Building Evaluation: Capital in Government
Overview

The Queensland Financial Accountability Act 2009 requires that:

“accountable officers and statutory bodies achieve reasonable value for money by ensuring the operations of the department or statutory body are carried out efficiently, effectively and economically”
Outline

DAF’s Impact and Investment Framework:
- Helping keep our work on track and improve decision making
Challenges to building evaluation capital
Mainstreamed evaluation – Why have past attempts failed in practice?

- A lack of knowledge of the logic underpinning programs

- **Literature suggests:**
  - Lack of leadership, poor participation culture, path dependence, vested interest opposition (Picciotto 2001)
  - **Preskill and Boyle (2008)** state “participants must be provided with leadership support, incentives and opportunities to transfer their learning…to everyday work”.
  - **Heider (2011)** discusses the need for evaluation capacity at 3 levels; the individual, the environment and the institution
From theory to practice
In 2016/17 we established a **DAF Impact and Investment Framework**

The Framework

- It provides a **consistent, organisation-wide** approach to:
  - identifying our work and the impacts we seek to achieve
  - monitoring and evaluating our performance
  - deciding where we should invest in the future
The Framework

In 2016/17 we established a **DAF Impact and Investment Framework**

- It links **planning and performance** to the **delivery of impact**
- Its aims to embed **sustainable evaluation culture**
- It provides a clear **line of sight** for staff
The Framework

What impacts do we hope to have?

What work are we doing?

Are we on track?

Where should we invest?

Are we making a difference?

Our Impact

Our Work

Our Performance

Our Investment

Our Results

Department of Agriculture and Fisheries
Evaluation building blocks
‘our work’ & ‘our impact’
‘Our work’

Describes the work undertaken within DAF in a consistent manner

- Data collected at the activity level on resources (financial and human)
- Data aligned to - impacts, industry, function and location
‘Our impact’

Describes the impacts that DAF seeks to achieve

• Impacts are documented in the DAF Impact Map.
  – A customer centric visual tool, comprised of 15 pages

• Underpinning each of the pages is a series of logic models describing how the programs of work will deliver impacts
Underpinning sustainable evaluation

‘our performance’, ‘our results’ & ‘our investment’
‘Our performance’

Provides a way to monitor progress to the delivery of impacts and provides data for evaluation

- Data collection is summarised in the DAF Performance Measurement Plan
- Key focus of measurement was – ‘meaningful’
# ASQ – Horticulture & Forestry Science (H&FS) - Performance Measurement Plan

## Service Description

We add value by improving the profitability and sustainability of Queensland’s horticulture and forestry industries. The areas where we deliver impact are:

- Protect Queensland from plant pests and diseases
- Maintain and facilitate trade and market access
- Manage the risks associated with agricultural chemicals and food contaminants
- Effective and accountable business management

## Impact Pathways and Internal Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Pathways</th>
<th>Internal Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding pests, diseases and weeds</td>
<td>Subtropical Fruit &amp; Genetic Improvement RD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming pest and disease management</td>
<td>Forestry &amp; Bioresources RD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and improved diagnostics</td>
<td>Vegetables &amp; Deciduous Fruit RD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better varieties</td>
<td>Tropical Fruit &amp; Supply Chain RD&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive cropping systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnessing new agri-technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting protected cropping systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimising soil management systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancing food products and processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing and maintaining export market access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply chain innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimising environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Headline Performance Measures – What are they?

### Effectiveness

Average benefit cost ratio of independently evaluated RD&E projects.

**Targets**

- ≥ 2:1

**Unit**

- All H&FS

### Efficiency

1. Average external co-funding for priority RD&E attracted per dollar of State appropriation funds invested is within target range.

   **Targets**

   - ≥ $0.80 to $1.00
   - ≥ 90%

   **Unit**

   - All H&FS

**What do they tell us?**

Effectiveness: This measure demonstrates that the research program is producing significantly valued new or improved varieties, technologies, etc., for industry.

Efficiency: Measures the amount of co-investment by (reflecting the level of agreement) to raise the cost of production of project outputs, per unit expenditure of DAFR base Treasury appropriation – providing a useful measure of the efficiency of investment of Queensland Government funds. Target for headline efficiency will be set and regularly reviewed, with initial target of $0.80-$1.20 co-investment per $1.00 base investment representing excellent efficiency in use of State funds. Going higher than this might represent even better efficiency but at the price of greater risk of research co-investors obtaining excessive influence over the research agenda, to the detriment of focus on government objectives.

**How are we progressing?**

Business unit coverage:

- Insert graph

- TBA from investment snapshot

## Impact Pathway Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Pathway</th>
<th>Measurement Category</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding pests, diseases and weeds</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Number of pests, diseases or weeds for which biology is significantly better understood as a result of work completed during the reporting period</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Average external co-funding for priority RD&amp;E attracted per dollar of State appropriation funds invested</td>
<td>$0.80 to $1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming pest and disease management</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>% change in profits reported by growers after using new IPM practices (proposes pre and post survey of growers – first results likely to be available for 3+ years)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Average external co-funding for priority RD&amp;E attracted per dollar of State appropriation funds invested</td>
<td>$0.90 to $1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New and improved diagnostics</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Number of crop-damaging microorganisms/pathogens/strains for which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'Our results'

Is all about evaluation – for improvement and decision making

- It asks the questions:
  - Is our work making a difference?
  - Are we delivering impacts?
  - What have we learnt?
  - How can we improve?
‘Our results’

Is all about evaluation – for improvement and decision making

• It has two elements:
  – A strategic program of evaluation
  – Online evaluation toolkit
‘Our investment’

Is all about investment decision making

• It asks the questions:
  – Where should we invest?
  – What changes do we need to make?

• It positions us to ask these questions **across business units** and **empowers business units to ask the questions** of themselves
Investing for Impacts – Horticulture & Forestry Science: Our Investment decision-making principles, processes and criteria

Our Investment approach: Horticulture & Forestry Science provides great science and innovative solutions to the Queensland Horticulture and Forest industries. We have a proud history of delivering practical, cost-effective and relevant RD&E outcomes, whilst providing an outstanding return on investment to government and other stakeholders.

Operating within the National Horticulture RD&E Framework, we undertake applied RD&E in partnership with supply chain participants and other research providers. We also commission research and collaborate with other agencies, as well as adapt national and international research findings to benefit Queensland industries.

Horticulture & Forestry Science invests in a project portfolio that balances long-term and short-term benefits, high-risk and low-risk activities, and strategic and adaptive research needs. We avoid duplicating and competing with work by other credible providers, instead seeking to complement others’ capabilities. Our intent is to deliver critical step changes in productivity over time and significant short and medium term benefits to industry, whilst minimising the volatility of investment returns over time.

Our Principles

- **The principles** that guide our investment are:
  - **Principle 1** - We deliver on government objectives
  - **Principle 2** - We invest for impacts
  - **Principle 3** - We deliver world-class results
  - **Principle 4** - We operate where there is market failure
  - **Principle 5** - We build capacity and collaborations for the future

Our Processes

- **The processes** that we undertake to make investment decisions include:
  - Program planning and strategic investment discussions are held annually
  - Areas of strategic priority are set by the management team each year with reference to DAF priorities and the RD&E Blueprint
  - The Impact Map and Workforce Development Plan are updated accordingly
  - Project investment decisions are made by the management team throughout the year
  - Concept proposals are developed and screened against investment principles
  - Formal proposals are developed for externally-funded projects
  - Business cases are developed for internally-funded projects/activities
  - These are assessed by the Management Team against investment criteria
  - Approved proposals are submitted to funders
  - Investment performance is reviewed annually
  - Alignment to investment principles is checked
  - Performance measurement data is captured and analysed

Our Criteria

- **The criteria** that help us compare investments include:
  - **Criteria 1a** - Alignment to government objectives and DAF Impact Map
  - **Criteria 1b** - Policy Implications
  - **Criteria 2a** - Expected return on investment (factors in scope of impact and cost)
  - **Criteria 2b** - Alignment to industry objectives
  - **Criteria 2c** - Likelihood of success
  - **Criteria 2d** - Capacity and skills to undertake work
  - **Criteria 2e** - Quality of research design
  - **Criteria 3** - Tracking record of success in area/field
  - **Criteria 4** - Addresses a gap in knowledge/understanding
  - **Criteria 4b** - Ratio of public to private good
  - **Criteria 4c** - Unusual stakeholder funding to offset delivery of private good
  - **Criteria 4d** - Whether another agency/provider is better placed to undertake the work
  - **Criteria 5** - Alignment to H&F Workforce Development Plan
  - **Criteria 5a** - Alignment to National RD&E Framework
  - **Criteria 5b** - Collaboration that provides access to innovation and skills.
ECB and Evaluation Principles

Underpinning the framework

Business empowerment & learning

Support

Utility

Independence
Bottom up empowerment

Harnessed & built on knowledge skills and resources of Business Units through workshops

• Numbers
  • Approximately 400 participants, over 30 workshops
  • 25+ trained table facilitators
  • 10 investment focus groups
Bottom up empowerment

Harness and built on knowledge skills and resources of Business Units through workshops

• Outcomes
  • Promoted group ownership of the outputs
  • Increased skills in logic modelling and performance measurement
  • Built up enthusiasm and buy-in for the Framework
Top down supports

To support ECB at the individual level, **supports, systems and structures** were developed at the **organisational level**

- A ‘priority project’ for DAF
- DG as Champion
- Cross-DAF Steering Committee
- Introduction of **mandated systems/processes**
- **Reinforced** at every Senior Leaders meeting
Usefulness

Throughout implementation of the Framework, utility was a central concept.

• Most of the benefit was focused on the users
• Critical element to ensure ... evaluation is an integral part of the everyday operations of the department (Sanders, 2002)
Usefulness

Throughout implementation of the Framework, utility was a central concept.

- **Impact maps** – fill a gap between strategic and project level documents, providing a line of sight
- **Performance measures** – focused on providing data for business improvement
- **Activity data** – Tableau dashboard for investment insights
- **3 above elements** – provide automated business plans
- Also met **accountability** requirements & addressed audit findings
Independence

A fundamental principle of evaluation, ensuring creditability and providing quality assurance

- ‘Impact and Investment’ group established in the Office of the Director General
- Modelled on the IFAD approach
- Ensured consistent rollout across DAF
- Will enable evaluation across all business units
Questions, comments

Sarah Goswami | Principal Policy Officer | Impact and Investment | DAF
Ph: 07 3096 6515  email: sarah.goswami@daf.qld.gov.au