



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

DPME Guideline No 2.2.5

How to develop a Management Response to an Evaluation Report

Developed 28 March 2013

Updated 29 June 2014

Addressed to	M&E Units in Government Departments/programme managers who are undertaking evaluations
Purpose	The purpose of this practice note is to give practical guidance on how to develop a Management Response to evaluation final reports
Reference documents	National Evaluation Policy Framework
Contact person	Dr Ian Goldman, Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME E-mail: ian@po-dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 1918

1 Introduction

The research part of an evaluation is considered complete when the Evaluation Steering Committee approves the final evaluation report as a valid independent report. Departments will have provided comments on the draft report (eg to correct factual errors or to query recommendations) but there may still be areas in the report that the departments concerned do not agree with. For example evaluators may come up with some recommendations that are not feasible, or departments may not agree with all the recommendations. **Providing the report is technically valid and factually correct, the report should be approved by the Evaluation Steering Committee as an independent report.** However it is important for departments to be able to register the areas they do not agree with. Hence departments are provided an opportunity to provide a formal management response indicating which recommendations they accept, and substantive reasons for disagreement for the ones they do not accept.

2 Purpose of the Management Response

The purpose of the Management Response is to:

- 2.1 Ensure departments have an opportunity to respond to the specific recommendations from the evaluation indicating which they disagree with, and why;
- 2.2 Ensure that those recommendations that are agreed are identified for taking forward.

3 Process for developing the Management Response

- 3.1 Emerging results from evaluations should be presented to senior management prior to the final report. The steering committee should plan this as draft reports are received.
- 3.2 The Evaluation final report is produced and approved as technically acceptable by the Evaluation Steering Committee in a minuted meeting.
- 3.3 The DG of DPME then writes to the departments involved (or affected by the recommendations) with a table summarising the recommendations, asking the departments concerned to indicate for each recommendation whether they agree or not, and if they disagree why (see example in Annex 1).
- 3.4 Departments involved are given 30 days from the date of this letter to provide the management response to the evaluation.

- 3.5 The report/management response (and if finished the Improvement Plan) should be submitted by the Department to the Cabinet Committee within 3 months of the letter from DPME, failing which DPME will submit them.
- 3.5 The Evaluation Report is then presented to relevant Clusters, and then Cabinet for final approval.
- 3.6 Meanwhile an Improvement Plan is prepared within 4 months after the letter from the DG of DPME requesting a management response (see Guideline 2.2.6).
- 3.7 The department will be asked to submit a progress report on implementation of the improvement plan 10 months after the letter from the DG of DPME.
- 3.7 Communication processes are started after Cabinet approval, including putting up the evaluation report on the DPME website with the management response and improvement plan, and providing it to Portfolio Committees.

4 Format of the Management Response

- 4.1 **Annex A** shows the letter written by the DG DPME to the respective departments requesting a management response.
- 4.2 This includes a table listing the recommendations and providing an opportunity for the department to indicate agreement or disagreement and to explain, if a disagreement.
- 4.3 **Annex B** provides an example of a management response by a department. This must be signed by the Director-General (DG) of the commissioning Department.



Dr Sean Phillips
Director-General
The Presidency: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
Date: 29 June 2014

Annex 1



**THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Enquiries: (DPME contact person)

Name

Director General
Department of X
address
PRETORIA
0001

Dear Colleague

Name of evaluation

As you know the Department(s) of X and ourselves have been collaborating on a (name of evaluation) which was approved in the National Evaluation Plan of 20—to 20--.

The final report was approved by the Evaluation Steering Committee on (date). This is an approval that the evaluation is technically sound and that there are no factual errors, not necessarily agreeing with the content. I attach a copy of the Full Final Report as well as the Summary 1/5/25 report. The recommendations have been extracted and are shown in Table 1. We will immediately start the process of an independent quality assessment of the evaluation which is based on the evaluation standards which DPME has developed.

The next stages in the evaluation are to obtain a formal management response from the department involved about the content, particularly the recommendations. A Guideline on the Management Response is attached. To this end, I would like to invite you to respond officially within 30 days of the date of this letter (by date), endorsing or disagreeing with the combined recommendations in Table 1. To simplify this process could you endorse each recommendation (handwriting is fine) and indicate a substantive explanation if you disagree in the column provided. Then please initial each page and sign indicating your endorsement of the table as completed by you and return by (30 day date).

After the 30 days the Final Report and Management Response will be presented immediately by the Department to the (name of cluster) Cluster and Cabinet Committee. The report/management response (and if finished the Improvement Plan) should be submitted to the Cabinet Committee within 3 months of this letter by the Department, failing which DPME will submit them. After being tabled at Cabinet it will go up on the DPME and the Departmental websites and be sent to the relevant portfolio committees, suggesting you are invited to present the findings. Please let us know should you have any security concerns about a particular section of the report.

Within 4 months of this letter (ideally sooner), the Department with DPME will then develop an Improvement Plan based on the agreed findings.

The first six-monthly progress reports should be provided ten months from the date of this letter on the implementation of the Improvement Plan. I also attach a guideline on developing an Improvement Plan.

Kind regards

Dr Sean Phillips
Director-General
Date:

Signed

Name
Director-General
Department of X

Date:

Cc **Relevant Outcome Facilitator**
Cc Dr Ian Goldman, Head: Evaluation and Research
Cc **Relevant programme manager responsible for the evaluation (probably chair of the steering committee)**
Cc **Departmental M&E person involved in the evaluation**

Attached:

Annex 1: Table showing recommendations (management response table)
Annex 2: Full Final report on the evaluation
Annex 3: Summary 1/5/25 Report of the evaluation
Annex 4: Guideline on Management Response
Annex 5: Guideline on Improvement Plans

Table 1: Recommendations and management response (example from ECD)

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP	RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT	REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT
<p>1. A country strategy for ECD should be developed based on a National Integrated Regulatory framework for ECD, from which each department (DBE, DSD, DoH and if relevant other departments) should develop an implementation programme for their component. A Task Team should be established to produce the Strategy – with clear roles and responsibilities of key players and government departments. The country strategy should be submitted to Cabinet for approval.</p>		
<p>2. The national strategy should include a common definition of ECD; agreed provisioning based on age, stage of development, socio-economic circumstance and needs (including delivery services to reach poor and vulnerable children, and promoting universal access); multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral teams with funding streams & mechanisms in line with outcomes and results; specific institutional arrangements of interdepartmental and inter-sectoral cooperation with clear protocols; mechanisms for information sharing.</p>		
<p>3. etc</p>		

Annex 2: Example of Management Response

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE ECD EVALUATION STEERING GROUP	RECORD OF AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT	REASONS FOR DISAGREEMENT
services, showing models of good practice.		
15. Under-used space in community halls, traditional authority offices, schools, clinics, churches and homes can all be used to run home- and community-based programmes.	Agree with recommendation.	
HUMAN RESOURCES, TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING		
16. The National Curriculum Framework should take into consideration age ranges, ECD settings and, learning programme as articulated in Children's Act and NIPECD review recommendation.	Agree with recommendation. In addition to this recommendation it is also recommended that a decision should be taken on which department's responsibility the ECD Practitioners should be. Their basic conditions of employment needs attention.	
17. A human resource development strategy should be developed for all staff working in the ECD sector to improve staff qualifications, professionalise ECD, provide a career path and assist with retaining ECD workers. This should consider the different packages of services for different age groups. This should include staff working in early learning and care centres and programmes. To do this an audit of existing staff qualifications should be undertaken and resourcing made available for initial training	Agree with recommendation.	