



Responding to MPAT requirements

Lungiswa Zibi



planning, monitoring
& evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



MPAT Background

- ❖ In 2015 DPME decided to assess the readiness of departments in institutionalising the evaluation function in government by introducing a standard for evaluation in the DPME's Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT).
- ❖ The overall purpose of the MPAT is to assess the quality of management practices in departments in four management performance areas namely:
 - Strategic Management,
 - Governance and Accountability,
 - Human Resource Systems and
 - Financial Management
- ❖ The evaluation standard forms part of the Strategic Management Key Performance Area 1 (KPA).
- ❖ MPAT is a self assessment tool. However the scores are moderated.

What does the MPAT Evaluation Standard entail?

Standards

Level 1

- Evaluations system in the department is not formalised and implemented

Level 2

- Department has planned capacity to manage/conduct evaluation

Level 2+

- Relevant staff are in place
- Department has approved or adopted guidelines that follow the national evaluation system

Level 3

- Multi-year evaluation plan that follows the national evaluation system

Level 4

- Department has undertaken at least 1 evaluation of a programme, policy, plan, project or system in the previous 2 years, or is currently undertaking one
- Each evaluation has a steering committee ensuring effective oversight of the evaluation process
- Each completed evaluation has an approved management response and improvement plan
- Departmental evaluations are made public on departmental websites

Findings for Level 1 Standard

Evaluations system in the department is not formalised and implemented

Findings for Level 1:

- ❖ Departments scored themselves a 1, although in some cases the evidence showed otherwise.
- ❖ There were cases where departments scored themselves higher but evidence was not submitted or was insufficient.

Recommendations:

- ❖ Departments are encouraged to go through the *DPME Evaluation Guideline 2.2.18: Toolkit for addressing Evaluation Standard for MPAT* as it provides details on expectations.

Findings for Level 2 Standard

Department has planned capacity to manage/conduct evaluation

Findings:

- ❖ No clear indication that evaluation is the core function.
- ❖ Focus is more on policy, planning, monitoring and research.
- ❖ In most cases, the evidence provided was outdated and does not cover the financial year under review.

Expectations:

- ❖ Posts exist on the approved structure and is funded.
- ❖ Evaluation is one of the key functions of the job description or performance agreement.
- ❖ Departments to upload evidence covering the year under review.

Issues to be considered to avoid low rating

1. Unclear organisational structure and job descriptions
2. No clear indication that evaluation is a core function in the post
3. Focus of job description is more on policy, planning, monitoring and research

Findings for Level 2+ Standard

Relevant staff members are in place; Department has approved or adopted guidelines that follow the national evaluation system

Findings:

- ❖ Relevant staff members are in place: More departments seems to be getting this right based on the evidence submitted.
- ❖ Adoption of DPME guidelines: Most departments submitted 1 guideline (DEP) and did not indicate formal adoption.

Expectations:

- ❖ Filled position (Recent evidence of appointed staff with an evaluation responsibility)
- ❖ Adopt the DPME's NES guidelines as they are; **or**
- ❖ Develop a Departmental Evaluation Guideline customised to be relevant to the needs of the department, building on the NES guidelines and detailing how evaluation are undertaken in the department.

Findings for Level 3 Standard

Multi-year evaluation plan that follows the national evaluation system

Findings:

- ❖ There is an improvement from the past cycles
- ❖ Provincial departments submitted the PEP.
- ❖ Some national departments submitted the NEP.
- ❖ Other departments were loading TORs, concept notes and other short documents that do not look like plans.

Expectations:

- ❖ Current approved multiyear departmental evaluation plan (DEP) that follows the guideline on DEP

Level 4 Standards

Department has undertaken at least 1 evaluation of a programme, policy, plan, project or system in the previous 2 years, or is currently undertaking one; Each evaluation has a steering committee ensuring effective oversight of the evaluation process; Each completed evaluation has an approved management response and improvement plan; Departmental evaluations are made public on departmental websites.

Findings:

- ❖ Research reports were submitted instead of evaluations
- ❖ Some loaded TORs instead of Steering Committee minutes
- ❖ Lack of understanding of the terms used e.g. management response and improvement plan.

Recommendation :

- ❖ Departments are encouraged to go through the *DPME Evaluation Guideline 2.2.18: Toolkit for addressing Evaluation Standard for MPAT* as it provides details on expectations.

NGIYATHOKOZA

DANKIE **KE A LEBOGA**

NGIYABONGA

NDIYABULELA

INKOMU **NDI KHOU**
LIVHUHA

Thank you