

School of Government

MMPM 527 / MAPP 554
MONITORING AND EVALUATION
(15 Points)

Trimester Two 2008

COURSE OUTLINE

Names and Contact Details

Course Coordinator: **Kate McKegg**
PO Box 68, Te Awamutu
Telephone: (07) 870 1665
Mobile: 021 475 919
Fax: (07) 870 1663
Email: kate.mckgee@xtra.co.nz

Administrator: **Darren Morgan**
Room RH 821, Level 8, Rutherford House, Pipitea Campus
Telephone: (04) 463 5458
Fax: (04) 463 5454
Email: darren.morgan@vuw.ac.nz

School of Government Office Hours: 8.30am to 5.00pm, Monday to Friday

Trimester Dates

Monday 7 July to Saturday 8 November 2008

Class Times and Room Numbers

Module One:	Thursday 21 August 2008	8.30am – 6.00pm
Module Two:	Thursday 16 October 2008	8.30am – 6.00pm
Module Three:	Thursday 20 November 2008	8.30am – 6.00pm

Locations: Classes will be held on the Pipitea Campus of Victoria University and you will be advised of your classroom one week prior to each module by email.

Course Content

Module One: Monitoring and evaluation in a managing for outcomes context

- Performance, accountability and learning in an outcome focussed public sector context
- Evaluative thinking, capacity and capability in public sector organisations
- Performance measurement and the role of evidence in a political environment
- Integrating evaluative information and evidence into public sector planning, budgeting, managing and decision making
- Developing and applying intervention logic

Module Two: Evaluation fundamentals for planning, designing, managing and using evaluation in a public sector environment

- The logic of evaluation
- Evaluation forms, theories and approaches
- The purposes and types of evaluation
- Planning for evaluation and evaluation use
- Doing and managing evaluation in a public sector context
- Using evaluation - reporting and disseminating results

Module Three: Building public sector monitoring and evaluation capacity and capability - addressing the opportunities and challenges

- Evidence based policy and practice - what are the opportunities and challenges?
- Creating the conditions for the demand for and engagement with evaluative information
- Addressing the supply of skills and human capability for engaging with and using evaluative information
- Ensuring there are the necessary systems and structures to support evaluative inquiry
- Building 'evaluative cultures' in a public sector?

Course Objectives

At completion of this course, participants will have developed an understanding of:

- The types and purposes of a range of evidence and their application to performance measurement and management in a public sector context;
- The purposes and types of evaluation, evaluation logic, methodologies and approaches;
- The fundamentals of planning, managing and implementing evaluation;

- Some evaluation practice tools; and
- The issues and challenges faced by public sector organisations striving to effectively ‘manage for outcomes or results’ including the development of evaluative capacity and the integration of performance information into policy and public sector management contexts.

Expected Workload / Learning Commitment

The learning objectives set for each course are demanding and, to achieve them, candidates must make a significant commitment in time and effort to reading, studying, thinking, and completion of assessment items outside of contact time. Courses vary in design but all require preparation and learning before the first module. Regular learning is necessary between modules (students who leave everything to the last moment rarely achieve at a high level). Expressed in input terms, the time commitment required usually translates to 65-95 hours (excluding class contact time) per course.

Readings

Required Text

Davidson, J., (2005) *Evaluation Methodology Basics, The Nuts and Bolts of Sound Evaluation*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Highly Recommended Text

Lunt, N., Davidson, C., and McKegg, K., (2003) *Evaluating Policy and Practice, A New Zealand Reader*, Pearson Education, New Zealand

The Required Readings for this course will be provided in hard copy. Electronic copies of these readings are also available in Blackboard.

Many of the further readings are also available electronically in the same places. Others in the further reading list are available from the Victoria University and other libraries.

In relation to the readings, please note the following:

- This course is based on close reading of a relatively small number of documents. Most of the required readings are applied in nature, drawn from government or independent agencies, but do not underestimate their quality. Many are equal in substance to their commercial and academic counterparts.

Module One

Required Readings

- Mayne, J., (2003) Reporting on Outcomes: Setting Performance Expectations and Telling Performance Stories, Discussion Paper, Office of the Auditor General of Canada (July 2005)
- Mayne, J., (2007) Challenges and Lessons in Implementing Results-Based Management, Evaluation, Vol. 13(1): 87-109
- De Lancer Julnes, P., (2006) Performance Measurement – an Effective Tool for Government Accountability? The Debate Goes On, Evaluation Vol. 12(2): 219 - 235
- Managing For Outcomes Steering Group (November 2003) *Learning from Evaluative Activity, Enhancing Performance through Outcome-focussed Management*, Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Te Puni Kokiri, State Services Commission, The Treasury, New Zealand
www.ssc.govt.nz/display/document.asp?NavID=208&DocID=3580 (July 2005)
- State Services Commission and The Treasury, (December 2005) *Getting Better at Managing for Outcomes: A tool to help organisations consider their progress in results based management and identify development objectives*.
www.ssc.govt.nz/display/document.asp?NavID=253&DocID=4728
- Dr John Whitehead (2008) *The Ongoing Pursuit of State Sector Performance, Background Paper*, New Zealand Treasury, Wellington.
www.treasury.govt.nz/publications/media-speeches/speeches/continuity-change
- McKegg, K., (2006) (unpublished) Intervention Logic – A Tool for Demonstrating and Understanding Results

Recommended Readings

- Mayne, J., (1999) *Addressing Attribution Through Contribution Analysis: Using Performance Measures Sensibly*, Working Paper, Office of the Auditor General of Canada (July 2005)
- Innovation Network (2005) Logic Model Workbook, www.innonet.org

Pathfinder *Building Block 3: Intervention Logic*

http://io.ssc.govt.nz/pathfinder/documents/pathfinder-BB3-intervention_logic.pdf

Further Reading (Optional)

(The following are held as electronic files in Blackboard)

- State Services Commission and The Treasury, (March 2006) *Guidance and Requirements for Departments, Preparing the Statement of Intent*.
www.ssc.govt.nz/display/document.asp?NavID=253&DocID=5288

- Review of the Centre (September 2003) *Doing the Right Things and Doing Them Right, Improving Evaluative Activity in the New Zealand State Sector*, State Services Commission and Treasury, New Zealand.
www.ssc.govt.nz/display/document.asp?NavID=177&DocID=3506 (July 2005)
- Office of the Auditor-General, New Zealand (2002) *Reporting Public Sector Performance*, 2nd ed., Wellington.
- Perrin, B., (2002) *Towards a New View of Accountability*, Paper presented to the European Evaluation Society Annual Conference, Seville, Spain.
- Ussher C. and Kibblewhite A. (2001) *Outcome-Focused Management in New Zealand – A Background Paper*, Treasury Working Paper 01/05, Wellington.
- Department of Finance and Administration (2000) *The Outcomes and Outputs Framework: Guidance Document*, Canberra.
- Affholter, D., (1994) ‘Outcome Monitoring’, pp 97-118 in *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, Wholey, J., Hatry, H., Newcomer, K., (eds.), Josey-Bass Inc, San Francisco.
- HM Treasury, Cabinet Office, National Audit Office, Audit Commission, Office for National Statistics (March 2001) *Choosing the Right Fabric, A Framework for Performance Information*, United Kingdom
- Ryan B. (1992) ‘Monitoring Effectiveness in selected Social Policy Programs’, in O’Faircheallaigh C. and Ryan B. (eds.) *Performance Monitoring and Program Evaluation*, Sth Melbourne, Macmillan.
- Treasury Board Secretariat (2001) *Guide for the Development of Results-based Management and Accountability Frameworks*, Ontario.
- Chelimsky, V., (1985) ‘Comparing and Contrasting Auditing and Evaluation, Some Notes on Their Relationship’, *Evaluation Review*, Vol. 9, No. 4. pp 483-503.
- Caracelli, V., Droitcour, J., (2000) ‘*Cross Discipline Reports: Providing Policy Information by Combining Audit and Evaluation*’, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Evaluation Association, November 2, 2000, Hawaii.
- Program Development and Evaluation, University of Wisconsin Extension, Logic Model resources (as at July 2005)
www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicmodel.html
- Cabinet Office UK, *The Magenta Book: Chapter 1 – What is Policy Evaluation?*
www.policyhub.gov.uk/magenta_book/ (July 2005)
- Duignan, P., (2004) *Intervention Logic: How to Build Outcomes Hierarchy Diagrams Using the OH Diagramming Approach*,
www.strategievaluation.info/se/documents/124f.html (July 2005)

Office of the Auditor-General (OAG) (2000) *First Report for 2000: Chapter 6, Impact Evaluation*, Wellington.

Canadian International Development Agency, 1997, *The Logical Framework, Making it Results Oriented*
www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/acdicida.nsf/En/REN-218132726-PPN

Sue Funnell, '*Program Logic: an adaptable tool for designing and evaluating programs*' in *Evaluation News and Comment*, July 1997

Module Two

Required Readings

Lunt, N., Davidson, C., and McKegg, K., (2003) *Evaluating Policy and Practice, A New Zealand Reader*, Pearson, New Zealand - **Sections Two – chapters 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 AND Section Three – chapter 3.1 and 3.5**

Stevahn, L., King, J., Ghore, G., Minnema, J., (2005) *Establishing Essential Competencies for Program Evaluators*, *American Journal of Evaluation*, Vol. 26, pp 43-59

Recommended Readings

Davidson, J., (2005) *Evaluation Methodology Basics, The Nuts and Bolts of Sound Evaluation*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California. – **Chapters One, Two, Six and Eight**

Australasian Evaluation Society Inc (2002) *Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations* Australia. www.aes.asn.au

American Evaluation Association (2005) *Program Evaluation Standards Summary*
www.wmich.edu/evalctr/jc/

Further Readings (Optional)

Weiss, C., (1998) *Evaluation*, Second Edition, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Bamberger, M., Rugh, J., and Mabry, L., (2006) *RealWorld Evaluation – Working Under Budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Smith, N., and Brandon, P. R., (2008) *Fundamental Issues in Evaluation*, The Guildfuil Press, New York.

Module Three

Required Readings

Lunt, N., Davidson, C., and McKegg, K., (2003) *Evaluating Policy and Practice, A New Zealand Reader*, Pearson, New Zealand **Sections Five and Six**

Mayne, J., Divorski, S., Lemaire, D., (1999) 'Locating Evaluation: Anchoring Evaluation in the Executive or the Legislature, or Both or Elsewhere?' pp 23-52 in *Building Effective Evaluation Capacity, Lessons from Practice*, Boyle, R., and Lemaire, D., (eds.), Transactions Publishers, New Jersey.

Cousins, B. J., Goh, S.C., and Clark, S., (2004) 'Integrating Evaluative Inquiry into The Organizational Culture: A Review and Synthesis of the Knowledge Base', *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, Volume 19, (2) pp 99-141.

Mark. M., and Henry, (2004) The Mechanisms and Outcomes of Evaluation Influence, *Evaluation*, Vol. 10(1): 35-37

Recommended Readings

McDonald, B., Rogers, P., and Kefford, B., (2003) 'Teaching People to Fish? Building the Evaluation Capability of Public Sector Organizations', *Evaluation*, Volume 9 (1) pp 9-29.

Further Readings (Optional)

Duignan, P., (2002) 'Building Social Policy Evaluation Capacity', *Social Policy Journal*, Issue 19. December, pp 179-194.

Ryan B. (2003) 'Death by Evaluation? Reflections on Monitoring and Evaluation in Australia and New Zealand', *Evaluation Journal of Australasia* Volume 3, No. 1. August, pp 6-16.

Owen, J., (2003) 'Evaluation Culture: A Definition and Analysis of its Development Within Organisations', *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, Volume 3. No. 1. August, pp 43-47.

Sonnichsen, R., (1999) 'Building Evaluation Capacity within Organisations', pp 53-73 in *Building Effective Evaluation Capacity, Lessons from Practice*, Boyle, R., and Lemaire, D., (eds.), Transactions Publishers, New Jersey.

Sonnichsen, R.C., (2000) *High Impact Internal Evaluation, A Practitioner's Guide to Evaluating and Consulting Inside Organisations*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Preskill, H., and Torres, R., (1999) *Evaluative Inquiry for learning in Organisations*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks.

Walker, R., (2001) 'Great Expectations: Can Social Science Evaluate New Labour's Policies?' *Evaluation*, Vol. 7. No. 3 pp 305-330.

Assessment Requirements

There are four items of assessment. They are:

Item	Marks	Due
Essay One (3,000 – 3,500 words)	30%	Monday 15 September 2008
Logic Model	20%	Friday 24 October 2008
Essay Two (3,500 – 4,000 words)	40%	Friday 28 November 2008
Attendance and Participation	10%	A roll will be taken at each block course and credit will be given for individual and group participation during the year

Essay One (due Monday 15 September 2008)

There is now considerable evidence and literature that point to some of the important characteristics of organisations who are effectively managing for outcomes or results. One key feature identified is evaluative capacity i.e., the capacity of organisations to integrate performance information into the planning, budgeting and management systems and processes.

There is also now a considerable body of literature that discusses the challenges that exist to effectively realising the high levels of evaluative capacity and capability considered necessary to effectively manage for outcomes or results.

The Assignment

Choose a public sector organisation and review at least 2 years of the organisation's Statement of Intent and Annual Reports. You may also review and draw from other publicly available performance information relevant to the organisation.

Drawing on the literature and examples from the organisation's performance documents and information, undertake a critical analysis and present a robust argument that addresses the following questions:

1. What characteristics of an organisation 'managing for outcome or results' does your selected organisation demonstrate?
2. What are the strengths to the organisation's approach, and what are the weaknesses and/or challenges?

3. To what extent does the public sector organisation demonstrate it has evaluative capacity, i.e., it is integrating performance information into its planning, budgeting and managing systems and processes?
4. To what extent does the organisation demonstrate it is effectively managing for its outcome or results?

Logic Model (due Friday 24 October 2008)

Step One

Select a public sector programme that you are familiar with, or that you have access to information about.

Step Two

Provide a contextual analysis (maximum of 2,500 words) of your chosen programme based on the following questions:

1. What is the background and rationale for this particular programme?
2. Who is/are the target group(s) for the programme?
3. What need(s) is the programme designed to address?
4. What evidence is there to support questions 1 to 3 above?
5. What are the intended immediate, intermediate and longer term outcomes for the programme? Why have these have been selected and not others? Do these reflect the needs identified above, or are they different?
6. Are the underlying causes of the programme outcomes addressed in the programme theory? If so, then how? If not, why not?
7. What factors might limit the ability of the programme to achieve the intended stated outcomes been identified?
8. What foreseeable negative outcomes could also occur?

Step Three

Prepare a logic model or results-expectations chart for the programme. This will need to include at the very least, programme activities or process components, as well as a range of expected outcomes. It will need to demonstrate logical linkages between each component of the logic. It should be presented in a one page diagram.

Essay Two (due Friday 28 November 2008)

Step One

Taking the programme that you developed the intervention logic for in the second assignment:

1. Select two programme activities / process components of the logic that you consider to be crucial to the operation of the programme. Identify the criteria you would use to make a judgment about how good or valuable these components of the programme's

content or implementation is / was? Explain (i) why you selected these components; and (ii) how you identified the criteria. Are some of the criteria more important than others? In other words, are there some criteria that should the programme do poorly on, it would jeopardise the viability of the programme? What are these and why?

2. Select at least two outcomes that you consider are critical outcomes to evaluate. Identify the criteria you would use to judge how good or valuable the outcomes are for programme recipients? As in (1) above, explain (i) why you selected these outcomes; and (ii) on what basis you decided upon the criteria? Are some of the criteria more important than others? In other words, are there some criteria that should the programme do poorly on, it would jeopardise the viability of the programme? What are these and why?
3. Now for these outcomes, develop the standards (merit criteria) by which you would judge how well the programme had performed on these outcomes?
4. Now looking at the criteria you have developed for the process components and the outcome components, what kind (form, type etc) of evidence do you think you would need (i.e., would be credible to you and the key stakeholders) if you were going to evaluate the programme?

Step Two

Now, consider you are going to manage an evaluation of the programme. You have decided that you will contract an external evaluator or a team of evaluators to undertake this work. With reference to the logic and criteria you have developed, as well as credible evidence requirements, prepare a detailed specification of the particular skills and competencies that you consider would be necessary for an evaluator or evaluation team to have, in order to evaluate this programme.

Identify the competencies you would consider to be (i) most important; (ii) very important; and (iii) somewhat important. Explain why you have ranked them as you have.

Now, outline a process you consider would be appropriate for identifying and selecting an evaluator or evaluation team to do the work.

Step Three

Finally, identify the important organisational and political characteristics that will be necessary to support the design, implementation and use of this evaluation? Thinking about the context surrounding this programme, do these conditions appear to exist? Describe in detail what the implications for the management of the evaluation are in this instance?

Please submit ALL assignments IN HARD COPY to:

Post Experience Programmes,
School of Government,
Victoria University of Wellington,
Level 8 Reception,
Rutherford House,
23 Lambton Quay,
P.O. Box 600,
Wellington.

Assignments that are submitted in person should be placed in the secure box at School of Government reception (Level 8, Rutherford House) during office hours of 8.30am to 5.00pm, Monday to Friday. The assignment box is cleared daily, and assignments will be date stamped.

Students should keep a copy of all submitted work.

Penalties

The ability to plan for and meet deadlines is a core competency of both advanced study and public management. Failure to meet deadlines disrupts course planning and is unfair on students who do submit their work on time. It is expected therefore that you will complete and hand in assignments by the due date. Marks may be deducted where assignments are submitted after the due date. For out of town students, two calendar days' grace is given to allow for time in the post.

If ill-health, family bereavement or other personal emergencies prevent you from meeting the deadline for submitting a piece of written work or from attending class to make a presentation, you can apply for and may be granted an extension to the due date. Note that this applies only to extreme unforeseen circumstances and is not necessarily awarded. You should let your Course Coordinator know as soon as possible in advance of the deadline if you are seeking an extension.

Mandatory Course Requirements

To fulfil the mandatory course requirements for this course, you are required to:

1. Submit all assignments by the due date;
2. Attend all contact sessions of the course.

Communication of Additional Information

Additional information may be provided in class, by post, by email or via Blackboard.

Withdrawal Dates

Students giving notice of withdrawal from this course after **Monday 1 September 2008** will NOT receive a refund of fees.

Students giving notice of withdrawal from this course after **Wednesday 19 November 2008** are regarded as having failed the course, unless the Associate Dean subsequently gives approval to withdraw.

Notice of withdrawal must be in writing / emailed to the Masters Administrator. Ceasing to attend or verbally advising a member of staff will NOT be accepted as a notice of withdrawal.

Faculty of Commerce and Administration Offices

Railway West Wing (RWW) - FCA Student and Academic Services Office

The Faculty's Student and Academic Services Office is located on the ground and first floors of the Railway West Wing. The ground floor counter is the first point of contact for general enquiries and FCA forms. Student Administration Advisers are available to discuss course status and give further advice about FCA qualifications. To check for opening hours, call the Student and Academic Services Office on (04) 463 5376.

Easterfield (EA) - FCA/Education/Law Kelburn Office

The Kelburn Campus Office for the Faculties of Commerce and Administration, Education and Law is situated in the Easterfield Building on the ground floor (EA 005). This counter is the first point of contact for:

- Duty tutors for student contact and advice.
- Information concerning administrative and academic matters.
- Forms for FCA Student and Academic Services (e.g. application for academic transcripts, requests for degree audit, COP requests).
- Examinations-related information during the examination period.

To check for opening hours, call the Student and Academic Services Office on (04) 463 5376.

Use of Turnitin

Student work provided for assessment in this course may be checked for academic integrity by the electronic search engine www.turnitin.com. Turnitin is an on-line plagiarism prevention tool which identifies material that may have been copied from other sources, including the Internet, books, journals, periodicals or the work of other students. Turnitin is used to assist academic staff in detecting misreferencing, misquotation, and the inclusion of unattributed material, which may be forms of cheating or plagiarism. At the discretion of the School, handwritten work may be copy typed by the School and subject to checking by Turnitin. You are strongly advised to check with your tutor or the course coordinator if you are uncertain about how to use and cite material from other sources. Turnitin will retain a copy of submitted materials on behalf of the University for detection of future plagiarism, but access to the full text of submissions will not be made available to any other party.

General University Policies and Statutes

Students should familiarise themselves with the University's policies and statutes, particularly the Assessment Statute, the Personal Courses of Study Statute, the Statute on Student Conduct and any statutes relating to the particular qualifications being studied. See the Victoria University Calendar or go to www.victoria.ac.nz/home/about/policy/students.aspx

For information on the following topics, go to the Faculty's website www.victoria.ac.nz/fca, under Important Information for Students:

- Academic Grievances
- Student and Staff Conduct
- Meeting the Needs of Students with Impairments
- Student Support

Academic Integrity and Plagiarism

Academic integrity is about honesty – put simply it means *no cheating*. All members of the University community are responsible for upholding academic integrity, which means staff and students are expected to behave honestly, fairly and with respect for others at all times.

Plagiarism is a form of cheating which undermines academic integrity. The University defines plagiarism as follows:

The presentation of the work of another person or other persons as if it were one's own, whether intended or not. This includes published or unpublished work, material on the Internet and the work of other students or staff.

It is still plagiarism even if you re-structure the material or present it in your own style or words.

Note: including the work of others will not be considered plagiarism as long as the work is acknowledged by appropriate referencing.

Plagiarism is prohibited at Victoria and is not worth the risk. Any enrolled student found guilty of plagiarism will be subject to disciplinary procedures under the Statute on Student Conduct and may be penalised severely. Consequences of being found guilty of plagiarism can include:

- an oral or written warning
- cancellation of your mark for an assessment or a fail grade for the course
- suspension from the course or the University.

Find out more about plagiarism, and how to avoid it, on the University's website: www.victoria.ac.nz/home/studying/plagiarism.html

Manaaki Pihipihinga Programme

Manaaki Pihipihinga is an academic mentoring programme for undergraduate Māori and Pacific students in the Faculties of Commerce and Administration, and Humanities and Social Sciences. Sessions are held at the Kelburn and Pipitea Campuses in the Mentoring Rooms, 14 Kelburn Parade (back courtyard), Room 109D, and Room 210, Level 2, Railway West Wing. There is also a Pacific Support Coordinator who assists Pacific students by linking them to the services and support they need while studying at Victoria. Another feature of the programme is a support network for Postgraduate students with links to Postgraduate workshops and activities around Campus.

For further information, or to register with the programme, email manaaki-pihipihinga-programme@vuw.ac.nz or telephone (04) 463 6015. To contact the Pacific Support Coordinator, email pacific-support-coord@vuw.ac.nz or telephone (04) 463 5842.