress in the implementation of government and other public sector programmes to be collated and updated on an ongoing basis
- information on the outcomes and impact achieved by government and other public bodies to be periodically collected and presented
- the quality of monitoring and evaluation practices in government and public bodies to be continuously improved.

The Presidency (2007b:3) identifies seven principles for M&E in South Africa. Some of these key principles are outlined below. It is worth noting that while all the principles are relevant for this discussion, the researcher chose only some of them for discussion in order to illustrate the importance of these principles. However, even the ones that are not discussed here remain critical to the institutionalization of M&E.

M&E should contribute to improved governance. This can be achieved if M&E promotes transparency by ensuring that its findings are made available to the public unless there are compelling reasons for not doing so. M&E must promote accountability by ensuring that the use of public resources is subjected to public scrutiny. In upholding the governance principle, M&E must be participatory and inclusive. This can be achieved through ensuring that the historically marginalized people and interests are given a voice and are represented throughout the M&E processes (Presidency, 2007b:3). M&E should be rights based through ensuring that the rights based culture enshrined in the Bill of Rights is promoted and entrenched by its inclusion in the value base for all M&E processes (Presidency, 2007b:3). The Policy Framework also states that M&E must be operationally effective. This means that M&E must be planned thoroughly with the scope and purpose defined accurately, and that robust systems are to be built in line with the resources available.

There is also a general emphasis expressed about the need for the M&E system to integrate with other reforms which include the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF), the National Planning Framework and other related reforms (Presidency, 2007b:11).

3.2.2 Treasury Regulation

3.2.2.1 Framework for Programme Performance Information

In May 2007, the National Treasury issued a document entitled 'Framework for Programme Performance Information' (2007a:1). Among other things, the aim of the Framework is to promote accountability and transparency by providing Parliament, Provincial Legislatures, Municipal Councils and the public with timely, accessible and accurate performance information.

According to the National Treasury's Framework for Programme Performance Information (2007a:2), the policy and legal requirements aimed at improving public sector financial and performance information management related to this Framework are found in:

- Section 92 of the Constitution, which states that 'members of the Cabinet are accountable collectively and individually to Parliament for the exercise of their powers and the performance of their functions', and that they must 'provide Parliament with full and regular reports concerning matters under their control'
- Section 133 of the Constitution provides for the accountability of members of the executive council (MECs) of a province to the provincial legislature
- similar arrangements are specified for municipalities in the Municipal Structures Act (1998).

The focus of the framework is on the information that is collected by government institutions in the course of fulfilling their mandates and implementing the policies of government. This information includes output and outcome information collected at provincial level for strategic and annual performance plans and budgets, and at local level for Integrated Development Plans and service delivery and budget implementation plans.

The National Treasury (2007a:1) asserts that within the context of monitoring and evaluation, the framework is aimed at:

- ‘clarifying definitions and standards for performance information in support of regular audits of such information where appropriate’
- ‘improving integrated structures, systems and processes required to manage performance information’
- defining roles and responsibilities for managing performance information
- ‘promoting accountability and transparency by providing parliament, provincial legislatures, municipal councils and the public with timely, accessible and accurate performance information’.

The framework identifies the importance of performance information in planning, budgeting and reporting. This argument supports the need to integrate monitoring and evaluation with the process of planning, budgeting and reporting of performance.

Against this background, the Framework for Programme Performance Information serves as one of the regulatory instruments for the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in the South African government institutions.

3.2.2.2 Public Financial Management Act (PFMA)

The government of South Africa approved and institutionalized the Public Financial Management Act (PFMA) in 1999. The PFMA was introduced to regulate financial management in the national government and provincial governments; to ensure that all revenue, expenditure, assets and liabilities of government are managed efficiently and effectively; to provide for the responsibilities of persons entrusted with financial management in those governments; and to provide for matters connected therewith (National Treasury, 2007b:30).

The key objectives of the Act are summarized as being:

- ‘to modernize the system of financial management in the public sector ‘

- ‘to enable public sector managers to manage, but at the same time be held more accountable ‘
- ‘to ensure the timely provision of quality information’
- ‘to eliminate waste and corruption in the use of public assets’.

The PFMA adopts an approach to financial management which focuses on outputs and responsibilities rather than the rule driven approach which characterized public financial management before the introduction of the PFMA. The Act is part of a broader strategy on improving financial management in the public sector (National Treasury, 2007b:14).

3.3 Public Service Commission

The Republic of South African Constitution (Chapter 10) set out to establish the Public Service Commission (PSC). The main functions of the Public Service Commission (2008:4), as explained in section 195 of the South African Constitution, are

- to promote the values of and principles of public administration set out in Section 195 of the Constitution throughout the public service
- to investigate, monitor and evaluate the organization, administration and personnel practices of the public service, especially the adherence to the values and principles set out in Section 195 as well as the public service procedures
- to propose measures to ensure effective and efficient performance in the public service
- to give directions aimed at ensuring that personnel procedures relating to recruitment, transfers, promotions and dismissals comply with the values and principles set out in section 195 of the Constitution
- to advise organs of state, both national and provincial, regarding personnel practices
- to report its findings and recommendations to the National Assembly and or to various Provincial Legislatures at least once a year
- to report issues of immediate operational concern to the relevant operational authority

- to investigate grievances of employees and recommend appropriate interventions to remedy these situations.

The PSC functions listed above reveal that the notion of monitoring and evaluation in the South African Public Service is anchored in the Constitution. It is also evident that the PSC has a major role to play in ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in the Public Service. The PSC must monitor and evaluate the organization and administration of the Public Service and can propose measures to improve its performance. It must also provide to Parliament an evaluation of the extent to which the values and principles governing public administration have been complied with in the Public Service. Based on these functions the PSC aims to establish itself as a leader in monitoring and evaluation of the performance of the Public Service (Public Service Commission, 2008:16).

3.4 Statistics South African and its Statistical Quality Framework (SASQAF)

Statistics South Africa derives its mandate and role from the South African Statistics Act (Act No.6 of 1999) (Statistics South Africa, 2008:1). The need for credible and reliable information to be used as a baseline for planning and tracking progress in service delivery necessitated the establishment of an institution that produces official statistics (Statistics South Africa, 2008:1). It therefore became the mandate of Statistics South Africa to set up common standards and criteria as a basis for evaluating statistics in terms of their quality and fitness for the required purpose.

Statistics South Africa manages the national statistics system that collects, analyses and publishes a range of demographic, social and economic statistics. It also collects reliable statistics on a set of key development indicators without which planning of government services, and M&E, at a level of sophistication that is required of government, would not be possible (Statistics South Africa, 2008:16).

Statistics South Africa (2008:16) declares that evaluation of statistics that are to be used in the public domain and might influence the development of government policy as well

as the measurement and monitoring of government programmes must be done within the standards provided by the South African Statistical Quality Framework (SASQAF). SASQAF provides the rationale, transparency and a suitable framework for assessing the quality of statistics. It puts emphasis on the quality of data and explains the quality dimensions needed for the data to pass the evaluation process. This is of critical importance to monitoring and evaluation, especially when M&E findings are to be used to inform planning and resource allocation decisions.

In view of this discussion, it is evident that Statistics South Africa plays a major role in regulating the monitoring and evaluation environment and that M&E produced data have to meet standards set in the framework defined by the SASQAF.

3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation Related Reforms

This short section discusses management systems that have a specific relevance to monitoring and evaluation.

3.5.1 Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF)

The Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) was adopted in 1998 as part of budget reforms which included the Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations Act of 1997 (IGRA). The MTEF is a tool that is aimed at encouraging cooperation across ministries and planning over a longer period beyond the immediately upcoming fiscal year (Muradzikwa, 2005:41). This longer-term approach is preferable to piecemeal, reactive, short-term decisions that ordinarily characterise budgeting.

The following represents how the MTEF, as a reform element, relates to monitoring and evaluation:

- Enhances stability: ‘It enhances stability by letting provincial and national departments know what resources will likely be available to them’. This allows government planning to be more credible and accurate. This is consistent with the

M&E objective of ensuring that there is proper alignment of planning and the budgets allocated to such plans in order to maximise the results (National Treasury, 2007c:4).

- Improves transparency: ‘It improves transparency and can generate public discussion. It does this by making government’s longer term policy goals and overall strategy for getting there publicly available. Outlining future spending provides a signal to civil society and public at large of government’s priorities and how it intends to implement its vision’ (National Treasury, 2007c:26).
- Facilitates programme evaluation: The future predictions also provide a ‘baseline for assessing the effectiveness of the past year’s programmes’ (National Treasury, 2007c:5). Therefore, MTEF created greater certainty in budgets and, since its inception, budget management has been supportive of macro-economic management. This is in line with the results management approach supported by the South African Government which ties in with monitoring and evaluation.

The discussion presented above shows that there is a need to align or integrate M&E with the MTEF process. This integration ensures the utilization of M&E outputs in the MTEF process.

3.5.2 National Planning Framework (NPF)

Several weaknesses in the way the state functioned were identified towards the end of the first term of the new democratic government. These included the lack of alignment between the different planning cycles in government, weak coordination - both across national departments and between the different spheres of government, and the imperative to emphasize a more integrated approach to policy formulation, planning and implementation (Presidency, 2001:1). A key issue is the integration of cross-cutting issues within the overall policy and implementation framework. In order to correct these weaknesses, the Forum of South African Directors-General (FOSAD) was established in 1998, followed by the establishment of Directors-General Clusters to mirror the main cabinet committees (Presidency, 2001:1). Two key elements of this integration process were integrated planning across the national and other spheres of government and the

Medium Term Strategic Framework aimed at advancing the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) (Presidency, 2001:1).

M&E is critically important to planning because it provides useful information for weighing up decision alternatives (Alkin, 1990:82). Mackay (2008:177) emphasizes that utilization of the M&E information for planning is the measure of success of the M&E system. Therefore, it can be plausibly assumed that if M&E provides useful information for planning, there will be greater demand for M&E. In turn, M&E needs to be integrated into planning in order for it to inform the development of plans. This explains the relevancy of planning to M&E.

3.6 Summary

This chapter discussed monitoring and evaluation within the South African context. It provided insights on the regulatory instruments for M&E. It further discussed the M&E relevancy to the MTEF and planning, these being major management reforms introduced in the South African government during the democratic dispensation.

CHAPTER 4: THE CASE STUDY: PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WESTERN CAPE

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the ways in which the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape have organised their M&E function. It begins by providing an overview of post-apartheid government formation in the Western Cape Province. The relevancy of providing this historical background is that it gives the context for the need for monitoring and evaluation as a management function in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape. The chapter also presents selected reforms that have been instituted within the Western Cape Provincial Government since the demise of apartheid. It further explores specific issues regarding the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in each of the five case departments. The discussion of these topics forms the basis for responding to the research question formulated for this study.

4.2 Post-apartheid History of Government Formation in the Western Cape

The National Party achieved 53 per cent of the vote in the Western Cape provincial elections in 1994 and, having won an overall majority, was able to dominate the broad coalition that was formed to govern the Western Cape (Nijzink & Jacobs, 2000:38). A provincial constitutional reform process was then initiated, and that was a sign of change in the political landscape of the province. The African National Congress (ANC) had cooperated in the Provincial Government of Unity. When the ANC walked out of this Provincial Government of unity in 1998, the National Party (NP) gained dominance over the other parties that were left in the Provincial Government of Unity (Nijzink & Jacobs, 2000:38). Prior to the 1999 provincial elections, the National Party experienced a dramatic decline in its support in the province. This can be attributed mostly to leadership changes that had challenged the party.

Following the 1999 provincial elections where the ANC became the majority party, the Western Cape Provincial Government witnessed the formation of a multi-party government which included the New National Party (NNP) and the Democratic Party (DP). Although the ANC received the most votes, it was relegated to being the opposition as it failed to get the 50 per cent plus it required to obtain the majority seats in the Provincial Legislature (Nijzink & Jacobs, 2000:40).

The 2004 Western Cape Provincial election results favoured the ANC. It received 45.25 per cent of the votes which translated to 19 seats in the Provincial Legislature, with the Democratic Alliance (DA) receiving 27.11 per cent of the votes which translated into 12 seats in the Provincial Legislature. This meant that the ANC would continue to express its political aspirations in the Western Cape Province. Therefore, the ANC continued to use its political dominance in the Province to control the Provincial Legislature and the Provincial Government.

4.3 Major Reforms Aimed at Improving Effectiveness in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape

The Provincial Government of the Western Cape instituted mechanisms that directly sought to strengthen the management of the administration. While these mechanisms were meant to allow for strong political direction, the key rationale for their introduction was to improve and advance the delivery of services.

This section of the study describes the major reforms that the Provincial Government of the Western Cape has instituted to improve and advance service delivery. While a number of reforms were implemented in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape, only selected reforms will be discussed which are relevant for the purpose of this study. Particular attention will be given to monitoring and evaluation. The discussion of these reforms is critical for this study because it positions monitoring and evaluation as management function which is part of other management reforms that are also supportive to the success of institutionalising M&E.

4.3.1 Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS)

One of the prominent reforms that the Provincial Government of the Western Cape instituted since the beginning of the democratic dispensation is the development and implementation of the Provincial Growth and Development Strategy (PGDS), a province-wide instrument to align and coordinate the work of the three spheres of government within the Province (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2008:10). The PGDS is situated within the strategic context of deepening the province's commitment to achieving the vision of the Western Cape as 'A Home for All'. The PGDS is founded under the ideals of holistic governance. The approach that underpins the implementation of the PGDS rests in the following ideals:

- policy coherence and coordination
- integrated planning and implementation
- integrated resource mobilization
- integrated service delivery and strategic action
- participatory and collaborative governance and delivery.

It is therefore evident that holistic governance is the overarching principle guiding the functional norms and procedures in the implementation of the PGDS (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2008:13).

The purpose of the PGDS is to introduce the national imperatives (NSDP, Vision 2014, the MDGs, the MTSF, the AsgiSA, the NIPF, the NFLED, the NFSD and the anti-poverty strategy) in the Province of the Western Cape and ground them within the realities and specificities of the Province (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2008:13). The PGDS also serves to guide municipal (district, local and metropolitan) Integrated Development Plans (IDPs), Local Economic Development (LED), and district and metropolitan Growth and Development Strategies (GDSs). The PGDS plays a pivotal role in guiding inter-governmental engagements as prescribed by the Inter-Governmental Relations Framework Act, informing the strategic plans and investment priorities of the provincial departments in the Western Cape Province. In order to strengthen partnerships,

participation, transparency and accountability in conducting the business of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape, the PGDS informs non-governmental stakeholders (the business sector, civil society, labour and the higher education sector) operating in the Province of the Western Cape about the Province's desired growth and development objectives, priorities and outcomes. In its complete form, the PGDS seeks to redress the spatial and socio-economic legacy of apartheid (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2008:23).

The above explication shows that the PGDS is a reform instrument with centralised responsiveness to the policies of the government of the day. Central to it is an integrated approach for the resolution of the problems faced by the Province as founded in the policy direction of the democratic government in South Africa.

4.3.2 Provincial-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System

Apart from the influence of the national call by the then President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape was triggered by the quest for efficiency and improvement in the delivery of public services in the Province. The prioritisation of the notion of accountable governance, performance management and target-driven service delivery often featured in the speeches of the then Premier Ebrahim Rassool (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:2). This can be viewed within the strategic context of political support for administrative efficiency.

In response to this drive of establishing mechanisms that seek to enhance transparency, accountability, evidence-based decision making and tracking specific elements of holistic governance geared to ensuring effective service delivery, the Province responded by institutionalising a Provincial-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System led by the Department of the Premier. The development of this system is characterised by an inclusive approach that acknowledges and promotes the principles of a learning organisation. Giving effect to the drive to uphold inclusiveness and learning, an M&E

Provincial Learning Network was established with representation from all the Provincial Line-Departments (with members coming mostly from the M&E units in the Provincial Line-Departments) (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:3). This was viewed as a means of ensuring that the much needed broad representation was observed and that effective alignment of the various M&E units and their functioning (in terms of their operationalization of M&E) in the provincial system would be achieved.

The document entitled *Current Reality of Monitoring and Evaluation in the Western Cape* argues that the provincial departments have the will and capacity to monitor and evaluate their own performance, but that they lack a coherent framework for ensuring that monitoring and evaluation activities are contributing to strengthening holistic governance in the province (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:3). It is through this realisation that the Department of the Premier, which is statutorily and strategically responsible for championing transversal projects in the province, leads and coordinates the process of institutionalising monitoring and evaluation in the Provincial Government.

The Provincial Monitoring and Evaluation System is aimed at monitoring, evaluating, reporting on and supporting policy development, policy research and analysis for the purposes of policy review. It is also intended to disseminate monitoring and evaluation outputs and results to key decision-makers within the Provincial Government and other stakeholders (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:50). Its primary objective is to develop a provincial monitoring system that is able to collect, interpret, analyze and disseminate data and information that add substantial value to the performance management and decision-making processes of the Provincial Government (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:50). The monitoring and evaluation system is also aimed at supporting the implementation of the strategic levers of the PGDS as it applies to all the provincial line departments.

4.3.2.1 Institutional Arrangements for Monitoring and Evaluating in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape

While the South African Constitution allows for a great number of institutional establishments to be set up to monitor and evaluate the performance of government institutions, this study focuses on selected ones that are of immediate relevance to its context. In exploring the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation within the context of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape, this section will focus on transversal issues which entail the constitutionally provided arrangements and province-wide issues, i.e. provincial performance management issues and transversal arrangements of monitoring and evaluation. It will later describe how the five case study line departments have organised their monitoring and evaluation function. This will provide a basis for responding to the research question set for this study.

4.4 Provincial Transversal Institutional Arrangements

The South African Constitution made provision for specific structures to be established to monitor and evaluate the delivery of public services by government institutions. These structures straddle legislative and executive establishments. This section explores the transversal institutional arrangements that guide monitoring and evaluation in the Province.

4.4.1 Legislative Structures

4.4.1.1 Legislative Portfolio Committees

Portfolio Committees play a very important role in the legislative process and are often regarded as the 'engine-rooms' of Parliament (in this case, the Provincial Legislature of the Western Cape).

While they provide avenues for debate, these committees also investigate matters of public importance, hold public hearings and receive submissions from the public. In this

way the views of the people are taken into account before a Bill is passed in the Legislature. Committee meetings are open to the public, and the public is encouraged to attend sittings of the Provincial Legislature. Portfolio Committees play a significant role in ensuring the scrutiny and strengthening of the overseeing role of the Provincial Legislatures.

In line with the strategic objectives of monitoring and evaluation presented in the section above, drawing the public on public issues debated in the Legislature strengthens accountability and transparency which are the key tenets promoted by monitoring and evaluation. Portfolio Committees also provide for strategic links with the executive establishment. Through a process of regular reporting and liaison with the various line departments, Portfolio Committees strengthen the oversight role of the Provincial Legislature (Moagi, 2000:29). Portfolio Committees are equipped with research capacity in the form of research units. These research units critically analyze government policies and departmental performance on a quarterly and annual basis. While this provides for in-depth insights into policies and achievements of various programmes flowing from policies, the limitations of skills in these research units and with members of these committees threaten the execution of proper monitoring and evaluation of government and performance departments.

4.4.1.2 Committee on Public Accounts

The Committee on Public Accounts enables the Provincial Legislature to scrutinise and play its oversight role over the various line departments in respect of financial management. The Committee analyses financial performance of line departments, thus holding accounting authorities accountable for the utilisation of public funds in their respective departments. Moagi (2000:30) explains that the Committee on Public Accounts strives for the following:

- ‘to improve the quality of financial management, especially ensuring tight internal control measures’

- ‘to provide for the realisation of the notion of value-for-money through the services rendered to the public’
- ‘to ensure that public institutions are held accountable if they transgress the law pertaining to public financial management’.

The role of the Committee is to ensure that the policies and programmes of the Provincial Government are implemented within a framework of sound financial management and that finances are utilised effectively and efficiently. While the quarterly and annual reports provide a basis for this analysis, the Committee also utilises the reports of the Auditor General (Moagi, 2000:31).

4.4.2 Executive Structures and Autonomous Bodies

4.4.2.1 Office of the Auditor General (AG)

The Auditor General Act (Act 12 of 1995) and the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) outline the powers and functions of the Auditor General. The Office of the Auditor General is an apolitical body and independent of any executive authority.

The Auditor General functions are to audit and report on the accounts, financial statements and programme performance information of government departments. In broader terms, the Auditor General is responsible for the assessment of regularity and compliance with regard to government finances. This is also viewed within the strategic context of ensuring that the departments function economically, efficiently and effectively in their utilisation of public finances. This requires that departments implement sufficient management systems or measures in order to promote the notions of economy, efficiency and effectiveness (Moagi, 2000:32). Therefore, while its role relates mostly to keeping proper accounts, proper authorisation of expenditures and collection of revenue, the Office of the Auditor General plays a pivotal role in the monitoring and evaluation of performance of the various government departments (Moagi, 2000:32).

4.4.2.2 Public Service Commission (PSC)

The Public Service Commission (PSC) was established in terms of Chapter 10 of the 1996 Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Public Service Commission, 2008:16). As explained in section 195 of the South African Constitution, the PSC main functions are:

- to promote the values of and principles of public administration set out in Section 195 of the Constitution throughout the public service
- to investigate, monitor and evaluate the organisation, administration and personnel practices of the public service, especially the adherence to the values and principles set out in Section 195 as well as the public service procedures
- to propose measures to ensure effective and efficient performance in the public service
- to give directions aimed at ensuring that personnel procedures relating to recruitment, transfers, promotions and dismissals comply with the values and principles set out in section 195 of the Constitution
- to advise organs of state, both national and provincial, regarding personnel practices
- to report its findings and recommendations to the National Assembly and various Provincial Legislatures at least once a year
- to report issues of immediate operational concern to the relevant operational authority
- to investigate grievances of employees and recommend appropriate interventions to remedy these situations.

A closer look at the functions of the Public Service Commission presented above provide a critical insight of how monitoring and evaluation as a management practice is embedded in the work of the Public Service Commission.

It is also evident, in the light of the above presentation that the Public Service Commission has a major role to play in ensuring efficiency and effectiveness in the public service.

4.4.2.3 Provincial Treasury

Moagi (2000:32) examines the institutional arrangements of M&E in the public service. He notes the critical role played by the Provincial Treasury in monitoring and evaluating government performance. He argues that the Provincial Treasury plays a critical role in promoting effective and efficient service delivery through promoting and enforcing sound financial planning and budgeting. Besides its role of promoting the government's fiscal objectives, the Provincial Treasury serves to ensure value-for-money in the delivery of public services. Through the statutory quarterly and annually reporting, the Provincial Treasury monitors the performance of provincial line departments in terms of utilisation of their respective budgets against the set plans and achievements through the Quarterly Performance Review (QPR) process.

The Quarterly Performance Review process is the legislative strategic planning compliance tool for national and provincial government that monitors the implementation of the Annual Performance Plan (APP). It is a high-level compliance and reporting tool that tracks the progress of the strategic goals set by the department on a quarterly basis against set outputs and targets as per the APP. These processes form the legislative basis for managing performance information in the department and are monitored by means of a reporting template that is completed and submitted to Provincial Treasury (Moagi, 2000:33). This reporting template primarily contains performance information of a quantitative nature based on meeting cash flow projections and programme targets set in the APP.

Each line function department must, in terms of the strategic management framework for government, complete and submit the performance report to the Provincial Treasury on a quarterly basis. Flowing from this legislative requirement, departments have to varying

degrees developed processes and institutional systems to ensure the completion and submission of the report. This would include data-collection, processing, verification and analysis (Moagi, 2000:33).

4.5 Specific M&E Institutional (Organizational) Arrangements in the Five Case Study Departments

This section describes the institutional arrangements set for the province-wide monitoring and evaluation of the Western Cape Province. It looks at the transversal institutional arrangements by reference to the Department of the Premier as the lead department in establishing and implementing the Provincial-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System, and also describes line department specific institutional arrangements. The main focus is on how the M&E function is organised in each of the five case study departments by means of reference to institutional positioning (levels and location) covered under institutional arrangements, mandate (scope and purpose) covered under roles and responsibilities, and stewardship or championship of the M&E function.

4.5.1 Transversal Institutional Arrangements: Department of the Premier

The Chief Directorate in the Department of the Premier charged with leading the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation throughout the Provincial Government of the Western Cape is located in the Governance and Integration Branch alongside with Policy Development and Policy Implementation Support. This is believed to be a suitable placement of the M&E unit, given that M&E is aimed at supporting both the process of policy development and implementation. It is also viewed within the context of promoting strategic integration in order to add value to the policy flow process (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:60).

The Chief Directorate: Monitoring, Evaluation, Review and Reporting is tasked with the implementation of the provincial system of monitoring and evaluation. The system is aimed at providing feedback on the higher level strategic goals and five pillars as derived

from the PGDS. The system further serves to evaluate over a longer-term period if the outcomes and impacts of the programmes within the PGDS have been achieved and, if so, whether they are sustainable. This is envisaged to be achieved through the utilization of a compendium of indicators for the PGDS (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:64). As the PGDS is implemented through the work of the line departments, it is vital that these departments forge a strategic alignment with the Department of the Premier.

4.5.1.1 Institutional Arrangements

The Chief Directorate: Monitoring, Evaluation, Review and Reporting is located in the Governance and Integration Branch alongside with the Policy Development and Support and Policy Implementation functional units. This institutional arrangement is viewed within the context of promoting strategic integration in order to ensure a value adding chain in the policy flow process (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:71). This is believed to be the suitable location for the M&E unit, given that M&E supports both the process of policy development and implementation. The Chief Directorate is divided into the following three Directorates:

Directorate: Provincial Monitoring

This Directorate is responsible for the facilitation of the monitoring function through strategic and business planning (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:71). It is headed by the Director with the assistance of a Deputy Director and an Assistant Director.

Directorate: Provincial Evaluations

The Directorate is responsible for providing pertinent perspectives on the effectiveness of policies and strategies and pinpoint where the desired results are achieved, where there are evident gaps, and where evaluation results show the need for policy and

implementation review (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:62). It is headed by the Director, with a Deputy Director and a Secretary to the Director as part of its staff complement.

Directorate: Provincial Review and Reporting

This Directorate is responsible for the interpretation of evaluation results in order to make pertinent proposals and recommendations on necessary reviews of policies, strategies, implementation support as well as strategic-decision making (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:62). It is headed by a Director and also has a Deputy Director and an Acting Assistant Director.

4.5.1.2 Roles and Responsibilities of the M&E Unit

Directorate: Provincial Monitoring

This Directorate is responsible for the facilitation of the monitoring function through strategic and business planning (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:71). Amongst other things, the Directorate is also responsible for the development of the monitoring framework, the development of a compendium of indicators and the development and management of an information management system. Furthermore, it is envisaged that it will also develop monitoring reports that feed into the evaluation function in order to give effect to periodic reviews (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:71).

Directorate: Provincial Evaluations

This Directorate is responsible for the evaluation management function. Its function includes the analysis and assessment of monitoring results as well as commissioning and management of other forms of evaluations when necessary. Evaluation results will then be forwarded to the review function for recommendations to internal clients such as the

Policy Development Unit and other provincial line departments (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:58).

Directorate: Provincial Review and Reporting

This Directorate is responsible for making recommendations, based on evaluation results, to the Policy Development Unit in order to initiate a systematic provincial review (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:59). It is therefore responsible for using evaluation results to recommend changes in the existing strategies and policies to strategic decision-makers. The Directorate also functions as the hub of provincial reporting, performing an inter-governmental function, through coordinating and facilitating the reporting of various provincial entities. It is responsible for ensuring that the province is aligned with the national requirements and systems, and operates in alignment with the national planning cycle (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:59). It is also responsible for the dissemination of information to all the key stakeholders and partners.

4.6 Line Departments

The institutionalization of a Province-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (PWMES) in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape called for the establishment of M&E units in all the line departments. These line function departments are required to establish M&E systems that should feed into the PWMES. Departmental M&E systems are required to measure the performance of key departmental policies and programmes over time in order to ensure appropriate allocation and utilization of resources and to enhance service delivery. The PWMES stresses the need for proper alignment of the M&E functions in the line departments with the centralized PWMES (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:14).

This section explores the efforts of five case study departments in establishing and institutionalizing M&E within their department-specific contexts. The reasons leading to

the focus on only the chosen five case study departments have been explained in the first chapter of this study

4.6.1 Department of Social Development

Following the implementation of the Transformation Plan, the need to measure the degree of transformation success and to ascertain whether the services rendered to the communities provide value for money led to the institutionalization of a systematic monitoring and evaluation of funded service providers (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:5). The Department had already established an M&E unit at a Directorate level. It adopted, customized and uses the Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT) to monitor the performance of its funded organizations and its District Offices.

4.6.1.1 Institutional Arrangements

Head Office

There is a dedicated M&E unit operating at Directorate level. The M&E unit is located within the Chief Directorate: Transformation and exists alongside with the Directorate: Human Resources. The M&E Directorate is headed by the Director with four Sub-Directorates, each headed by a Deputy Director. Each Sub-Directorate has two Assistant Directors and at least one Administration Officer, officially referred to as the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, and a Social Worker. There are also two Administration Clerks and a Personal Assistant to the Director (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:10).

These officials collectively possess the following skills: policy analysis, financial management, social work, human resource management expertise, and general administration (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:10).

District Offices

With the establishment of District Offices as Cost Centers, the Department established M&E units in all the District Offices. The District Office M&E units are located within the Service Delivery Support Units and are headed by the Service Delivery Manager (Assistant Director Level). There are also two M&E Officers (Administration Officers level) and a Social Worker (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:10).

4.6.1.2 Roles and Responsibilities of the M&E Unit

The Western Cape Department of Social Development (2008:13) describes the scope and purpose of the M&E unit as follows:

- to monitor the implementation of the transformation imperatives identified by the Department
- to monitor compliance with the Public Financial Management Act (PFMA)
- to monitor the implementation of services in the District offices and by NPOs
- to develop and recommend the implementation of corrective plans emanating from the monitoring process
- to monitor the implementation and compliance to the Transfer of Payment Agreements (TPAs)
- to conduct programme evaluations to determine the worth of programmes.

4.6.1.3 Operationalization of M&E in the Department

In the Department of Social Development, monitoring and evaluation was established in the year 2003, following the implementation of the Department's Transformation Plan. It was established with the mandate of monitoring the transformation process in the delivery of services by Non-Profit Organizations (NPOs), and to collect baseline data on the various areas of service delivery (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:5). The unit adopted and customized the Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT) to monitor the performance of its funded organizations (NPOs). The tool was

customized to measure organizational development and to identify organizational capacity development needs.

With the establishment of the District Offices as Cost Centers, the role of the unit was later refined to include the monitoring and evaluation of service delivery in the District Offices. This necessitated customizing the OCAT and adapting it to the context of the business of the District Offices. In the refined mandate, the M&E Directorate monitors issues of service delivery in the District Office; it also monitors the NPO funding process through the paneling process (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:15).

The unit shares the monitoring of results and makes recommendations in form of corrective measures to the Directorate: District Office Management and Support for it to consider and act on. Once these corrective measures have been implemented through the assistance of the Directorate: District Office Management and Support, the unit does a follow-up assessment of their implementation (Western Cape Department of Social Development, 2008:15).

4.6.2 Department of Local Government and Housing

The Department has made strides in defining the purpose of its monitoring and evaluation function. It has identified a strategic link between managing performance information and implementation monitoring and evaluation. Through its recently developed monitoring and evaluation conceptual framework, the Department has noted that monitoring and evaluation measures the progress of programmes through the programme life cycle and reports against a set of agreed annual targets or milestones (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:25). It also acknowledges that through the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation, the Department will be able to evaluate progress and assess programme performance in terms of outputs delivered against set targets and milestones as agreed within the APP. A set of institutional arrangements to

support the functioning and implementation of monitoring and evaluation have been set (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:25).

4.6.2.1 Institutional Arrangements

In the Department, the M&E Directorate exists alongside the Directorates: Human Resources and Administration; Policy and Strategy; Financial Management and Communication. The Director of the unit reports directly to the Deputy Director General (DDG) (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:10). The Directorate is divided into three Sub-Directorates headed by Deputy Directors. These Sub-Directorates are Programme Performance, which deals with monitoring the performance of the Department's programmes through the QPR process; the newly established Metro Monitoring which will be tasked with the monitoring of the services of the Metropolitan Municipality; and Municipal Performance which monitors the performance of all the District and Local Municipalities in the Province (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:10).

The Sub-Directorate: Programme Performance is headed by a Deputy Director with two Assistant Directors and a Senior Administration Officer. The Sub-Directorate: Municipal Performance is headed by a Deputy Director with three Assistant Directors and a Senior Administration Officer. The Sub-Directorate: Metro Monitoring is headed by a Deputy Director with two Assistant Directors and a Senior Administrative Officer (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:10).

4.6.2.2 Responsibilities of the M&E Unit

According to the Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing (2008:12), the M&E unit tasked with driving the M&E function has its scope and purpose defined under its responsibilities as listed below. The unit is responsible for three key functions:

- to monitor and evaluate the performance of the programmes of the Department using the QPR process
- to monitor and evaluate the performance of the Metropolitan Municipality
- to monitor and evaluate the performance of the District and Local Municipalities through the Five-Year Local Government Strategic Areas.

4.6.2.3 Operationalization of M&E in the Department

The operationalization of monitoring and evaluation in the Department flows from the realization that the alignment of the Department's Annual Performance Plan (APP) with the Member of the Executive Committee's (MEC) budget deliverables are essential to ensure that the budget priorities are monitored as a component of the Department's performance (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:14). The Department's APP, with its clear strategic goals and indicators to measure programme level objectives in terms of inputs and outputs, forms the basis for the operationalization of monitoring departmental performance. The Department uses the Quarterly Performance Review (QPR) Process as the compliance tool to monitor the implementation of the APP (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:14).

The APP currently forms the basis for monitoring departmental performance. The QPR process (a compliance tool legally prescribed by the Provincial Treasury) is used to monitor progress against allocated budgets and the measurable objectives identified in the Department's APP (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:13). Furthermore, the QPR process measures the strategic goals set by the Department on a quarterly basis, against performance on quarterly targets. These processes form the basis for managing performance information in the Department. The Department's performance is monitored via a set of measurable input, process, and output indicators as set out in the APP. The monitoring process is geared towards enabling the Department to take remedial steps, where necessary, to ensure that implementation

matches policy and that the desired policy and programme outputs are achieved (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:14).

The Department instituted the QPR 'Roundtable' process as a means by which departmental managers are allowed an opportunity to review the performance of programmes of the Department. This process is led by the M&E unit. It allows for the quarterly assessment, analysis and review of programme performance by the M&E unit, Head of the Department (HOD) and Senior Management of the Department. It also provides for the reflection on the achievement or non-achievement of targets set for the quarter under review (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:14).

Furthermore, the Department's M&E unit provides data collected on the output indicators developed for the interventions or priority projects, and on the assessment of the outputs or deliverables as agreed within the APP and strategic plans. The output indicators measure the quantity, quality, access, cost and distribution of the outputs. The integrated and standardized reports developed by the M&E unit serve to inform the review of the programme implementation process (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:26).

4.6.3 Department of Economic Development and Tourism

The institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in this Department is still in its preliminary stages. While the Department established an M&E Sub-Directorate or Unit in 2007, it was only in the 2008/09 financial year that monitoring and evaluation was built into the APP of the Department. Various activities that support monitoring and evaluation are undertaken. These activities are currently not built into a coherent monitoring and evaluation structure supported by clearly defined systems and processes.

4.6.3.1 Institutional Arrangements

The Department established its M&E Unit in 2007. The M&E Unit is located in the Directorate: Strategic Support as a Sub-Directorate alongside the Sub-Directorates: Research and Support; Knowledge Management; HIV and AIDS; and Strategic Coordination. Its Director reports directly to the HOD (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:25). In the Department, monitoring and evaluation falls under the portfolio of the HOD and hence the reporting arrangement outlined above. The Deputy Director heading the M&E Sub-Directorate is also responsible for the two other Sub-Directorates: Strategic Coordination and Knowledge Management. Given that her competencies straddle these three Sub-Directorates, the M&E function supports the strategic planning process and exists alongside the knowledge management function (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:25).

Except for the Deputy Director heading the M&E Sub-Directorate, there are no dedicated M&E staff members involved on the content side of M&E operations. In its staff complement, the Sub-Directorate also has an Administration Officer who provides administrative support.

4.6.3.2 Roles and Responsibilities of the M&E Unit

The M&E function has the following scope and purpose in the Department. The Department defines the core function of the M&E Unit as having to support all monitoring and evaluation initiatives in the Department (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:25). This function involves providing leadership in the monitoring of the Department's transversal strategies and policies, including the Macro Economic and Development Strategy (MEDS). It also involves supporting the monitoring of programmes and projects of the Department. The unit has to ensure that the Departmental monitoring and evaluation processes and systems are aligned with the Provincial-Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:25).

While it is explained that various units within the Department will conduct their line-function monitoring and evaluation through their own budgets, the Sub-Directorate M&E must provide support to these processes. The overall role of the Sub-Directorate M&E is to develop monitoring and evaluation capacity within the Department (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:26).

4.6.3.3 Operationalization of M&E in the Department

The M&E Sub-Directorate is responsible for the implementation and management of the Departmental Organizational Performance Management System (DOPMS).

DOPMS is a monitoring and evaluation as well as information management tool used by the Department to monitor, record and report on all the projects and interventions undertaken by the Department (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:1). The Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism (2008:1) outlines that DOPMS was designed to achieve the following:

- to monitor and evaluate the Department's performance
- to monitor and evaluate individual performance
- to enable the HOD to keep track of the departmental activities and to intervene when necessary
- to enable the managers in the Department to keep track of activities in their respective spheres of responsibility and to intervene when necessary
- to serve as an information repository system for the Department
- to provide readily available information to the HOD's office to develop annual reports, budget speech inputs and other reports.

The M&E Unit collects data and promotes information flows within the Department using DOPMS. The Department is planning to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation System that will be firmly based in the context of DOPMS.

4.6.4 Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport

4.6.4.1 Institutional Arrangements

In the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport, an M&E function was established in 2005. The M&E Unit is located in the Chief Directorate: Corporate Services under the Directorate: Strategic Management which exists alongside the Directorate: Human Resource Management (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:7). The unit is at Sub-Directorate level, headed by a Deputy Director. In the Department, M&E is within the portfolio of the HOD. In terms of the current reporting arrangements, the unit reports directly to the HOD. The unit is mandated with ensuring that the principles of good governance (transparency, accountability and responsiveness) are upheld in the Department (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:7). The unit also has an Assistant Director and an Administration Officer as part of its staff complement. As a means to supplement its capacity, the unit employs interns, with only one intern currently utilized. It is also worth noting that all the staff members mentioned above forming the staff complement of the M&E Sub-Directorate are employed on a contractual basis.

4.6.4.2 Roles and Responsibilities of the M&E Unit

The M&E Unit is tasked with promoting good governance and improving the manner in which the Department delivers its services. The Unit is also tasked with the implementation of the M&E strategies through providing expertise and support. It also serves as a service hub for M&E related activities within the Department (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:9). The unit measures and reports on the progress or lack thereof of the programmes of the Department and also makes recommendations on possible corrective measures where necessary.

4.6.4.3 Operationalization of M&E in the Department

The M&E Unit has positioned itself to operationalize monitoring and evaluation in the Department in line with its recently proposed monitoring and evaluation framework.

The Unit recognises that monitoring and evaluation should be an integral part of planning processes. M&E should be integrated in the planning of interventions, programmes and projects of the Department, and responsibilities should be spelled out in each phase of executing these responsibilities (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:17). Monitoring is planned to happen at two levels. The first level is the line function monitoring undertaken by the respective departmental functional units when implementing their programmes and projects. The M&E unit does the monitoring of these programmes and projects, verifying findings reported by the line function areas and identifying gaps in the implementation process (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:17). The M&E Unit will further use the APP, the work plans of all the units, as the basis for monitoring the performance of the Department's functional units. The M&E Unit plans to generate monthly, quarterly and annual reports using the APP, and the work plans.

The Department positions itself to undertake programme evaluations at programme development and implementation levels in the short to medium term (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:18). Evaluation geared towards assessing the outcomes and impact of the programmes is scheduled to be conducted in the longer term. This is a decision that is informed by the consideration of whether resources and expertise needed to conduct evaluations at these levels are adequately available or not (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:18).

4.7 Summary

This chapter introduced and described the case study. It commenced by describing a brief history of government formation in the Provincial Government of the Western Cape. It then presented a discussion on the ways in which the five case study departments have organised their M&E function. The discussion alluded to the mandates of the M&E units

(scope and purpose) discussed under roles and responsibilities; institutional positioning (location or level); and stewardship of the M&E function discussed under institutional arrangements. Integration issues with other functions that co-exist with M&E units are also mentioned. The discussion of all the above topics forms the basis for responding to the research question formulated for this study.

University of Cape Town

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 5: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS ON THE CASE STUDY

5.1 Introduction

Kusek and Rist (2002:151) note that an effective and efficient public sector is necessary for achieving the desired results of economic growth, social development and poverty alleviation. In line with this statement, the institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape marks the efforts geared towards ensuring an effective and efficient public service.

In line with the purpose of this study to assess how the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape have organized their monitoring and evaluation function, this chapter presents the findings emanating from the documents of the five case study departments described in the previous chapter. The identification of relevant issues from the case study provides a basis for the analysis of the findings and will lead to responses for the research question set for this study.

This chapter is organized as follows: following this introduction is a section that presents the findings based on the key areas covered in Chapter Four. These areas include institutional positioning, scope and purpose, stewardship or championship of the M&E function, and the integration of the M&E function to other functions of the departments that were studied. Specific issues (informed by the surveyed data) within these areas are dealt with in this section. The chapter ends with a brief summary describing the areas discussed in the chapter.

5.2 Findings

The literature that describes alternative approaches in the institutionalization of M&E discussed in Chapter Two identifies the following key issues as criteria for organizing an M&E function in an organization:

- definition of scope and purpose of the M&E function (mandate)
- institutional positioning (level and location) of the M&E function, and stewardship or championship of the function
- integration of the M&E function to other institutional management functions.

The findings presented in this chapter are based on these criteria.

5.2.1 Scope and Purpose

All five case study departments have identified the scope and purpose of their M&E function. The identification of the scope and purpose in the documents of the five case study departments is presented under the subsection discussing roles and responsibilities. With regard to the scope, the following are the broad areas covering the main focus of the departments' M&E function:

Strategy Development, Support and Planning

The documentation reveals that the M&E units participate in the process of developing strategic plans and annual performance plans in their departments. Other departments like the Department of Economic Development and Tourism and the Department of the Premier play a critical supporting role in the development of long term departmental strategies that inform the business of the respective department. In terms of the Department of the Premier, this support role is evident in the development of the PGDS (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:64). In the case of the Department of Economic Development and Tourism, strategic support is given to the development of the MEDS (Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism, 2008:25).

It has been noted that the emphasis is on the fact that M&E must be an integral part of planning. Even departments that have not yet engaged thoroughly in aligning planning and M&E hold this view in the conceptualization of their M&E function. This is evident

in the argument advanced by the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports. This Department argues that monitoring and evaluation should be an integral part of the planning process. M&E should be integrated in the planning of interventions, programmes and projects of the Department, and responsibilities should be spelled out in each phase of the execution of these plans (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:17).

Institutional Performance Monitoring

Generally the case study departments have their M&E function set to monitor the performance of the programmes, projects and work plans of their departments. The operationalization of the monitoring function differs between departments. Some departments use the APP as the basis for monitoring their performance across the performance and reporting cycles. Other departments allude to monitoring performance while acknowledging that they do not use the APP approach. An example of this is the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports whose M&E Unit's scope is identified as being the monitoring of programmes and projects, verifying findings reported by the line function areas, and identifying gaps in the implementation process, without specifying the tools it uses (Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, 2008:17).

It is argued that the monitoring of performance is aimed at tracking target achievement. The targets tracked are the ones set in the APP, and they are tracked in each quarter of the financial year. This entails collecting and analyzing data on service areas tracked by the output indicators against set targets. The Department of Local Government and Housing identifies this as the scope of its M&E function. In support of this, the Department argues that the M&E unit must provide data collected on the output indicators, developed for the interventions or priority projects. It further argues that it must conduct an assessment of the outputs or deliverables as agreed in the APP and strategic plans (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:26).

The case study departments also identify that performance information management in support of performance monitoring must be the key focus of their M&E functions. It is envisaged that through proper performance information management systems, the M&E function of the case study departments would be able to link up with other national, provincial, local and other internal departmental management functions and processes. This provides the benefit of ensuring links that seek to promote the utilization of M&E findings in other related functions that might benefit from these findings.

Policy and Programme Reviews

The review of policies and programmes is also identified as being within the scope of the M&E function for the case study departments. While there is evidence of other departments supporting this, the main proponent of incorporating this element within the scope of the M&E function is the Department of the Premier. This case study department holds the view that the scope of the M&E function must cover the provision of empirical evidence obtained through evaluations to inform strategic decision makers on the need for policy and programme reviews (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:59). Other case study departments do not state clearly how this element of the scope is working in practice.

M&E Capacity Development

With regard to the development of M&E capacity as part of the defined scope for the M&E function, the case study departments identify that the M&E function must develop indicators for monitoring and evaluating performance. Development of indicators is a technical process that requires critical skills and insights. The Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism (2008:26) acknowledges the need for capacity development and provision of leadership when it notes that part of the scope of its M&E function must be to develop monitoring and evaluation capacity within the Department. Therefore, development of M&E capacity within the M&E Unit and broadly within the Department is identified as part of the scope of M&E.

The Western Cape Department of Social Development (2008:13) notes that the scope of its M&E function must also include monitoring compliance with the Public Financial Management Act (PFMA). This also requires specialist skills that M&E officials need to acquire in order to execute their functions in this regard. The Department commits to capacity development initiatives to promote line function monitoring and evaluation which is the competence of all executing units of the Department.

With regards to the purpose of M&E, the case study departments identify the following as the purpose which their M&E function is set for. It must be noted that this is a summarized presentation of the broad purpose issues identified across all the case study departments. The reason for presenting these as a broad summary stems from the commonalities identified. Therefore, the issues presented are traceable to each department forming part of the case study.

Generally, it became evident that the institutionalization of M&E by these case study departments is designed to:

- track performance on set targets and recommends corrective measures when necessary: tracking performance on activities entails ongoing collection and analysis of performance data related to performance expectations captured in the indicators and targets set to be achieved. This enables programme staff to intervene when necessary.
- inform and support planning: it is envisaged that monitoring information and evaluation findings will inform planning in order to effect continuous management improvement. The case study departments all suggest purposes that support the view that reliable M&E information and findings can be used to enhance advocacy for policies, programmes and resources.
- enhance transparency and accountability: a critical assessment of the documentation presented for the case study departments suggest that through M&E, the departments aim to promote openness and answerability. Depending on the participatory nature of departmental M&E processes, the general public will benefit from the release of

M&E findings and will be able to hold public officials accountable for service delivery. Service standards would have been clearly explained, enabling the public to assess whether performance relates to the services and service standards described prior to implementation and reporting. According to Zaltsman (2006:4), the entrenchment of accountability and transparency measures within an institution makes an institution be responsive to the needs and aspirations of those it serves.

- Make other departments regard M&E as a repository for departmental information: this suggests that critical information about performance of strategic programme and policy, decisions on resource allocation and other information will be kept in the M&E Unit. This makes M&E responsible for information management. The location of the M&E Unit alongside with knowledge management is indicative of a commitment to M&E serving as the repository of strategic departmental information.

5.2.2 Institutional Positioning (level and location) and Stewardship or Championing of the M&E Function

The level at which the M&E function is placed within the establishment of the case study departments differs from department to department. However, there are also marked similarities amongst these departments. The level at which the M&E function is placed ranges from Chief Directorate to Sub-Directorate with each department having its own specific reporting arrangements.

Of the five case study departments, one (the Western Cape Department of the Premier) has its M&E function at the Chief Directorate level, two (Departments of Social Development, and Local Government and Housing) have their M&E function at Directorate level with supporting Sub-Directorates. The other two (Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports, and Economic Development and Tourism) have their M&E function at the Sub-Directorate level.

The M&E units charged with institutionalizing the M&E function are located at different areas in the establishments of these case study departments. Some are located close to

policy development and policy implementation support (Department of the Premier); to service delivery support, transformation and human resource management (Department of Social Development); to research, knowledge management, strategic coordination and HIV and AIDS (Department of Economic Development and Tourism); to human resource management and administration, policy and strategy, financial management and communication (Department of Local Government and Housing); to corporate services, strategic management and human resource management (Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport).

The institutional arrangements presented above suggest that most of the case study departments have their M&E functions co-existing alongside human resources (most common) or policy, strategy, service delivery or implementation support. It is also evident that most of these departments have placed the M&E function under the portfolio of the HOD as an accounting officer of the department.

The stewardship for M&E in the case study departments also varies considerably. While the reporting arrangements suggest that most of the M&E units (charged with institutionalizing M&E) report to the HOD, the day to day activities of M&E rest with other staff members. The lowest level of overall accountability rests with a staff member operating at the level of the Deputy Director, while at the highest level the accountability is located with a staff member operating at the level of a Chief Director. The documentation surveyed does not provide profiles of the officials responsible for M&E within the context of their departments, so that their relevancy and power status for steering and championing an effective M&E function could not be assessed. Also, the lack of profiling of the skills of M&E staff (with the exception of the Department of Social Development) limits the assessment of whether the M&E units tasked with driving the M&E function are equipped with staff members who have the critical skills necessary for the implementation of M&E, as the literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests.

5.2.3 Integration of the M&E with other Institutional Management Functions

While the documentation of the case study departments is not very clear on how the way of organization of their M&E function promotes integration, the institutional arrangement issues described serve as an indication of the functions which the M&E units perform to forge collaboration and integration with other management functions within the organisation. This can be traced through the assessment of the other functions that co-exist with the M&E function, and the purpose which the various departmental M&E functions are set to serve.

With regard to assessing integration through location or other functions co-existing with the M&E function, it can be argued that the study departments aim to have their M&E functions collaborating and integrating with functions oriented towards policy or strategy development; strategic planning, coordination, management and support; policy or strategy or service delivery implementation support; capacity development through human resources management; research; financial management; and strategic communication and flagship interventions or projects like HIV and AIDS.

In terms of assessing integration through the purpose which the various departmental M&E functions are set to achieve, it can generally be argued that the case study departments forged integration with functions oriented to realizing the purposes of effective strategic planning; promoting good governance through promoting transparency; accountability and responsiveness; functions that seek to align the departmental processes with other national, provincial and local management process; and service delivery and management improvement and promoting institutional learning.

5.3 Summary

Chapter Five presented the findings emanating from the presentation of the case study. It presented the findings on how the case study departments have organized their M&E function. In summarizing these findings, reference is made to the criteria described in

Chapter Two in the section that presents the alternative approaches to institutionalizing M&E. These findings are based on the data extracted from the surveyed documents of the case study departments presented in Chapter Four.

University of Cape Town

CHAPTER 6: ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS FROM THE CASE STUDY AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

As clearly stated earlier, the objective of this study is to examine the ways in which the five case study departments of the Provincial Government of the Western Cape have organized their monitoring and evaluation function. It is therefore the purpose of this chapter to present a brief analysis of the findings, using the insights gained from the criteria discussed in the literature described in Chapter Two. This analysis assists in responding to the research question set for this study and is based on the findings presented in Chapter Five. However, it must be noted that given the challenges and limitations presented by the inadequacy of the information emanating from the review of the documented M&E information of the case study departments, the findings presented are provisional and tentative.

The chapter is organized as follows: following this introduction is a section that analyses the findings; this is followed by concluding remarks which summarize the responses to the research question set for this study. Lastly, a summary of the chapter end off the study.

6.2 Analysis of Findings on how the five Case Study Departments have organized their M&E Function

6.2.1 Scope and Purpose

According to Simister (2009:2), defining the scope and purpose of M&E assists in focusing the efforts of institutionalizing an M&E function and understanding its boundaries. According to the surveyed documentation of the case study departments, these departments have made reasonable strides in defining the scope and purpose of

their respective M&E function. The M&E scope and purpose are defined in terms of the roles and responsibilities assigned to the M&E units and follow some common patterns. The majority of the case study departments have their M&E functions set to support policy and strategy development; support policy, strategy and service delivery implementation; policy and programme review; and capacity development. However, these departments have failed to explain explicitly and clearly how each of these will be realized. This is indicative of a huge gap between the definition of the scope and purpose of the M&E function and a clear strategy to operationalize this. This might be a limitation linked to the inadequacy depicted in the case study source documents reviewed.

The documentation lacks the description of a clear framework on how the M&E function will achieve its objectives. This is found to be extremely limiting in terms of advocating for a properly institutionalized M&E function, so that there is greater institutional support for establishing M&E and forging commitment of other departmental units to utilizing M&E findings. This is viewed as an obstacle in ensuring that M&E findings support policy and strategy development, policy, strategy and service delivery implementation, policy and programme review and capacity development as planned.

While the purpose of these M&E functions is set to inform policy and strategy development, suggesting that there will be a focus on assessing results, the M&E activities described appear to be premised on the monitoring of implementation. This means that the current conceptualization of the M&E function only signify a focus on monitoring and evaluating inputs, activities and outputs. There is no clear description of how outcomes and impacts of the policies and programmes aimed to be evaluated will be measured in order for the findings to inform policy and programme reviews. This analysis finding is supported by Segone (2008a:102), when he argues that within a results management framework, an M&E function must allow for an in-depth study of whether results (outcomes and impacts) were achieved or not, in order for the organization to make strategic policy and programme decisions. If there is no clear description of how an M&E function allows for this, the hope of M&E findings informing policy and strategy reviews appears to be distant.

6.2.2 Institutional Positioning (location and level) and Stewardship of the M&E Function

On the institutional positioning of M&E within the establishment of the case study departments, the findings reveal that the M&E units charged with institutionalizing the M&E function are located in different areas in the establishments of these departments. Some are located closer to policy development and policy implementation support (Department of the Premier); service delivery support, transformation and human resource management (Department of Social Development); research, knowledge management, strategic coordination and HIV and AIDS (Department of Economic Development and Tourism); human resource management and administration, policy and strategy, financial management and communication (Department of Local Government and Housing); corporate services, strategic management and human resource management (Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport).

According to the Presidency (2007b:18), the M&E institutional arrangements must be made with a consideration of how M&E processes will relate to planning, budgeting, programme implementation, project management, financial management and reporting processes of an institution. Similarly, Simister (2009:5) notes that it is also important that the location of the M&E function promotes the free flow of M&E information to other critical functions of the institution, and that the M&E function must command the necessary support from the institution. Therefore, in view of the institutional positioning of the M&E function presented above, it can be argued that the case study departments have made strides in locating their M&E functions closer to the critical functions. This is viewed to be in line with suggestions provided by Simister (2009:5) and by the Presidency (2007b:18).

However, except for the Department of the Premier, which has at least attempted, though superficially, to describe how the evaluation findings will inform policy reviews, none of the case study departments have clearly described how the promotion of M&E

information flow to these critical functions is going to be achieved. These departments failed to describe how the M&E function will operationally relate to other departmental management functions, despite its close location to them. This is viewed as a critical limitation especially if there is a need to influence greater utilization of M&E findings in the departments.

With regards to stewardship for M&E, Mackay (2008a:185) notes that when institutionalizing an M&E function, it is important to understand whether there is an influential champion for M&E or not. He also notes that it helps to have an influential and respected institutional lead for M&E. Mackay further states that it is beneficial when the institutional lead for M&E is close to the center of the department. The findings on stewardship for M&E in the case study departments reveal that most of the M&E units charged with institutionalizing M&E report to the HOD, while the day-to-day activities of M&E rest with other staff. The first and lowest level of overall accountability rests with a staff member operating at the level of the Deputy Director.

While the documentation reveals these reporting and leadership arrangements in terms of level of location for M&E, it does not profile the individuals tasked with leading M&E in terms of the power, authority, respect and influence they command within their respective departments. This limits the assessment of whether or not the individual or unit championing M&E has the required capacity to lead and drive the institutionalization of M&E, to persuade other colleagues about M&E priority, and to devote significant resources for the M&E function as prescribed in the described literature on criteria in Chapter Two.

This forces the researcher to only make assumptions that those departments who have their day-to-day M&E activities led by Chief Directors and Directors might be better positioned to lead and drive the institutionalization of M&E, to persuade other colleagues about M&E priority, and to devote significant resources for the M&E function than those who are led by Deputy Directors. This assumption is informed by the understanding that Chief Directors and Directors are part of the Senior Management Services (SMS) and

participate in senior management meetings which normally take decisions in the departments. Therefore, this makes them better positioned to advocate for the needs of the M&E function. However, against this assumption, those M&E functions led by Deputy Directors report directly to the HOD who is an accounting officer of the department. Therefore, depending on the commitment of the HOD to M&E reports, he or she can better advocate for M&E as they are well placed to take decisions in terms of institutional positioning on the general business of the department.

6.2.3 Integration of the M&E with other Institutional Management Functions

According to Mackay (2008a:175), successful institutionalization of M&E relies on whether the M&E function is able to produce monitoring information and evaluation findings which are judged valuable by key stakeholders and are used to improve government performance. While he notes that M&E information and findings must be valuable for use by other stakeholders, he fails to address how the M&E function should relate to these stakeholders targeted to use M&E information and findings, and he also does not suggest ways in which this can be achieved. Mackay provides no insights on how monitoring information and evaluation findings can be channeled to other functions or stakeholders tasked with executing activities that are aimed at improving government performance through using of M&E information and findings.

A similar trend is noted in the literature for the case study departments. The literature indirectly notes the stakeholders for M&E information and findings. These stakeholders are noted through the institutional positioning of the M&E function closer to functions oriented towards policy or strategy development; strategic planning, coordination, management and support; policy or strategy or service delivery implementation support; and capacity development. However, although the literature reveals the institutional positioning of M&E in close proximity to these critical functions of the case study departments, the links between these functions and M&E are ill-defined. There is no clear outline of structural and operational arrangements that promote the utilization of M&E

information and findings in the critical departmental functions positioned closer to M&E for the obvious benefit of improving government performance.

It must also be noted that while other roles and responsibilities, or the scope and purpose for the M&E function described in Chapter Four indicate that the M&E units have a mandate to support some of the other critical functions of the case study departments, there is no (at least in most departments) clearly defined framework on how this support happens or is made possible. Not surprisingly, the Department of the Premier has (though vaguely with no details) attempted to describe how M&E findings will feed into the planning process. In this regard, the Department of the Premier notes that the Directorate: Review and Reporting is responsible for making recommendations based on evaluation findings to the Policy Development Unit in order to initiate a systematic provincial review (Western Cape Department of the Premier, 2006:59).

It should also be noted that the Department of Local Government and Housing did not fare badly in terms of describing how the M&E function will or is currently integrated with other functions in order to achieve that M&E information and findings will be used by other related stakeholders. The Department attempts to describe this when noting that it instituted the QPR 'Roundtable' process as a means by which Departmental managers are allowed an opportunity to review the performance of programmes of the Department, a process which is led by the M&E unit. It allows for the quarterly assessment, analysis and review of programme performance by the M&E unit, HOD and Senior Management of the Department. It also provides for the reflection on the achievement or non-achievement of targets set for the quarter under review (Western Cape Department of Local Government and Housing, 2008:14).

6.3 Conclusion

Despite the noted limitations and inadequacy of data obtained from the five case study departments which in some areas did not permit a full examination of how M&E has been organized in terms of the criteria identified, the researcher used the available data

satisfactorily to respond to the set research question. It should also be noted that in some cases there are gaps in the literature on assessment criteria. In some cases, the literature fails to provide a clear account of the criteria issues described. These gaps have led to serious shortcomings with regards to limiting the researcher's ability to give a thorough analytical account of the findings.

The findings of this study can be summarized as follows:

- Despite the evident lack of adequate clarity on how to operationalize the scope and purpose, the case study departments have made reasonable strides in the ways in which they have organized their M&E functions. They have done rather well in defining the scope and purpose of the M&E function. This was described under the description of roles and responsibilities for the M&E units. There is a sense of clarity with regard to what the M&E function entails and its operating boundaries.
- The departments have also not done badly in terms of institutional positioning (location and level) of the M&E function within their respective establishment. The institutional positioning is as follows: located closer to policy development and policy implementation support (Department of the Premier); service delivery support, transformation and human resource management (Department of Social Development); research, knowledge management, strategic coordination and HIV and AIDS (Department of Economic Development and Tourism); human resource management and administration, policy and strategy, financial management and communication (Department of Local Government and Housing); corporate services, strategic management and human resource management (Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport). This is the positioning that is mostly championed or favoured, as is described in the literature on criteria described in Chapter Two.
- It is common across all the departments that the M&E unit is found to be located closer to human resource management; policy development, implementation and support; and strategic planning. This is commendable given that even the expert or guiding literature on criteria as described in Chapter Two suggests this institutional position of the M&E function. Although the institutional positioning coupled with the

definition of scope and purpose is commendable, the case study departments did not present clearly and adequately how the M&E information and evaluation findings will feed to other stakeholders or related functions through a clearly defined framework.

- There are also noted limitations regarding addressing issues of M&E integration with other critical functions clearly and adequately, in order to maximize the utilization of M&E information and findings.
- It must also be noted that the study was conducted before the M&E function of these case study departments had matured to some degree; hence the data limitations in some areas.

In conclusion, when comparing the reviewed literature which presents the criteria for organizing an M&E function presented in Chapter Two, and the analysis of the case study department's documentation, describing how these departments have organized M&E in their establishments, it can be noted that these departments are to some degree aligned to the expert criteria defined. However, there are also some noted gaps which have been alluded to in the sections presented above.

6.4 Summary

This chapter presented an analysis of the findings regarding the ways in which the five case study departments have organized their M&E function. The analysis was done using the insights gained from the literature presented in Chapter Two which presented the criteria on institutionalizing M&E. It further presented concluding remarks which sought to summarize the responses to the research question formulated for this study.

REFERENCE LIST

Alkin, M. C. Ed. 1990. *Debates on evaluation*. London: Sage Publications.

Arild, H. 2001. Strengthening capacity for monitoring and evaluation in Uganda: results based perspective. *ECD working paper series*. 8: 1-32 [Online]. Available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/4585672-1252437578683/ECDWP8.pdf> [2007, March 22].

Babbie, E., Mouton, J., Vorster, P. & Prozesky, B. 2001. *The practice of social research*. Oxford; Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Bedi, T., Coudouel, A., Cox, M., Goldstein, M. & Thornton, N. 2006. *Beyond the understanding the institutions for monitoring the poverty reduction strategies*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Cloete, F., Wissink, H. & de Coning, C. 2006. *Improving public policy: from theory to practice*. 2nd ed. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.

Davies, I. C. 1999. Evaluation and performance management in government. *Evaluation*. 5:150-159. [Online] Available at <http://evi.sagepub.com/content/5/2/150.full.pdf+html> [2009, November 18].

Department of Provincial and Local Government. 2007. *The State of Skills Readiness in the South African Public Service: An overview of the Department of Provincial and Local Government*. Sheoraj, R. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Development Assistance Committee. 1998. *Principles for evaluation development assistance*. [Online]. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/63/50/2065863.pdf> [2008, April 13].

Diabre, Z. 2002. *Forward: the handbook on monitoring and evaluation for results*. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Dictionary of the Social Sciences. 2002. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fontaine, C. & Monnier, E. 2002. Evaluation in France. In *International Atlas of Evaluation*. J.-E. Furubo et al. Eds. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Henry, G.T. 1990. *Programme evaluation*. In M.L. Whicker & T.W. Areson. Ed. New York: Praeger Publishers.

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. 2002. *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation*. [Online]. Available at <http://www.ifrc.org/docs/evaluations/handbook.pdf> [2007, July 23].

Kroukamp, H.J. 2006. *Policy implementation for improved local government service delivery*. [Online]. Available at <http://econ.ufs.ac.za/templates/staff.aspx?pid=zsiZi4Qlei0%3D> [2009, November 23].

Kusek, J.Z. & Rist, R.C. 2002. Building results-based evaluation system: assessing developing countries readiness. [Online]. Available at http://www.zfev.de/fruehereAusgabe/ausgabe2002-1/download/kusek_rist.pdf, [2007, July 23].

MacDavid, J.C. & Hawthorn, L.R.L. 2006. *Programme evaluation and performance measurement: an introduction to practice*. London: Sage Publications.

Mackay, K. 2002. *Evaluation capacity development (ECD) and the poverty reduction strategy initiative: emerging*. [Online]. Available at [www.afrea.org/documents/Document.cfm%](http://www.afrea.org/documents/Document.cfm%20) [2009, September 20].

Mackay, K. 2008a. *Building monitoring and evaluation systems to improve government performance*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.ceecis.org/remf/Country-led_ME_systems_PART2.pdf. [2009, July 17].

Mackay, K. 2008b. *Helping Countries Build Government Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: World Bank Contribution to Evidence-based Policy Making*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Moagi, D.M. 2000. *Institutional arrangements for performance monitoring and evaluation in the public service*. MA Thesis. Faculty of Management, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Muradzikwa, S, 2005. *Implementing performance budgeting: lessons learnt from the Mpumalanga Department of Health*, Lecture notes distributed , University of Cape Town, Cape Town, July 2006.

National Treasury. 2007a. *Framework for programme performance information*. Pretoria: National Treasury.

National Treasury. 2007b. *Medium term expenditure framework*. Pretoria: National Treasury.

National Treasury. 2007c. *Medium term expenditure framework: Treasury guidelines*. Pretoria: National Treasury.

Nijzink, L. & Jacobs, S. 2000. Provincial elections and government formation in the Western Cape: the politics of polarization. *South African Journal of Public Studies*, vol.27,no.1[Online]Available:<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/routledg/cpsa/2000/00000027/00000001/art00003> [2007,September18].

Patton, M.Q. 2008. *Utilization-focused evaluation*. 4th ed. London: SAGE Publications.

Picciotto, R. 2005. The value of evaluation standards: a comparative assessment. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*. No. 3:30-59. [Online] Available at http://www.vision2020.info.tt/pdf/Guidelines_Tools_Techniques/Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation/Evaluation%20Papers/The_Value_of_Evaluation_Standards_A_Comparative_Assessment.pdf [2007, July 18]

Presidency. 2007a. From policy vision to operational reality: annual implementation update in support of the GMWE policy framework. Pretoria: The Presidency

Presidency. 2007b. Policy framework for the government-wide monitoring and evaluation system. Pretoria: The Presidency

Presidency. 2001. *A guide to the national planning framework*. Pretoria: The Presidency.

Presidency. 2005. *Proposal and implementation plan for a government-wide monitoring and evaluation system*. Pretoria: The Presidency.

Public Service Commission. 2004. *News: monitoring and evaluation*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Public Service Commission. 2006. *State of the public service report*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Public Service Commission. 2007a. *Guide on performance management for social development departments*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Public Service Commission. 2007b. *State of the public service report*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Public Service Commission. 2008. *Basic concepts in monitoring and evaluation*. Pretoria: Public Service Commission.

Republic of South Africa (RSA). 1996. *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*. Cape Town: Government Printer.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M. W., & Freeman, H. E. 2004. *Evaluation: a systematic approach*. 7th ed. London: SAGE Publications.

Scriven, M. 1991. *Evaluation thesaurus*. 4th ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Scriven, M. 2003. 'Michal Scriven on the differences between evaluation and social science research'. *The Evaluation Exchange*, vol. IX, no.4 [online]. Available: <http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/reflecting-on-the-past-and-future-of-evaluation/michael-scriven-on-the-differences-between-evaluation-and-social-science-research> [2007, October 18].

Segone, M. 2008a.Ed. *Bridging the gap: The role of monitoring and evaluation in evidence based policy making*. Washington, D.C.: UNICEF

Segone, M. 2008b.Ed. *Country-led monitoring and evaluation systems: Better evidence, better policies, better development results*. Washington, D.C. UNICEF.

Simister, N. 2009. *Developing M&E systems for complex organizations: a methodology*. [Online]. Available: www.samea.org.za/index.php%3Fmodule%3 [2009, August 28].

Sivagnanasothy, V. 2007. *Institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation systems in Srilanka – lessons learnt, best practices, issues, challenges and the way forward*. [Online]. Available: http://www.google.co.za/search?q=sivagnanasothy+2007&btnG=Search&hl=en&source=hp&aq=f&aqi=&aql=&oq=&gs_rfai= [2010, September 18].

Smith, P. 1995. On the unintended consequences of publishing performance data in the public sector. *International Journal of Public Administration*, vol.18, 277-310. [Online]. Available at www.informaworld.com/smpp/906147680-7. [2009, November 18].

Smith, N. L. & Brandon, P.R. Ed. 2008. *Fundamental issues in evaluation*. London: The Guildford Press.

Smith, N. L. 2004. Evidence and Ideology. Paper Presented at the Meeting of the Canadian Evaluation Society. Saskatoon, Canada: The Canadian Evaluation Society.

Statistics South Africa. 2008. *South African statistical quality assessment framework (SASQAF)*. Pretoria: Statistics South Africa.

United Nations Children's Fund. 1991. *A UNICEF guide for monitoring and evaluation: making a difference*. New York: United Nations Children's Fund.

United Nations Development Programme. 2002. *Handbook on monitoring and evaluating for results*. [Online]. Available at <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/HandBook/ME-HandBook.pdf>. [2009, August 15].

United Nations Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2002. *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management: United Nations Development Assistance Committee*. Washington: United Nations Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Development Co-operation Directorate.

United Nations Population Fund. 2004. Programme Manager's Planning Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit, Tool Number 1: Glossary of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Terms. New York: United Nations Population Fund.

Weiss, C. H. 1991. Evaluation research in political context: sixteen years and four administrations later. I. M. W. Maclaughlin & D.C. Phillips. Ed. *Evaluation and Education: At Quarter Century*. Chicago: The University Press. 211-231.

Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports. 2008. *Proposed monitoring and evaluation framework for the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sports.

Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism. 2006. *Departmental organizational performance management system*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism. 2008. *Departmental planning, monitoring and evaluation framework*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of Economic Development and Tourism.

Western Cape Department of Local Government. 2008. *Monitoring and evaluation conceptual framework for the Department of Local Government and Housing*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of Local Government.

Western Cape Department of Social Development. 2003. *Transformation plan*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of Social Development.

Western Cape Department of Social Development. 2008. *Integrated monitoring and evaluation strategy*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of Social Development.

Western Cape Department of the Premier. 2006. *Conceptual framework for the provincial-wide monitoring and evaluation system in the Western Cape*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of the Premier.

Western Cape Department of the Premier. 2008. *The Ikapa growth and development strategy: white paper for the Western Cape*. Cape Town: Western Cape Department of the Premier.

Zaltsman, A. 2006. Experience with institutionalizing monitoring and evaluation systems in five Latin American Countries: Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica and Uruguay. *Evaluation Capacity Development*, vol. 16 [Online]. Available: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEVACAPDEV/Resources/45856641253899870336/experience_inst_lac.pdf. [2010, July 25].

University of Cape Town