AN ANALYSIS OF THE PURPOSES AND USES OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION WITHIN NGOS: A CASE STUDY OF THE CENTRE FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE (CCJ)

BY

Johnson, Uduak Friday
208505766

BA HONOURS in PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS
(UNIVERSITY OF KWAZULU-NATAL)

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Social Science (Policy and Development Studies), in the Faculty of Humanities, Development and Social Science at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

2011

DECLARATION

I, Johnson, Uduak Friday declare that

(i) The research in this dissertation, except where otherwise indicated, is my original work.

(ii) This dissertation/thesis has not been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

(iii) This dissertation/thesis does not contain other persons' data, pictures, graphs or other information, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other persons.

(iv) This dissertation/thesis does not contain other persons' writing, unless specifically acknowledged as being sourced from other researchers. Where other written sources have been quoted, then:

a) Their words have been re-written but the general information attributed to them has been referenced;

b) Where their exact words have been used, their writing has been placed inside quotation marks, and referenced.

(v) Where I have reproduced a publication of which I am an author, co-author or editor, I have indicated in detail which part of the publication was actually written by myself alone and have fully referenced.

(vi) This dissertation/thesis does not contain text, graphics or tables copied and pasted from the internet, unless specifically acknowledged, and the source being detailed in the dissertation and in the references sections.

Student Signature: .... Date: ....

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- My most revered gratitude goes to God, the maker of all things, who in His infinite mercy and love is pleased to see me complete this thesis to His Glory in Jesus. In the same light, I thank my Christian family, members of Rabboni House of Missions, for their support in standing by and praying for me during the tough times.
- I also wish to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Desiree Manicom, for her valuable contribution and leadership in directing this study. I appreciate her patience and vital suggestions towards ensuring that this paper is of high quality.
- My family deserves special mention, for the trust, the prayers and the love, despite being miles away, and for their emotional support when I needed them most.
- For all those who have contributed financially to the success of my studies, I ask God to bless you, and I thank you.
- I thank the Centre for Criminal Justice (CCJ), for making the dream of doing a Masters degree a reality, through the experience and opportunity to learn with them as an intern. Your support was invaluable; Winnie Kubayi, the director of CCJ deserves special thanks for encouraging my desire to do a study on monitoring and evaluation, and for engaging me intellectually towards achieving this end.
- To Mr Richard Bell, who edited the final draft of this thesis, thank you.
- As the saying goes, if I can see farther, it is because I am standing on the shoulders of giants. Thank you to all those who allowed me to stand on their shoulders in order to see this far. Although some names are not mentioned here, there are many others whom I sincerely thank from the depth of my heart.
- God bless you all.

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to critically analyze the purposes and uses of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) within NGOs. It proceeded from the criticisms often levelled against M&E with regards to its relevance and its numerous failures. Moreover, if development programme interventions are already justified through useful services rendered to beneficiaries, what impact does development assistance projects like M&E have in the lives of individual beneficiaries of these programmes, especially considering the fact that significant resources and time are expended on M&E? Prompted by this question, the study investigated the strengths and challenges experienced by NGOs in using M&E in programme implementation.

Given the numerous and diverse definitions of M&E and its diversity in practice among organizations, it was necessary to carry out the investigation through a case study; using a qualitative research method. The Centre for Criminal Justice (CCJ) was chosen for the case-study, given its history of the use of M&E in its outreach programme implementation. A semi-structured interview was used to gather data from a sample of seven members of the organization from different levels, ranging from management, the evaluator, head office staff and implementation staff who are either directly or indirectly involved in a vital way in the M&E process. This was to solicit diverse and in-depth responses from different perspectives on the purposes and uses of M&E within the organization.

Findings revealed that the organization has institutionalized a well-structured, top-down and ongoing monitoring process to gather data daily from the services provided by the implementation staff. It also boasts an ongoing M&E system that follows the three-year cycle of the programme. This is besides other M&E related research carried out in the organization. The study found that some of those involved in the M&E process within CCJ have little or no understanding of the role of M&E within the organization. The implementation staff, for instance, who gather routine monitoring data, were found not to understand the full significance of their services to the M&E and development process as a whole. Beneficiaries were found not to understand the role of M&E within the organization and the impact it has on the services which they receive.

The implications of such lack of knowledge to the development process is based on the assertion that the ‘objectives of social development programmes should be to help the indigenous communities or underprivileged groups (such as women, landless labourers, ...) develop the organizational capacity and knowledge needed to identify and satisfy their own needs’ (Valadez & Bamberger 1994: 9). In other words, if their participation should have more relevant outcomes, they need to be aware of what they are engaged in. This is a precondition for sustainable development and ownership of the development process. When this is lacking, there can be resistance or poor participation in the process and the threat of paternalism. The dilemma is that M&E is very technical.

TABLE OF CONTENT

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary* defines *purpose* as 'the intention, aim or function of something; the thing that something is supposed to achieve' (Wehmeier 2001: 948). Murphy & Marchant (1988: 1) define monitoring as 'an internal function, and integral part of good management'. Evaluation can be described as a means of assessing a programme or policy to measure its effectiveness or efficacy (Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1995: 5). The objectives of this research include: to critically analyse the function of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) in the implementation of programmes within Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), to determine the role of M&E in the implementation of programmes within organizations, to examine the strengths or usefulness of M&E and the problems and challenges that an organization faces in using M&E in its programme implementation.

The Centre for Criminal justice (CCJ) which this study uses as a case study, 'operates as an integrated development, outreach and research entity within the Faculty of Law on the Pietermaritzburg campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal' (CCJ Document 4 2009: 2). CCJ began by initially conducting research into the limitations of South Africa's criminal justice system; and went on to implement an outreach development programme that provides access to justice to poor people who could not access the justice system in rural communities within KwaZulu-Natal. CCJ is suitable for this research because its experience of regularly conducting various types of monitoring and evaluations to continually assess the operation, progress and effectiveness of the outreach programme implementation (CCJ Document 3 2001).

Tuckermann (2007: 21-22) states that understanding the challenges and strengths of M&E should help organizations to better utilize M&E in their programme implementation. This happens if an organization harnesses the identified strengths and uses them to enhance their programme implementation. Weaknesses, challenges and bad practices, when identified, can be reflected upon to make amendments and corrections, where necessary. Other unsuitable practices can be discontinued for the growth and better use of M&E in the organizations' programme implementation (Tuckermann 2007: 21 & 27).

Regarding the concepts of M&E, Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick (1997: 5), and Carol Weiss (1998: 3), agree that almost all definitions of M&E contain some elements of measurement or judgment of the worth or merit of something. Examining the worth and value of things is a basic human behaviour (Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997: 6 & 7). Weiss (1998: 3-4) adds that people evaluate or make different kinds of judgements of the worth of things daily, without actually calling it evaluation. This study is interested in the monitoring and evaluation of social programmes. A social programme can be described as an administrative means designed to address an identified social problem in a given society (Rutman 1984, in Babbie & Mouton 2002: 335). Social programmes are therefore more complex phenomena than everyday judgement of values. The systematic nature of social programmes requires systematic judgements which characterize the popular use of the term M&E adopted in this study (Weiss 1998: 6).

The practices of programme evaluations have become increasingly popular over the years[1] and this can be attributed to three factors. Firstly, Weiss (1998: 6) distinguishes between private programmes and non-profit ones, observing that private programmes survive due to the quality of services – where customer satisfaction attracts more use and thus justifies the programmes (Weiss 1998: 8). Government and non-profit programmes, to the contrary, are often immune to such means of assessment because they are sometimes the only services available in certain areas, or the only ones that are free (Weiss 1998: 6). These programmes often continue irrespective of demand or level of customer satisfaction. To determine the value of such programmes, stakeholders, especially funders and programme managers, often seek some form of assessment, not just to ensure the survival of specific programmes, but also to answer relevant questions about a programme that arise among different stakeholders. This has popularized the use of M&E around the world in programme implementations within public or non-profit organizations (Weiss 1998: 6).

Secondly, Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick (1997: 4) and Estrella & Gaventa (2008: 3) reveal that, over the years, as resource deficits began to plague non-profit and public agencies, with programmes and policies still needing to be implemented, policy-makers and programme managers are forced to cancel some programmes in order to provide sufficient

[1] The formal nature of programme evaluation distinguishes it from informal evaluation, which is based on impression and lacks systematic assessment (no evidence collected about the relative merit of the available alternatives). Informal evaluation is said to date as far back as the beginning of mankind. Programme evaluation is traceable to years around 1900; and Scriven (1967) is considered the earliest proponent of formal evaluation in the United States (Worthan, Sanders and Fitzpatrick 1997: 8).

funds to launch and maintain others. The criteria for making such choices and decisions required a systematic approach to decision-making by these policy-makers and programme managers. Such criteria included progress, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, accountability, justice, equity, acceptability in terms of community standards, enjoyment and satisfaction, contribution to social harmony and proper planning (Weiss 1998: 4). These criteria are assessed through formalized and systematic evaluation. This has made M&E increasingly popular as the means of responding to these questions, issues and concerns within organizations.

Thirdly, as M&E continues to grow in popularity and practice, and with target audiences in virtually every sector of modern society around the world, new questions about M&E are emerging (Valadez & Bamberger 1994: 4-5 and Worthan, Sanders &, Fitzpatrick 1997: 4). These questions include: Why is there confusion about what evaluations are? Is there a way of reaching a common understanding of the term and practice of evaluation (Estrella & Gaventa 2008: 4 & 12, Valadez and Bamberger (1994: 4-5)? Why are there discrepancies in the purposes and uses of evaluations among organizations that utilize them (Palumbo & Hallett 1998: 39-43)? Following this confusion and the high rates of failure recorded of M&E conducted by organizations, many evaluations have been seen not to answer the questions that they were meant to answer (Ambrose 2010: n.p.).

In spite of these above challenges, Weiss (1998: 6) and Michael Patton (1997: 197) feel that more and more people[2] care about whether or not programmes are doing what they are supposed to; and getting the expected results. People are also increasingly interested in how less money could be spent on programmes or how better results could be achieved or, better still, how to achieve both of these objectives in programme implementation (Weiss 1998: 6). Weiss (1998: 6) stresses that there is no alternative for addressing these concerns for M&E theorists, programme managers, funders, evaluators and programme staff, except through improved M&E information. This raises an important question for both scholars and M&E practitioners: how do we make M&E better?

[2] These people are those who spend money to keep the programme going, including the government, business, non-profit organizations, etc.; The legislators, boards of directors and future clients of a programme also have such interests (Weiss 1998: 6; Patton 1997: 197).

In addressing a similar question, Brunner (2004: 103) suggests that a context-sensitive approach to M&E might help to answer this question. This is an approach that pays attention to differences and changes in context to accommodate uncertainties and ambiguities arising from the human factors central to a programme. These human factors are issues related to people in poor communities trusting in themselves and in outsiders who bring in development aid. Brunner (2004: 103) emphasises that developing such a system must harvest from the experience of practitioners in the field. The current study is thus motivated not to focus on results, but to look at the experience of M&E practices for the purpose of learning lessons for improvement of the M&E system. The study is interested in lessons related to the strengths and challenges that NGOs experience in the practice of M&E; focusing on the purposes and uses of M&E within these NGOs.

The present investigation focuses on a case study of an organization, the Centre for Criminal Justice (CCJ) which has a track record of using M&E for its programme implementation (Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005: 43). The contextual issues investigated in the practice of M&E within the CCJ range from common assumptions, understandings of theory and practice and how these affect the actual practice of M&E within the organization. The next section presents the research problems and objectives of this study.

1.1. Research Problems and Objectives: broad questions to be asked

The broader questions that this study present in order to answer the specific questions are:

- What is monitoring and how does it differ from evaluation? (what do organizations monitor and what do they evaluate?)
- Why are organizations undertaking M&E? (Is it for decision-making? For organisation learning? For accountability? To understand whether or not their interventions are making a difference? To record their programme history? Or is it evaluation to fulfil grant requirements?)
- How do organizations undertake an M&E exercise (design and management)?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of M&E within organizations?
- How do organizations utilize M&E reports?

Research Problems and Objectives: Key questions to be asked

The specific focus is on the case-study: the questions are related to M&E in the CCJ Outreach Programme:

- What is the understanding of M&E within the CCJ? (the different perceptions of what M&E is among different stakeholders; including the differences between monitoring and evaluation)
- Why does the CCJ undertake M&E (the purposes and uses of M&E)?
- How does the CCJ undertake M&E exercises and who is responsible for designing and managing M&E within the CCJ)?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of using M&E within the CCJ?
- How does the CCJ utilize M&E reports?

1.2. Overview of Research Design

The research uses a qualitative methodology. The main concern of this methodology is to 'understand social action in terms of its specific context rather than trying to generalize to some theoretical population' (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 270). The method tries 'to describe and interpret people's feelings and experiences in human terms rather than through quantification and measurement' (Blanche, Durrheim & Painter 2006: 272). It is adopted where in-depth information is needed to explain a phenomenon. What is important is an acquaintance with the perspective of the insider; where the goal is to describe and understand, not merely to explain the behaviour of the respondents.

1.2.1. Case Study

The type of qualitative methodology used in this research is the case study. Rubin & Babbie (1997: 402) define a case study as an empirical enquiry that 'investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident and when multiple sources of evidence are used'. The main aim of a case study is to try and understand a person, an institution or an event by studying a single case (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 280) for a period of time. Bouma (1996: 89) explains that a case study is aimed at answering the question 'what is going on?' This is achieved through considering Babbie and Mouton's (2002: 281) view that a case study takes 'multiple perspectives into account and attempts to understand the influences of multilevel social systems on subjects' perspectives and behaviours'.

A rationale for undertaking this case study is derived from Brunner's (2004: 103) argument that M&E can be improved if it is made sensitive to each specific situational context. This assists in addressing the uncertainties and ambiguities that uniquely characterize each programme that needs to be evaluated. Moreover, since the practice and theories of M&E

are so complex, a case study is necessary to unearth issues of using M&E within an individual organization, if the findings are to be of benefit. This approach is appropriate to the present study, because M&E is understood differently, practised differently and used differently by different organizations. Trying to study it in general would thus have reliability problems. A case study focuses on one group, in this case, the CCJ, without making comparisons with any other group (Pratt & Loizos 1992), but investigating the perspectives of the actors in the chosen case (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 271).

1.2.2. Sampling

According to Tuckett (2004: 2), sampling in qualitative studies relies mostly on a small number or respondents, seeking an in-depth study of a particular phenomenon. Purposive sampling was used to select respondents for the present study. Seven respondents were chosen, who represented the diversity of the research population within the organization, and who are directly or indirectly involved with M&E activities within the CCJ, as prescribed by Wilmot (2005: 3). Priority was given to those directly involved, rather than those who are indirectly involved in M&E. The study sample included the director of the organization, two management staff, three of the 14 implementers of the programme and the external evaluator. These seven respondents are involved in M&E at different levels within the CCJ.

The different respondents were chosen for the following reasons: the director is the one in charge of the direction of the programme and everything that happens in it, including the M&E. The external evaluator has been involved with facilitating M&E within the CCJ since the first M&E was carried out in the organization. The outreach monitor, from head office, is involved in M&E at two levels. She is responsible for visiting and monitoring the outreach staff's management systems and training them where necessary. She is also responsible for collating data that is routinely collected by the outreach staff and analysing them into statistical formats. She also takes part, with the director, in planning M&E activities. She recently completed a course on M&E. The programme manager is responsible for training the implementation staff whenever that is necessary. He also provides other technical assistance during M&E activities. Three co-ordinators were chosen to represent the fourteen staff who implement the programme. The implementation staff provide routine data for monitoring and help in other forms of data collection procedures. The three implementation staff were chosen to represent the staff working in rural communities and those working in peri-urban communities. They also represented staff whose support centres are located within the court facilities, and those based at police stations.

1.2.3. Data Collection Method

Primary data was gathered through in-depth, semi-structured interviews. Secondary data was available from the organization's previous monitoring and evaluation reports. There are M&E report documents for the following cycles: 1998 – 2000, 2001- 2003 and 2004 – 2006, while 2007 – 2010 is in progress. Impact study documents for 2006 and 2009, and other secondary data, are available through case reports, manuals, monthly report forms and programme review documents.

1.2.4. Data Analysis

A thematic content analysis was used to analyse the data. Common themes were identified from the respondents in relation to research aims and objectives. Data was analyzed to describe the perspectives of the different respondents, which are obviously impacted by their beliefs, histories, contexts, roles and level of participation in the M&E process (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 271). Attention was paid to inconsistencies among the respondents' views with each other and with those of the literature review and the conceptual framework. The significance of the findings was then outlined to indicate either the strength or the challenge of the use of M&E within the CCJ with regards to its purposes and uses. Finally, the lessons to be learnt for M&E are drawn, based on what is either unique to the CCJ or what is contrary to popular beliefs about M&E, as found in the CCJ.

1.3. Structure of Dissertation

Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter which presented the rationale and background to the study. It described the problem area, defined the research question and outlined the research methodology.

Chapter 2 constitutes the conceptual framework of the research. It gives an overview of the conceptual perspective of M&E.

Chapter 3 discusses the background to the CCJ, the case study and its M&E system. It pays attention to the CCJ's M&E framework and system and asks relevant questions about the role it plays in programme implementation.

Chapter 4 presents the findings and analyzes them. It identifies common themes emerging from the findings of the study in relation to the conceptual framework.

Chapter 5 This final chapter discusses and concludes the study.

CHAPTER TWO

Conceptual Framework

2.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses the purposes and uses of M&E from M&E literature and provides the conceptual framework of the study. The chapter locates M&E in the policy process by defining public policy which is the broader field of study under which programme M&E is discussed. Social programmes are discussed within the context of their relationship to public policies and attention is focused on the M&E of social programmes. The chapter then defines M&E and engages the controversies with the meanings of the concepts of M&E. It discusses the different purposes of M&E and the common types of M&E. It identifies some common strengths and challenges of M&E within programme implementations.

The questions that this chapter answers include: what are the common purposes identified of M&E within NGOs?; how are these purposes of M&E determined within an organization – including issues of stakeholders' information needs, their roles and their participation?; what are the different approaches and means of determining these purposes and uses of M&E? These questions have consequences for the proper timing of an evaluation, the appropriate type of evaluation, and who should facilitate an evaluation process. A brief exposition of public policy is pertinent to set the scene for the discussions.

2.2. Public Policy

Colebatch (2002: 110) describes policy as a formal statement by authorized decision-makers, often in political or leadership positions, aimed at resolving a particular social problem in a specific sphere. In the public sector, policies express intentions about executive and legislative actions that have priority (Shadis *et al.,* in Owen & Rogers 1999: 34-35). They are 'formally articulated goals that government intends pursuing with a society or societal group' (Hanekom 1987: 7). These definitions imply that public policies are the guidelines that the government set out for their intervention in social issues within societies. However, Colebatch's (2002: 110) definition reveals that a policy is also an officially accepted statement of objectives within any organization. A 'policy gives guiding assumptions or goals for many programmes' (Shadis *et al* 1991; 107 in Owen & Rogers 1999: 35).

2.2.1. Social Programmes

According to Weiss (1998: 7), a social programme is a set of activities that are strategically designed and tied together, specifying how an objective can be met through a combination of these activities, aiming at a specific target and specifying roles for different actors involved in order to meet a set goal. Social programmes are often used as administrative umbrellas for distributing funds under a policy (Shadis *et al.,* 1991; 107 in Owen & Rogers 1999: 35). As such, social programmes are not as broad as public policies, but they are designed 'to meet some recognized social need or to solve an identified social problem (Rutman 1984: 11, in Babbie & Mouton 2002: 335). Valadez and Bamberger (1994: 8) explain the functions of social programmes, with examples:

> *[Social] programs may focus on improving physical wellbeing (health, nutrition); providing access to services (housing, water supply, local transportation); protecting vulnerable groups from some of the adverse consequences of economic reform and structural adjustment; or providing education, literacy, and employment and income-generating opportunities (vocational and technical training, credit, integrated rural development, small business and development). Other programs may focus directly on empowerment and equity issues by strengthening community organizations, encouraging women to participate in development, or alleviating poverty (Valadez & Bamberger 1994: 8) (A similar view is also asserted by Weiss (1998: 4)).*

Many NGOs, some donors and international agencies such as the World Bank and the United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF) assert that the main 'objectives of social development programs should be to help the indigenous communities or underprivileged groups (such as women, landless labourers, ...) develop the organizational capacity and knowledge needed to identify and satisfy their own needs' (Valadez & Bamberger 1994: 9). It is pertinent to establish the role of civil society organizations, like NGOs, to justify their roles in the implementation of policies and programmes in the society.

2.2.2. Civil Society Involvement in Policy and Social programme Implementation

The public sector is not always efficient, on it its own, to implement all the policies and programmes that are necessary to address identified social issues. Thus, Scarpf (in Hill et al 2005: 59) argues that policy formation and implementation are inevitably the result of interaction among a plurality of separate actors with separate interests, goals and strategies. Agranoff (2007:9) relates that no single agency or organization at any given level of government or the private sector has a monopoly on the power, resources, or information, necessary to address the most prevailing public problems. As such, other institutions outside of government, like civil society organizations get involved in the implementation of policies and programmes; often deriving their goals and assumption from public policies (Shadis *et. al.* 1991: 107 in Owen & Rogers 1999: 35).

A civil society can be defined in line with Glaser (1997: 5) as an organization that occupies the empty spaces that exist within the public sphere. These spaces are often protected by formal state guarantees of individual liberty and social order; yet they would have been redundant if civil society organizations were not occupying and working in them. These spaces are also often open to multiple issues by free equal citizens. Civil society organizations often have a mission of people coming together for the benefit of some society members. Rutman's (1984: 11, in Babbie & Mouton 2002: 335) assertion that social programmes are often designed to meet and solve identified social problems justifies the roles of civil society organizations in advancing programmes to: assist the government in addressing identified social problems, addressing problems that the government has not yet identified, or challenging the government on poorly implemented, inefficient or discriminatory policies. The case of Apartheid South Africa illustrates that civil society organizations are not always at par with the government.

In the South African context, on which this study is based, the post 1994 constitutions allow collaborations between civil society organization and the public sector. The south African welfare white paper 6(16) of 1997, admits that there is enormous constraints in meeting the social and economic needs of the most disadvantaged sectors of the population in south Africa, noting further that government would not be able to address the discrepancies by itself; thus acknowledging and endorsing the prominence of working with civil society organizations to meet these needs. This trend is justified on a global scale by the marked increase in the number of NGO involvements in national and international policy-making and policy implementation, especially over the last decade (Nzimakwe 2008: 92). Moreover, due to globalization, non-governmental organizations' roles have evolved to now include providing services which government are sometimes unable to fulfil. The case-study organization of this study, the centre for criminal justice, is assisting the government to provide access to justice to people in disadvantaged and mostly rural communities in and around KwaZulu-Natal.

Babbie and Mouton (2002: 334) argue that 'whenever people have instituted social reform for a specific purpose, they have paid attention to its actual consequences, even if they have not always done so in a conscious, deliberate, or sophisticated fashion.' Colebatch (2002: 49-51) states that the assessments of the programmes' consequence are the professional roles of monitoring and evaluation. He explains that the improvement of policies and social programmes are dependent on evaluating them. This brings us to the all-important question: what is monitoring and evaluation (M&E)?

2.3. Monitoring and Evaluation

The terrain of monitoring and evaluation is very obscure and controversial. Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick (1997: 5) present a plethora of definitions of M&E to assert that there is no universally accepted definition of M&E, as the following quotation demonstrates:

> *Unfortunately, evaluation literature has been clouded with other definitions we see as less useful. For example, some writers equate evaluation with research or measurement. Others define it as the assessment of the extent to which specific objectives have been attained. For some, evaluation is synonymous with and encompasses nothing more than professional judgment. Others equate evaluation with auditing or several of the variants of quality control. There are those who define evaluation as the act of collecting and providing information to enable decision makers to function more intelligently (Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997: 5).*

This quotation is useful in summarizing some of the different, limited and often conflicting approaches to defining M&E. Each of the approaches to defining evaluation in the quotation discounts some of the important elements of M&E, such as the fact M&E involves the use of scientific methods to measure the implementation or outcome of a programme (Babbie and Mouton 2002: 335). It is necessary to distinguish between the terms "monitoring" and "evaluation", because there are controversies that arise from the relationship between these terms.

So far, the term M&E has been used as an acronym to represent the terms "monitoring" and "evaluation". However, M&E theorists are divided about the relationships and distinctions between monitoring and evaluation. Munce (2005: 6) notes that 'monitoring and evaluation have traditionally been considered separate activities although they are inter-related'. Other scholars feel that the distinctions created between them are unnecessary and merely conceptual, stressing that both are one thing; yet others assert that these two are different approaches or different phenomena with different objectives (Murphy & Marchant 1988: 2). Rossi and Freeman (1989: 170-173) differ slightly in opinion and state that monitoring, though different, is a part of evaluation or a type of evaluation equivalent to process evaluation. De Coninck *et al.* (2008: 14) argue that monitoring is interested in how a programme reaches its goals, while evaluation explains why it is going the way it is.

In spite of the distinctions made between monitoring and evaluation, there are points of agreement - that monitoring is very useful, or even invaluable, for evaluation. However, Beck (2003: 24) cautions against the fluidity of the term monitoring, with its multiple definitions, approaches and opinions. It is therefore imperative to present a definition of monitoring to further the discussion.

2.3.1. Monitoring

Munce (2005: 6) defines monitoring as a descriptive report of the process of evidence collection through measurement and systematic observation, regular record-keeping or planned qualitative study. Beck (2003: 12) adds that monitoring is generally integrated into everyday programmes to ensure regular collection of both qualitative and quantitative data concerning the programme. Murphy & Marchant (1988: 1) emphasize the characteristic of monitoring as 'an internal function, and integral part of good management', which aids management to respond to three key questions: (i). Whether or not development activities such as infrastructures, services and trainings are being implemented as planned, on schedule and within budget? (ii). Whether or not these activities are leading to expected results. Are they enhancing the utilization of infrastructure and services by beneficiaries, increasing their capabilities through training, or changing behavioural patterns? (iii). What is causing delays or unexpected results? Is there anything happening which would lead management to revise/modify the original plans? De Coninck *et. al* (2008: 15) sums it up: 'monitoring focuses on ongoing surveillance or assessment of an initiative'.

Rossi and Freeman (1989: 171) describe monitoring as 'a systematic attempt by evaluation researchers to examine programme coverage and delivery'. They emphasize the relationship between monitoring and evaluation, with the claim that monitoring is a type of, or an initial part of, evaluation by reason of being systematic. This brings us to the definition of evaluation.

2.3.2. Evaluation

Weiss (1998: 4) defines evaluation as:

> *The systematic assessment of the operation and/or outcomes of a program or policy, compared to a set of explicit or implicit standards, as a means of contributing to the improvement of the program or policy (Weiss 1998: 4).*

There are four elements to the above definition of evaluation, including: (i). Evaluation is a systematic assessment. (ii). It assesses operations and/or outcomes of a programme. (iii). It compares these operations or outcomes to a set of implicit or explicit standards. (iv). It is a means of improving the programme or policy being evaluated.

Mitchell (2010: 2), Babbie & Mouton (2002: 334) and Rossi & Freeman (1993: 4) support Weiss' view that evaluation is a systematic assessment; a type of social science research (using social science research methods). They advocate a rigorous process of information gathering and stipulate methodical criteria for analysis. Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick (1997: 5) refute the comparison of evaluation to research or measurement; contending that the idea of judging the worth or merit of a thing describes evaluation. The next section, which engages the main issue of the study, namely the purposes and uses of M&E, emphasize the fact that evaluation is a type of social science research.

2.4. Purposes of Monitoring and Evaluation

The purposes of M&E programmes raise the question: why monitor and evaluate? Munce (2005: 1) poses a similar question which can be paraphrased thus: if project intervention is already justified through poverty alleviation, what impact does development assistance projects like M&E make in the lives of individual beneficiaries of such programmes, especially considering the fact that significant resources are expended on M&E? The definition of evaluation relates the purpose for doing evaluation to its use for improving the programme (Weiss 1998: 4 & 5). As such, M&E investigates the achievement of the programme and contributes to its effectiveness (Munce 2005: 1).

However, in order for M&E to contribute to programme effectiveness, its results must be useful for authorities and stakeholders to apply. Meanwhile, if stakeholders are to use M&E results to take action, their interests must be considered in the evaluation process; in other words, they must contribute the kind of questions that M&E investigates and affect the kind of information that M&E should generate. If the results are to be useful to diverse stakeholders, then their different interests must be taken into consideration in the M&E design and process (Weiss 1998: 20). The purposes of M&E are therefore the interests of stakeholders, which will inform their decisions in or about the programme. Weiss (1998: 20) emphasizes that the evaluator must locate the diverse needs of stakeholders to determine who is actually interested in evaluation information and why they need this information.

Evaluation research is always in response to people (the programme community or stakeholders) needing information about the programme in question (Weiss 1998: 15).

The question that arises from this is: how does evaluation pay attention to these diverse stakeholders' needs? This question is further expounded by a quote from Munce (2005: 1), who identifies the common problems that are often identified with determining the purposes of M&E:

> *Criticism of conventional monitoring and evaluation practices include: insufficient stakeholder participation in M&E planning and implementation; ... limited local ownership of M&E processes and limited use of outcomes; and little building of local capacity for ongoing M&E (Munce 2005: 1).*

The above criticism indicates that the purposes of M&E are often either insufficiently established because the needs of all stakeholders are not pursued, or the process lacks the practical and theoretical capacity to answer relevant questions. Brunner (2005: 104 & 118) points out that different contexts evoke different kinds of problems and different approaches to handle them. Before engaging with the problems of purposes and uses of M&E, it is useful to identify those stakeholders that often need information from M&E; and how their needs often determine the purposes and uses of M&E.

2.5.1. Commissioning Evaluations – Purposes and Uses

Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick (1997: 6) assert that different stakeholders have different purposes for M&E. They affirm that one defines evaluation according to what one believes the purpose of evaluation to be; in other words, stakeholders define evaluation according to their perspectives. These stakeholders include: funding organizations, organizations overseeing a programme, programme managers, programme staff, evaluators and beneficiaries of the programme (Weiss 1989: 4).

i. Funding Organization: Funders often ask for evaluation to determine what the local operating agency is doing with the money that they receive and how well they are serving their clients (Weiss 1998: 20). This might be used to make decisions related to whether or not funds should be increased, decreased or totally withdrawn from the programme. It could also be a matter of accountability demanded of the operating agency by the funding organization (Rubin 1995: 31). Where multiple funders are involved, competitions sometimes arise between them for control over the programme, creating controversy.

ii. An Organization that Oversees the Programme: The organization overseeing a programme sometimes needs evaluation to determine what aspect of the programmes needs to be prioritized (Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997: 4). When organizations overseeing a programme are located far from where the programme is actually being implemented, evaluations serve as a mechanism to provide unbiased information about what is happening on the ground (Weiss 1998: 21). Such evaluations aim to learn lessons (Rubin 1995: 38) and to ask questions about why the levels of successes in some areas are higher than others. Lessons learnt often facilitate sharing of results within projects, between projects and between organizations (Rubin 1995: 31). This can indicate what should be replicated.

iii. Managers: Managers of programmes ought to be aware of what is going on, why and what success is being achieved. Managers can require evidence on the short- and long-term effects of the activities of the programme through M&E (Weiss 1998: 21). Being very close to the programme, managers can assume that activities are going in a certain direction; but the complexities of development programmes and the problems they try to address make it imperative to seek some systematic assessment of the programme. Thus, managers use M&E for learning lessons (Rubin 1995: 38) that help them to determine the following: whether the programme is serving beneficiaries in expected ways, whether variation in activities is producing differential outcomes, whether some services are producing better outcomes than others, whether increasing intensity or length of services would improve outcomes, whether the qualifications and capacities of some staff are having an impact on service provision, whether the same or even better results could be achieved with less investment and whether there are problems (Weiss 1998: 21). Managers can use evaluation information to make decisions that would justify the programme's relevance and show evidence of accountability. They can use it to make choices and try to improve performance.

iv. Evaluators: These are the people responsible for carrying out the evaluation research; sometimes they can be the ones needing evaluation information. For instance, an evaluator would need data on monitoring or process evaluation before embarking on an impact study. The evaluators can either be part of the staff of the organization (an internal evaluator) or an expert (maybe a consultant) employed from outside the organization (Rubin 1995: 44). An internal evaluator can stimulate the periodic study of issues that arise during the conduct of projects. Evaluators who are not part of the agency can only do so indirectly by marketing the importance of evaluation to the particular organization (Weiss 1998: 21). It is an important role of evaluators to consider the interests of other stakeholders who have questions about the programme in the evaluation (Weiss 1998: 21).

The merits of using internal evaluators who are directly or indirectly involved in the project are that they can facilitate increasing understanding and proper planning within the organisation (Rubin 1995: 44). They can also direct the use of evaluation results to effect changes in the programme. However, internal evaluators can be biased; unlike the external evaluator who is invited from outside the organization to do a short-term assessment of a project (Rubin 1995: 44). Funding agencies often prefer external evaluators because they are considered to be objective about their findings, since they have no interest to protect in the project. They are better at probing the accountability of a project.

v. Programme Staff: Rubin (1995: 30) notes that administrative staff are the ones most in need of evaluation information that would help to improve performance; they have practical day-to-day concerns about techniques. They often rely on their own experience and intuitive judgement and thus often expect evaluations to come up with something practical for them (Weiss 1998: 30). Evaluations thus help staff to identify problems or weakness areas in the programme implementation and things that can be improved upon (Rubin 1995: 30). Assessing the extent of service delivery implies investigating the services of programme staff; but, unfortunately, the implementation staff are often last in the consideration of who needs evaluation, yet they are invaluable to the programme and the evaluation process. The evaluation processes often make huge demands on their time, requiring information and co-operation from them, ignoring their workload. Tuckermann (2007: 21) notes that they often lack knowledge and capacity of what M&E is and they often fear that evaluation results will be used to make decisions that negatively affect their jobs.

vi. Beneficiaries: Beneficiaries with a stake in a programme also have questions for evaluation. Weiss (1998: 30) identifies some of these questions as follows: whether the programme is meeting an objective that they value, whether the programme is effective compared to other alternatives that they might have and how best to access the services of the programme. Some approaches to evaluations discount the needs of beneficiaries for whom the development initiative was meant, but the participatory approach to evaluations emerged to address this (Brunner 2004: 103-104).

Other interest-holders in evaluation include the programme designers or policy-makers, who need direction in furthering programme designs, and management and staff of other similar programmes or projects that might have interests in an evaluation for the sake of replicating it (Weiss 1998: 30). To meet all the stakeholders' requirements, there is a need to identify the common purposes that stakeholders have of evaluations. However, the purposes of evaluation identified above and those whom they will benefit are clearly diverse and some of them cannot be reconciled.

When the information needs of beneficiaries and other stakeholders are identified, choosing an appropriate approach or type of evaluation is then feasible, based on the kind of information that they collectively need. The appropriate type of evaluation is one that satisfies the criteria of defining key concepts and information needs, guiding data collection and analysis and providing a framework for the interpretation of empirical findings. After determining the purposes of M&E, the evaluation team focuses on the type of evaluation to be carried out. The next section presents the types of evaluation.

2.6. Types of Evaluation

The types of evaluation are concerned with the focus of the investigation which tries to answer the question: what should be measured in order to answer relevant questions by different stakeholders (Annecke 2008: 2841)? Rossi and Freeman (1989: 173) stress that knowing what took place within a programme is significant for explaining why the programme did or did not work. Different types of evaluation have developed to address different needs that generally arise at different stages in the life of a programme. There are a variety of classifications of the focus of evaluation (Estrella & Gaventa 2008: 8). The present study concentrates on five common types, namely: needs assessment, evaluability assessment, process evaluation, outcome evaluation and the impact evaluation.

2.6.1. Evaluation of Needs/Needs Assessment

Sometimes referred to appraisal or ex-ante evaluation (Rubin 1995: 33), this type of evaluation focuses on measuring the needs of the target population that the programme will envisage to meet (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 340-341). It systematically gathers information that justifies the need for the programme to effect social change within a target group (Colebatch 2002: 49-50). It often takes place before a programme starts, or at an early stage (Rubin 1995: 33). It is a means of testing programme ideas, a precondition to effective programme planning and it is done to provide a baseline for measuring change within a programme (Rubin 1995: 33; Babbie & Mouton 2002: 341).

2.6.2. Evaluability Assessment

According to Trevisan & Yi (2003), Evaluability Assessment (EA) is a 'strategy that can be used to determine the extent to which a programme is ready for full evaluation'. In the words of Annecke (2008: 2841), EA is concerned with whether or not the programme action is sufficiently well conceptualized and consistently implemented to withstand a rigorous evaluation. Rutman (1980) explains that EA is a process 'used to analyse a programme's logic and operation and to identify programme design options'. EA 'seeks to gain information from important documents and inputs from stakeholders concerning the content and objectives of the programme' (Rutman 1980). EA is expected to determine the programme's clear objectives, identify programme indicators and options for programme improvement, develop programme theories, which 'depicts a "logic" of how components interact to produce outcomes, and show performance indicators for the objectives' (Trevisan & Yi 2003). It is useful for clarifying to staff and participants what their perceptions and roles are in the programme (Annecke 2008: 2881).

EA is an initial step to evaluating programmes, increasing the likelihood that evaluations will provide timely, relevant and responsive findings for decision-makers (Trevisan and Yi 2003). EA aids the definition of criteria for determining which programme components and goal/effects should be considered for evaluation. These criteria include whether or not the programmes can be implemented in a prescribed manner, whether or not they have clearly specified goals and effects and plausible causal linkages between programme components and effects. Feasibility factors are also considered, namely programme design and implementation, research methodology and the severity of the constraints that are political, legal, ethical and administrative.

The logic of EA allows the identification and questioning of different stakeholders and interviewing them to get their perception on the programme's objective. Trevisan and Yi (2003) state that EA must be conducted by a team, whose members are from stakeholder groups, programme implementers and administration. EA also allows the opportunity to record the difference between programme failures and evaluation failures, it allows accurate estimation of long-term outcomes, increased investment in the programme by stakeholders, improved programme performance, improved programme development and the evaluation skills of staff, increased visibility and accountability of the programme, clearer administrative understanding of the programme, better quality policy choices and continued support (Trevisan & Yi 2003). It also ensures that money is not wasted on more complex evaluation when this is not necessary

2.6.3. Process/Ongoing Evaluation

Weiss (1998: 8-9) points out that process evaluation is quite similar to the notion of monitoring, discussed earlier. Like monitoring, process evaluation is carried out in the process of implementing a programme to investigate what is going on in the programme (Rubin 1995: 33). Rossi and Freeman (1989: 172) explain that, over time, the distinction between monitoring and evaluation becomes blurred, justifying why the terms are often used interchangeably. It measures whether or not activities are being carried out as planned (Rubin 1995: 33). It can be periodic, that is scheduled to take place after a certain duration of time. The regular commitment to this type of evaluation is often with the hope that ineffective practices can be identified before they do lasting harm. It could also inform decisions about redefining the eligibility criteria of beneficiaries (Weiss 1998: 25). It can easily be done by a staff member. It is very useful for programme staff and administrators to improve performance; while its reports give stakeholders something to consult about the programme.

Process evaluation might show that some participants did particularly well, while others did very poorly. It provides reasoning to explain such findings: maybe some participants received different kinds or quality of services, which also depends on the experiences of the staff that attended to them or how regularly they attended. Thus, if an evaluator wants to understand and analyze what conditions were responsible for the different outcomes, process evaluation data should reveal exactly what went on in the programme (Weiss 1998: 9).

Weiss (1998: 9) stated that the growing popularity of process evaluation helped to correct the ill-founded assumptions that once programmes were sanctioned, they were actually doing what the operators claimed. This is affirmed by Rossi and Freeman's (1989: 173) view that 'without process information, the evaluators were engaged in "black box" research'. Process evaluation is therefore relevant, to analyse what the programme is doing, before making any inferences or drawing conclusions about the success or failure of the programme. There are instances of programmes that get evaluated and terminated for lack of impact, without foreknowledge that the programme was not implemented in the first place (Weiss 1998: 9; Patton 1997: 197).

Three situations are identified by Weiss (1998: 9-10) as calling for process data: firstly, when the key questions of the programme community are concerned with process; secondly, when evaluation sponsors want to know what is going on - what kind of services are participants being given? Is the service following the prescriptions of the programme developer? How often are participants showing up? Are they happy with the programme? What problems are they encountering? Finally, when key questions concern outcome, there is a need to be sure about what the outcome is resulting from (Weiss 1998: 9-10). The evaluator could also be interested in knowing which features of the programme were associated with greater or lesser success in order 'to link outcomes with specific elements of the program' (Weiss 1998: 10).

2.6.4. Outcome Evaluation

This type of evaluation is useful for a programme that has been implemented according to plan (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 341). It measures the end results and effects of the programme for the people at which the programme was aimed (Weiss 1998: 8). Annecke (2008: 2841) and Babbie & Mouton (2002: 341) maintain that this type of evaluation is used to look at behavioural change, attitudinal change and quality of services. Outcomes are measured about changes in relationships or activities among the targets. Some outcomes are results anticipated by programme planners, while others are side-effects that nobody expected and often effects that nobody wanted (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 341). This type of evaluation involves high levels of participation of stakeholders such as the programme planners, funders, administrators, staff and participants. It measures the relative success or not of an intervention (Babbie & Mouton 2002: 341).

Information from outcome evaluation could be used to determine whether or not to change the direction of a programme, to make adjustments to a programme, to continue a programme and to weigh cost and compare alternative programmes for an intervention (Rubin 1995: 33; Weiss 1998: 25 & 26).

2.6.5. Impact Evaluation

According to Rossi, Freeman and Lipsey (1999: 235), 'impact assessments are undertaken to find out whether interventions actually produce the intended effects'. Estrella and Gaventa (2008: 7) call it 'a comparison between programme objectives and actual achievements.'

This is supported by Weiss' (1998: 8) view that 'an impact study looks at what happens to the participants as a result of the program'. Impact is also sometimes construed as long-term outcomes. Weiss (1998: 8) observes that impact is sometimes used by writers to mean the effect of the programme on the larger community. Since impact evaluation does not aim at certainty, but some degree of plausibility, its design must take account of the fact that if firm conclusions are to be reached, then rigorous evaluation must be undertaken.

Another important consideration while undertaking impact assessment is the issue of time, money, co-operation and protection of participants. This is vital when determining the net effect of a programme through comparison between the outcome for participants and non-participants (Rossi, Freeman & Lipsey 1999: 234-235). The evaluator estimates the impact by subtracting outcomes for non-participants from the outcomes for participants. Here, the assessment discounts what would have happened in the absence of the programme. It is imperative that a process evaluation should precede impact evaluation (Patton 1997: 197). This kind of evaluation could also be conducted a few years after a project has been completed, to assess its sustainability (Rubin 1995: 34).

Proper timing is essential for a useful evaluation. It is the role of the evaluator to determine how to focus the investigation after examining the information needs of stakeholders and the purpose of the evaluation. Evaluations can either be facilitated or constrained by the focus of evaluation, available information and resources available for the evaluation. It is also important that the evaluation's results be credibly and systematically presented. The logical framework is a good example of how to do this. Munce (2005: 6) explains that the logical framework summarizes and presents project results in terms of a hierarchy of outputs, outcomes and impact. The next section highlights a few common problems and challenges that can adversely influence the evaluation process and affect the quality and use of the results.

2.7. Challenges of Monitoring and Evaluation

Munce (2005: 7-9) cautions that M&E may not contribute sufficiently to development outcomes due to lack of stakeholder participation and responsiveness, lack of M&E focus on project processes in relation to development result, poor conceptualization of M&E among some stakeholders and the lack of M&E capacity building. Estrella and Gaventa (2008: 37) add that from the perspective of participatory M&E there is limited understanding of M&E as a social process. They emphasize issues of the role of power, conflicts and the difficulty of translating participation into practice among the different stakeholders. Methodological difficulties also confront the process: the difficulty of developing new standards of rigour to improve the M&E system, the difficulty of choosing appropriate indicators, confusion about what role the facilitator should play, the difficulty of institutionalizing M&E, including issues of resources, and the need for more documentation, identifying enabling factors and documenting outcomes (Estrella & Gaventa 2008: 37).

Annecke (2008: 2841) identifies the challenges of types and methodologies of M&E to include the initial question of what should be measured. There is the question of determining whether or not the programme is ready for evaluation. Deciding what approach to use is sometimes compounded by the diversity of stakeholders and their diverse needs. The issue of resources, namely financial, technical and human and time constraints, to demonstrate change is another matter. Developing appropriate and useful indicators and the difficulty of attributing impact to the project are challenges. The method of data collection is another problem, including user perspectives and the question of participation.

Weiss (1998: 24) lists these conditions as unfavourable for evaluation: when the programme has few routines and little stability, when people involved in the programme cannot agree on what the programme is trying to achieve, when the sponsor of the evaluation or programme managers set stringent limits to what the evaluation can study, putting off-limits many important issues, and when there is not enough money or qualified staff to conduct the evaluation. Additionally, the evaluator's status as an internal or an external evaluator can affect the usefulness and credibility of evaluation results.

2.8. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed relevant issues concerning the purposes and uses of the monitoring and evaluation of social programmes from a conceptual perspective. The chapter identified and defined relevant terms that inform the study, including public policy, social programmes, monitoring and evaluation. The chapter illustrated the conceptual link between the concepts; proceeding from the assertion that social programmes are often used to address recognized social problems in a society (Rutman 1989: 11, in Babbie & Mouton 2002: 335). Social programmes are often developed to aid the implementation of a policy in order to sufficiently meet a need in a given society. Whenever social reform programmes are instituted, stakeholders are often concerned about the consequences of these programmes. The most popular means of determining the consequences of social programmes is though M&E; a kind of social science research (Colebatch 2005: 49-51). There are however, controversies about the relationship between the concepts of “monitoring” and “evaluation”.

Since the purposes and uses of M&E in a given programme are determined by the different stakeholders within the programme, there are often different and conflicting purposes that motivate different M&E researches. The duty of the evaluator is to identify different stakeholders, their interest in the programme and what they want to know about the programme. Achieving this is a technical process with several challenges. The different needs of stakeholders, when harnessed, determine what type of evaluation is necessary. This is also dependent on what stage in the life of a programme the evaluation takes place. Finally, the chapter identified some common challenges that confront organizations in trying to use M&E in their programme implementation. These problems challenge the smooth design, implementation and use of M&E results.

Chapter two served as the conceptual framework for understanding the purposes and uses of M&E within the CCJ, which is the case study organization. The next chapter describes the M&E system of the CCJ.

CHAPTER THREE

Case Study

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the M&E systems of the CCJ. It highlights how the M&E system of the organization is integrated into the development of the CCJ's outreach programme. The chapter begins with a brief background to the CCJ, presenting its mission and vision, its objectives and a description of its community outreach programme. The profile and location of the different outreach communities are also presented. The chapter then proceeds to describe the capacity building training programmes that the service providers (known as co-ordinators) receive to do their jobs and lists the strategies that they utilize to meet the goals of the organization.

Finally, the chapter focuses on the M&E activities of the CCJ; the M&E systems and the aims and objectives of M&E within the CCJ. This is described by presenting the different kinds of M&E activities that are undertaken within CCJ and their main purposes. The data collection instruments for M&E are highlighted and the uses of M&E reports are presented. This chapter provides the baseline information for the analysis of the M&E experiences of the respondents from the semi-structured interviews conducted with the director, consultant evaluator, management staff and three outreach staff of the CCJ to critically discuss the purposes and uses of M&E within the CCJ, which is the subject matter for Chapter Four.

3.2. Background to the Centre for Criminal Justice

The CCJ was established in 1990 as a centre to conduct research into criminal justice by the Law School of the then University of Natal (now the University of KwaZulu-Natal) in Pietermaritzburg (Fernandez, Hoctor & Lund 2008: 6 & 12). The Centre 'operates as an integrated development, outreach and research entity within the Faculty of Law on the Pietermaritzburg campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal' (CCJ Document 4 2009: 2). The organization began by initially conducting research into the limitations of South Africa's criminal justice system; and went on to implement an outreach development programme that provides access to justice to poor people in rural communities within KwaZulu-Natal.

Initial research of the CCJ aimed at promoting and protecting human rights within and through the criminal justice system, by investigating the reasons for the poor service delivery in community policing (Fernandez, Hoctor & Lund 2008: 6; Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005: 34). The research revealed that rural women and community members in rural areas generally experienced difficulty in dealing with the criminal justice system (CCJ Document 3 2001 n.p.). Rural women reported that they were poorly treated when reporting crimes such as domestic violence and rape to the courts or police officials – without sensitivity and privacy (CCJ Document 3 2001 n.p; Griggs Morris & Ehlers 2005: 34). The secondary trauma experienced by these victims while trying to access justice was noted to be the cause of distrust among women towards the criminal justice system.

CCJ then tried to understand and address the needs of disadvantaged community members who were denied proper access to the criminal justice system (CCJ Document 3 2001: n.p.). This culminated in the establishment of a Community Outreach Programme in 1997 (CCJ Document 8 2004). Outreach Support Centres were established within rural and peri-urban communities to implement this programme, with a vision and a mission geared towards assisting community members to access the legal system and protect their rights (CCJ Document 3 2001 n.p.). The next section presents the vision and mission of the CCJ in order to assist the contextualization of the objectives and activities of the CCJ outreach programme to the principles of M&E.

3.3. The Vision and Mission of the Centre for Criminal Justice

The vision of the organization is 'To achieve access to justice for all' (CCJ Document 2 2009: 1). This vision emphasizes action-oriented research with immediate and tangible benefits for the grassroots community. The organization's mission, therefore, is to direct its research activities in the area of criminal and social justice towards understanding and attempting to solve the local community problems, with particular, though not exclusive, focus on challenges within the justice system (CCJ Document 4 2009: 1; CCJ Document 2 2009). The mission is focused on providing access to justice to those living in 'rural areas where resources are most scarce and where the level of the misery in which they live is largely invisible' (CCJ Document 7 2000: vi). Guided by this vision the CCJ formulated some aims and objectives to execute its mission, as listed below.

3.4. The Aims and Objectives of the Centre for Criminal Justice

The CCJ constitution outlines its aims and objectives:

- *To promote and support the protection of human rights through the justice system and alternative dispute resolution mechanisms; to develop, empower and support* *disadvantaged communities to resolve conflicts and to achieve their rights to justice and services;*

- *To educate and train members of disadvantaged communities on their rights and to access justice and to contribute to teaching in relevant subjects in the Faculty of Law;*
- *To collect and maintain data on social and legal problems encountered in disadvantaged communities;*
- *To monitor the implementation and impact of law, policy and performance of state agencies in disadvantaged communities;*
- *To undertake and promote research into the work and experience of the CCJ in its development and outreach activities in the resolution of conflict, the furtherance of access to justice and the protection of human rights or any other related research including multi and interdisciplinary research;*
- *To train, develop and support researchers through consultation and collaboration with established researchers in any relevant discipline and institution;*
- *To advocate for the reform of law, policy or practice on the basis of research findings; and*
- *To develop and maintain links and collaboration with other institutions, organizations and agencies with similar goals and interests* (CCJ Document 4 2009: 1).

To realize these aims and objectives, and to ensure the cultivation of a human rights culture at grassroots level, the CCJ designed and implements an outreach programme that empowers and protects the rights of victims of violence (CCJ Document 7 2000: vi).

3.5. The Community Outreach Programme

The CCJ programme is called an outreach programme because it is implemented at different outreach centres within and around KwaZulu-Natal. A head office, located on the Pietermaritzburg campus of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, oversees the activities of the fourteen outreach centres. These outreach centres are run by local women, who are trained in paralegal skills, human rights and victim assistance, as well as in the provision of education and awareness to rural communities (CCJ Document 9 2009: 3). The organization uses women as co-ordinators of the outreach centres in order to assist victims of rape and abuse commonly perpetuated by men and to ensure sensitivity in handling these cases, thus addressing this limitation of the criminal justice system (CCJ Document 8 2004). The outreach support centres are located at police stations or magistrates' courts to ensure security and to facilitate the sharing of infrastructure in service delivery. This location facilitates a close working relationship between the co-ordinators and the institutions of criminal justice; an essential element for the implementation of the programme (CCJ Document 8 2004).

3.6. The Target Areas and Beneficiaries of the Outreach Programme

CCJ's fourteen outreach support centres are located in rural and peri-urban communities in the Midlands and Northern KwaZulu-Natal (CCJ Document10 2009: 22). Nine are located at police stations, four in Magistrates' courts and one at a tribal court (CCJ Document9 2009: 3). The target communities are prone to high levels of domestic violence, unemployment and illiteracy and have a patriarchal social structure. Table 1 lists the different support centres, the municipalities and whether or not they are in rural or peri-urban communities.

Table 1: Conditions of the target communities, including their municipal location

	SUPPORT CENTRES	RURAL/ URBAN	Province	Local Municipality	District Municipality
1	BULWER	Rural	KZN	Ingwe	Sisonke
2	MPOPHOMENI	Rural	KZN	Umgeni	UMgungundlovu
3	PLESSISLAER	Peri-urban	KZN	Umsunduzi	UMgungundlovu
4	EKUVUKENI/	Rural	KZN	INdaka	UThukela
5	GLENCOE	Rural	KZN	ENdumeni	UMzinyathi
6	IMPENDLE	Rural	KZN	IMpendle	UMgungundlovu
7	NEW HANOVER	Rural	KZN	Umshwathi	UMgungundlovu
8	ESTCOURT	Rural	KZN	UMtshesi	UThukela
9	HIMEVILLE	Rural	KZN	KwaSani	Sisonke
10	MADADENI	Peri-urban	KZN	Madademi	Amajuba
11	MPUMALANGA	Peri-urban	KZN	Mpumalanga	eThekwini Metro
12	OSIZWENI	Rural	KZN	Newcastle	Amajuba
13	BERGVILLE	Rural	KZN	UKhahlamba	UThukela
14	IXOPO	Rural	KZN	Ubuhlebezwe	Sisonke
15	MOOI RIVER	Peri-urban	KZN	Mpofana	UMgungundlovu

Source: (CCJ Document 10 2009: 6; CCJ Website). The table and its contents is designed from different sources and maps, with some help from staff at the CCJ.

These target communities are remote, have poor infrastructure, have few government services and share similar problems relating to women and children's access to justice CCJ Document 10 2009: 22). However, although women and children are the main beneficiaries, they are not the only beneficiaries of the programme, as Table 2 indicates.

Table 2: The different categories of target beneficiaries and ways that they benefit from the support centres

Beneficiaries	Ways the Centres Benefit them
Women and children	These beneficiaries learn how to access social and child support grants and access legal services (e.g. protection orders). They also obtain psychological support after a violent incident and acquire income-generating skills that empower them financially.
Men	While not a direct target group, men benefit as they become aware of how their behaviour affects the lives of their partners and children. They may sometimes be referred for therapy and mediation. Men are also increasingly benefiting from the other services of the centre.
Community	The centres are able to deal with issues at a family level that otherwise spill over into the community. Workshops and advocacy campaigns with government departments also help the elderly and disabled.
Government and NGOs	These partners benefit from the research generated by the organization and the capacity-building programmes offered by the centre. The organization is involved in joint training and other activities with the government and other NGOs.

Source: (Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005: 38).

3.7. Training Programmes for Outreach Co-ordinators (Implementation Staff)

Co-ordinators (programme implementers) are chosen from the target communities and trained as paralegals (CCJ Document 1 2002: 8). Although they are paralegals, these programme implementers are referred to as co-ordinators. This is because their work goes beyond that of paralegals, to include the social support services that they provide to clients. The training that co-ordinators receive equips them to support clients through counselling, giving legal advice, taking statements in sensitive cases such as rape, instituting legal action on behalf of clients, assisting police and court officers, co-operating with other NGOs, government institutions and agencies working in related fields and assisting clients with referrals to specialized agencies (CCJ Document1 2002: 8).

New co-ordinators receive an **orientation programme**, which entails working with an experienced co-ordinator to learn skills such as statement taking, interviewing clients and how to conduct community workshops (CCJ Document11 2010: 6). After that, they receive **Paralegal Training** (a diploma course), which is offered and run by the Community Law and Rural Development Centre (CLRDC), in conjunction with the University of KwaZulu-Natal (Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005: 40). The diploma exposes them to legal issues related to maintenance and custody, child abuse, domestic violence, rape, labour law, interviewing and statement taking (CCJ Document11 2010: 6). Next, the co-ordinators are assessed based on their capacity to put knowledge from this training into practice. **Diplomas** are awarded based on individual competencies in providing legal advice and their improved knowledge of the law (CCJ Document11 2010: 7; Griggs Morris & Ehlers 2005: 40). Continuous training and refresher courses are provided to co-ordinators by the director or head office staff on writing and presentation skills, which become important for them in writing their monitoring reports.

Within the programme, co-ordinators receive three categories of training, namely internal capacity building, capacity building support and external capacity building training. The **internal capacity building** training is provided by the CCJ to the co-ordinators. It is aimed at responding to the needs of co-ordinators in the areas of the organization's vision, context of work, statement writing, conflict management, fundraising, information management, resource mobilization, methods of conducting workshops, amendment to acts and ongoing data collection and review instruments for data collection during service delivery (CCJ Document 14: 21-25). The training on ongoing data collection is also important for M&E because this data is used for M&E.

The **capacity building support** includes the information material that CCJ develops to support the capacity of co-ordinators, including newsletters, information posters and legal series. This information material can either be sold or distributed by co-ordinators to clients coming into the centres or attending training activities that the co-ordinators organize or to partner institutions (CCJ Document11 2010: 7).

The **external capacity building** refers to training workshop that co-ordinators receive when they are invited by other institutional partners (the police and the courts) or networking partners (other NGOs involved with the provision of similar kinds of services). It gives co-ordinators the exposure to share and exchange information and experiences with others.

There are other training activities that are relevant for M&E. Although these activities are not recognized as M&E related training, they are valuable in this regard. The first of such training is *ad hoc*. Whenever there are changes in the data collection instruments with which co-ordinators gather routine monitoring data during service provision, they are trained on the use of these data collection instruments. During outreach monitoring visits, staff from the head office visits the outreach centres to monitor their filing systems. These assessments often results in on-the-spot training whenever problem areas are noticed (CCJ Document 13 2010: 24). This is an indirect way in which co-ordinators receive training that eventually becomes useful to the M&E process. Nevertheless, CCJ has trained the outreach monitor with a professional course on monitoring and evaluation in order to further strengthen the capacity of these co-ordinators. Other M&E training is given during the M&E process.

The co-ordinators provide their services in separate prefabricated structures, away from the police or the court offices to ensure client privacy (Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005: 34). This gives the co-ordinators the capacity to empower the rest of the community through the outreach programme. Co-ordinators also provide education and awareness activities such as workshops and presentations to community members and local community schools and clinics. The services provided by co-ordinators are discussed below.

3.8. Programme Strategic Activities

The co-ordinators provide advice and assistance on many issues, under these different strategic activities: direct services, education and awareness, school presentations, partnership and networking, for, but not limited to, the following nine categories[3] of cases: domestic violence, child maintenance, rape, social problems, labour, child abuse, legal advice (such as on pensions and deceased estates), general crime and issues related to HIV/AIDS (CCJ Document 1: 9).

The services provided directly to clients who visit the support centres are either legal or social support services. When these services are provided in the form of topical educational and awareness workshops, presented in schools and communities, they are referred to as education and awareness activities (or outreach activities). Table 3 shows the activities of the programme, the targets and the aims of the services provided.

[3] These categories are designed for the purposes of reporting to the head office.

Table 3: Table indicating the programme activities, the targets and the aims of the services provided

	ACTIVITIES	TARGET	AIM	SERVICE PROVIDED
1	**Direct Services**: These services are provided directly to clients that visit the support centres for help. They are either legal or social support services.			
	1. **Legal Support**	Community women, children and, increasingly, men, elderly and disabled that approach the centre for help.	To provide community based legal support services and empowerment. To assist victims to negotiate the criminal justice system to claim their rights.	Legal advice, counselling clients, making follow-up calls or visits, doing mediation and conflict resolution between clients. Obtaining a protection order[4] to prevent further violence or to have the police remove or arrest the perpetrator. Referral to, and negotiations with, public institutions of criminal justice (e.g. police or court) on behalf of the clients.
	2. Social Support	Community women, children and, increasing, men, elderly and disabled that approach the centre for help.	Provision of community based social support services and empowerment. Development of links and collaboration with other organizations and agencies with similar goals and interests (CCJ Document 4 2009).	Home visits to clients and accompanying clients to service points. Helping clients to assess other services that they need help with, which are not legal, e.g. Identity Document, accessing a grant, child maintenance, labour issues, retrenchment and administration of estates.

	ACTIVITIES	TARGET	AIM	SERVICE PROVIDED
2	**Education and Awareness (Outreach Activities)**: these are educational workshops and awareness campaigns that co-ordinators provide at schools or within the communities. The workshops are designed through the co-ordinators' assessment of the specific needs of the target community, based on frequently reported cases or emerging trends in the communities.			
	1. Community presentation, focus group workshops and forum presentations	Community women, children and, increasing, men, elderly and disabled who can attend.	To educate community members about their human rights and how to access them. To find out from the public about prevalent legal problems facing them. To help people solve their problems on their own through creating awareness, to increase the number of people coming into the centres for help.	Workshops or presentations at public venues, raising awareness and providing human rights and legal rights information, newsletters and brochures. Forum presentations are jointly conducted by co-ordinators and the institutional partners to address community needs that were jointly identified.
	2. School Presentation	School teachers and pupils of primary and secondary schools of	These workshops are aimed at creating awareness about dangerous and illegal practices in order to prevent recurrences. To educate the targets about	Addressing teachers and learners on issues of human rights, children's rights, rape, teenage pregnancy, sexuality, crime, abuse, HIV/AIDS and how to recognize symptoms of abuse.

[4] This is a court order prescribed by the Domestic Violence Act No 116 of 1998 of the South African Constitution. It is a court order that warns a perpetrator of violence that, in case of any further abuse, an arrest will be made by a member of the South African Police Force.

		specific ages are being targeted for training.	their rights and how to access them. How to report abuse and to whom.	
3	**Community Development**	Unemployed women in the community that are willing to learn a skill and to work together.	To educate unemployed women and especially victims of violence and abuse, to provide a skill for self-sustenance in order to curtail economic dependency on the abusive partner and enhance sustainability through poverty alleviation.	Identification of community members with specific income generating skills and organizing interested and needy women to be part of it for their own empowerment and to generate their personal income (CCJ Document 10 2009: 1).

Source: Designed by the researcher from different documents within the CCJ.

3.9. Monitoring and Evaluation within the Centre for Criminal Justice

The CCJ has an enduring reputation of monitoring, since their initial research was essentially monitoring the implementation and impact of criminal law, policy and performance of the criminal justice institutions in disadvantaged communities (CCJ Document 4 2009: 1). The focus was on how effectively institutions were providing justice to disadvantaged people (CCJ Document 1 2002: 12). The initial research of the CCJ therefore served as an appraisal or needs assessment. This gives a background to the fact that the CCJ conducts various types of evaluations and assessments, instituted to continually assess the operation, progress and effectiveness of the outreach programme implementation (CCJ Document 3 2001). Below are the aims and objectives of M&E within the CCJ.

3.9.1. The Purposes of Monitoring and Evaluation within the Centre for Criminal Justice

The objective of having an M&E system within the CCJ was to institute a systematic process of **documenting activities and processes** of the CCJ community outreach programme. The first M&E report of the organization sums up its purpose thus:

> *The exercise serves as a basis on which to set standards for the operations of support centres, specifying elements such as the layout of premises, record-keeping and reporting, and the monitoring and setting of indicators for acceptable performance. The evaluation considers whether the Support Centres are fulfilling their intended purpose, and identifies practices that contribute to success, so these may be reinforced or implemented by the poorly performing centres* (CCJ Document 3 2001).

Other objectives of M&E within the CCJ have been to 'document, track levels of service utilization, facilitate continuous research, provide information' (CCJ Document 7 2000: iv), to determine the impact of the outreach programme in the target communities. Moreover, different M&E activities often have different purposes and objectives. The purposes of M&E

in the CCJ will be summarized according to each M&E activity in the CCJ. Meanwhile, it is pertinent to present the M&E systems within the CCJ.

3.9.2. Organizational Monitoring and Evaluation System within the Centre for Criminal Justice

The CCJ instituted an on-going monitoring and evaluation process into the programme after four years of implementing the outreach programme, to '*document, track levels of service utilization, facilitate continuous research, provide information ... to inform policy on criminal justice issues and to serve as a baseline for future on-going monitoring and evaluation exercises in* the organization' (CCJ Document 7 2000: iv). There is an on-going process of daily gathering of data from the service providers. The co-ordinators (implementation staff) gather this data and it is sent to the head office. It serves as secondary data for the preparation of programme evaluations and impact assessments. The information serves the purposes of compiling statistical reports for M&E and other research purposes.

Periodically, the CCJ also conducts "outreach monitoring visits", by a member of head office staff, the programme manager, to assess the management systems and other processes and activities of the co-ordinators in their offices. Through this assessment, the programme manager determines where each co-ordinator needs training or support. Problems identified during these visits are dealt with on the spot and training is provided immediately. Reports are also kept from "outreach monitoring visits" to inform programme evaluation and growth (CCJ Document 13 2011: 24).

The CCJ conducts evaluations at the end of every three-year period, known as a programme cycle (CCJ Document9 2009: 11). So far, four of such programme cycle evaluation documents have been produced: 1997-2000, 2001-2003, 2004-2006, and currently there is an evaluation activity for 2007-2010 in progress. Other evaluation activities include the programme overview of 2001, an impact study of 2006, a programme review of 2007, an appraisal evaluation for a research programme in 2008 and another impact study in 2009. These evaluations are conducted and reported through a logical framework and have helped to inform the strategic direction of the outreach support programme. The framework's model 'allows for logical reporting and assessment of programme activities against the centre's stated objectives, as well as the resources invested in the programme' (CCJ Document7 2000: iv).

3.9.3. Evaluation Activities within the Centre for Criminal Justice's Outreach Programme

Table 4 puts together all the M&E activities that have been undertaken since the establishment of the outreach programme of the CCJ, specifying details, from organizational records, of the year of the evaluations, the type of evaluation, those involved in the evaluation (the evaluation team) and the purposes or objectives of each of the evaluations. This section creates a basis for Chapter Four, by trying to identify what the main purposes of the M&E carried within the organization were, as well as what types of evaluation have been undertaken to assess the outreach programme, the year of the evaluation, the evaluation and the people constituting the evaluation team.

Table 4: List of the different Monitoring and Evaluations undertaken within the CCJ, specifying the year, type and purpose of the evaluation, as well as the evaluation team

Year of evaluation	Type of evaluation	Evaluator /Evaluation team	Purpose of evaluation
1997-2000	On-going/ Process evaluation	**Team leader/quality control:** Winnie Kubayi **Evaluation co-ordinator & Editor**: Zandile Vilakazi **Research Evaluation**: Carol Friedmann **Research Assistant**: Themba Mntambo	Documenting the first four years of the community outreach programme – evaluating the first cycle (three-year period) of the programme. Creating a baseline for measuring change Establishing a framework for future M&E activities. The framework combines both monitoring and evaluation as a single process.
2001	Formative evaluation	Winnie Kubayi	Overview of The Scheme for Establishing a Community Outreach Programme (looking back at the four years of the programme). A series that is aimed at informing those interested in requesting the establishment of the outreach support centres in other provinces. Detailing the strengths and constraints of establishing new programmes.
2001-2003	On-going/ Process evaluation.	**Team leader/quality control**: Winnie Kubayi. **Evaluation co-ordinator & Analysis**: Zandile Vilakazi, **Data and Information gathering**: Carol Friedmann, **Data Capturing**: Themba Mntambo, **Editors:** Mary Matthews, Winnie Kubayi, **Technical Support**: Isabel de Granpre	Evaluation of the second cycle of the programme. Using the same framework as that of the first cycle, with additions and some subtractions, where necessary. The monitoring and evaluation frameworks still combined.
2004-2006	On-going/ Process evaluation.	Facilitated by Winnie Kubayi and Carol Friedmann	Evaluating the third cycle of the programme. Making preparation for an impact study.

2006	Impact Evaluation	**Written by:** Carol Friedmann **Editor**: Ann Nixon	Impact Study: to find out how the programme has impacted on the lives of the beneficiaries.
2007	The Programme Review	Co-ordinated by Winnie Kubayi and Carol Friedmann with much assistance from Jabu Sangweni	Programme Review year was 2007. The purpose was to review the programme in order to change ineffective practices and learn from past experiences.
2008	Appraisal Evaluation	Lovel Fernandez, Shannon Hoctor and James Lund	Evaluation of the CCJ for the development of the research programme. The management board of CCJ commissioned this evaluation to determine the viability and desirability of developing the research side. The evaluation found that there is sufficient knowledge and experience to provide a unique and rich source of material for analytical research in law (CCJ Document10 2009: 2).
2009	An Impact Evaluation	Led by Carol Friedmann and Winnie Kubayi, with assistance from Linda Manyathi, Jabu Sangweni, the co-ordinators and other researchers.	Assessing the impact of the programme on the target beneficiaries.
2007-2010	Monitoring	Work in progress at the moment. Winnie Kubayi, Carol Friedman, Jabu Sangweni and Uduak Johnson.	To inform a change in focus of the organization's outreach programme in a number of areas, including independence of the support centres from the head office. Establishing a separate monitoring framework from the evaluation frameworks. Monitoring the 2007 year, plus the 2008-2010 programme cycle.
2007-2010	Evaluation	Work in progress at the moment. Winnie Kubayi, Carol Friedman, Linda Manyati and Timothy Obaje.	To set up a separate evaluation framework from the monitoring framework. The evaluation of the fourth programme cycle 2007 - 2010. Assessment of the readiness of the organization to return the original focus on research.

Source: Formulated by the researcher based on available documents within the CCJ

Table 4, in outlining the year of evaluation, the type of evaluation, the evaluation team and the purposes of evaluation undertaken on the outreach programme of the CCJ does not give any details concerning the method of data collection that was used during these evaluation exercises. The next section discusses these data collection methods and some of the instruments that CCJ uses for M&E.

3.9.4. Data Collection Instruments used for Monitoring and Evaluation

The secondary data for evaluations comes from ongoing monitoring. The data from the ongoing monitoring is gathered by the outreach co-ordinators when they serve clients. To deal with a case such as domestic violence, the co-ordinator opens a file for each client. This file contains an intake form, which documents the individual's details and that of the perpetrator (if known). Data is also gathered to keep a record of how the victim was supported in dealing with the situation (Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005: 41). The collection and maintenance of data on legal problems encountered within the community provides data that is used for the monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

All co-ordinators keep case registers, that they attend to daily, on every case. From the case registers they extract a bi-monthly report for the head office to analyze. This information is verified by the field co-ordinator from the head office and stored in standardized templates and formats as statistical and qualitative case reports. The information is entered into the database of the organization and available as research resources. Table 5 illustrates the different data collection instruments[5] used for gathering secondary data.

[5] Samples of some of the data collection instruments are attached as "Appendix II".

Table 5: The different data collection instruments used during service delivery

DIRECT SERVICES	
Activities of Direct services	**Instruments Used**
Statement taking	Case register, intake forms, breakdown of cases forms, facilitation of payment and maintenance forms
Mediation	Monthly report forms
Counselling	Monthly report forms
Referrals to public institutions	Monthly report forms
Negotiations with other institutions	Monthly report forms
Follow-ups	Monthly report forms
Home visits	Home visit forms
EDUCATION AND AWARENESS	
Activities of Education & Awareness	**Instruments Used**
Community presentations	Activity forms
School presentations	School visit forms
Forum presentations	Forum presentation/meeting/support group forms
Focus group workshops	Activity forms
Community meetings	Forum presentation/meeting/support group forms
Information dissemination	Material distribution forms

Source: Formulated by the researcher from available information in the CCJ.

An independent external evaluator is also used by the CCJ to assess its work in cycles of three-year periods. The primary data for the evaluations are obtained through interviews with the co-ordinators and the beneficiaries and, where necessary, the other stakeholders. M&E data is planned and gathered following the logical framework.

3.9.5. The Uses of Monitoring and Evaluation

The information gathered through M&E is used for the continuous monitoring by the field co-ordinator. The field co-ordinator visits the outreach offices once in a while to monitor their activities. She checks their filing and management systems and provides training on the spot where this is necessary. This serves as one means of capacity building for the co-ordinators, though it is not directly targeted for M&E purposes. The reports from the outreach monitoring visits play a major role in planning M&E activities. Thus, for M&E, the data collected by co-ordinators during services provision and the reports from the outreach monitoring visits help as secondary data for M&E activities (CCJ Document 13 2011: 24).

When M&E reports are finalized, they are useful for the capacity building training of coordinators. M&E reports have different purposes, including the funders' reports and the annual reports which are passed back to the co-ordinators in the form of a booklet, allowing them to reflect on past cases and clients and assess the validity of various strategies that they employed. The information is used to effect changes in the organization, refine processes and take into account variations at different outreach support centres. It is also invaluable data for furthering the research programme (CCJ Document9 2009: 11).

3.10. Conclusion

This case study chapter presents some basic information about the CCJ, its vision and mission, aims and objectives, its outreach programme and the M&E system of the organization. The CCJ established an on-going monitoring of the outreach programme four years into the establishment of the programme. The main aim of the monitoring system was to provide documentation, to track the growth and changes taking place within the target community as a result of the programme and to make adjustments to the programme. At the end of every three years, the CCJ also undertakes an evaluation research on the outreach programme. As time progressed, the CCJ began to assess the impact of the programme within the target communities. M&E was not alien to the CCJ, because the organization was originally established as a research organization and its original research activities entailed monitoring the implementation of policies by the criminal justice organizations.

The implementation staff are responsible for gathering secondary data for M&E by routinely entering the details of every case that they attend to into the data collection instruments designed by the CCJ. The implementation staff sends this information to the CCJ at bi-monthly intervals for collation and storage. Whenever there are changes in the data collection instruments, the implementation staff are trained to that effect. There is also an outreach monitoring visit every now and then, where a head office staff visits the outreach communities to monitor their management systems and observe them at work. Whenever the need arises, the outreach monitor carries out training on the spot. Evaluation activities employ an evaluation team to assist in the gathering and analysis of primary data. This process is overseen by the director and an external evaluator who has always been with the CCJ.

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and Analysis

4.1. Introduction

Chapter Four presents the findings and analyses from the semi-structured interviews conducted during the study. The chapter critically explores the strengths and challenges of implementing M&E in the CCJ's outreach programme. Data was collected during in-depth interviews of seven participants. Those interviewed included the director of the CCJ, a consultant evaluator, the programme manager/outreach monitor, the programme co-ordinator and three outreach co-ordinators (representing the implementers of the programme). This sample of seven draws participants from staff members involved in different capacities and at different levels, both in the outreach programme and in M&E within the CCJ. The responses are based on the M&E experiences of the participants. The seven respondents have been coded as R_1 – the director, R_2 – the external evaluator, R_3 and R_4 – the management staff, and R_5 to R7 – the implementation staff.

The following questions guided the investigation:

- How is M&E perceived/understood within the CCJ?
- Why does the CCJ undertake M&E for the outreach programme (purposes of M&E)?
- Who is responsible for designing and managing M&E in CCJ (how data is collected)?
- How does the CCJ undertake the M&E exercise?
- What are the strengths and challenges of using M&E in the CCJ, in relation to the purposes and uses of M&E? (The semi-structured interview schedule is attached as "Appendix I" at the end of this document).

Three broad themes were identified from the respondents. They include the conceptualizations of M&E within the CCJ, the purposes and uses of the M&E systems and the challenges of M&E within CCJ – issues of process and participation at different levels in the M&E process within the CCJ. These themes are discussed in terms of the strengths and challenges experienced in implementing M&E within the CCJ.

4.2. Conceptualizations of Monitoring and Evaluation

Worthan, Sanders and Fitzpatrick (1997: 6) argue that how one defines evaluation is a product of what one believes the purpose of evaluation to be. In other words, the capacity of respondents to describe what M&E is indicates what they think the function of M&E is.

This section discusses issues related to how the understandings that respondents have of M&E can either facilitate or constitute a challenge to the M&E process within the CCJ.

The findings from this study revealed that all respondents have some awareness that M&E takes place in the outreach programme of the CCJ. However, different respondents in the CCJ have different conceptualizations of M&E. The following responses reflect how M&E is conceived within the CCJ. The first response on conceptualization of M&E is from a management perspective:

> *my understanding is that ... monitoring and evaluation are definitely separate activities... they provide different levels of information to assess whether the strategies in the organization are working or not working…. with M&E, the most important objective ... is: you want to prove the work that you are doing and at the same time you also want to improve. So that is the basic principle of monitoring and evaluation* (R_ 1).

A respondent from head office describes M&E as:

> *systems and tools … that help the organization to assess what it has achieved and to … examine the performance of the co-ordinators, the improvement of the programme, and the challenges and the strengths … progress of the programme in general… it is merely just to check everything that is done in the organization to see the challenges and to rectify the problem when necessary* (R_3).

Another head office staff member, admitting that M&E is not her area of expertise, says:

> *It helps you to know... whether you are doing what you are supposed to do, what you set out to do. Because if you don't monitor and look back as to what you are doing, what you are supposed to do, and what you have done, you might end up doing something completely different from what you set out to be your key areas; then you find that you'll have to expect performance result from the activities that do not lead to what you want it to arrive at. The evaluation actually tells you whether you have achieved what you set out to achieve. It is like the impact, to say: am I making a difference? ... that one also helps you to plan for the future ... Because if your strategy hasn't worked, during evaluations you find out that ... it may have come up with completely different results from what you had anticipated. Then it helps to refocus, realign and address such a challenge (R_4).*

The apparent differences between respondents' views revealed that each respondent's understanding of M&E is mainly based on their roles or contribution to the M&E processes within the organization. Their conceptions illustrate how M&E helps or fails to help them reflect on their experience of the programme. For instance, R_4 is responsible for using evaluation results for looking at the past in order to adjust the present, and examining the present in order to direct the future of the CCJ's outreach programme. R_3's emphasis on systems and tools indicates her responsibility for, and relationship with, these systems and tools like instruments of data collection for M&E in the CCJ. This also indicates what their interest in M&E would be.

Two of the three outreach programme's implementation staff interviewed said that they did not know much about M&E because it is a domain of activity for the head office, suggesting that they are not involved in the M&E process. Their responses include:

> *M&E is really what it is, what the words say, you monitor and you evaluate. I don't know much* (R_7).

> *I think when <u>they</u> monitor and evaluate, <u>they</u> want to check if our services are still needed by the communities, or if they are still doing okay* (R_5).

R_5 emphasizes that M&E is done by the head office. This indicates some kind of distance from the process. This observation was affirmed by a head office staff member, who expressed her concern about the outreach staff's understanding of the concepts of M&E.

> *For the outreach staff, ... Some of them … understand because they are being called and they are being phoned and they know the reason why we do monitoring and evaluation, and every time they are kept reminded about it (R_3).*

Two issues for analysis arise from these findings: firstly, some interest holders, the implementation staff, reveal that not all of them are personally and voluntarily involved in the M&E process. Secondly, there are diverse conceptions of M&E among respondents. The implications of the first issue, based on the opinion of Worthan, Sanders and Fitzpatricks (1997: 6), is that people define evaluation according to what they perceive the purpose of evaluation to be. Some of the implementation staff of the CCJ are passive to the process and this implies that they have been excluded. It also implies that the M&E system in the CCJ is top-down; designed and implemented by management at the top of the hierarchy. Therefore it is not really the responsibility of the implementation staff to conceptualize and understand M&E. Rubin (1995: 30) asserts that implementation staff are most in need of M&E information to help them improve their performance; adding that implementation staff have the experience that would help them to identify problem areas in the implementation process.

Apparent diversities in the conceptions of M&E within the CCJ, as evident from respondents' (stakeholders') different experiences, imply that respondents understand M&E based on their subjective involvement[6] in the process. The consequence of this is expressed by Palumbo & Hallett (1998: 39-43) and Patton (1997: 179) in their opinion that differences of conceptions of M&E within an organization can cause discrepancies in the purposes and uses of M&E within that organization. This is because each conception should entail a purpose and each purpose implies an objective that M&E should meet. Tuckermann (2008: 21) explained that poor participation implies poor learning from the M&E process, which in turn, implies a lack of ownership of the M&E process, or the development process. Below are the experiences of the implementation staff in the M&E process in the CCJ:

> *Speaking as a person who is working at the office within the community... they monitor ... my work, if I am doing the right thing for the benefit of the community! … if I am continuing ...the programme as it was designed by CCJ. Evaluation is to check if the services are still needed in the particular area or whether the services that were rendered in the community is still relevant; rather than doing the same thing when it doesn't apply (R_6).*

> *They [referring to the evaluation team] come to the communities and ask the beneficiaries questions about how the support centre is helping them, what kind of help they are getting from the support centres ... the researcher had the questionnaires. We made appointments with the victims to come to the support centres and then the evaluators would administer the questions to them'* (R_7).

In describing their involvement in the M&E process, the implementation staff highlight some distinction between monitoring and evaluation within the CCJ. They describe monitoring as an assessment of their services akin to the "outreach monitoring visit". The outreach monitoring visits process is described by a head office staff in these words:

> *The example of the monitoring will be the outreach monitoring visits or the field visits that we conduct (after we have introduced something to the co-ordinators like the new instruments or the intake forms, ... we ... call them and teach them how to fill the intake form)... go again to monitor... whether this has been implemented as planned or whether they are following the guidelines that have been given to them... and also you will just check file management, checking the systems ... whether what we teach them, they are following, they are understanding (R_3).*

Findings revealed that, although M&E affects the services of the programme implementers, these programme implementers are not aware of it, as the response by a member of the implementation staff on the use of data that they collect reveals:

> *It is used at the head office; I don't know how! I know that they collect all sorts of data... but to do what? I'm not sure.... they know what they use this data for (R_6).*

[6] The term involvement is used here, not just to refer to taking part in the process, but doing so voluntarily.

When staff do not understand that their services, for example, routine data collection, are a contribution to M&E, it can negatively influence their commitment to such services. This issue illustrates the technical difficulty with linking M&E theory to practice, a problem faced even by a respondent who has been involved with M&E since its inception within the CCJ, as she reveals:

> *When I first started here, I didn't have a clear idea about the difference [between monitoring and evaluation], and nobody did... We adopted this method, or this log-frame ... because it seemed to cover every single aspect that was worth looking at. It took us a long time to realize that there are two different processes. So I'm still grappling with that (R_2).*

Although the implementation staff do not yet link their services to the M&E process, on the one hand, and they do not realize the usefulness of M&E in improving their services, on the other, such knowledge and capacity can develop over time and continuous involvement in the M&E process, as the above response suggests. This follows Brunner's (2004: 104-105) assertion that knowledge of monitoring and evaluation is reached through learning by continuously taking part in the M&E process and through some explanation.

This section has revealed that that CCJ has a top-down approach to M&E, where M&E is implemented by the management, while others contribute to the process when their services are needed. Some respondents are more conscious of their roles, while others are not. Having analyzed respondents' understanding of M&E and involvement in the M&E process, their views about the purposes and uses of M&E within CCJ is ideal to further the analysis.

4.3. The Purposes and Uses of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

Babbie & Mouton (2002: 337) and Rubin (1995: 30) identify the purposes of programme evaluations as being generating knowledge, making judgments of merit or worth, to improve performance, and for accountability purposes. Weiss (1998: 4) states that the purposes of programme evaluation are determined by the people who have expectations about the programme being evaluated, funders, programme managers, staff, implementers and beneficiaries, who need M&E information because of their stake in the programme. Respondents in this study identified the purposes of M&E in their organization as: to generate knowledge, to make judgements about the programme and improve performance, for accountability purposes and to meet the needs of institutional partners.

4.3.1. Monitoring and Evaluation to Generate Knowledge

Rubin (1995: 30) and Weiss (1998: 21, 30) emphasize the importance of M&E for learning lessons for the programme managers, implementation staff, beneficiaries and funders alike. Two types of knowledge-generating purposes of M&E were identified by respondents: research into criminal justice and to learn lessons about the programme.

Monitoring and Evaluation to Further Research in Criminal Justice

M&E is a kind of research, according to Weiss (1998: 4). Respondents 6, an implementation staff, and respondent 4, a head office staff, described the situation in the CCJ as follows:

> *I think they started monitoring even before they opened our offices because our offices were a result of the monitoring (research) that they did in the communities... so our offices was born through that! (R_6)*
>
> *CCJ was originally set up for research, and I think as part of the accumulation and collection of information, it [M&E] had to be done in order to inform some of the data as to how things go along... It was from the inception. It became a necessary tool in order to meet the end (R_4).*

This "action oriented" research or evaluative studies can serve as a pre-programme planning, which led to the establishment of the outreach programme, thus having the status that Rubin (1995: 33) and Estrella & Gaventa (2008: 22) refer to as a needs assessment. According to Brunner (2004: 104), establishing M&E at the inception of a programme is the best way to ensure that it is effective and sustainable, because it has the potential to be ongoing and incorporates the perspectives of those who need the intervention.

M&E in the CCJ is part of an on-going provision of information for research to interested stakeholders. An example of this kind of research is a 2008 publication by the Law School of the University of KwaZulu-Natal, titled: *Evaluation of the Centre for Criminal Justice for the Development of a Research Programme: Furthering Human Rights through Access to Justice,* by Fernandez, Hoctor & Lund (2008). This publication provides evidence to support the use of M&E in the CCJ for research purposes by the Law School of the University of KwaZulu-Natal. On-going data gathered from the services of the outreach programme continues to serve the purpose of research in criminal justice, as the response from R_6 reveals below:

> *Recently, ... the results of the cases that we reported, mainly on customary marriages or civil marriages, the corruption that is there, ... CCJ, together with the ... [a professor in the Law School] compiled a... white paper... (from) cases in the challenges that are faced by women in their marriages... It's got an impact in amending some of the laws (R_6)*

The use of knowledge from the programme's service provision provides knowledge that goes beyond the programme to affect policies in South Africa. However, this interest in providing research data to affect policy or feed the Law School with research data does not affect the primary M&E role of programme improvement. This introduces us to another knowledge-generating characteristic: to learn lessons.

Monitoring and Evaluation to Learn Lessons

Estrella & Gaventa (2008: 22) note that M&E is an educational experience for those involved in the programme. Respondents from implementation staff and management staff indicated that lessons were learnt from the M&E that helped in the programme development:

> *I think it must be helpful for the head office to know what is going on and whether the community is receiving the benefit that the programme had planned; whether it is necessary for the offices to continue to be there (R_7).*

> *I think it is a way of helping them [the head office] to improve where they had to improve; and where they are supposed to improve!... I think it always helps them because when... - after evaluation, they see that we are not doing okay in a particular issue, they call us and train us (R_5).*

> *Monitoring...[and] evaluation... results ... give the organization an understanding of what exactly is happening, and what exactly needs to be changed, what exactly are the challenges, what is the way forward? Or what are the new decisions to be taken? Do we have to shift the focus? Or we need to apply more... or we need to change other things? Or what are the new trends in the community based on the reports that are being provided... it does help, and then the organization ... grows (R_3).*

The director, who makes decisions on how to correct ineffective practices said:

> *We don't want to run a programme that people don't want; we don't want to run a programme that is not practical - for the people that it is not meant to benefit - so it is very important that we have monitoring and evaluation system to track progress! To track effectiveness! Relevance is very important as well!! Efficiency is very important!!! Impact is very important!!! ...You are interested in the outcome of your investment, isn't it? to know what is working and what is not working (R_1).*

A regular commitment to evaluation often has the hope that ineffective practices can be identified before they do lasting harm (Weiss 1998: 25). M&E reveals where there are limitations among implementation staff, in order to provide training. It is clear that information collected through M&E actually gets used within the organization to improve the programme. The next section discusses respondents views on using M&E to learn lessons to ensure that informed judgement are made about the programme.

4.3.2. Monitoring and Evaluation to Make Judgments about the Programme

According to Babbie & Mouton (2002: 337), 'the evaluations which aim at establishing the intrinsic value, merit or worth of a programme are judgement oriented'. It tries to determine programme success and its effectiveness in meeting objectives and goals. This section discusses how knowledge generated from M&E is actually used for making judgments, as reported by the respondents, to determine the focus of the programme.

From lessons learnt through M&E, decisions can be made to determine the focus of the programme. Rubin (1995: 30) stresses that, from a management perspective, M&E can help in shaping the programme activities in order to improve the programme. Respondents assert this in the CCJ. The director described it in these words:

> *... Because you track progress, you track the direction of the programme also to check ... If trends are beginning to change ... you have to adjust the programme. And then it helps you to introduce more new strategies in order for you to meet the needs ... of the people that are utilizing the programme (R_1).*

A staff member from head office described it in these words:

> *It makes the organization to understand whether … it is achieving its intended goals or objectives. …if not, it helps the organization... to shift focus and also to make new decisions, and to change strategies, and to learn from the mistakes because you will do something and you expect certain results, and if it is not the results that you expected, then you find the reason why* (R_3).

One of the implementation staff explains:

> *to see how you are going to shape future intervention, so [M&E] has to be there so that the decisions you make, has to be part of the decisions ... focused on what you are going to do. ... (R_5).*

M&E can help to determine the focus in order to improve the programme. It determines how decisions are made to shift focus and cause change to strategies by learning from mistakes (Brunner 2004: 118; Tuckermann 2007: 21; Ambrose 2010: n.p). An example of how M&E has helped to change focus in the CCJ was given by an implementation staff member, thus:

> *...it has helped CCJ to see that ... the rights that were abused are not only for women and children; the ... boys or males are also being abused, so there is a change that is happening in the community, so if we deal with the clients, we are not dealing with the women and the children only (R_6).*

The challenge that arises from such judgements that would change the focus of the programme is that it sometimes leads to changes in the M&E systems (Brunner 2004: 103-103). When there is change in the system, new training is required. This incurs more costs and impacts on the time and routines of some staff. M&E introduces changes that often bring something new, as this respondent, reports:

> *Ok look at this challenge... now we are introducing economic justice to our existing programme... and part of that economic justice is to see how our authorities in municipalities are delivering to people. Do they hold meetings, and how are they transparent? I am looking now at a barometer, and I don't know how to hang it so that it will be easy to collect... we have to think of what are those things that you want to be able to document systematically enough to say: "hah! I can see now where the problem is'' (R_6).*

Another problem that was identified by most of the respondents was that whenever there is a change in focus, this leads to changes in the data collection instruments; something is either added to, or taken off, the data collection instruments. Implementation staff have to be trained again on it and they have to adjust, having become accustomed to the previous forms. The challenge that this poses to making judgements about the programme is that the director has to decide whether to err on the side of adding to the work load of the staff, in order to improve the programme, or to consider the financial demands that changes would impose on the budget and available funds. This leads us to the next section, concerning the impact of accountability and the role of funders in M&E within the CCJ.

4.3.3. Monitoring and Evaluation for Funders and other Accountability

The conceptual framework identified three accountability-related reasons for evaluation: to serve the needs of funders, to investigate whether an alternative programme is less expensive and more effective, and thus preferable to the current one, and to demonstrate to the public about the services of the organization (Rubin 1995: 31; Weiss 1998: 20). These three reasons are related to the management of resources for the implementation of the programme.

Resource constraint is commonly known to play a major role in popularising the establishment and use of M&E within organizations for decision-making purposes (Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997: 4; Weiss 1998: 6). Funders often want to get value for their money through M&Es (Rubin 1995: 31). Although most respondents agreed that M&E served the needs of funders within the CCJ, they expressed different views about the extent to which funders affect the purposes of M&E within the CCJ. Implementation staff respondents suggested that funders are possibly the main reasons why the CCJ does M&E:

> *It ... helps the organization when they need funding, ... reporting back to funders or for them to check if the organization is still on the right track or not... I think it is also needed by the funders to check if everything is working, rather to just give money and without knowing what is happening in the particular organization (R_6).*

Regarding the assertion that funders use M&E for budget allocation, and to financially control managers (Bamberger 1989: 388 - 391), the situation in the CCJ proves otherwise, as the following response from the a member of head office staff explained:

> *When you do a proposal for the organization, you just say: this is what I do, and then the funder will say: "ok, we are interested in this aspect and this aspect..." the funder ...would need reports to ...know that the organization is implementing... and directed at its intended target group ... they would also require you... to give monitoring report and evaluation report and say ... "now has the organization achieved what it had intended to?" (R_3).*

Another respondent, the consultant evaluator, demonstrated that M&E is more motivated by organizational needs, such as documentation, than an imposition by funders to meet their needs:

> *... with documentation you can show the work you are doing. Obviously donors are very important, not to please but to show; to demonstrate that the work you are doing is valuable. Documentation wasn't there, so our first documentation was monitoring and evaluation. ...So we didn't just prescribe, but described that in terms that would monitor and evaluate, which we put together back at that time. We knew that we needed to do it, but ... donors really appreciate that effort to evaluate!* (R_2).

R_2 indicated that there is a need to track whether or not the organization's investment is yielding results. Most respondents expressed a difficulty in knowing how important M&E information is to funders, because funders do not always send any feedback after receiving M&E reports. Despite the uncertainties about funders' interest in evaluation, the diversity of their interests and the fact that M&E is not just meant to please funders, the director of the CCJ revealed that there is no difficulty in securing funding for M&E in CCJ because:

> *We always make sure that for every funder that gives us – especially for those funders that give us a three year cycle funding – we always build in the monitoring and evaluation (R_1).*

Concerning the argument that the different needs that different funders have of M&E sometimes lead to competition amongst funders over who has control over the programme (Rubin 1995: 31), the director stated that funders have different templates for which they receive reports from the organization, which are not evaluation documents. The following response illustrates how this apparent difficulty is addressed within the CCJ:

> *It is easy! Using the same document, you can actually adapt that to soothe their requirement. The information is the same, what is not the same is how you want it. It would be difficult if you don't have the information, so that is why when you are designing your programme, you must actually have a generic template where you can draw information to fit different parameters or different frameworks (R_1).*

This prevents the situation where donor control over M&E often causes M&E to ignore the needs of the organization and those of the beneficiaries of the programme (Bamberger 1989: 389-391). Besides the funders, there are other stakeholders. The next section discusses the views of respondents on how the interests of other stakeholders affect the purposes and uses of M&E within the CCJ.

4.3.4. Monitoring and Evaluation for Institutional Partners

Different stakeholders have different purposes for M&E (Worthan, Sanders and Fitzpatrick 1997: 6). Munce (2005: 1) emphasizes the importance of paying attention to the needs of stakeholders in M&E. The institutional partners of the CCJ include the police and the courts, with whom co-ordinators share facilities. They also assist the implementation staff in the implementation of the programme because they are institutions of criminal justice. Respondents had the following contributions about these networking partners' interests in, and contribution to, M&E in the CCJ. A member of the head office staff noted that:

> *... as far as the stakeholders are concerned ... they only want to see people being helped, ... what we need to do is just to prove to them that people are getting assistance... but I think CCJ is the one that has all this information and needs to take it out to people and say: "this is what we are doing" (R_3).*

A member of the implementation staff cited an example:

> *I remember recently... the results of the cases that we reported, mainly on customary marriages or civil marriages, the corruption that is there, ... CCJ, together with the professor (from the Law School) ... compiled a ... a white paper ... she had requested ... those particular cases in the challenges that are faced by women in their marriages. So with what we are experiencing at our offices, it's got an impact in amending some of the laws! ... our director ... translates laws and see if they are relevant to what is happening on the ground, because you find sometimes that the laws are there, but what is happening on the ground is different (R_6).*

The above response indicates how monitoring data of the programme is serving the purpose of influencing regulations in South Africa. The laws that the director translates and distributes in fliers are also seen to be very helpful for the courts and the police; while making the information about the laws accessible in the vernacular for the people.

Another way that stakeholders such as the police and the courts contribute to the M&E process of the CCJ is highlighted by the response from the director below:

> *But from stakeholders, we have a system now of getting information from them, so that is why, from our monitoring system, Jabu can be able to track how many cases were handled because the record is there. And then they [co-ordinators] record also the outcome of cases that they have referred. ... with the domestic violence cases they are able to say ... twenty cases were resolved through protection orders, these protection orders need to go to court as well to be confirmed, so they are able to track that... on the so date, ten protection orders sent for confirmation, only six were confirmed; the rest are not (R_1).*

Stakeholders like the police department and the law courts benefit from M&E within the CCJ, but they do not necessarily ask questions that the M&E considers as the purpose of M&E. The outcome of cases referred to the police or to the courts can be traced through the filing systems of the respective police station or court. Society at large also benefits because when laws are amended it benefits South African society at large.

The next section extends the analysis by focusing on the approach to M&E within the CCJ. This approach has made it possible to meet the needs of funders and stakeholders, yet still having the needs of the organization as a priority (Estrella & Gaventa 2008: 6 & 37; Tuckermann 2007: 21). The section deals in a special way with the involvement of different stakeholders and the challenges that are encountered in the M&E process. The important issue here is the controversies among respondents, about whether or not there is participation in the M&E process within the CCJ and what implications this has on M&E within the CCJ.

4.4. Challenges of the Monitoring and Evaluation Process

This study has so far identified that stakeholders within the CCJ outreach programme have subjective understanding of M&E, based on their subjective experience or involvement in M&E processes. This section focuses on how these subjective experiences culminate in a useful process that meets the purposes of M&E and the challenges thereof. The section answers two of the research questions: how the CCJ undertakes M&E exercises and who is responsible for carrying out M&E for the CCJ? These questions are answered by presenting the views respondents on the challenges encountered during the design of M&E within the

CCJ (who designs it, why and how?), the data gathering process/instruments and the challenges during impact studies.

Brunner (2004: 104) emphasizes that the monitoring system should be tailored to a programme from the onset, so that management, staff and other participants can develop an organizational culture that is sensitive to it. This section presents the description of respondents of an M&E process in the CCJ that is top-down, yet also allowing for different levels of participation by different stakeholders. The section analyses responses on the various systems of M&E within the CCJ; how stakeholders are overtly and covertly involved in the M&E process and the challenges experienced during the following processes: the M&E design, data gathering and storage, the analysis and use of M&E reports.

4.4.1. The Design of the Monitoring and Evaluation System

De Conincks (2008: xiii) states that when M&E is designed as a well-structured system, linked to the planning cycles of the organization, it indicates that the organization is aware that sustainable development depends on a vibrant learning organization. The following response illustrates this characteristic in the M&E system in the CCJ:

> *When we first did ... a framework... It was just the very top people. It was Winnie [the director] ... the external [evaluator], and the consultant, Zandile Vilakazi, in 2000. ...The design... was... to isolate the aspect and put in the indicators of how we will get that data coming to us. ... The design is the log frame. ... after every three years, we will look at it again and say "what have we missed?", or "what is not working that we can never get to?"... it is a lot of thought... if you don't get that together, you don't know what you are doing! ... Your framework is your guide for the next three years.... I find it one of the most brain-demanding things because you've got nothing, and you have to come up with something and project it through for other people to do and get the kind of result that you have in your head before you get there,... it is very hard! (R_2).*

The first M&E design in the CCJ was linked to the three-year cycle of the organization; and it followed a top-down approach to set up the framework. The "top people" involved were the director, the external evaluator and a consultant. Munce (2005: 1) revealed that the main criticism against conventional top-down approach to M&E is the lack of participation by all stakeholders in the different aspects of the M&E process. De Coninck *et al* (2008: xiv) and Brunner (2004: 103-104) warn against using highly technocratic and intellectualised M&E systems that are monopolized by inflexible M&E specialists; adding that it is ideal to enhance the learning capabilities of staff regarding M&E as something essential for organizational survival and sustainable development. When there is no involvement of stakeholders, especially the programme staff, they would not be capacitated for M&E and this often causes M&E not to contribute sufficiently to the development outcomes (Munce 2005: 7-9).

Although the M&E system within the CCJ did not involve all stakeholders from the onset, the respondents indicated that after every three years the system incorporated the concerns of different stakeholders and included their participation. This allowed for lessons to be learnt for improving the framework. The first response is from the director:

> *The person responsible ... that is the overall overseer of the entire programme ... decides the M&E, but that person cannot design the M&E without an input from staff and other people who are responsible for implementing (R_1)*.

A head office staff respondent explained the situation in these words:

> *before anything takes place CCJ will have a meeting and plan to "say this is what we want to do", and "this is what we want to achieve..." after meeting ... with the head office, then the next meeting with all the co-ordinators (implementation staff) and table everything and say: "... this is what we have identified through what has been happening, and we want to now shift focus based on the information you've given us, so what do you guys think of this information?" And then they [the coordinator]) would give you their views; they would tell us exactly what has changed, whether the new trend is what is happening ... saying themselves what they want to see and how. And then ... would start planning for monitoring and evaluation based on the information provided by the outreach staff - most of the time (R_3).*

Another head office respondent remarked on their participation, thus:

> *We participate in the formulation of some questions ... (R_4).*

Concerning the beneficiaries' involvement in the design, the director expressed this view:

> *We do focus group participation with clients depending on what we want to know. Once people have been through the programme before, we do that through focus groups... they might not be part of the designing, but definitely they participate in giving us information (R_1).*

The director works with the external evaluator in designing the M&E process; following the log frame. Thereafter, there are three other levels of participation: the head office staff have their input; then the outreach staff have their input and then the beneficiaries give theirs through focus group workshops, depending on the type of M&E. Nevertheless, the kind of participation here is different from what Munce (2005: 7-9) advocates. He is interested in a participatory situation, in which all stakeholders jointly take part in the designing stage and every other stage of the M&E process.

Respondents identified some challenges in the design of M&E. According to the director:

> *For the person that is responsible for the direction of the entire programme, it adds, because you have to fundraise as well. You've got to make sure that there is money; you've got to service the funders. You've got to service your network partners; you've got to make sure that, with issues - in terms of the sector that you are operating, you are not left behind with the changes that are taking place in the sector. So when you have to be responsible for monitoring and evaluation it is an add-on (R_1).*

The consultant evaluator identified that her greatest challenge in the M&E process is designing a framework, which is a guide for the next three years. In her words:

> *I find it one of the most brain demanding things because you've got nothing, and you have to come up with something and project it through for the other people to do and get the kind of result ... that you have in your head before you get there... I have to say that I found it really hard. ... that is what really challenges me, because ... We have to think of ... those things that you want to be able to document systematically enough to say: "Hah! I can see now where the problem is: there isn't transparency" (R_2).*

The consultant evaluator admitted that her role in designing the framework is not an easy one, especially because it demands intense thought. She also has to be present, to learn from the organization and to put baselines in place before it is time for the evaluation.

On designing the M&E framework in the CCJ, there is not much participation of beneficiaries. This is against Brunner's (2004: 104) suggestion that to develop a context-sensitive M&E framework, beneficiaries' views in planning development indicators are vital. All respondents admitted that the M&E system of the CCJ relies mainly on the data that co-ordinators send routinely to the head office. This data could not have been gathered if there were no beneficiaries seeking assistance from the centres. The monitoring process, however, illustrates greater levels of participation in the M&E process.

4.4.2. Programme Monitoring and the Data Gathering Process

Annecke (2008: 2841) states that developing appropriate and useful indicators is always a challenge to an M&E system. When appropriate indicators are identified, data is needed that would inform these indicators to reveal useful information about the programme. A system has to be in place to provide data from the programme that would help management and the entire organization to know what is going on (Weiss 1998: 21). On this note, Mitchell (2010: iv) stresses that consistent performance reporting is vital to the M&E process. This section discusses the problems and challenges encountered during the data gathering that is used for the M&E purposes. Respondents identified three levels of data collection that are useful to the M&E process, namely the routine data collected during service provision, data from the outreach monitoring visits and the primary data that is gathered through semi-structured questionnaires or focus group interviews during the evaluation process.

Respondents reveal that the monitoring system was instituted in the year 2000; the system precedes every other type and level of M&E within the CCJ as revealed by the director and the evaluator:

> *The programme started in 1997. So we did develop systems then, but there was no uniform standard at the time. So... we managed to put uniform standards of monitoring and evaluation across all the support centres in 2000 - that was when we produced the first evaluation and monitoring report (R_1)*.
>
> *A very regular monitoring is done through data that our co-ordinators have to submit for analysis: that is ongoing. … there is another subtle kind of monitoring which is looking at their quality very subjectively… assessment is made and training is brought in…. to do with the co-ordinators' abilities which are then rectified… it is through their report and their data that we analyze (R_2).*

The important contribution of the head office or management staff in this process of data gathering, as identified by respondents, is mainly to collate monitoring data coming from the outreach offices and verify them with the co-ordinators when they arrive bi-monthly. They are also lauded for their role in outreach monitoring visits.

The strength of the first two means of data collection: the routine data collection and the outreach monitoring visits data, in relation to the involvement by implementation staff, is described by a head office staff member as follows:

> *Some of the things which I think contributes more to the success of M&E is that they [implementation staff] don't see it [M&E] as an event; they do it along the way when they do their work. ... compile the information, ... they provide the information as you go along ... at regular intervals during the service provision for the evaluation, rather than saying "ok let us go and monitor, let's go and evaluate", it is built into... the daily routine so that it is something that is continuous, ... it is not just ...started and stopped (R_4).*

While this respondent affirms the institutionalization of the M&E system within the CCJ, she also states that there is consistent performance reporting, which Mitchell (2010: iv) thinks is a precondition for improved performance in the implementation of an M&E within an organization. Some of the implementation staff are not aware of how their work of routine data gathering actually constitutes participation in the M&E process, as the following response by one member of the implementation staff reveals:

> *they do check something that is done by us not by them. So that is how we get involved. Sometimes, they send people to the communities and we go with those people (R_5).*

Tuckermann (2007: 21) points out that when M&E results are used against the work of the implementation staff, it can elicit a resistance to the process; stifling any form of reflection and action towards empowerment of individuals and the team. The implication, for instance, is that if the co-ordinators are not relating their data-gathering to the M&E process; they can be ignorant of the value of the data; and will not own the M&E process. This can affect their commitment to gathering data, thus having some adverse effects on the quality of data and the sustainability of the M&E process. In relation to this challenge, a respondent, the consultant evaluator stated that:

> *Co-ordinators just don't like the issue of gathering data (R_2)*

The implementation staff assist in the M&E process by making data about service provision available through the two monitoring processes. They also assist in the gathering of primary data, where they provide the needed help for the evaluators or researchers. An external evaluator comes in every three years for the programme cycle evaluation, as described below:

> *I will be there in between to set things in place, because you can't come at the end of three years and expect things just to be there. You must help in developing all the indicators, the instruments to collect things. …an external person… not an employee of CCJ… comes to sample things, and then sampling has not been systematic (except during impact studies). It has been subjective… I say to the co-ordinators: "bring me some clients to interview". Then they will choose the ones they want, either because it is easy – they successfully handled it… it's been really evidence of success (R_2).*

R_2 explains that the reason for having an external evaluation every three years is to give sufficient time to let things happen within service provision. R_1 adds that legal cases take time before outcomes can be achieved; thus three years is a fair duration, even though it might be ideal to do it after five years, for the same reason. There are also financial and other resource demands of M&E. Three years gives sufficient time to review what the previous M&E cycle framework missed in order to determine what was left out, what was not working and what were the new trends arising within the target communities that needed programme attention. Some respondents displayed a lack of knowledge concerning why things happen the way they do.

Some respondents expressed concerns about the reliability of primary data gathered for M&E purposes. One of the outreach staff respondents, in commenting on the quality of data, identified a challenge to the objectivity of the primary data gathered for evaluation:

> *The evaluators should go into the communities and see what is going on there. They should take the details of these victims and go there and see themselves, the kind of life that these people are living. They should not just sit at our offices (R_7).*

Other outreach staff suggest that community members should be trained to do the job of interviewing beneficiaries if co-ordinators cannot do it. This suggestion identifies the kind of participation that is involved in the M&E process and the challenges that confront it.

There is a language barrier, which an implementation staff member, R_7 identifies as a serious challenge. The evaluator and the researchers are English-speaking, but the beneficiaries who are respondents are Zulu-speaking, making the work of translation an additional problem. R_6, an outreach staff respondent, observes that, during an impact study, the researchers looked down on the beneficiaries and this led to beneficiaries not opening up.

Implementation staff also experience some challenges during the data collection process of M&E. Firstly, they make appointments with clients when evaluators go into the communities for evaluation research; this is necessitated to foster co-operation, because they are familiar with their clients, as the response below shows:

> *I think it [M&E] is planned by the head office, we just assist in providing the information and making appointment with the clients for them... They come into the communities and they ask beneficiaries questions about how the support centre is helping them... what kind of help they get from the support centres, etc. ... we made appointments with the victims to come to the support centres and then the evaluators would administer questions to them (R_7).*

Implementation staff expressed their frustration with the M&E process. Some of this arises from M&E related phone calls from head office:

> *They just call us and tell us such and such are coming to your office on that particular day (R_5).*

In describing their participation in the process, co-ordinators give the impression that they are distant from, and unaware of, the rationale of the M&E process. They are merely following directives without owning the process. This has an implication for the kind of M&E organizational culture that the CCJ is creating. A respondent from management expresses her awareness of this challenge thus:

> *... in the past, they [implementation staff] did not understand the importance [of M&E]... their immediate concern is helping the people they see on a regular basis, so documentation is something that is not primary, ... For them to buy-in, you need to guide them, you need to encourage them, ... when they begin to realize that in fact this M&E is actually helping us to manage our work better - then they start getting good information, then they become happy. So you've got to allow them time to build this system into their day-to-day activities. ... then they are happy because their work is professionally managed. They can track their cases when clients come to the offices, they have given them numbers ... when the clients come back, where to get that specific file, they can find it in time, and then they are able to update their case; which is very helpful later on! ... if they did not put systems in place, they would not know when did they meet this client and for what? (R_1).*

Most respondents, apart from the implementation staff themselves, concurred with this view. This implies that familiarity with the M&E process requires experience and training; learning together from change because M&E is very technical and complex. The success of the M&E process is dependent on their being reminded and familiarized, several times:

> *Every now and then... explanations have got to be done so that people understand that it is necessary to do it, rather than just a burden on them. ... they say 'oh too many forms, too many information' and all that, so you have to explain, we need this information in order to stay in employment (R_4).*

The outreach staff describe their challenges in the M&E process differently:

> *If they [referring to head office staff] need something, they need something! Just like... she phones every now... while I was busy with mediation and she needed some information. I even told her that I am in the middle of mediation, but she continued asking questions. So I thought that maybe it was urgent (R_5).*
>
> *... the challenges, I think will be... we are dealing with our daily work,... it interferes with what we are doing at that moment in our offices. We have to leave everything and focus on M&E. It is just that it interferes with our routine work at the offices (R_6).*
>
> *For the data that we gather when we are providing services, it is very challenging because we do not gather that data whilst we are providing services; we do that after.... if you attend to three clients... you have to fill those forms.... we close the office at 4pm, but you have to take the forms home. And you know, we have our own*

families and responsibilities at home, so you find that you have to wake up in the middle of the night to fill in those intake forms (R_7).

Respondents from management stress the magnitude of this problem for the outreach staff. The implication here, as most of the outreach staff agreed, is that their major focus is on assisting clients, not on gathering data. This confirms Bamberger's (1989: 329) warning that M&E processes can be challenging if staff perceive the process as making unnecessary demands on their limited time. Weiss (1998: 30; Rubin 1995: 30) states that M&E sometimes makes serious demands on implementation staff, ignoring their work load, yet not eliciting in them a perception of the value of the process. The fact that the implementation staff consider M&E as an interference with their work is an indication that they have not yet owned and personalized their contribution to the M&E process.

Another challenge is expressed by a member of the implementation staff regarding their role in providing data for M&E:

*for instance, in 2010, we found that the office will need the information on something that happened in 2006. ..... you have to go back to those people. Some are there, some are not willing to come, then you then you have to drop everything that you are doing at that time so that you can help them to continue with **their monitoring,** it sometimes give us a problem (R_6).*

We do focus group participation with clients depending on what we want to know. Once people have been through the programme before, we do that through focus groups. And that is done by people who are responsible for collating the information together with field staff. They do it together with beneficiaries. Then the information ... comes back for evaluation and monitoring (R_1).

All respondents conveyed the difficulty of getting beneficiaries' participation during impact evaluations. In 2006, beneficiaries from the rural areas refused to co-operate because they thought that the information being gathered about the outreach staff (who serve their communities) was going to be used to close down their offices (R_3). This supports the ideas of Palumbo & Hallett (1998: 39-42), that poor conceptualization of roles in the process of M&E can constrain the process. Although beneficiaries are the original source of routine data, they do not know that they serve the organization in this manner. This explains the difficulties that gathering M&E information from them poses to the M&E process, as respondents related:

During the M&E, when we have to call the clients to the office, we found that – even the community at large, you find that if you call them for this interview, some would say, "this people want to make money, using us". Some would say, "what are we *going to be getting after the interview?" They think that after giving us their stories, they would get some money. The director makes sure that transport money is given to them (R_6).*

The above response is from a member of the implementation staff, who are closest to the beneficiaries. If the implementation staff have difficulty getting beneficiaries to co-operate, chances are the external evaluator has an even harder time. The main explanation to this is an indication that the M&E process has not yet been owned by the community and the beneficiaries. Arguably, the kind of participation that is obtainable is not such that facilitates sustainability and ownership by involving all stakeholders, especially beneficiaries at every level of the M&E, from its design stage to its use of results.

Another respondent, R_6, expressed her dissatisfaction with some of the researchers from the urban areas, who came wearing high heels and had a difficult time relating to the poor rural beneficiaries. It is for this and similar reasons that the director thought it important to use the co-ordinators as researchers, rather than employing strangers. The outreach staff felt that someone from the communities should be trained for the job of gathering impact study data, revealing that another reason for the failure was that the researchers, who were university students, had no knowledge of the local communities and how to approach the people (R_6). Another member of the implementation staff pointed out a related challenge:

The evaluators were English-speaking, but the clients were Zulu-speaking, so this was a problem (R_7).

The resistance of the beneficiaries have some implications, including: they do not want the outreach centres to be closed down; meaning that the programme is appreciated by the community members who do not want the service to be terminated. They want to be paid for participating in M&E, meaning that they do not yet own the development initiative of the programme and they do not understand that M&E is meant to better the programme for their own benefit.

This section's discussion centre around the data collection instruments that the CCJ has for M&E purposes. These instruments also constitute some issues that affect the success or failures of the purposes and uses of M&E. The next section focuses on the issues specifically related to the data collection instruments and the challenges that come with them, with regards to M&E within the CCJ.

4.4.3. Data collection instruments

Babbie & Mouton (2002: 367) recommended that when there is multi-site service delivery, a standardized means of collecting data from all sites is necessary. This entails creating one standard for data collection that applies to all field workers during data collection. This section examines responses to the problems and challenges of keeping M&E system useful and relevant through a standardized data collection instrument that facilitates the gathering of routine information for M&E. Even if the purposes of M&E are well determined, the kind of data being gathered, which depends on the appropriateness of the data collection instruments, can influence the kind of data collected, which, in turn, determines whether or not the relevant questions can be answered by the study. This section gives the respondents' views on why the instruments are useful, who designs the instruments and how training is provided for the use of the instruments and the challenges related to these issues.

To ensure consistent reporting from the fifteen outreach offices that implement the programme, the CCJ developed some data collection instruments to facilitate uniform data collection for the M&E process, as the response below indicates:

> *We managed to put uniform standards of monitoring and evaluation across all the support centres in 2000 (R_1).*

Initial data collection instruments were designed by the evaluator, the director and the consultant, to aid the M&E system in the year 2000. Since then, the instruments have undergone review, with some contributions from head office staff and the implementation staff, to ensure the gathering of more relevant data:

> *Initially, it was the director… together with the ….evaluator, Carol.., but when time goes on… [Other head office staff] who do a lot of data capturing… creating statistics from… data... being collected from the field… have to be involved… provide input and say what is required based on the information received… the co-ordinators tell us "this is something that is happening that is new that has not been happening before, and then we will find a way of including that in the new design (R_3).*

> *When you evaluate, … you find out what is working and what is not working, using the information, isn't it? And then you make adjustments… It tells you… this information is missing, you need this information. Then it means you need to add a character to your instrument about the information that is required (R_1).*

The above response indicates that the data collection instruments are subject to changes as the programme progresses and as new trends arise in service delivery. It also explains that there is contribution from different levels of the programme in the review of the data collection instruments; emphasizing that there is a gradual learning together from change. A member of the implementation staff described the data-collection instruments:

> *You know the forms that we fill in … some information about the details of the victim or the client... about their age, why they have come to the centre, what problems ... they need help with, what the outcome of those cases are. … give the head-office some ideas about what is happening in the communities and what kind of problem the people are having (R_7).*

A head office staff respondent describes how data gathered using these instruments move from the field to the head office and how they become useful for M&E:

> *...During their service delivery, they [implementation staff] collect all the required data, and they use all the provided instruments, because the instruments are... provided to collect the required data, but then after they've collected that information, then they send the information bi-monthly to the head-office for... recording, for documentation and for analysis. ... then the person involved... would be the field co-ordinator. And then ... the monitoring and evaluation purposes, ... at the head office; statistics, narrative reports, case reports, and then the evaluator would come into place. She will just look for all this information [for a cycle] and they would start to work on that, creating some graphs, looking at the case-reports that have been developed from the narrative, then she would look on that, combining with the interviews that are conducted at the outreach R_3.*

Most of the outreach staff respondents, indicated that they are not sure about what the head office uses the data, which they collect at service provision, for:

> *Really I wouldn't know about that... because it is mainly for the head office. What I know is that it helps with the intake forms too. The forms that we fill in, some things were taken out of the forms as a result of evaluation (R_7).*

This lack of knowledge of the role these data play can affect their commitment to the process of data capturing. Moreover, unlike head office staff, none of the outreach staff acknowledged that the routine data which they collect informs evaluation. The important point here is this: if outreach staff are aware of the importance of M&E within the organization, yet they cannot link the two processes, and their role of gathering routine data, to it, then their commitment and contribution to the M&E process is questionable (Brunner 2004: 121). This explains some of the challenges that the organization faces when something has to be added to the data collection instrument:

> *The co-ordinators would exclaim aaaaah! You are adding more! So then you have to go through the process again to say: no! We need this, and it is very important for you to get it (R_1).*

Bamberger (1989: 392) explained that a lack of incentive on the part of the field staff to carefully collect and present data in a report can arise from poor or no relevant feedback between head office and local staff on the importance of data for organizational development. This often leads to poor, incomplete, carelessly collected, or deliberately falsified, data being sent to head office. Some of the outreach respondents admitted that they send data to the head office late. The head office staff regrets that, very often, incomplete data are sent to the head office, but all the respondents attribute this problem to the fact that the outreach staff has implementation of the programme as their primary concern; and they sometimes view data collection as secondary and an add-on to their work.

Nevertheless, most of the respondents were in agreement with the director's explanation on how the problem of quality of data is handled. Here are the director's words:

> *If you are working with data you need to have system of verification! ... They send you records, you take those... on face-value that they are correct. You work with them and then you go back to the field and say "I just want to verify that the records that you have given me are correct". And then if there is a discrepancy with the records, you correct. So before you finalize your records you must actually do that, because remember when you monitor or evaluate, you have to have a mid-term kind of process. ... So that is why there are multiple systems in the field. There is the case register, there is a monthly report form, there is a weekly report form and there is a database here, the database depends on the information that is in the file (R_1).*

This means that the outreach monitoring visits also play the role of verifying the quality of data that is being sent to the head office. Training is provided to each staff wherever a problem is noticed. All the respondents admitted that that whenever there are changes in these data-collection instruments the implementation staff are trained appropriately.

Other challenges that respondents identify with regards to the data collection instruments include: Information sometimes arrives late at the head office from the outreach offices, causing delays. However, it was for this reason that the information is sent to the head-office bi-monthly, to give them sufficient time. All respondents admit that data collection is a strain on the implementation staff. Suggestions towards remedying the situation, as suggested by the director, are to make the implementation staff focus on implementation, while other people are employed to gather data; but she recognizes that, unfortunately, doing so would incur extra cost, which is the problem. The next section analyses responses that are related to challenges that are experienced during the impact evaluation studies.

4.4.4. Challenges during Impact Studies

Respondents indicated that the kind of problems experienced during regular M&E are more complicated during impact studies. The challenges of impact studies for the head office staff have significant influence on the success of the process:

> *... in the impact study ..., what I was helping with was just to make sure that ... the outreach staff had organized for researchers all the people that they needed to see - the community members and the stakeholders and to make sure that transport was available. If it is far, I had to make sure that accommodation was available and food and to make sure that ... the interview papers or the questionnaires that they were using were available, printing more and to... make sure that ... when the time for payment comes... everyone gets paid (R_3).*

Another challenge concerning the impact studies on the head office staff is summed up in this response from a member of the head office staff:

> *... you work Saturdays and Sundays, you work early hours in the morning because you need to be sure that transport is available for them to leave or they call you overnight, they say: "We are booked here, but they say there is no food, we haven't been-a-a-a-h provided food!" so what do we do? We have to run around and provide... but then working extra hours, working... weekends ... But CCJ compensated staff by giving them time. ... towards December... the organization closed a week earlier to make sure that everyone will go and rest (R_3).*

Although the director had indicated that she and the implementation staff have extra work because of M&E, pointing out that the head office staff have M&E as part of their routine service provision, head office staff emphasized that M&E creates extra work for themselves. They maintained that they had to find time to do some of the work, even though most of the work is part of their job description.

4.5. Conclusion

Chapter Four presented an analysis of findings from the semi-structured interview. Using extensive quotes from respondents, the following three broad sections have been discussed: the conceptualization of M&E within the CCJ, the purposes and uses of M&E within the CCJ and the challenges of the M&E process within the CCJ. Each of these sections revealed the design or process of M&E in a way that affects the purposes or uses of M&E within the CCJ. The study showed that the CCJ has an M&E system in place; with monitoring instruments institutionalized in the organization, ensuring consistent programme reporting. The roles of different staff in the process are clearly defined and linked together for a comprehensive system. The system was created in 2000 and is reviewed and improved upon through time and experience, maintaining a three-year cycle programme M&E to-date, with two of impact studies. The findings revealed that the organization's M&E system meets the purposes of generating knowledge to improve the programme, to further research and to influence policy. The M&E also provides information that helps the organization to make judgements about the future of the programme, as well as where changes are necessary. Institutional partners of the CCJ use M&E information to better their programmes and learn lessons. Finally, M&E within the CCJ is seen to meet the needs of funders.

The study showed that the M&E system in the CCJ is top-down in its design and management. There is evidence that staff at different levels contribute in different ways towards M&E. Staff are seen to understand M&E, based on what they experience during M&E and how they contribute towards the M&E process. This has resulted in different conceptualizations of what M&E is within the CCJ and different views of what the purposes and uses of M&E are within the organization. While head office staff show greater awareness of the purposes of M&E and contribute more directly to the process, implementation staff showed lesser awareness of the purposes of M&E, especially its usefulness for them. They consider M&E as something useful for the head office, for funders and some other stakeholders. Although their contribution towards the M&E process is significant, namely data gathering, making appointments with beneficiaries, and it is their services that are often assessed, they did not value it highly as something that facilitates their jobs. In other words, the implementation staff do not see the necessary link between M&E and the services that they provide; including their contributions to the M&E process.

The beneficiaries do not not know that the focus group interviews which they sometimes take part in are used to assess the programme; they sometimes resist, or are afraid of, being involved. Implementation staff and beneficiaries have a poor idea of what the purposes of M&E are, or of the significance of M&E to the programme and to the services that they provide or receive in the programme. This implies that they are engaged in M&E processes without understanding their value. In spite of this, the M&E system in the CCJ is quite effective. It has contributed to programme improvement and change of focus, it has contributed to affecting policy and serves as a means of accountability to funders and to the programme.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

Regardless of failures recorded of M&Es and the expenses involved in M&E, practitioners, theorists, programme managers and funders insist on monitoring and evaluating their programmes, because there is no better alternative for assessing and answering questions about a programme (Weiss 1998: 6). This study set out to critically analyze the purposes and uses of M&E within NGOs, using the CCJ as a case study. The aim was to examine the strengths and challenges that the CCJ faces in implementing M&E for its programme implementation. The approach was to examine the purposes and uses of M&E within the CCJ.

The following broad questions guided the investigation:

- How is M&E perceived/understood within the CCJ?
- Why does the CCJ undertake M&E for the outreach programme (purposes of M&E)?
- Who is responsible for designing and managing M&E in the CCJ (how data is collected)?
- How does the CCJ undertake the M&E exercise?
- What are the strengths and challenges of using M&E in the CCJ in relation to the purposes and uses of M&E?

Three concluding observations are worth special consideration: firstly, that the purposes of M&E are determined by those stakeholders who have interests in using it to answer questions about a programme; secondly, although M&E within the CCJ is top-down, there are significant contributions, both direct and indirect, to the process; thirdly, there is a uniqueness that is peculiar to the CCJ on how funders' contributions influence it.

In answering the first two research questions, the study revealed that the purposes of M&E are determined by those who are interested in using M&E to answer questions about the programme; and that those interested in this kind of information are often diverse and have different interests in M&E. These stakeholders include the director, who wants to ensure that the programme is alive, relevant and progressive, management staff, who want M&E to help them learn lessons and make informed decisions/judgements about the programme; programme implementation staff: who want M&E to help them improve performance, funders, who want to know whether or not their investment in the programme is yielding useful results, beneficiaries, who are interested in how better the programmes can meet their needs, and other institutional partners such as the police, the law courts and the South African legislature, who are concerned with how effective their policies are. One M&E is often carried out within a three-year period, to answer all these diverse questions; making M&E a difficult and challenging endeavour, with multiple, and sometimes irreconcilable, purposes and objectives.

Regarding the design and management of M&E, the director is in charge of the M&E process, in collaboration with the external evaluator, who monitors what is going on within the organization. Management staff conduct outreach monitoring visits, they collate data arriving from the field during ongoing monitoring and evaluation and they contribute questions for the M&E investigation, based on their experience. The implementation staff are the ones that send routine data from their services, bi-monthly, to the head office. They are also involved in bringing beneficiaries in for focused group interviews during M&E. Sometimes they are invited to verify whether or not questions formulated for M&E are appropriate for the investigations and whether claims made about the programme are true. Beneficiaries are the ones providing a majority of the primary data that is used to assess the effectiveness of the programme or its impact. This is either through data gathered when they are receiving services, or through their contributions during the focus group interviews.

The diversities among stakeholders and their different interests in M&E revealed that each stakeholder conceives the meaning of M&E according to their relationship with the programme. Stakeholders also conceive M&E according to their contribution towards the programme and the M&E and their different interests in how M&E can help them within the programme. This means that there are subjective conceptions of M&E by each stakeholder which determine what that person considers to be the purposes of M&E. Stakeholders within the CCJ defined M&E based on **how they relate to, contribute towards, or use M&E** within the programme. Those involved in the design of the programme therefore have a better understanding of M&E, while others who merely contribute to the process have a poor understanding of M&E. Some do not realize that their contribution is towards M&E; as they might not even know what M&E is. The poor understanding of what M&E is has the consequence of not ensuring the sustainability of M&E and its ownership by stakeholders such as the implementation staff and the beneficiaries.

The study found that some of the stakeholders, for example management, the director and the funders, are using M&E to answer their questions and to meet their needs concerning the programme. Other stakeholders, such as the implementation staff and the beneficiaries, only benefit indirectly, because the CCJ has institutionalized M&E in the programme and manages the process in such a way that it addresses *some* of their needs. The system is managed in such a way that M&E is used to improve the programme and provide relevant capacity for implementers to meet identified needs in order to improve the programme. Some of these needs are identified by the implementation staff and beneficiaries themselves during the M&E process. For the beneficiaries, whenever the programme is improved it is for their overall benefit.

The implementation staff and beneficiaries are involved in the data collection for M&E, but they do not know in-depth the value of this data and what the process of M&E entails. This has created difficulties for them in relating to, and contributing towards, the M&E process. Implementation staff and beneficiaries do not know exactly how the information that they produce from service provision, or during M&E, actually impacts on their jobs and the services received by beneficiaries. This is a matter of how they relate to the M&E process. Findings lead to a deduction that they do not have sufficient capacity to utilize development assistance programmes like M&E to satisfactorily meet their specific needs concerning the programme. They consider M&E to be mainly useful for management and the funders and other stakeholders. They consider M&E as the domain of activity for the head office staff; not knowing how to own, or take advantage of, the M&E process for themselves.

The CCJ outreach programme, like any development initiative, is already justified by the services provided to beneficiaries and other stakeholders. The studies revealed that the CCJ has a well-functioning M&E system, institutionalized in the programme and making useful contributions to the programme. The findings of the present study further an assertion that M&E, being a development assistance programme, is a part of the development initiative and should be understood by every stakeholder in the programme, staff, management and beneficiaries, through more voluntary participatory roles in the process. This is to ensure the relevance and value of the process to their lives and work; in respecting their agency, reducing paternalistic relationships among the service providers, managers, funders and the beneficiaries; and to ensuring the sustainability of the M&E process.

Some implementation staff expressed the opinion that M&E is not an important aspect of their jobs. It was just something that had to be done to meet the needs of the head office and other interested parties. Implementation staff sometimes felt that the process was distracting them from their services. They referred to M&E as the domain of activity for the head office, which they only assist in data collection. If their contribution to the M&E process is not voluntary, stakeholders would struggle to take part in the M&E process. However, the only aspect of the M&E that does not involve much of the implementation is the design of the M&E.

The study notes the dilemma in that M&E is very technical and some of its processes elude the capacity of certain less technically inclined stakeholders from being totally involved at all levels. This explains the two kinds of involvement in the M&E process by the implementers and the beneficiaries. The first one is top-down, directed, managed by the head office, where implementation staff follow directives and perform their services, and the second ought to be voluntary, value laden, forging an understanding of the process and its relevance to their services and capable of ensuring sustainability.

The implementation staff find it difficult to adjust whenever changes are made to the data collection instruments in order to improve the programme. On the one hand, it is very difficult for them to combine their roles of service provision and to gather routine data and help with other primary data for M&E, but on the other hand it seems critical that they should have an informed and voluntary participation in the process. Their involvement in M&E already makes the job stressful for them, as it encroaches on their family times, but even more is expected of them. This is one of the greatest difficulties that M&E poses to the implementation staff of the CCJ and to the organization as a whole.

Beneficiaries may observe that sometimes there are changes in the programme and the services that they receive, but they do not know to attribute these changes to M&E. They are often called upon as respondents to M&E researchers, but they do not know to ascribe their contribution to focus group participation as being towards improving the programme. They do not know what M&E is, but it is often expected that their participation in the development process that meets their needs should educate them on the significance of their roles to the M&E process and the programme as a whole. As a development initiative, M&E ought to empower everyone involved in the process. It is for this reason that there is difficulty when trying to get primary data from beneficiaries through focused group interviews or semi-structured interviews. Beneficiaries sometimes resist giving information because they fear that the information would be used to close the outreach offices. At other times, some beneficiaries think that the data being collected would be used in some ways to make money at their expense and demand to be paid before providing any information.

As far as the role, interests and influence of funders on the M&E process are concerned, the CCJ has unique experience. In some organizations, funders were reported to impose their needs on the M&E process, to the detriment of other stakeholders, who also have interests to be met by M&E because of their financial power in the process. In other instances, funders used M&E to control the management and staff of an organization, not paying attention to the needs of other stakeholders (Bamberger 1989: 388-391). In the CCJ, however, findings reveal that M&E is primarily for the benefit of the programme and funders are only a secondary consideration. Unlike other organizations, where funders' monopoly of the process resulted from the fact that they had to fund the process separately, the CCJ includes the cost for M&E in the overall proposal of the programme. Any sponsor funding the programme is automatically funding the M&E at the same time. This is because M&E is institutionalized within the outreach programme of the CCJ.

The CCJ is also immune from, funder related problems that arise where there are multiple funders. Some NGOs have to perform different M&E assessments to meet the needs of different funders, based on when they ask for it. The CCJ, having institutionalized M&E, deals with this problem by having a generic M&E system in place and then supplying the information needs of different funders by imputing the already available information into the specific funder's templates. The challenge still remains that, in cases where funders are not satisfied, they can bring their own judges to evaluate the programme. This poses one of the many other problems identified in the M&E process for the CCJ.

To close the discussion, it is worth recalling that NGOs, some donors and international agencies, such as the World Bank and the United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF), assert that the main 'objectives of social development programmes should be to help the indigenous communities or underprivileged groups (such as women, landless labourers, ...) develop the organizational capacity and knowledge needed to identify and satisfy their own needs' (Valadez & Bamberger 1994: 9). Failing to do so could be termed paternalistic. Development assistance programmes such as M&E should meet these requirements as much as possible if they are to be efficient, effective and relevant and decrease apathy, while increasing informed participation and sustainability of the development process as a whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agranoff, R. 2007. Managing within Networks: Adding Value to Public Organisations in *Public Management and Change Series.* Georgetown University Press: Washington DC.

Ambrose, K. 2010. *Outcome Mapping in Ecuador: Enhancing Learning* – Practice Report (Online PDF). Capacity.org. Accessed August 15 2010.

Annecke, W. 2008. 'Monitoring and Evaluation of Energy for Development: The Good, the Bad and the Questionable in M&E Practice'. *Energy Policy Journal*. 36 (2008) 2839-2845). http//www.elsevier.com/locate/enpol. Accessed October 18 2010.

Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. 2002. *The Practice of Social Research.* Oxford University Press: Cape Town.

Bamberger, M. 1989. *The Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Sector Programmes in Asia: Why are Programmes Monitored but not Evaluated?* The World Bank: Washington, D.C.

Beck, T. 2003. *Humanitarian Action: Improving Monitoring to Enhance Accountability and Learning (ALNAP Annual Review)*. Overseas Development Institute: London.

Bhana, A. 2006. Participatory Action Research: A Practical Guide to Realistic Radicals. In Blanche, M. T; Durrheim, K. & Painter, D. (ed.) Research *in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences.* UCT Press: Cape Town.

Blanche, M. T; Kelly, K; & Durrheim, K. 2006. Why Qualitative Research? in Blanche, M. T; Durrheim, K. & Painter, D. (ed.) Research *in Practice: Applied Methods for the Social Sciences.* UCT Press: Cape Town.

Blatter, J. and Blume, T. 2008. In Search of Co-variance, Causal Mechanisms or Congruence? Towards a Plural Understanding of Case Studies. Swiss Political Science Review, 14: 315–356. doi: 10.1002/j.1662-6370.2008.tb00105.> Accessed August 3 2010.

Bouma, G. D. 1996. *The Research Process*. Oxford University Press: Melbourne

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. 2006. *Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology*. [Online Research], Auckland: Edward Arnold Publishers Ltd. Available from <http://www.QualResearchPsych.com> Accessed August 3 2010.

Brunner, D. R. 2004. Context-Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation for the World Bank, in Brown, S R (ed.). *Policy Sciences: Integrating Knowledge and Practice to Advance Human Dignity: The Journal of the Society for the Policy Sciences (Volume 37 Number 2),* 103-136. Kluwer Academic Publishers: Dordrecht.

CCJ Document 1. 2002. Centre for Criminal Justice: Furthering Human Rights Through the Law. Annual Report 2001-2002. A project based at the University of Natal.

CCJ Document 2. 2009 Special Annual Report.

CCJ Document 3. 2001. Brochures

CCJ Document 4. 2009. Constitution: Centre for Criminal Justice, Faculty of Law, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Pietermaritzburg. (Approved by the Law Faculty Board 17 August 2009).

CCJ Document 5. 1997-2000.

CCJ Document 6. 2001. Overview of a Scheme for Establishing a Community Outreach Programme.

CCJ Document 7. Evaluation Report 1997-2000.

CCJ Document 8. 2004. The Centre for Criminal Justice Outreach: the Quarterly Newsletter of the Centre for Criminal Justice (CCJ). Volume 1 No 1 2004. Pietermaritzburg: CCJ Publications & Publicity Unit.

CCJ Document 9. 2009. Community Outreach Programme Presentation for Policy and Development Studies (31 July 2009): Outline of Community Outreach Programme Activities.

CCJ Document 10. 2009. CCJ Ford Foundation Report of April 2009.

CCJ Document 11. 2010. CCJ Ford Foundation Report

CCJ Document 13. 2011. CCJ Diakonia Sweden Report December 2010.

CCJ Document 14. 2011. CCJ Community Outreach Programme: Final Draft of Monitoring Report 2007, 2008 – 2010.

Colebatch, H. K. 2002. *Policy.* 2nd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Creswell, J. W. 1994. *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: Sage Publications.

De Coninck, J. Chaturvedi, K. Haagsma, B. Griffioen H. & Glass M. V. D. 2008. *Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in Development Organizations: Sharing Training and Facilitation Experiences*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Estrella, M & Gaventa, J. 2008. *Who Counts Reality? Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation: A Literature Review IDS Working Paper 70.* http://raculty.miis.edu. Accessed November 6 2010.

Fernandez, L. Hoctor, S. & Lund, J. 2007. *Evaluation of the Centre for Criminal Justice for the Development of a Research Programme: Furthering of Human Rights through access to Justice*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press: Pietermaritzburg.

Fetterman 1996, in Babbie E, & Mouton, J. 2002. *The Practice of Social Research. Oxford University Press: Cape Town.*

Glaser, D. 1997. South Africa and the Limits of Civil Society. *Journal of Southern African Studies*. Vol 23 (1).

Griggs, Morris & Ehlers 2005. *Preventing the Victimization of Women and Children: A Review of Six South African Programmes*. Newlands: Open Society Foundation For South Africa.

Hanekom, S. X. 1987. *Public Policy Framework and Instrument for Action.* Macmillan South Africa Publishers Limited: Pretoria.

Jacobs, K. & Manzi, T. 2000. Evaluating the Social Constructionist Paradigm in Housing Research.http//www.jthomasniu.org/class/Stuff/PDF/Work/socialconcrit.pdf. Accessed Oct 18 2010.

James, R. 2001. *Practical Guidelines for the Monitoring and Evaluation of Capacity-Building: Experiences from Africa (Occasional Paper Series Number 36)*. Intrac: Oxford.

Laird, J. 1993. *Revisioning Social Work Education: A Social Constructionist Approach*. The Haworth Press, Inc. Binghamton.

Mitchell, R. (ed.) 2010. *Monitoring & Evaluation* in GCRA Department of Education Leadership Journal. Volume Five. Gauteng Provincial Government.

Munce, K 2005. As Good as it Gets? Projects that Make a Difference: the Role of Monitoring and Evaluation. PDF Accessed November 15 2010.

Murphy, J. & Marchant, T. 1988. *Monitoring and Evaluation in Extension Agencies*. World Bank: Washington, DC.

Nzimakwe, T.I 2008. South Africa's NGOs and the quest for development. *International NGO Journal.* Vol. 3 (5), pp 090-097.

ODI 2009. (Overseas Development Institute: Research in Policy Development). *Outcome Mapping. http:www.webmater@odi.org.uk*March 4 2011.

Palumbo, D. & Hallett, M. 1993. Conflict Versus Consensus Model in Policy Evaluation and Implementation. In *Evaluation and Program Planning. (*Volume 1 Number 6), 11-23.

Patton, M. 1997. "Implementation Evaluation": Utilization Focused Evaluation. 3rd ed. Sage Publications: London.

Pirog, M. A. 2008 (ed.). Social Experimentation, Program Evaluation, Public Policy. In *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management Classic Series.* Wiley Periodicals Production: Indiana.

Pratt, B. & Loizos, P. (1992) *Choosing Research Methods: Data Collection for Development Workers* Oxfam, Oxford.

Rossi, H. & Freeman, H. 1989. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach.* 4th ed. Sage Publications: California.

Rossi, H. Freeman & Lipsey 1999. *Strategies for Impact Assessment: A Systematic Approach.* Sage Publications: London.

Rubin, A. & Babble, E. 1997. *Research Methods for Social Work. 3rd ed*. Brooks and Cole Publishing Company: California.

Rubin, F. 1995. *Putting Evaluation into Practice.* A Basic Guide to Evaluation for Development Workers. Oxfam Publications: Dublin.

Rutman, L. 1980. Planning Evaluations – Evaluability Assessment. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks. Http://www.ncjrs.gov/app/publications/asbstract.aspx?ID=67317. Accessed March 3 2011.

Rutman 1984 in Babbie and Mouton 2002. *The Practice of Social Research.* Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Scott, C. 1985. *Sampling for Monitoring and Evaluation*. World Bank: Washington, DC.

Schweitzer K, 2005. *How to Write a Case Study Analysis*. About.com. (Assessed September 12 2010).

Shadis *et al.,* in Owen, J. M & Rogers, J. P. 1999. Programme Evaluation: Forms and Approaches. Sage Publications: Beverly Hills.

Tembo, F. 2003. *The Multi-Image Development NGO: an Agent of the New Imperialism [online Source] (http://www.jstor.org/stable/40299?seq=6*. Accessed September 11 2009.

Trevisan, M, S. & Yi, M. H. 2003. Evaluability Assessment: A Primer Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation. http:pareonline.net/getvn.asp. Accessed March 3 2011.

Tuckermann, B. C. 2007. *Challenges and Key Success Factors to Integrating Learning and Change in Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Projects. Case Study of an Urban Agriculture Project in Eastern Cuba. Knowledge Management for Development Journal 4(1): 21-30 www.km4dev.org.journal. Retrieved March 6 2011.*

Tuckett, A. 2004. "Qualitative Research Sampling – the very real complexities" in Nurse Researcher, Vol 2(1). 47-61.

USAID 1996. *Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Tips: Preparing a Performance Monitoring Plan*. USAID Centre for Development Information and Evaluation.

Valadez, J. & Bamberger, M. (eds.) 1994. *Monitoring and Evaluation Social Programs in Developing Countries: A Handbook for Policymakers, Managers, and Researchers*. World Bank: Washington D. C.

Wehmeier, S 2001 (ed.). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 6th Edition. Oxford University Press: New York*

Weiss, C. 1998. *Evaluation Methods for Studying Programs and Policies.* Prentice Hall: New Jersey.

White paper for Social Welfare 1997.
http://www.info.gov.za/view/DownloadFileAction?id=127937. Downloaded on 29-06-2011

Wilmot, A. 2005. Designing Sampling Strategies for Qualitative Social Research: With Particular Reference to the Office of National Statistics' Qualitative Respondent. www.ons.gov.uk/about/who-we.../designing-sampling-strategies-pdf. Accessed November 14 2008.

Worthan, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997. *Evaluation's Basic Purpose, Uses and Conceptual Distinctions. Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines.* White Plains, Longman Publishers: New York.

APPENDIX I

Semi-Structured Interview Schedule

1. How do you understand M&E?
2. Why does the CCJ undertake M&E for the outreach programme (purposes of M&E)?
3. Who is responsible for designing and managing M&E in CCJ (how data is collected)?
4. How does the CCJ undertake the M&E exercise?

   Are there any problems with collecting the data and with the data itself?
5. How is M&E funded in CCJ?

   Do the funders influence what and how you monitor and evaluation your programmes?
6. What are the strengths and challenges of using M&E in the CCJ?

APPENDIX II

Data Gathering Instruments for Monitoring within the Centre for Criminal Justice

CASE REGISTER

MONTH/YEAR______________

COORDINATOR _____________________________

SUPPORT CENTRE___________

	Contact Date	New/Current Case	Name of Client	Location/ Area		Age	Marital Status					Home Visit (Y / N)	Pending	Ref. No.	Referred by	Referred to	Date Closed/Completed	Outcome
1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		

Form 1 D **INTAKE FORM**

LABOUR PROBLEMS

Support Centre: ______________________ **Date:** ______________________

Name of Coordinator: ______________________ **Client Ref No:** ______________________

Police Case No: ______________________

CLIENT INFORMATION

Client Name: ______________________ **Surname:** ______________________

Gender: Male Female **Date/Year of Birth:** ______________________

Marital Status: Customary Divorced Married Unmarried Widowed Domestic Partnership

Home Address: ______________________ **Tel:** ______________________

______________________ **Cell:** ______________________

Name of Friend/Relative: ______________________ **Tel of Friend/Relative:** __________

No of family members: 1-4 5-8 more than 8

Employment/Economic Status: Unemployed/No Income Housewife-looking for employment

Grantee-only income is govt. grant Housewife-by choice Employed/Self-employed Pensioner Scholar

How long employed/unemployed: ________ **Employer:** ______________________

Position: ______________________ **Case Referred by:** ______________________

Disability Status: Blind Deaf Physical Mental Other None

How did you know about the centre? friend/neighbour/relative/community member Poster/sign Community meeting/School presentation/Workshop Radio/TV Other Institutions ______________

Is this the first time you've come to this centre for help? Yes No

<u>If NO</u>: were you happy with the service you received last time you were here? Yes No

what were the reasons you came to the Centre last time? domestic violence rape child abuse maintenance labour general crime legal advice social problems

Form 1 D

DETAILS OF THE EMPLOYER

Name: ____________________ **Surname:** ____________________

Home Address: ____

Work Address: ____

Tel: (h)______________ (w) ______________ **Cell:** ______________

OUTCOME

What was the outcome of this case? [7]Mediated successfully | Protection Order Confirmed

Maintenance Order | Mediated Unsuccessfully | Conviction | Case Withdrawn | Acquittal

Facilitation of Payments | Advice & counseling provided | Closed – No contact for 6 months

Referral to an Institution | Interim Protection Order | Case Referred to CCMA/Labour Department

How did the client feel about the outcome of the case? happy | unhappy

If happy, comment on client's expression of satisfaction (e.g. did they say something/send a letter):

____

____

If unhappy, what are the reasons? needs help the centre can't provide

does not want to go elsewhere | believes the outcome was not in their favour and is disappointed

other______________

[7] *Mediated Successfully* could include Reinstatement.

Form 1 D

OTHER DETAILS REQUIRED – complete details known as best as possible

Specific nature of the problem:

Unfair dismissal | Constructive dismissal because of HIV/Aids | Constructive dismissal for other reasons

Non-payment of salary/wages | Overtime pay | UIF benefits | Non-payment of retrenchment packages

Leave & sick leave disputes | Work conditions disputes | Injury at work

No alternative accommodation after dismissal from farm labour

Other ____

History of the problem:

Is this the first time the problem is being reported? Yes No

How long has the client worked for this employer? Less than 5 years More than 5 years

More than 10 years

Knowledge of labour rights & responsibilities:

The employee is aware of his/her rights? Yes No

The employee knows about the *Commission for Conciliation, Mediation & Arbitration*? Yes No

Form1 B **INTAKE FORM**

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Support Centre: ______________________________ **Date:** ______________________

Name of Coordinator: _________________________ **Client Ref No:** _______________

Police Case No: ______________

CLIENT INFORMATION

Client Name: ________________________________ **Surname:** ______________________________

Gender: Male Female **Date/Year of Birth:** ______________________

Marital Status: Customary Divorced Married Unmarried Widowed Domestic Partnership

Home Address: ____________________________ **Tel:** ________________________________

____ **Cell:** ______________________________

Name of Friend/Relative: ____________________ **Tel of Friend/Relative:** _______________

No of family members: 1-4 5-8 more than 8

Employment/Economic Status: Unemployed/No Income Housewife-looking for employment

Grantee-only income is govt. grant Housewife-by choice Employed/Self-employed Pensioner Scholar

How long employed/unemployed: ____________ **Employer:** ____________________________

Position: __________________________________ **Case Referred by:** _____________________

Disability Status: Blind Deaf Physical Mental Other None

How did you know about the centre? friend/neighbour/relative/community member poster/sign Community meeting/School presentation/Workshop Radio/TV Other Institutions _______________

Is this the first time you've come to the centre for help? Yes No

<u>If NO</u>: were you <u>happy with the service</u> you received last time you were here? Yes No

what were the reasons you came to the Centre last time? domestic violence rape

child abuse maintenance labour general crime legal advice social problems

OUTCOME

What was the outcome of this case? [Mediated successfully] [Protection Order Confirmed]

[Maintenance Order] [Mediated Unsuccessfully] [Conviction] [Case Withdrawn] [Acquittal]

[Facilitation of Payments] [Advice & counseling provided] [Closed – No contact for 6 months]

[Referral to an Institution] [Interim Protection Order] [Case Referred to CCMA/Labour Department]

How did the client feel about the <u>outcome of the case</u>? [happy] [unhappy]

If <u>happy</u>, comment on client's expression of satisfaction (e.g. did they say something/send a letter):

____

____

If <u>unhappy</u>, what are the reasons?

[believes the outcome was not in their favour and is disappointed] [needs help the Centre cannot provide]

[does not want to go elsewhere] [other____________________________________]

DETAILS OF ALLEGED PERPETRATOR – complete details if you know them.

Perpetrator's Name: ______________________________ **Surname:** ______________________________

Home Address: ____________________________________ **Tel:** ____________________________________

____ **Cell:** __________________________________

Work Address:
____

____
____

PROFILE OF ALLEGED PERPETRATOR

Who is the client having a problem with? Boyfriend/Girlfriend | Spouse | Ex-boyfriend/Ex-girlfriend

Parent-in-law | Uncle/Aunt | Father | Mother | Nephew/Niece | Brother/Sister | Uncle/Aunt | Child

Parents | Grandparents

Acts Committed: Indecent assault | Femicide | Attempted rape | Rape – Married couple | Incest

Sexual Harassment | Assault | Rape - Unmarried | Insulting (Verbal Abuse)

Form of Violence/Abuse: Emotional | Verbal | Physical | Sexual | Economic

Who else knows about the problem? Family member | Friend | No one | Other

Dynamics of the problem: First time | Ongoing | Previously not reported | Other

Previous attempts to solve the problem: Talk to abuser | Talk to family members | Counseling | Other

What happens when client tries to speak to the alleged abuser or others about the abuse?

Abuse continues | Ignored

Who does the client live with? Family | Other people | Own home | Other

Precipitating factors: Drinks | Drugs | Problems at work | Depression | Unemployment | None | Other

Who else is abuse affecting? Child | Children | Other family members | Other

How is problem affecting the client and other family members?

Child performing poorly at school | Child keeping bad company & acting out | Survivor is depressed | Other

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Support Centre: ______________________________ **Date:** ________________________________

Name of Coordinator: _________________________ **Client Ref No:** ________________________

Police Case No: _______________________

CLIENT INFORMATION

Client Name: ____________________________ **Surname:** _________________________________

Gender: Male Female **Date/Year of Birth:** _________________________

Marital Status: Customary Divorced Married Unmarried Widowed Domestic Partnership

Home Address: ________________________________ **Tel:** _______________________________

____ **Cell:** _______________________________

Name of Friend/Relative: _________________________ **Tel of Friend/Relative:** _______________

No of family members: 1-4 5-8 more than 8

Employment/Economic Status: Unemployed/No Income Housewife-looking for employment

Grantee-only income is govt. grant Housewife-by choice Employed/Self-employed Pensioner Scholar

How long employed/unemployed: _______ **Employer:** ____________________________

Position: _____________________________ **Case Referred by:** ______________________

Disability Status: Blind Deaf Physical Mental Other None

How did you know about the centre? friend/neighbour/relative/community member Poster/sign

Community meeting/School presentation/Workshop Radio/TV Other Institutions _______________

Is this the first time you've come to the centre for help? Yes No

<u>If NO</u>: were you happy with the service you received last time you were here? Yes No

What were the reasons you came to the Centre last time? domestic violence rape

child abuse maintenance labour general crime legal advice social problems

OUTCOME

What was the outcome of this case? Mediated successfully Protection Order Confirmed

Maintenance Order Mediated Unsuccessfully Conviction Case Withdrawn Acquittal

Facilitation of Payments Advice & counseling provided Closed – No contact for 6 months

Referral to an Institution Interim Protection Order Case Referred to CCMA/Labour Department

How did the client feel about the <u>outcome of the case</u>? happy unhappy

If <u>happy</u>, comment on client's expression of satisfaction (e.g. did they say something/send a letter):

____

____

If <u>unhappy</u>, what are the reasons?

needs help the centre cannot provide does not want to go elsewhere

believes the outcome was not in their favour and is disappointed

other____

OTHER DETAILS REQUIRED – complete details you know

Specific nature of the problem:

Poverty | Teenage pregnancy | Stranded child | Missing child/person | Child not attending school

Child chased from school | Juvenile delinquency | Cultural Belief[8] | Elder abuse | Drug & Alcohol Abuse

Other ______________________________

<u>If poverty:</u>

- **Does the client wish to join or establish a community development initiative?**

Garden club | Sewing club | Women's club | Craft club | Dance club | Other____________

- **Were you able to assist the client with their social problem?** Yes | No
- **What gaps are evident/What more does the client require?** ______________________

____

<u>If teenage pregnancy</u>, is the client at school? Yes | No | Completed Grade 12

What option did the client choose? Keep the child | Termination of pregnancy | Adoption

Informal foster care with a relative

Does the client have support from her family for her choice? Yes | No

[8] Cultural belief relate to witchcraft, virginity testing, circumcision, traditional medicine/poisoning, payment of 'damages' in relation to pregnancy, cleansing rituals, *ukungenwa*.

Centre for Criminal Justice

Breakdown of Cases

Support Centre: ______________________ **Name of Coordinator:** ______________________

NEW CASES (first time cases)

	Month & Year	**Month & Year**	**TOTAL PER CATEGORY**
Domestic Violence			
Rape			
Social Problems			
Maintenance			
Labour			
Child Abuse			
Legal Advice			
General Crime			
Unspecified*			
TOTAL MONTHLY NEW CASES			

MAINTENANCE RECORDS FORM

Centre for Criminal Justice

Name of Support Centre: ______________________ **Month:** ______________________

Date	Paid By	Receipt No:	Amount	Signature	Coordinator	Date	Collected by	Signature	Coordinator	No. of b/ficiaries	Recurring beneficiary
Subtotal Amount Collected:							**Subtotal Beneficiaries:**				
GRAND TOTAL COLLECTED:								**GRAND TOTAL BENEFICIARIES:**			

* If you use more than a page in one month, please place the subtotals on each page and the grand total on the last page, under the subtotal.

** Maintenance beneficiaries pertain to DIRECT beneficiaries, i.e. children.

Gender	Male = **M** Female = **F**
Economic Status	Employed = **EM** Self-Employed = **SE** Unemployed = **UE** Housewife by choice = **HWa** Housewife = **HWb** Pensioner = **PE** Scholar = **SC** Grantee - **G**
Disability	None = **NO** Physical = **PH** Blind = **BL** Deaf = **DE** Mental = **ME**

To count *Economic Status & Disability* **Coordinators *could ask participants to raise their hand or estimate.***
Complete box below.

Centre for Criminal Justice

ACTIVITY FORM

☐ **Community Presentation*** ☐ **CCJ Focus Groups***

DATE: - - - -

VENUE:

TOPIC:

TIME & LENGTH: **TOTAL PARTICIPANTS:**

Coordinator to communicate the following demographics

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS: EM = _____________ SE=_____________ UE:_____________ HW: _____________ PE= _____________ SC= _____________

DISABILITY: NO= _____________ PH = _____________ BL = _____________ DE = _____________ ME = _____________

	NAME & SURNAME	AREA / ARD:	PHONE/FAX	Gender	Age 21-30	Age 31-50	Age 51+
1							

*** Community Presentation =** Presentation conducted by Coordinator that are organized/initiated by the Coordinators.

*** CCJ Focus Groups** (no more than 20 people) = Discussion group of community members who have previously attended a CCJ workshop or presentation.

Centre for Criminal Justice

Place school stamp here/Signature o

SCHOOL VISIT FORMS

DATE:

SUPPORT CENTRE:______________________________ **COORDINATOR:** ____________________

LEVEL OF SCHOOL:	Pre-Primary	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary

NAME OF SCHOOL			
LOCATION			
EADMASTER		**TOTAL NO. OF LEARNERS**	
PARTICIPATING CLASSES		**NO. IN PRESENTATION**	
TOPIC OF PRESENTATION		**TIME OF PRESENTATION**	
WHO INITIATED PRESENTATION			

COMMENTS FROM LEARNERS	
COMMENTS FROM EDUCATORS	
GENERAL COMMENTS	

DEMOGRAPHICS:

GENDER	
Male	**Female**

AGE			
<5	**6-12**	**13-20**	**21+**

FORUM PRESENTATION / MEETING / SUPPORT GROUP FORM

Support Centre: ______________________________ **Name of Coordinator:** ____________________________

☐ **CCJ Support Groups** ☐ **Forum Presentation** ☐ **Meeting**

Date: ____

Venue: ____

Topic: ____

Total No. Attending: ____

Time & Length: ____

Who Initiated this activity?: ____

General Comments:

Support Group: Group established by Outreach Centre (or with stakeholders) to provide support to a group of people with the same issues/problems.

*** Remember that Support Staff must complete this form and hand to Coordinator to report on.**

Forum Presentation: Presentation by Coordinator at a Forum gathering or presentation where Coordinator invited but initiated by stakeholders.

Meeting: Stakeholders/Community organisations etc which meet to discuss issues/strategies.

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTION FORM

MONTH/YEAR ______________________________

COORDINATOR ___________________________________

SUPPORT CENTRE ________________________

Date	Title of Material	Type of Material	Language	Quantity	To Whom	During what Activity

Centre for Criminal Justice

MONTHLY REPORT FORM

Support Centre: ________________________ Name of Coordinator: ____ __________________

		Month & Year	Month & Year
1	No. of cases seen		
2	No. of people seen		
3	No. of first time cases		
4	No. of people who have been at the Centre before		
5	No. of cases referred to the Centre by other institutions		
6	No. of cases referred to other institutions		
7	No. of cases completed		
8	No. of cases closed		
9	No. of cases where there has been a success		
10	No of cases mediated		
11	No.of cases mediated successfully		
12	No. of cases referred for Protection Orders		
13	No. of cases where Protection Orders were confirmed/finalised		
14	No. of cases where Interim Protection Orders were granted		
15	No. of home visits		
16	No. of cases not completed (pending in the office) for follow up		
17	No.of cases pending in court		
18	No. of convictions		
19	No. of community presentations organised by Coordinators		
20	No. of people attending community presentations		
21	No. of focus group workshops organised by Coordinators		
22	No. of people attending focus group workshops		
23	No. of schools visited (presentations)		
24	No.of pupils attending school presentations for reporting periods		

25	No.of pupils at schools for reporting period		
26	No. of visits made to schools, as follow-up or ON CALL		
27	No. of meetings attended		
28	No. of forum presentations by Coordinators		
29	No. of community outreach events attended by Coordinators		
30	No. of people attending support groups		
31	No. of new support groups established by Coord in the area during reporting period		
32	No. of clients accompanied to institutions by Coordinators		