THE MATURITY OF
MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS OF
THE BRAZILIAN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

TEAM
Selma Maria Hayakawa Cunha Serpa
Hiroyuki Miki

SUPERVISION
Glória Maria Merola da Costa Bastos
Maridel Piloto de Noronha

ADVISOR
Paulo Carlos Du Pin Calmon
University of Brasília

Bangkok, October 2015
Objectives

✔ Evaluate Brazilian Ministries` (Federal Departments) capacity to demand, do and use evaluation

✔ Describe their evaluation systems
Analysis Framework

**Focus I - Do governmental decision-makers**
- have well defined program objectives, targets, goals, budget and other resources?
- know which, when and for what purpose evaluative information is needed?
- know who needs the evaluative information to be produced?

**Focus II – Do Brazilian Ministries have (to produce evaluative information)**
- Institutionalized organizational process?
- Evaluative procedures and practices?
- Skilled resources to develop or to ask for evaluation?
- Evaluative rules and organizational support (resources to do evaluation)?
## Evaluation Systems Maturity Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not structured</td>
<td>A system or focus is considered <strong>not structured</strong> when the mechanisms and instruments needed to characterize the evaluation systems are <strong>partially present</strong> and they are <strong>not</strong> enough and do not regularly meet the decision-makers` needs of evaluative knowledge</td>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incipient</td>
<td>A system or focus is considered <strong>incipient</strong> when the mechanisms and instruments needed to characterize the evaluation systems are <strong>present</strong>, but they are <strong>partially sufficient</strong> and do not regularly meet the decision-makers` needs of evaluative knowledge</td>
<td>≥ 50 e ≤ 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>A system or focus is considered <strong>intermediate</strong> when the mechanisms and instruments needed to characterize the evaluation systems are <strong>present, partially sufficient</strong> and <strong>regularly</strong> meet the decision-makers` needs of evaluative knowledge</td>
<td>&gt; 60 e ≤ 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>A system or focus is considered <strong>Improved</strong> when the mechanisms and instruments needed to characterize the evaluation systems are <strong>present, sufficient</strong> and <strong>satisfactorily</strong> meet the decision-makers` needs of evaluative knowledge</td>
<td>&gt; 70 e ≤ 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>A system or focus is considered <strong>advanced</strong> when the mechanisms and instruments needed to characterize the evaluation systems are <strong>present</strong> and <strong>entirely adequate</strong> to meet the decision-makers` needs of evaluative knowledge</td>
<td>&gt; 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

- Web-survey (as of 26, August to October 4th, 2013)
- Target group - 2,062 governmental decision-makers at 28 ministries (Secretariats (DAS 6), Directors (DAS 5) and Coordinators (DAS 4 and DAS 3))
  - 750 respondents (36.4%)
- Descriptive statistics and content analysis
- Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis (constructivist approach) – MCDA-C (index – ISA-Gov)
Survey Target Group

Percentage - per job position

- **General Coordinators** → 38.4%
  - Respondents: 15.7%
  - Non Respondents: 22.7%
- **Others** → 32.9%
  - Respondents: 10.3%
  - Non Respondents: 22.6%
- **Directors** → 16.9%
  - Respondents: 5.9%
  - Non Respondents: 11.1%
- **Secretariats** → 7.1%
  - Respondents: 1.5%
  - Non Respondents: 5.6%
- **Coordinators** → 1.8%
  - Respondents: 0.5%
  - Non Respondents: 0.8%
- **General Directors** → 1.4%
  - Respondents: 0.3%
  - Non Respondents: 0.5%
- **Executive Secretariats** → 1.1%
  - Respondents: 0.8%
  - Non Respondents: 0.5%
- **Non identified** → 0.4%
  - Respondents: 0.4%
  - Non Respondents: 0.4%
Respondents Profile

Period of time at the current job position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>23.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>33.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>19.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 6 years</td>
<td>6.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6 years</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 57 %
Results

Maturity Level per Focus

Capacity to do evaluation

Focus I score (Demand): 59.17
Focus II score (Supply): 49.57
Focus III score (Organizational Capacity Learning): 82.50
Focus IV score (Evaluation use): 80.00
General score: 63.96
Results
Breakdown of Foci - Dimensions of Analysis
Main evaluation practices

- Others: 35%
- Annual Financial Report: 17%
- Monitoring: 15%
- Evaluation: 13%
- Follow up: 10%
- Meeting: 10%
- Others: 10%
Results

Comparative analysis between evaluation demand x supply – Focus I x Focus II
Focus Radar

- Score Focus I - Demand
- Score Focus III - Org Capacity Learning
- Score Focus II - Supply
- Score Focus IV - Evaluation Use

General Score
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Ministry 28
## Purposes of Evaluation Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Organizational Learning</th>
<th>Performance Monitoring</th>
<th>Evidence-Based Policy</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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