The main focus of the article is the necessity of using M&E as a catalyst and accelerator for increased public service efficacy. The South African government has been under tremendous pressure lately to meet the needs of its people in terms of development. This needs to be carried out in a transparent and citizen-focused way. The purpose of this article is to provide a strong link between performance management and M&E, two enablers that are now essential to the success of public service delivery in the twenty-first century, in light of the requirement to guarantee that M&E enhances such service delivery to the public. Additionally, the corrupt existing condition of affairs belies our understanding of the amount to which programmes have the intended effects and the degree to which they may continue to supply services over time. A diverse look at the meaning of M & E will be offered in this presentation. This is a conceptual study based on an examination of the literature from many sources, such as academic publications, popular media pronouncements, and policies.
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Introduction

Public employees in South Africa's public sector have popularised and applied the M&E idea to the reform of the state. The Government Wide Monitoring and Evaluation System (GWM&ES), the Constitution of South Africa (1996), and many public service and public finance related regulations and policy plans which provide the framework for public sector M & E in South Africa (Nelson, 2016:47). The aforementioned frameworks offer an integrated guidance, outline the parameters of M&E, articulate its guiding principles, and specify M&E norms and practices that are applicable to the public sector as a whole. The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF), which was introduced in 2011, was the most recent effort at creating a coherent framework. The result has been the state aligning all available resources to achieve numerous goals through M & E.

M&E is a source of check and balance, according to Zwane (2014:31), and both the public and private sectors need to use a standard framework with quantifiable indications. Zwane (2014) goes on to say that while M&E use is relatively new, there are differences in the specifics of what it entails. Standardising concepts and techniques are crucial to improving service delivery because disparate philosophical and conceptual approaches can cause confusion. Furthermore, Zwane (2014:31) argues that the role of the state is inevitably changing with time and it is now abundantly obvious that good government actions are essential to accomplish sustainable development. States are under a great deal of pressure to improve democratic systems while addressing the demands of the global economy and pursuing social, economic, and technical equality in a sustainable manner. As a result, M&E is a tactic that can enhance how governments and other organisations are able to accomplish favourable outcomes.

However, Gorgen and Kusek (2009:2), referenced in Nelson (2016), contend that M&E allays stakeholders' concerns about accountability by providing information to public sector officials on the status of achieving particular goals and offering recommendations for any changes that should be made to programmes, policies, or projects. According to Mackay (2007:17), the M&E system is used to assess the volume, calibre, and focus of the services that the government offers, as well as the consequences and outcomes that arise from these and other associated outputs. This relates to the concept as understood by Kusek and Rist (2004:1),
who highlight the fact that M&E is an effective public management tool that can be used to enhance how government and developmental organisations accomplish results because they also require effective performance feedback systems. According to the aforementioned theories and justifications, M&E generally aids in enhancing performance and achieving objectives. More accurately, it is understood to be the process of monitoring and evaluating performance in order to efficiently manage the outputs and results that are referred to as development results. Performance is defined as achieving predetermined objectives and benchmarks (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2002:5).

M&E is closely related to performance management, a discipline that is equally important because of its inseparability. Performance management makes use of data on performance to oversee organisational capabilities and procedures, such as reviewing programmes, evaluating, and amending policy objectives, monitoring progress towards goals, conducting staff assessments, and creating and defending budgets (Zwane, 2014:42). As a result, performance assessment is necessary as a management tool to define objectives, track progress towards those objectives, and record the returns on investment for each programme. M&E generally aids businesses in achieving their goals and improving performance. More accurately, it can be defined as performance evaluation and monitoring aimed at enhancing policy outcomes that are collectively referred to as development results. Actually, any performance would be a step in the right direction towards achieving the goals that have been set (UNDP, 2002:5). To put it another way, M&E is concerned with determining the relative contributions of multiple elements to a certain development outcome (Zwane, 2014:40). These variables may include, among other things, results, collaborations, policy advice and discussion, lobbying, and programme coordinating (UNDP, 2002:5).

It is clear from the arguments and discussion that came before that the organization's business strategy, which places a strong emphasis on its goal and vision, is one of the most important M&E concerns. In the upcoming sections, M&E a combination of the monitoring and evaluation practices will be further explored in this paper. The process of monitoring establishes performance goals that are in line with the purpose, vision, and strategic plans of the business. The benchmark used to assess performance is the key performance areas. The next step in the review process verifies that the financial and human resources needed to meet the goals established are available. This leads the study to the conclusion that, in accordance with Zwane's writing (2014:40), M&E is a management tool to manage policies and programmes of an institution.

In conducting M & E efforts, the specific areas of consideration depend on the actual intervention, and its stated outcomes. Areas and examples of questions include, as discussed by Sera and Beaudry (2007) as cited in Zwane (2014:40). These are listed and explained as follows:

i. Relevance: Do the objectives match the problems or needs that are being addressed?
ii. Efficiency: Is the project delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner?
iii. Effectiveness: To what extent does the intervention achieve its objectives?
iv. Impact: What happened as a result of the project? This may include intended and unintended positive and negative effects.
v. Sustainability: Are there lasting benefits after the intervention is completed?

The researcher believes that the organization's business strategy, which emphasises the stated vision and objective, is one of the primary difficulties in M&E, based on the examples that came before it. As a result, performance goals that are in line with the organisational strategic plan are established through the monitoring process. The benchmark used to measure performance is comprised of the main performance categories and key performance indicators. The next step in the review process verifies that the financial and human resources needed to meet the goals established are available. M&E is a management tool used to oversee an institution's policies and initiatives. Nelson (2016:23) points out that the GWM&ES policy framework was the first formal government-centered policy document pertaining to M&E initiatives inside the South African public sector. Planning, budgeting, and reporting systems are examples of associated management processes and activities that this GWM&ES policy framework aims to promote and push within the public sector (Presidency, 2007:80). Along with the previously mentioned, the improvement of governance through accountability, transparency, involvement, and inclusion is another reason for this policy framework (Presidency, 2007:7). Also, the NEPF which is aimed at improving effectiveness and impact of government by reflecting on what is and is not working and revising its programmes and policies, accordingly, contributes further to the guidelines for M & E in the public sector (DPME 2011:1).

In light of this, the paper examines the nature, relationship, and meaning of performance management and M&E as well as their importance to the South African public sector. Additionally, it examines how the 2007 introduction of the GWM&ES policy framework changed the game in terms of how the local public sector operates. A discussion of M&E in the context of South Africa is provided in the next section.

**Literature Review**

**Monitoring and Evaluation in the South African Context**

The term M & E is intentionally used in this study as opposed to just monitoring or evaluation. This statement discusses how, despite their apparent differences, they are actually related to one another and essential to a broader knowledge. The researcher combines
these concepts to reveal the meaning and implications for the operation of the South African public service because she believes that if these terms are used separately, they may not express the precise meaning that is necessary for the study being conducted. The paper now includes a comment from a scholar who made audacious remarks about using M&E to enhance public service.

In South Africa there have been several high-level political pronouncements supporting monitoring and evaluation, and internationally the relationship between monitoring and evaluation and development has helped to put monitoring and evaluation in the forefront, as being more than a tool but also helping to concretely address development issues (Naidoo, 2011: 51).

According to the aforementioned passage, M&E has gained support on various fronts and is now widely acknowledged as a valuable instrument for advancing sustainable development that can coexist with the political, administrative, and social landscape of everyday life. The distinctive character of M&E in South Africa stems from its application to both support the developmental state's transformation programme and aid in management. Given the history contaminated by the inequities of apartheid, M & E may considerably promote democracy by fostering multiple actions that contribute to increased transparency and accountability of government and its operations (Naidoo, 2011). In this regard, the Presidency (2007) noted that, the government’s major challenge is to become more effective. Thus, M & E processes can assist the public sector in evaluating its performance and identifying the factors that contribute to its service delivery.

Naidoo (2011) cites the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) definition of M&E as tenable, noting that it is conceptualised in a way that most organisations and development practitioners have adopted and used (see the extract below for an example).

**Monitoring is seen as a continuous function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and main stakeholders of an on-going development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, the aim is to determine relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, it should involve incorporation of lessons learned into decision-making process, it also relates to the worth or significance of an activity, policy or programme (OECD, 2002:27).**

To further elucidate this admirable habit, Naidoo (2011) asserts that the "M" is connected to the "E." Therefore, it is oversimplified to distinguish between monitoring, which is thought of as an ongoing management role, and evaluation, which is thought of as the post-event function that provides management with knowledge for the next event. Monitoring involves evaluation since it involves assessing progress and acting based on that assessment. Similar to this, monitoring data is the foundation for any review, and it is from these insights that decisions are most effectively made. In actuality, the sequencing is more dynamic and situation-specific rather than as linear as it could seemingly suggest. This means that evaluation can be carried out ahead of monitoring and vice-versa.

Based on the previous section and conversation, M&E now offers precise guidance for evaluating a strategy's execution. M&E provides important metrics for evaluating tactics and recommendations for achieving socio-economic developmental goals in an efficient manner. It notifies decision-makers about possible problems that could impede efforts to achieve predetermined results. Above all, M&E provides corrective measures to address the issues that have been recognised (Zwane, 2014:37). Globally, M&E practice has gained prominence, as the following sentences indicate. According to Zwane (2014:39), an international analysis reveals that M&E was changed globally to improve governments' capabilities. The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), approved by the USA in 1993, placed a strong emphasis on the concerns people have about the performance of government agencies, accountability, and transparency as key components of good governance. Additionally, New Zealand implemented the M&E procedure to serve as an oversight function. As a result, M&E is an essential managerial role in any business or development plan. The procedure ought to start as early as the project or policy program's planning phase. In state programmes at all three levels of government that try to solve pervasive social and economic challenges, M&E systems are especially important. In South Africa, these socio-economic issues incorporate unemployment, poverty and inequality.

According to Naidoo (2011), a number of significant occurrences at the governmental, administrative, and municipal levels are what gave rise to the push for M&E in South Africa. Former President Thabo Mbeki has made statements at the highest political level advocating for robust M&E and performance management in the State of the Nation Addresses for 2004, 2005, and 2006. The citation of the PSC in the 2008 address has underlined the importance of this M & E practice. The implementation of the GWMES, led from the Presidency, has also been essential in this regard (Naidoo, 2011). The PSC's profiling of many M&E results has made important evaluation findings publicly available and is proof that the PSC is carrying out its constitutional responsibility. Collectively, there now appears to be a critical mass of M&E supporters to keep performance issues on the public agenda. This has probably and inevitably raised public consciousness about the importance and power of M&E to hold government accountable.

Nelson (2016) on the other hand states that, the concept and practice of M & E has become popular and is increasingly being used by public servants within the South African public sector towards transformation of the democratic developmental state. As identified in the preceding section, GWM&ES, the Constitution (1996) and various public service and public finance related legislation provide the foundation for public sector M & E locally. The South African conceptualisation of the term ‘monitoring and evaluation’ according to the PSC is the following:
Evaluation is understood as a process of comparison between what occurred and what was expected while monitoring is understood as the continuous checking of progress towards the achievement of a particular objective (PSC, 2008:11).

Nelson (2016) states that, the PSC conceptualisation provided, one can factually deduce that the PSC understands M & E as a practice that can help provide a clear understanding of the causes of good and poor performance within governments. This is further supported by the strong legislative foundation including the Constitution (1996), the White Paper on Transforming Public Service Delivery (Batho Pele White Paper, 1997) and most recently, the NEPF (2011). In substantiation, Nelson (2016) citing Mouton (2010) argues that, the implementation of M & E and the results-based approach, begun as a slow process that only gained momentum due to the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which was an international effort towards alleviating poverty and promoting socio-economic development.

Discussed in the following section are the objectives of the GWM&ES, a practice that has gradually reshaped government functionally in post-apartheid South Africa.

Objectives of GWM&ES

The primary M&E policy document in South Africa is the policy framework for the GWM&ES (2007). It describes the GWM&ES’s goals on several fronts, as they are covered here. enhancing the quality of program-level performance data and analysis within state departments and municipalities (inputs, outputs, and outcomes); enhancing the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of outcomes and impact throughout the entire government; enhancing sectoral and thematic evaluation reports; enhancing the M&E of provincial outcomes and impact concerning Provincial Growth and Development Plans; enhancing the M&E performance in specific government institutions; and, finally, enhancing M&E capacity and cultivating a governance and decision-making culture that reacts to M&E findings (Presidency, 2007:7).

In order to guarantee that service delivery is efficient and meets the wants and standards of the populace, the GWM&ES additionally seeks to facilitate each stage of a project or policy, including adoption, design, execution, and assessment (Presidency, 2007:5). According to the NEPF (2011), assessments should be carried out on a regular basis to try to enhance performance and accountability, produce knowledge, and help make wise decisions on public sector initiatives (Presidency, 2011:2). The public sector would be able to develop policies, allocate funds, lessen unintended consequences of policies, and enhance the culture of utilising evidence to improve performance through the conduct of reliable and high-quality evaluations (Presidency, 2011:2). Similarly, the NEPF (2011) recommends impact, implementation, design, and economic evaluations be carried out by state or public service departments, as these assessments are associated with the government's results-based management approach (Presidency, 2011:8).

Therefore, in this regard, the GWM&ES works to make sure that the policies, POAs, and public service funding stay on course so that variations are promptly handled before they negatively impact the admirable goal of raising living standards in contemporary South Africa.

Processes of the GWM&ES

This section covers the several processes that have contributed to the GWM&ES's steady rise to success in South Africa. First and foremost, Statistics South Africa (StatsSA, 2008) states that the creation of the South African Statistical Quality Assessment Framework (SASQAF) aims to expand and improve transparency in data evaluation. The framework and standards for assessing and approving statistics generated by NGOs, state agencies, and government departments are provided by the SASQAF (StatsSA, 2008:1). Therefore, serving as an authenticator to prevent distributing incomplete data to the general public SASQAF describes the procedures used in the data gathering of M&E data. The framework includes regulated rules and processes that collectively aim to improve quality information across the public sector (Presidency, 2007:9). StatsSA is the agency responsible for the collection and dissemination of official statistics and has a central role in evaluation and improvement of data quality (StatsSA, 2008:i).

To develop the GWM&ES's principles and practices, information and reporting requirements, and evaluation procedures, the Presidency formed the GWM&ES working group at the national level of government (Presidency, 2007:17). To create the GWM&ES implementation plan at the national and provincial levels, two further forums were established: the M&E Coordinating Forum and the Provincial M&E Forum (Presidency, 2008). According to the GWM&ES (2008:8) policy statement, all government departments are required to build M&E systems that are in line with the provincial and national growth and development strategies. This is part of the Premiers' role in the process. Furthermore, “M & E strategies outline how related findings will inform strategic and operational planning, budget formulation, and implementation as well as in-year and annual reporting” (Presidency, 2008:10).

The main institutional functions and responsibilities connected to M&E of national and provincial departments are defined in the GWM&ES Policy Framework (2007). Executive authorities are in charge of reporting on the performance of their individual institutions and using M&E data for accountability and decision-making. The regularity and calibre of M&E are the responsibility of accounting officers and accounting authorities, which includes Heads of Departments (HODs) in government departments and CEOs of public entities. These personnel are in charge of making sure that M&E issues are promptly resolved and that the information they provide is genuine and reliable. Programme managers, project managers and other line managers and officials are responsible for developing and maintaining M & E systems by collecting, analysing, verifying and using M & E information.
Finally, by offering expertise for M&E duties, developing capacity, and reporting on the M&E strategies, M&E units are also accountable for guaranteeing the implementation of M&E plans (Presidency, 2007: 14). To guarantee that M&E practices and data are taken seriously, the M&E units should be housed in the department's HOD's office (Presidency, 2008: 36). In order to manage the information that provincial departments are already gathering and to concentrate on assessing the information that these departments are providing, the offices of the premiers must have access to it (Presidency, 2008:10).

This GW MES framework is applicable to all spheres of government from national to local though provincial (Presidency, 2007). Hence the GWM&ES has become an all stakeholder arrangement where various agencies such as the StatsSA have equally vital roles to play towards accurate, timely and reliable reporting as well as track and trace of progress in the public service.

Research and Methodology

The current study employed a qualitative research design that included a review and/or analysis of the documents. This methodological strategy makes use of official and popular literature, as well as scholarly literature, journal articles, news items, novels, and web reports. Thematic Content Analysis (TCA) was used to examine the obtained data at all study levels because the author was not concerned with data quantification. The analysis involved organising the content with theoretical, conceptual, and descriptive interpretations to better inform the paper's main goal.

An analysis of the South African M & E system is provided in the section that follows.

The South African Monitoring and Evaluation System

The South African Statistical Quality Framework, the Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information, and the governing laws and policies of the local M&E system are among the policy papers that have been included to the GW M & E Policy Framework (2007). Furthermore, the NEPF in 2011 and the South African President decided to form the DPME in January 2010, which came after the policy documents were developed. Although measuring performance was the norm in the South African context, Mouton (2010:101) argues that results-based management, when it was introduced in the public sector, was viewed as a public management tool that allowed policy makers to review the outcomes and impact of a particular policy or programme. Dassah and Uken (2006:711) are of the opinion that the late response of introducing public sector M & E in South Africa is due to the lack of transparency and accountability existing at all spheres of government.

However, Stolyarenko (2014:5) emphasised that the pivotal moment in the M&E context shifting within South Africa occurred following the 2009 national elections. This was due to a number of factors, including the rise in municipal service delivery protests, a decline in support for the ruling party in the 2009 elections, and the unfavourable outcomes of a 15-year review of government, which acknowledged flaws like low performance in education and results in relation to expenditure per capita, frequent service quality issues, and corruption. Therefore, in these difficult times, M&E can assist in reducing the negative consequences of bad administrative procedures and regaining the efficiency of the public sector. It is important to remember that the 2009 new administration saw M&E as a vehicle for enhancing government performance, which would solve problems with providing services to citizens (Goldman et al., 2015:1). The outcome was, as observed by Goldman et al (2015:1), a policy decision to create the Ministry under the Presidency for Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in 2009 and the DPME in 2010 which was a defining event for M & E in South Africa.

When analysing the M & E system of the public sector in South Africa the institutional stakeholders which Cloete (2006:8) maintains are:

i. National Treasury responsible for measuring the ‘value for money’ aspects of governmental policy programmes;
ii. Department of Public Service and Administration (DPSA) responsible for staff performance evaluations;
iii. StatsSA responsible for data collection, storage and quality control;
iv. PSC responsible for interdepartmental evaluations of those few constitutional process principles and publishers of guidelines about M & E in an attempt to synchronise the different perspectives of all the main governmental agencies involved in this venture;
v. Department of Cooperative and Governance responsible for assessing the policy programme performances of provinces and local authorities; and
vi. National School of Government responsible for the capacity-building through training exercises to improve M & E skills among thousands of officials who will be responsible for the implementation of the system.

Latib and Goldman (2012:165) outline the quality systems that comprise an outcome-based approach, frontline service delivery monitoring, management level performance tools, and a national evaluation system as part of the South African public sector M&E system. The draft Standards of Evaluation Framework (2012) also seeks to promote the application of standards and the use of findings in relation to the five stages of evaluation: pre-evaluation considerations, evaluation planning, evaluation process, evaluation findings, and utilisation of the findings.

Currently, the South African M & E system contains the numerous qualities which according to Goldman et al (2015:8); Above all, the NEPF (2011) gives clear guidance to the system from the outset. The system's rapid development can be attributed to its ability
to build methodically upon prior experience and to sustain close ties with other exponents through a demand-driven approach that encourages departments to use evaluation results and to request assessments. Provinces and national departments are also compatible with it. As a result, South Africa’s M&E system is highly coordinated and, despite ongoing development, has the ability to significantly alter the direction of sustainable government efficacy and efficiency. M & E if correctly applied, will provide public and private sectors ways to improve service delivery with available resources. In other words it is crucial to demonstrate positive results as an important part of accountability to all stakeholders. This is achieved through a realisation that M & E is linked with performance management. This being so, their indicators need to be established to achieve the above outcomes.

The following section covers a discussion of performance management as an equally important aspect of 21st century public service efficiency.

**Performance Management in The Public Service**

Armstrong (1995:429) defines performance management as the process of comprehending and controlling an organization’s, teams’, and individuals’ performance within a predetermined framework of predetermined objectives, standards, and competency criteria. On the other hand, performance management is described by Cardy and Dobbins (1994:2) as a formal and systematic procedure that allows individuals’ job-relevant strengths and weaknesses to be recognized, quantified, documented, and improved. In an effort to bring out the best in each employee, a continuous process of performance monitoring and evaluation is carried out. It is not as ill-conceived as trying to discover ways around enforcing punitive measures for subpar work.

Performance management and performance management systems are not the same thing, despite their seeming similarity. According to Simeka Management Consulting (2004:12), a Performance Management System (PMS) is a powerful tool for overseeing employee performance. It comprises a policy framework and guidelines for all areas and components of the performance cycle, such as performance planning and agreement, performance monitoring, review, and control, performance appraisal, and moderating and overseeing the results of appraisals. More specifically, a PMS provides instructions on how to execute all aspects of performance management, including goal setting, choosing how to track progress, and doing routine evaluations.

The study now gives a look at the historical genesis of the important practice of performance management, especially in the wake of its role as a feeder into a wide M & E practice.

**The Historical Context of Performance Management**

As long as there have been companies, performance management has been an essential aspect of organizational life, according to Jones (2005). The builders of the enormous pyramids needed to be “encouraged,” and the ancient Egyptians unintentionally employed performance management methods to do this. To accomplish their aims, their approach focused on giving workers who didn’t perform as expected a flogging. They created magnificent pyramids as proof that this worked well for them. There is proof that performance management systems existed in various ancient civilizations, including Rome and ancient China (Furnham, 2004). However, over time, as our understanding of human nature and the environment, in which we exist has changed, the importance of managing performance to align individual goals with a common vision has been recognised as being vital to an organization’s success. The necessity of an effective holistic performance measurement and appraisal system, therefore, became apparent.

The purpose of this work is to establish a link between performance management and M&E in the public service. Perplexingly, performance management can be used to both individual and organizational performance, and the phrases performance measurement and performance management are frequently used synonymously. In this case, the term “performance management” refers to a system that “aims to react to the ‘outcome’ measure using it in order to manage the performance,” and the term “performance measurement” refers to the “act of measuring the performance” (Radnor & McGuire, 2004:246), which is typically at an organizational or business unit level. It has been noted that performance measurement as we know it, now can be recognized as having started in the mid-1800s with cost and management accounting profession (Radnor & McGuire, 2004).

**Objectives of Performance Management Policies**

Performance Management policy encompass all those aspects of human resource management that is designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of both the individual employees and the organisation at large. For Brown and Armstrong (1999) performance management to be anything that an organisation does to improve its total performance. They postulate that it has four key purposes. Foremost, performance management assists organisations in managing both organisations and employee expectations. This is achieved by enabling individuals and organisations to clarify the nature of the psychological contract between them (Argyris, 1960; Schein, 1970).

Based on the analysis and clarification provided in the previous section, it is evident that the primary goal of performance management in public sector organisations is to raise individual and organisational performance. Performance management policies are “concerned not only with what is achieved, but also with how it is achieved” (Jones (2005) as cited in Price, 2000:177). Certain specific components are shared by all effective generic performance management systems; without these, the system would not function. These are the fundamental actions that need to be taken to guarantee the system operates efficiently.

One example of a PMS method is covered in the following section.
The Balanced Scorecard Approach in Performance Management

According to Kaplan and Norton (1992), the Balanced Scorecard Approach (BSA) is a multifaceted method for planning, controlling, and managing performance that is especially connected to organisational strategy. Since the early 1990s, Kaplan and Norton at the Harvard Business School have been developing the method. The BSA is used to identify a technique that has answered one or two key topics in detail but has left out other crucial ones. The BSA is potentially a powerful tool by which senior managers can be encouraged to address the fundamental issue of effectively deploying an organisation’s strategic intent in assessing the importance played by M & E policies in governance and performance management policies. (Kaplan and Norton, 1992, 1996).

BSA literature also indicates that it is as much the process of establishing a scorecard that yields benefit as the resultant measurement schema. Kloot and Martin (1998) argue that in practice, PMS requires the four dimensions of the BSA that is, financial, community or customer, internal business processes; and growth or innovation and learning. Designed to serve as the hub of an organization's planning and control mechanisms for performance management, the BSA helps to align operational practices with strategic intent, implement strategy efficiently, and permit objective performance measurement. Its integration with more conventional planning and control systems must be examined, though, as it is unable to function independently. Senior managers can be urged to address the basic problem of successfully delivering an organization's strategic aim by using the BSA, which is a potentially beneficial instrument.

It focuses on establishing links between strategic objectives and performance measures, it also pays some attention to measuring the achievement of the components of the strategic plan the organisation has espoused (this means that it is believed will lead to the desired ends). However, the literature is remarkably silent on these points.

Conceptual and Regulatory Framework for Performance Management

According to Armstrong (1995), referenced by Munzhedzi & Phago (2014:1084), performance management is a strategy for improving outcomes from groups, individuals, and institutions by recognising and controlling performance within a predetermined framework of predetermined objectives, standards, and competency criteria. On the other hand, performance management is described by Cardy and Dobbins (1994:2) as a formal and systematic procedure that helps identify, measure, document, and develop an employee's strengths and shortcomings related to their job (Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014:1084). Performance management and performance management systems are not the same thing, despite their seeming similarity. According to Simeka Management Consulting (2004:12), a PMS is a recognised framework for overseeing employee performance. It comprises policies and a framework for each component of the performance cycle, such as performance planning and agreement, monitoring, review, and control, performance appraisal, and moderating and appropriately managing the appraisal's results. More specifically, a performance management system (PMS) provides instructions on how to execute all aspects of performance management, including goal setting, accomplishment measurement, and periodical assessments.

The necessary element of the PMS entails performance improvement and productivity to ensure effective and efficient public service delivery. According to Van der Waldt (2004) cited by Munzhedzi and Phago (2014:1085), it is usually difficult to measure performance improvement and productivity in the public service because the outputs are usually intangible. For example, the general welfare of a given local community, effectiveness and efficiency and the general satisfaction of society in services provided are not readily measured as usually compared to the private enterprises whose survival and sustainability is based on profit margins.

The requirements set for the public service in terms of Section 195 of the Constitution (1996) is that good human resource management and career development practices to maximise human potential must be cultivated. It is further stated that efficient, economic and effective use of resources must be promoted. Section 195(1) of the Constitution (1996) serves as a reference point guiding the conduct of public officials on several issues including performance in all spheres of government. Van der Waldt and Du Toit (1999:384) also believe that the Constitution (1996), through Section 195, makes provision for the effective performance of administrative functions in this regard. Deductively therefore, the study argues that the Constitution (1996) is a key founding legal prescript from which the PMS emanates.

According to Section 2(1) of the Skills Development Act (No. 97 of 1998), emphasis should be placed on employee development in order to facilitate good and effective performance of employees in the institution. A skills audit is necessary to determine the gaps between the job requirement and competencies of a particular employee as a requirement of a PMS. This Act makes provision for the development of a Workplace Skills Plan by the employer. According to Coetzee (2002:95) Workplace Skills Plans refer to the strategic human resource training and development aimed at developing a skills capacity, which then helps institutions to achieve its own goals and objectives.

A performance management process must be legally sound to avoid unnecessary litigation (Nel, Van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schultz, Sonon & Werner, 2004:488). Schedule 8 of the Labour Relations Act (No. 66 of 1995) contains a provision that deals with the incapacities of employees and poor performance. Maila (2006:26) is critical of the Labour Relations Act (No. 66 of 1995) in that it makes it impossible to dismiss an employee when such employee has not reached the set and agreed performance targets. Furthermore, the Act makes provision for how to manage poor performance by employees without opting for dismissal as a first option. Before any
dismissal can be effected, lengthy and remedial measures including an investigation to establish the reasons for poor performance, in the process have to be applied (Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014:1085).

In a same spirit, the Public Service Regulations (2001) Part VIII, Chapter 1, states that the executing authority shall establish a framework that connects individual performance to institutional goals, in conjunction with their department. According to Part III of Chapter 4 of the Public Service Regulations (2001), performance agreements are the appropriate means of managing each Senior Management Services (SMS) member’s performance. It is further required in the regulations that a supervisor must monitor, supervise, and assess the subordinate’s work on a regular basis, using the prescribed format of performance assessment within an organisation (Munzhedzi & Phago, 2014:1085).

Performance Management Linked to Monitoring and Evaluation

Performance information is used by performance management, according to Zwane (2014:43), to manage organisational capacity and procedures. For example, to periodically evaluate programmes, assess and adjust objectives, check progress against targets, conduct personnel assessments, and develop and justify budgets. As a management tool, performance measurement is required to define objectives, track progress towards those objectives, and record the returns on investment for each programme. According to Zwane (2014:43), monitoring is a continuous process that makes use of the methodical gathering of data on particular indicators to give management and the primary stakeholders in a continuing intervention insight into the degree to which goals are being met and the advancement of the allocation of funds (unodc.org, 2017:2).

While evaluation is the systematic and objective examination of existing and or completed projects, programmes or policies, in respect of their design, execution, results (unodc.org, 2017:2). According to Zwane (2014:44), the idea of performance-based monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) has arisen as a result of the connections between performance management and M&E. The performance-based management and evaluation system combines traditional and contemporary methods of control. The PM&E uses a conservative approach, complementing the review-inclined modern evaluation methodologies with the implementation monitoring component. The goal of integration is to evaluate how policies or programmes are progressing, make necessary adjustments to the processes, and ultimately produce the intended, beneficial results. Zwane (2014:43) notes that the notion moreover requires selection of acceptable indicators, outlined in sub-sections that follow.

Indicators

Indicators are conceptualised by Nel and Goldman (2005:6), quoted by Montingoe (2012:91), as a way to know that the goal will be accomplished. This point of view is supported by Minnaar (2010:68), who claims that indicators aid an organisation in defining and tracking its goals. They are indicators of an organization's success characteristics. This is in line with Kasek and Rist's (2004:69) remark that an indicator is a quantitative or qualitative characteristic that offers a straightforward and trustworthy foundation for evaluating accomplishments, transformation, or performance. These are hints, indicators, or benchmarks that gauge a program's performance in a particular area and indicate how near it is to its intended course and results. This point of view is heavily supported by Van der Waldt (2004:53), who claims that indicators are measurements that indicate how well a programme is accomplishing its goals. They specify the information to be gathered, track advancement, and make it possible to contrast long-term findings with anticipated outcomes. Indicators so highlight and quantify trends. Montingoe (2012:91). As a way to summarise the situation, the Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment Policy and Implementation Framework (2010:16) demonstrated that indicators are signals that represent progress or lack thereof made towards goals. They serve as a tool for comparing actual outcomes to intended levels of quantity, quality, and timeliness.

To monitor performance in respect to inputs, activities, outputs, results, and impacts, appropriate performance indicators must be identified, according to the National Treasury's Framework for Managing Programme Performance Information (2007:7). It also demonstrates how the institution's mandate should be taken into consideration when choosing a set of suitable performance metrics. This means that managers must carefully consider what is to be measured when developing performance indicators, which calls for selectivity. Measures of inputs, procedures, results, and impacts for development projects, programmes, or strategies are called performance indicators. When supported with sound data collection, perhaps involving formal surveys analysis and reporting, indicators enable managers to track progress, demonstrate results, and take corrective action to improve service delivery (World Bank, 2004:6).

Any performance monitoring system's foundation is made up of performance indicators, which specify the kind of data that must be gathered in order to gauge progress and allow the assessor to compare actual results with anticipated outcomes (USAID, 1996:1). In order to measure the effectiveness of organisational policies, plans, and programmes and ultimately achieve desired results, performance indicators are therefore essential tools for logical decision-making processes in performance management systems.

Furthermore, according to Zwane (2014:45), it is critical that performance indicators be chosen as a programme in and of itself, practical to attain, rational to apply, capable of measuring and evaluating the strategies, and important in terms of alignment and accomplishment of monitoring and evaluation procedures. Understanding that an indicator must be useful for tracking outcomes is equally crucial. Stated differently, what is the ease of accessing and evaluating data for that specific indicator? Acquiring reliable and accurate data can be exceedingly difficult and expensive. It is not feasible to gather a large enough sample size of respondents
by an extended survey; instead, a smaller sample size that is representative of the population is more manageable. Indicators should therefore be as simple and few as possible, while demonstrating some measure of progress or magnitude of change. It will be difficult to understand or analyse the indicators if they are too complex (UNDP, 2002:69). The seven criteria for assessing performance indicators are covered in the section that follows.

Direct

A performance indicator ought to gauge the expected outcome as precisely as feasible. It must not be set at a value that is greater or lower than the outcome being assessed. If it is not possible to use a direct measure, one or more proxy indications may be suitable. For instance, managers may not always have access to dependable direct measure data on a frequent enough basis, in which case proxy indicators are required to offer timely progress updates. Indirect measurements known as "proxy measures" are connected to the outcomes by one or more presumptions. For example, in rural areas of Africa it is often difficult to measure income levels directly. Measures such as percentage of village households with roofs (or radios or bicycles) may be useful, if somewhat rough proxy. The assumption is that when villagers have higher income they have a tendency of buying certain goods. If convincing evidence exists that the assumption is sound (for instance, it is based on research or experience somewhere), then the proxy may be an adequate indicator, albeit second best to a direct measure.

Objective

There is no doubt about what is being measured using an objective indicator. In other words, opinions regarding how to interpret the data are generally agreed upon. It is operationally exact and unidimensional. One phenomenon is measured at a moment when something is unidimensional. Aim to avoid cramming too much into a single indicator. For example, measuring operational precision and access leaves little doubt as to what kind of data would be gathered for an indicator. While it may be unclear how many successful export companies there are, it is operationally precise to know how many export companies see an annual revenue rise of at least 5%.

Adequate

When considered collectively, a performance indicator along with its companion indicators should be able to accurately quantify the desired outcome. How many indicators should be employed to measure a specific result is a commonly questioned question. The intricacy of the outcome being monitored, the extent of resources available for performance monitoring, and the quantity of data required to make reasonably confident decisions all influence the response.

Quantitative, Where Possible

Quantitative indicators are numerical in nature. Qualitative indicators are descriptive observations. While quantitative indicators are not necessarily more objective, their numerical precision lends them to more agreement on interpretation of results data, and are thus usually preferable. However, even when effective quantitative indicators are being used, qualitative indicators can supplement the numbers and percentages with a richness of information that brings programme results to life.

Disaggregated, Where Appropriate

Disaggregating a people-level programme by gender, age, location or some other dimension is often important from a management point of view. Experience shows that development activities often require different approaches for different groups and affect those groups in different ways. Disaggregated data help track whether or not specific groups participate in and benefit from activities intended to include them. Therefore, it makes good management sense that performance indicators be sensitive to such differences.

Practical

An indicator is practical if data can be obtained in a timely way and at reasonable cost. Mangers require data that can be collected frequently enough to inform them of progress and influence decisions.

Reliable


The following section of the paper lays out the concluding remarks of the paper.

Conclusion

Each and every project requires M&E to gauge output and evaluate the initiative's efficacy. It is essential to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation system's capacity in order to achieve the intended results. Government organisations at all three levels can build a knowledge base on the kinds of projects, programmes, and policies that have the best chance of success by utilising the knowledge capital that comes from a well-organized M&E system. This will make it easier for decision-makers to evaluate the results and what has to be done moving forward to guarantee the success of service delivery. This paper discusses the relationship between M&E and performance. Performance management, which serves as a feeder process into mainstream M&E, is closely related to performance management, as discussed in the many sections of the synthesis that came before it. As the GWM&ES has proven to be the best tool
for performance management and enhancement, the South African public sector stands to gain by implementing it at every level of government. As a result, the public sector needs to enhance and step up performance management as well as expand M&E procedures. This includes the public service, which is an essential institution that helps individuals realise their rights to healthcare. Ultimately, a successful and efficient government will probably oversee citizen-centered service delivery, maintaining public satisfaction while raising living standards damaged by the discriminatory policies of the social Darwinist government that existed prior to 1994.
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