Influence of sector wide monitoring and evaluation (M&E) on the performance of Justice, Law and Order in Uganda

H Arinaitwe*
Mbarara University of Science and Technology
Uganda

E M Asiimwe
Uganda Technology and Management University (UTAMU)
Uganda

ABSTRACT

This article analyses the influence of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) on the Justice, Law and Order sector's (JLOS) performance as a case study of Sector Wide Approaches (SWAPs). The research focused on sector performance indicators and their influence on the attainment of the JLOS's goals and to examine the influence of JLOS M&E structural arrangements on sector performance. The findings revealed that recasting, planning and provision of feedback were required. However, there is increased concentration on output indicators. M&E structural arrangements were not very well developed and there was lack of an integrated M&E system and weak linkages between institutional M&E and sector schedules. The study findings further indicate that though the sector has an M&E communication framework (as stated by 60% of respondents) there is limited consideration of M&E findings as stated by 51% of respondents. 88% of the respondents said M&E funding was inadequate, raising a challenge for implementation.

INTRODUCTION

This article focuses on a case study of SWAPs to determine the influence of M&E on the JLOS. The research focused on sector performance indicators and their influence on attaining the goals of the JLOS. It also examines the influence of JLOS M&E structural arrangements to sector performance. The study is postulated on the institutional theory. The article provides a background and rationale to contextualise the study and discusses the evolution of SWAPs. The research design, findings, conclusion, policy implications and recommendations are also provided.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

M&E has evolved from being a reactive tool that measures and reports status to a proactive tool for planning, tracking and reporting on results. The latter is a core component of results-based monitoring (RBM) and evaluation where performance is measured on the basis of impacts and benefits that the institution or programme is expected to produce.

New Public Management (NPM) shifts the objective of the public sector to make it more competitive and efficient in resource use and service delivery. The main doctrines of NPM as explained by Hood (1991:4) are hands-on professional management, explicit standards and performance measures, emphasis on output controls, shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector, stress on greater discipline and economy in resource use and a shift to greater competition by the introduction of market disciplines in the public sector.

Sector wide monitoring in this study was construed to refer to all processes and procedures aimed at ensuring that sector priorities are attained. SWAPs are defined by "all characteristics where all significant funding for the sector supports a single sector policy and expenditure programme, under government leadership, adopting common approaches across the sector and progressing towards relying on government procedures to disburse and account for all funds" (Foster, Brown and Conway 2000:1). SWAPs have gone beyond aid delivery to encompass the development of country systems from a wider perspective in the form of institutions, capacities, monitoring and accountability (Boesen and Dietvorst 2007:5–7).

The overall focus of JLOS is improving administration of justice through coordinated programme planning, budgeting, implementation, and M&E of sector institutions in a participatory process. This makes a shift from institutional interest to sector wide interests where institutional interests do not supersede sectoral priorities.

JLOS in Uganda is constituted by 17 public institutions including Police, Prisons, Judiciary, Director of Public Prosecutions, Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Uganda Human Rights Commission. These institutions are coordinated by a sector secretariat. While SWAP application to this sector initially focused on pooling funds by different donors (basket funding) for implementation of programmes, little attention was paid to achievement of results. In the last 10 years donors and government have been searching for evidence of outcomes as a result of pooled funding in the context of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which prompted JLOS to reinvigorate its secretariat to oversee implementation of SWAP programmes and thereby the birth of the sector wide M&E.

EVOLUTION OF SECTOR WIDE APPROACHES

In Africa, the period after 2000 has seen the gradual evolution of SWAPs to replace a fragmented vertical-based institutional and departmental approach. SWAPs have evolved from an aid delivery tool through development assistance to an integrated performance mechanism. SWAPS are premised on improving coordination, cooperation and communication across the institutions delivering towards the same mandate, and in which case JLOS is improving access to justice, promotion of human rights and maintaining law and order.

In Uganda, SWAPs developed out of the desire expressed in the *Poverty Eradication Action Plan 2000* as the national *Poverty Reduction Structural Paper*. The need for deriving

and building consensus on priority objectives and strategies to be financed triggered sector working groups and by extension the SWAP. SWAPs are increasingly important for the Government of Uganda's planning and budgeting process, for sectors to secure resource allocation within the Medium Term Expenditure Framework and the national budget process.

JLOS as a SWAP has been in operation for over 10 years as a holistic government approach focused on improving the administration of justice, maintenance of law and order as well as the promotion, protection and respect of human rights.

JLOS in response to government reforms guided by the national planning framework enshrined in the National Development Plan 1 2010/11–2014/15 adopted the results chain framework for both planning and assessment of performance/monitoring.

The sector is guided by five year Strategic Investment Plans (SIPs) as planning instruments aimed in part at avoiding *wish-lists* of actions and projects but common goals, objectives, and performance measures, strategic issues, implementation plans and evaluation of results. The sector is currently implementing SIP III covering financial years 2012–2016. It should be noted that without establishing measurable performance targets, it would be difficult to measure performance. Thus the sector institutionalised results-based monitoring to improve planning and enhance performance measurement.

In 2012, the sector developed and adopted a new M&E framework articulating both outcome and output indicators with a focus on improving performance. This was premised on the Government of Uganda results chain M&E framework as outlined in the National M&E Policy Framework. In the same period an M&E advisor was recruited and policy planning units were strengthened to enhance data collection and reporting on results.

Despite such attempts, performance levels remained low in regard to the achievement of set targets as evidenced by unsatisfactory disposal of cases and failure to achieve undertakings (Callaghan 2010:4***).*** This was also compounded by the existence of case backlog, increased public perception of corruption among the JLOS agencies, increased incidences of human rights violations, the widening gap between laws on paper and enforcement, delayed reporting and continued mix-up between output, process and outcome results as opposed to impact oriented sectoral targets (JLOS 2012: 8–10). Against this background, the study to understand the influence of sector wide M&E on the performance of JLOS in Uganda was conceived.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The study used a cross sectional study design. Data was collected using questionnaires from 32 programme implementers of different sector institutions and in-depth interviews were also conducted with five managers of the secretariat and donors.

The study employed a cross sectional descriptive approach since the 17 institutions studied cover the whole country and this approach was best suited to gather the information in a specified period of time. The study used both qualitative and quantitative approaches to establish the influence of M&E on JLOS performance. Cross sectional study provided a snapshot of what was going on in relation to the study variables.

The study was carried out within the 17 JLOS institutions of Uganda based in Kampala (with the unit analysis as sector structures). The respondents were subdivided into the sector

structures with a focus on those with direct responsibility for monitoring and performance management. The target population comprised of 34 policy and planning forum members, five JLOS secretariat staff, 30 budget working group members, five development partner's group members and 30 technical committee members. The ultimate sample size of 45 respondents was derived from the target population of 109 as per Table 1.

Table 1: Category of respondents

Category	Total Population	Sample Size	Sampling Strategy
Technical Committee	30	05	Purposive sampling
Donor Partner's Group	10	5	Simple random sampling
Sector Secretariat	5	5	Purposive sampling
Budget Working Group	30	5	Simple random sampling
Policy Planning Forum	34	25	Purposive sampling
Total	**109**	**45**	

Source: (Author's own construction)

The study used both probability and non-probability sampling designs of purposive and convenience sampling. Purposive sampling was used to select respondents who were more knowledgeable and experienced in matters of the sector, M&E and planning, but most importantly formed the core of the target for response for this research because they were the ones that held the particular offices and there was no pool to randomly sample from. Convenience sampling was used to draw information from respondents who are more conveniently available to provide information regarding planning and M&E. Simple random sampling was used based on a lottery technique where all names of subjects were written on tags and placed in a basket. Tags were removed at random until the required number was realised. A self-administered closed-ended and open-ended questionnaire using a Likert rating scale of measurement was used to collect data from the respondents (five budget working group and 25 policy planning forum members). Quantitative data was coded and verified to detect errors and ensure coherence. SPSS Version 22 analysis tool was used for analysis; descriptive and inferential statistics were generated. Trends and distributions were examined. Data was organised to answer the research question. Qualitative data was indexed, categorised based on patterns, repetitions and commonalities into themes using study variables.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Characteristics of respondents

The research focused on staff within the JLOS with a responsibility for monitoring, performance management and sector structures.

Membership of respondents in JLOS working groups

Most of the respondents were from the Policy and Planning Forum at 56.3%, followed by Budget Working Group at 18.8%, Technical Committee at 12.5%, and Sector Secretariat at 6.3% with the lowest representation at Criminal Justice Working Group and Development Partner's Group at 3.1%. This mirrors the sectoral structure with performance and M&E being done by the Budget Working Group, Policy units and Technical Committee.

Table 2: Gender of respondents

Gender	Frequency		Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
	Number	%		
Male	18	56.3	56.3	56.3
Female	14	43.7	43.7	100.0
Total	**32**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: (Author's research)

Table 2 shows that 56.3% of respondents were male while 43.7% were female. This suggests that the targeted offices are occupied more by males than by females. However this difference is not significant to affect study results.

Table 3 :Education level of respondents

Education Level	Frequency		Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
	Number	%		
Bachelors	13	40.6	40.6	40.6
Master's	19	59.4	59.4	100.0
Total	**32**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: (Author's research)

The findings in Table 3 show that a total of 59.4% of the respondents had attained Master's level of education followed by Bachelor's at 40.6%.

Table 4: Respondent's profession

Profession	Frequency	
	Number	%
Lawyer	10	31.3
Economist	8	25.0
Social Worker	1	3.1
Accountant	1	3.1
Planner	11	34.4
Administrator	1	3.1
Total	**32**	**100.0**

Source: (Author's research)

The findings as presented in Table 4 show that 34.4% of the respondents are planners, 31.3% lawyers and 25% economists. Social workers, accountants and administrators posted the least percentage; all tied at 3.1%. This suggests that the data was collected from key professions that are responsible for monitoring, evaluation and performance and with high consideration to the nature of the sector being legalistic.

Influence of sector indicators and performance

In the study, 56.3% of respondents agreed that sector indicators facilitate performance while a further 28.1% strongly agreed. Respondents also indicated that M&E indicators facilitate forecast at 37.5% and early warning, choice of what to track and method to use at 28.1%, appropriate feedback at 19.4%, planning at 9.7% and in measuring results 3.2%.

The study also enquired about the influence of the nature of indicators on performance with special focus on whether the output indicators were more relevant than outcome indicators in performance assessment. The respondents indicated that there was increased focus on output indicators as compared to outcome indicators as illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Ranking of output indicators versus outcome indicators in performance measurement

Ranking	Frequency		Valid Per cent	Cumulative Per cent
	Number	Per cent		
Strongly Agree	5	15.6	17.2	17.2
Agree	13	40.6	44.8	62.1
Neither Agree or Disagree	4	12.5	13.8	75.9
Disagree	6	18.8	20.7	96.6
Strongly Disagree	1	3.1	3.4	
Missing System	3	9.4		
Total	**32**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

Source: (Author's research)

In the study 40.6% of respondents agreed, 18.8% disagreed, 15.6% strongly agreed, 12.5% neither agreed nor disagreed and 3.1% strongly disagreed that output indicators are more useful than outcome indicators in performance measurement. This was based on the reasons as shown in Table 6.

Out of the total questionnaire respondents, 31.3% agreed that output indicators are easy to measure, 28.1% hold that both outcome and output indicators are relevant while for 15.6%; they show immediate results of sector activities with 6.3% indicating that funding is targeted at outputs. 9.4% of respondents disagreed, based on the reason that outcome indicators are contributed to by many factors and/or are all equivalent at 28.1%. This suggests that output indicators are more tracked than outcome indicators because of the inherent advantages of being easy to track and ability to show immediate effects.

Table 6: Reasons for ranking output indicators

Reason for the ranking	Frequency		Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
	Number	%		
Funding is targeted at outputs	2	6.3	6.9	6.9
Show immediate results of sector activities	5	15.6	17.2	24.1
Easier to measure and track	10	31.3	34.5	58.6
Outcome indicators are contributed to by many factors some beyond the sector	3	9.4	10.3	69.0
All are equally relevant	9	28.1	31.0	100.0
Total	**29**	**90.6**	**100.0**	
Missing System	3	9.4		
Total	**32**	**100.0**		

Source: (Author's research)

M&E key sector areas

Using the critical sector areas of case backlog, prison congestion, human rights violations and corruption, the study endeavoured to find out which is tracked most. Findings indicated that JLOS M&E indicators track prison congestion most of all the key areas with 90.6% on the strongly agree or agree scale as compared to 68.8% for case backlog, 62.5% for human rights violations and 28.2% for corruption. Overall tracking of corruption within the sector was regarded as the most rarely tracked area with 40.7% of respondents putting it at the lowest side of disagree and strongly disagree respectively. This is opposed to 21.9% for human rights violations, 7.2% for prison congestion and 29.1% for case backlog. This implies that there could be differential emphasis on some indicators as opposed to others.

The findings from key interview respondents further indicate that whereas the indicators can track performance; corruption needs to be tracked from the concerns of the public based on their perception. It was further argued that some indicators are over-emphasised based on the sector priorities. R 02 reveals that some indicators are too broad and may not be representative enough. The quantitative focus negates the qualitative aspect especially of key areas of human rights and corruption. Institutions need to focus on micro-level indicators that can track activities and processes so that at the sector level outcome level indicators are used most.

M&E tools

The reliability and comprehensiveness of M&E is greatly supported by the tools to enhance the M&E system and easy collection of data on indicators. The study also looked at whether the M&E tools were comprehensive to measure performance. Study findings indicated that JLOS M&E tools measure performance at 53.1%, 18.8% disagreed while 9.4% either strongly agreed, strongly disagreed or neither agreed or disagreed. Key respondent R O1 notes that whereas field visits are very helpful to track on-ground results, there is a need to expand focus beyond the 'gang of four'- Judiciary, Prisons, Police and Prosecutions to increase their

relevance across the entire sector. However, R 05 notes that the tools do not provide for easy collection of disaggregated and gender-based data.

Correlation results between JLOS indicators and performance

To test if there was a relationship between JLOS indicators and performance, a correlation analysis was conducted using Pearson's Correlation (r) coefficient and significance (p) at the two- tailed levels

Table 7: Correlation matrix between JLOS indicators and sector performance

		M&E indicators track performance	M&E facilitate performance
M&E indicators track performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.438*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.012
	N	32	32
M&E facilitate performance	Pearson Correlation	.438*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	
	N	32	32
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Table 7 shows Pearson's correlation coefficient r = 438 and p = 0.012 between M&E indicators and sector performance suggesting that there was a positive significant relationship between monitoring indicators and performance. The sig. (2-tailed) level indicates that the p-obtained .012 was less than p- critical (0.05). Thus the directional hypothesis that JLOS M&E indicators make a significant contribution to sector wide performance is upheld.

Structural arrangements and M&E

The effectiveness of M&E on performance can only be measured by a requisite and matching M&E system with supportive structures. The study also examined the influence of such M&E sector structures on performance by analysis of the existence of an M&E system, M&E schedules, M&E data management, M&E funding, staff capability to manage M&E for performance, and stakeholder involvement.

M&E system

An M&E system is a basis for effective performance measurement using indicators through an established programming system. JLOS was found not to have an M&E system in place. Study findings showed that 53.1% disagreed, 31.2% agreed, 6.3% either strongly agreed or disagreed and only 3.1% neither agreed nor disagreed that an M&E system exists within the sector. When asked the reasons for their choice, respondents indicated that only a framework exists at 31.9%, implementation of the existing M&E framework is limited at 15.6%, there is lack of a computerised management information system at 9.4%, performance is based on work plans at 12.8%, funding is available for M&E at 6.3%, lack of M&E data at 12% and M&E is institutionalised at 12%. This is correlated with respondent 1 who asserts that there is no

M&E system in place and the framework which exists is not good enough because it does not adequately cover human rights issues and has not been updated based on baselines – *R 01.*

Relatively similar views are held by R 02, R 03 and R 04 who add that the framework provides a good start and is an improvement on what existed in the strategic investment II and will further help in analysis of performance. R 05 adds that "the system is still donor driven does not involve the public, data and information management are not strong…no supporting M&E structures and systems are not embedded in all institutions…".

M&E data management systems

M&E requires good data management systems to facilitate performance measurement. JLOS was found not to have effective data management systems. A total of 59.4% disagreed, 18.5% either agreed or strongly agreed and only 3.1% neither agreed nor disagreed that JLOS M&E has good data management systems. This ranking was based on the lack of an integrated Management Information System at 31.3%, missing data at 21.9%, differences in institutional data management levels at 18.8%, data availability subject to when it is demanded with 15.6% and reliance on manual systems at 12.5%.

M&E schedules and structures

JLOS has 17 institutions each with different mandates and constitutional obligations. For an effective M&E, it therefore requires a supportive schedule which is well known to all stakeholders with the sector framework being informed by institutional schedules. This study also examined the M&E schedules for the purpose of identifying how they influence performance. The respondents' ranking of M&E schedules is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: M&E schedules are well known

Ranking	Frequency		Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
	Number	%		
Strongly agree	9	28.1	28.1	28.1
Agree	14	43.8	43.8	71.9
Neither agree or disagree	3	9.4	9.4	81.3
Disagree	6	18.8	18.8	100.0
Total	**32**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: (Author's research)

The findings presented in Table 8 indicate that 43.8% of respondents agreed, 28.1% strongly agreed, 18.8% disagreed while 9.4% neither agreed nor disagreed that JLOS M&E schedules are well known among sector institutions. On whether the institutional M&E schedules feed into the mainstream sector schedules, 37.1% disagreed, 28.1% agreed, 15.6% neither agreed nor disagreed and 9.4% each either strongly agreed or strongly disagreed that institutional M&E schedules feed into sector schedules. This implies a likely mismatch between institutional and sector schedules and lack of communication between the two schedules.

Relatedly, the different institutional mandates and different levels of institutional M&E findings indicated that 48.4% agree, 29% strongly agree, 12.9% disagree, 6.5% neither agree

nor disagree and 3.2% strongly agree that the quality of institutional M&E affects performance. This was linked to the different mandates of sector institutions with the study findings indicating that sector mandates affect performance with 43.3% agreeing, 36.7% strongly agreeing, 16.7% disagreeing and 3.3% strongly disagreeing. This was further supported by the findings from the study on whether the institutional M&E goals were linked to the sector M&E with 56.3% disagreeing, 18.8% agreeing and 12.5% either strongly disagreeing or strongly agreeing. This was in contradiction of the results obtained from respondents on the institutional alignment of planning to the JLOS where 50% agreed, 34.4% strongly agreed and only 15.6% of respondents disagreed that JLOS institutions align their planning to the sector's. This was further linked to institutional goals and plans. For example, whereas institutional plans were aligned to the sector, institutional M&E plans were found not to be. This affects uniformity in reporting and performance measurement. This is corroborated by what R 01 noted that all institutions are at different levels of M&E understanding and implementation which affects uniformity.

The study further analysed the influence of M&E structures on performance by requesting respondents to rank if institutions have structures that can manage M&E for performance. Respondents indicated that M&E structures can support performance with 34% agreeing, 28.1% neither agreed nor disagreed, 28.1% disagreed, 6.1% strongly disagreed while 3.1% strongly disagreed. The choice was based on the system's reliance on the policy and planning forum (21.9%), inadequate staff training in M&E and mix-up between inspection and M&E at 15.6%, lack of M&E officers, representation of different institutions at sector structures tied at 12.5%, lack of M&E system in institutions at 9.4% and understaffing at 6.3%. The key respondent interviews re-echoed the lack of a single office as a data centre for most institutions and the inadequacy of the policy planning units in managing the M&E function because of their multiple tasking.

To facilitate performance, M&E requires a good communication framework with high levels of sharing findings supported by consideration of the findings. This study looked at how this is being done within the JLOS to facilitate planning and performance measurement. The findings indicate that M&E findings support planning and budgeting and present on indicators for all sector institutions. However, there is also reporting based on indicators/ work plans. The interviews present a contrary view as it was noted that whereas M&E findings are in place; achievements are not brought out clearly and there is more focus on activities than outputs. Further whereas annual reviews are very good, they did not bring out issues with some institutions having a lot reported on them and others very little. This greatly relates to usage of M&E findings, where the study found that there is limited consideration of M&E findings (51%). This was based on the reasons as identified by respondents where 74.2% noted that M&E recommendations are not considered for funding and 12.9% held that it is either difficult to prove if information has been used or whether it is reflected in budgets.

The study further analysed whether the M&E findings were considered. The findings from the study indicated that 34.4% agreed, 25% neither agreed nor disagreed, 21.9% disagreed, 15.6% strongly agreed and 3.1% strongly disagreed that M&E recommendations are considered. This was based on the reasons identified by respondents where 25.8% noted that M&E recommendations are not considered for funding, 22.6% held that M&E recommendations form a basis for the sector undertakings, 16.1% held that they guide strategies and action in the planning phase and 12.9% noted that it is difficult to prove if information has been used or it is reflected in budgets.

M&E for better results is expected to be participatory involving all possible stakeholders. The study further required respondents to give their views of how participatory the JLOS

M&E is. This was looked at from how participatory M&E is and stakeholders' contributions during M&E discussions.

Table 9: JLOS M&E is participatory

Valid	Frequency		Valid (%)	Cumulative (%)
	Number	%		
Strongly Agree	6	18.8	18.8	18.8
Agree	16	50.0	50.0	68.8
Neither Agree or disagree	2	6.3	6.3	75.0
Disagree	7	21.9	21.9	96.9
Strongly Disagree	1	3.1	3.1	100.0
Total	**32**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: (Author's research)

Of the respondents 50% agreed, 21.9% disagreed, and 18.8% strongly agreed, 6.3% neither agreed nor disagreed and only 3.1% strongly disagreed that JLOS M&E is participatory. This was based on the following reasons; all institutions are involved at 50%, only selected members attend at 21.9%, participation is one-sided at 15.6% and there are frequent discussions on M&E issues at 12.5%. However, interview respondent R 05 notes that the participation is only limited to key institutions leaving out the most relevant stakeholders–the public – who are the consumers of the JLOS services.

Funding for M&E showed mixed responses as to whether M&E is adequately funded with 88% of the respondents disagreeing and 12% neither agreeing nor disagreeing. This was based overall on limited financial support and budgetary provision for M&E in sector work plans; inadequate transport provision as well as inadequate field visits. Financial support to policy planning units in the form of purchase of motor vehicles and computers especially for purposes of data collection was acknowledged; 17 sector institutions had benefited equally. However, when the respondents were asked if M&E funds are released, 37% agreed, 25% strongly agreed, 21.9% neither agreed nor disagreed, 9.4% disagreed while 6.3% strongly disagreed.

CONCLUSION, POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The limited number of respondents indicating that indicators measure results, create a concern implying that the sector may not be able to measure performance using the indicators. The indicators were also found to be too comprehensive to cover key areas of sector performance. This suggests that indicators require special attention to deliver results.

The sector is at a broad level despite the constituent institutions' roles in achieving sector goals. The reliance on output indicators as per the study findings negates the impact level assessment and overall outcome mapping whose focus should be on achievement of sector goals as opposed to apportioning credit to contributing institutions.

The background professions of the respondents, sends a signal of one of the likely reasons why M&E or performance is not measured against set indicators. Their technical orientation

as administrators, economists and lawyers affects their technical capacity in M&E and yet they are the ones that have to operationalise it.

It has been noted that the optimisation and provision of timely, accurate data and information that is required for decision-making at various levels of programme implementation and management is another key success factor for e ective M&E (Olivier and Bernhoeft 2015:21). The study findings indicate that there is a lack of integrated data management systems, there are no consistent data collection tools and there is over-reliance on manual systems. This may therefore affect the processing of information on performance with the least relevant data being processed in the continuum at the expense of vital information. The lack of integration implies that some data from some constituent institutions may be left out thereby not clearly bringing out the achievements.

In addition the study findings recognised the existence of M&E schedules, structure and use of findings. However, institutional M&E schedules do not feed into sector schedules thereby creating a mismatch which may affect the structural M&E arrangements.

M&E to be effective requires structures and human resources that are knowledgeable of their role, well trained, equipped and funded. The study findings indicate that there is over-reliance on policy planning units to drive M&E in the sector despite their limited training in M&E, institutional mandates take first call, there is limited financial support and institutions are not adequately equipped to gather data. Though the same findings are re-echoed in the available literature, the sector has not yet provided the maximum inputs to realise their potential. This may therefore affect the quality of M&E and subsequently performance assessment when using M&E.

The study's qualitative findings indicate that though M&E findings are available, they are based on activities and some achievements are not brought out clearly. Some of the means of sharing these findings especially annual reviews were reported not to cover much of the information.

The study findings indicate that JLOS does not have a fully functional M&E system but only a framework which is also limited in implementation and coverage. The limited implementation of the existing framework hinders the integration of policy, development of comprehensive indicators and overall performance measurement.

In conclusion, there is a structural M&E framework system with qualified staff to manage it; however, it is grossly under-resourced, not well integrated in all sectors and underutilised. The study therefore recommends that the M&E system be upgraded and localised at institutional level (across all JLOS institutions). Data management systems should also be improved and integrated across JLOS institutions and create demand and use of M&E findings.

Based on the study findings and recommended practice to enable the sector to achieve maximum results from M&E to improve performance, the following recommendations should be considered:

- On objective one of influence of indicators on JLOS performance; the data management systems should be improved, integrated across all JLOS institutions and tools standardised.
- On objective two of influence of M&E structural arrangements on performance; M&E units should be institutionalised in all JLOS institutions with clear linkages to the sector. This may be supported by localising the M&E framework at the institutional level.
- In addition M&E should involve the consumers of the JLOS services – the public– beyond being at the receiving end and where possible civil society organisations should also be involved.
- Staff involved in M&E need to be trained on how best to incorporate M&E systems.

NOTE

* H Arinaitwe is a Research Facilitator at the Centre for Public Management and Governance at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boesen, N. and Dietvorst, D. 2007. *SWAPs in Motion-Sector Wide Approaches: From and Aid delivery to a Sector Development Perspective.* London: Europe Aid.

Brown, A., Foster, M., Norton, A. and Naschold, F. 2001. *Status of Sector Wide Approaches. Working Paper No.142.* London: Overseas Development Institute.

Callaghan, S. 2010. JLOS Development Partner Group Response to Annual Progress Report. Available at: **www.jlos.go.ug:442/index.php/document-centre/annual-review-conferences/15th-annual-jlos-review-2010**. (Accessed on 10 March 2014).

Foster, M., Brown, A. and Conway, T. 2000. *Sector-Wide Approaches for Health and Development. A Review of Experience.* Geneva: World Health Organization (WHO).

Hood, C.C. 1991. A Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration,* 69(1):3–19.

Holvoet, N. and Rombouts, H. 2008. The Challenge of Monitoring and Evaluation Under the New Aid Modalities: Experiences from Rwanda. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 46(4):577–602.

JLOS. 2012. *Strategic Investment Plan 2012–2016.* Kampala: MOJCA.

Olivier, J. and Bernhoeft, G. 2015. Harmonising M &E Systems: Positioning the data atom at the centre. In *A Selection of the Best papers from the 5th Biennial South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association Conference 2015.* Available at: **http://www.sameaconference.co.za/conference%20papers/A%20Selection%20of%20the%20Best%20Papers%20from%20the%205th%20Biennial%20South%20African%20Monitoring%20and%20Evaluation%20Association%20Conference%202015%20.html**. (Accessed on 10 August 2016).

Rynn, S. and Flew, C. 2009. *Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements for the Justice, Law and Order Sector in Uganda: A Case Study.* Kampala: MOJCA.

World Bank. 2009. *Building Government M&E systems. Priority for Government M&E Systems.* Available at: **http://www.worldbank.org/ieg/ecd/priority_for_government_me.html**, (Accessed on 2 September 2012).

AUTHORS' CONTACT DETAILS

Herbert Arinaitwe
Mbarara University of Science and Technology/
Uganda Technology and Management University
and Ag. Commissioner Monitoring and Evaluation,
Directorate of Community Service, Ministry of
Internal Affairs
Plot 75, Jinja Road
Kampala
UGANDA
Tel: 256 782027087
E-Mail: herbertarinaitwe@gmail.com

Elizabeth Margret Asiimwe
Lecturer Uganda Technology and Management
University (UTAMU)
UTAMU Resource Centre
Plot 6 & 8
Erisa Road in Bugolobi.
Uganda
Tel: +256(0)772 670816
Email: easiimwe@yahoo.com