Managing for efficiency and effectiveness

Unit assessment guide and supplementary resources
The Institute of Leadership and Management level 5 middle manager qualification has units that address both issues of leadership and management. The Researchers into Management course emphasises management rather than leadership, although these are inextricably linked in a formal organisation and as Kotter (1990/2001) suggests are “two distinctive and complementary systems of action.” (p.3)

The notion of managing for efficiency and effectiveness aligns most easily with a ‘unitarist’ view of organisations which Rollinson (2008) defines as:

“A management frame of reference in which an organisation is seen as one large family, all on the same side and pulling in the same direction, and in which conflict is seen as deviant behaviour.” (p. 415)

Where a more critical view of management is taken in which different views concerning organisational goals and outcomes are acknowledged then gaining agreement as to what constitutes efficiency and effectiveness in a given context is much more problematic. The ILM assessment is written from the simplistic managerial perspective and invites you to do two potentially difficult things:

1. Be able to assess the organisation’s ability to manage efficiently and effectively to achieve targets and objectives

A key difficulty here is of the scope of the word ‘organisation’ - the implication is that the whole organisation should be analysed, however from a middle manager perspective it is of most relevance to localise the assessment to a particular part of the organisation for which the manager has control. There is a danger of talking in very general terms about weaknesses in whole organisation practices and processes unless there is a clear attempt made to link such general points to more local and specific issues.

2. Be able to evaluate own ability to manage efficiently and effectively

Here ILM are very much encouraging you to take a critical and reflective view of your own management approach, which will of course be difficult if you are not currently operating as a middle manager and very difficult if you have had no previous managerial experience at any level.

In respect of both learning outcomes the ILM want you to think and write like a manager and underpin your comments and arguments with relevant facts and evidence. Making general comments and criticism about the University as a whole or the part of it in which you work won’t be sufficient to earn marks.

Therefore there are two broad foci for this assessment – the organisation (as a whole and then in your local area) and its ability and you and your ability and you’ll need to assemble evidence and make critical comment in a reasonable way about both.

Please note that this assessment guide expands on the guidance available to previous RIM cohorts now attached as Appendix 1, p.15.
AC 1.1 Assess own organisation's ability to translate vision, mission and strategic goals into operational objectives with realistic and measurable targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Own organisation's ability to translate vision, mission and strategic goals into operational objectives with realistic and measurable targets is not assessed, and/or own organisation's ability to efficiently and effectively delegate responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives is not assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How the organisation translates vision, mission and strategic goals into operational objectives is merely described with no assessment to make a judgement as to level of ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How the organisation translates vision, mission and strategic goals into operational objectives is assessed and a judgement made as to level of ability, although the criteria used for making the judgement may be limited or subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your answer in relation to this criterion constitutes 20% of the available marks (similarly for 1.2 and 1.3). To address this we first need to be clear what we regard as ‘ability’. Oxford Dictionaries online (1) define it as:

- Possession of the means or skill to do something
- Talent, skill or proficiency in a certain area

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/ability: 2.11.15

As ability is a skill that one would normally associate with a person, the phrasing here is another clue of unitarist/personified notion of the organisation as a unified organism that has a level of ability or otherwise to translate its vision, mission and goals into operational objectives that are realistic and measurable. In fact, the ‘ability’ lies in the hands of the people who have penned strategic vision and mission statements and documents to articulate them in a meaningful way that managers at all appropriate levels can then state them realistic, relevant and measurable operational terms. One could also consider the ability of organisational decision-makers who have ratified such documents to understand the implications of the statements which they authorise. In addition to such abilities one could assess the processes by which such documents and decisions come about and ultimately, as the challenge is to assess how broad organisational aspirations and statements are translated into operational objectives, the links between the broad vision/mission/strategic goals, operational objectives and realised outputs and outcomes.

The diagram: below provides a broad overview of the links although not all of these will necessarily be fully in evidence in your particular part of the University/in relation to your role:
To address this assessment criterion therefore requires investigation around what is happening at each of the stages outlined above to translate the more general, strategic, high-level aims and purposes into deliverable operational objectives that have realistic (for example in relation to available resources to deliver them within a given timescale) and measurable targets. The organisational mechanism for reviewing progress against objectives is the Annual Performance Review (APR), sometimes known as Operational Performance Review (OPR). A copy of the 2020 document, the Research strategy and statement of expectations, faculty and school strategic/operational plans and access to APR reports (if available) or data are the main sources you need to review to be able to assess how the broader strategic vision, mission and goals are translated. The periodically published Stock Take reports provide a useful overview of progress against strategic objectives. You need to be able to trace and assess the links back to your immediate work area and work as an actual or potential middle manager.

Once gathered, some of the questions you can use to interrogate the information include:

- Is there a clear link between this mid-level objective and the UOM vision, mission and strategic goals?
- How realistic are the objectives given contextual parameters?
- What measures have been set in place to monitor and review progress?
- Is progress accurately communicated to appropriate people/managerial levels?
Below is an extract from the Planning Support Office website on staffnet (2) concerning the APR process:

**Annual Performance Reviews**

The five main Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) take place in autumn each year and assess the performance of the primary activity centres of the University: the four Faculties and the Professional Support Services (PSS). The meetings include a detailed analysis and evaluation of the operational performance of each Faculty, School, Directorate, Division and Office within the University, and the progress which they are making towards the goals of Manchester 2020.

The Faculty and PSS Review meetings are chaired by the President and Vice-Chancellor, accompanied by a panel of senior executive members of the University. A range of data is provided to the panel members in advance of the meeting, including a number of specific key performance indicators (KPIs), performance in satisfaction surveys, statements on the management of risk and compliance, and progress against Strategic Plans and Operational Priorities.

A similar process is undertaken for the Annual Performance Reviews of the University of Manchester Library, Manchester Museum, Whitworth Art Gallery and the Jodrell Bank Discovery Centre.

The meetings focus on the identification of areas of emerging good practice to be consolidated and generalised over the next 12 months; the documentation of any under-performance together with agreed processes for remediation; and advice about any re-planning that seems desirable to improve the alignment of Strategic Plans and Operational Priorities, as appropriate, with the priorities of Manchester 2020. The key outcomes of each meeting are identified in a report, which plays a central role both in the re-planning process and in the University's annual report to the Board of Governors.

As part of the APR process key performance indicators relating to sustainability and HR issues, including equality and diversity, are considered by the Capital Planning Sub-Committee and the HR Sub-Committee respectively.

Other useful sources of data that are potentially relevant to your assessment narrative include results in the staff survey, relevant budgets outlining research income generated compared to targets, end of project reports that show how well objectives and targets were achieved, research publications and citations compared to measurable targets set, and so on.
AC 1.2
Assess own organisation’s ability to efficiently and effectively delegate responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How own organisation delegates responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives is merely described with no assessment to make a judgement as to efficiency or effectiveness</td>
<td>• How own organisation delegates responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives is assessed and a judgement made as to level of ability, although the criteria used for making the judgement may be limited or subjective</td>
<td>• How own organisation delegates responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives is assessed and a judgement made as to level of ability using a range of objective criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here ILM make their first mention of efficiently and effectively but in relation to the delegation of responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives. The underlying question is basically, have the people who need to act so as to achieve targets and objectives been delegated appropriate power and authority and is the process by which this is done efficient and effective?

A simple example of this would be a low level purchasing decision. If you as a middle manager are responsible for a budget of say £200,000 then for the sake of efficiency one might assume that you will have been delegated the authority to make operational decisions regarding that use of the budget. So, if you wish to order a new computer printer at a cost of £100 but need to pass this request via your own manager to the Head of School and the decision can still then not be made without the agreement of a senior finance manager (who will have little knowledge of the day-today operations of your unit) one can judge the process to be both inefficient and ineffective – inefficient as it takes (unnecessary) time to communicate the simple decision upwards and for the decision to be made and communicated to you and ineffective as people are involved in the process (for example, the senior finance officer) who have no idea of the operational need for the decision you ideally should be able to make. Should you wish to recruit a new research associate or invest £100,000 in a major piece of equipment that will have associated Estate and maintenance costs then, sensibly, this might be beyond your level of authority as a middle manager and need to be considered and decided upon by your senior managers but perhaps Estates and Policy and resources staff and committees.

In many organisations the level of delegated authority to commit expenditure or make certain types of decisions is set out in a scheme of delegation. If such a scheme of delegation can’t easily be identified (it would be possible to make another comment if this is the case about lack of efficiency and effectiveness) then you should be able to work out roughly what the level of delegated authority is by taking to line and functional managers above you, and asking questions such as, “Who would be allowed to...? And Why?”

Below is a link to the scheme of delegation for the University of Leeds as an example (3):

The decision making and consultative structure of the University of Manchester appears to be particularly complex and it is possible to argue that this impacts on both efficiency and effectiveness, or alternatively, that it is a necessary aspect of the collegial Governance process of UK HEIs.

Remember, for this assessment criterion ILM are not asking you to comment on the efficiency and effectiveness of organisational operations in general but to focus on an objective assessment of efficiency and effectiveness in relation to the delegation of responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives.

Questions you might pose in this regard include:

- Who is responsible for taking particular decision?
- Are people clear about which decisions they have responsibility for taking/enacting?
- Are they the most appropriate person to take such a decision?
- Do they ensure they have the appropriate information to take decisions?
- Are more people involved in taking the decision than necessary?
- Are operational decisions taken and actioned in an appropriate time period?

Below is information on efficiency and effectiveness from a handout produced by www.goodpractice.net (4) that might be of general interest:

**Effectiveness and Efficiency**

Operating in efficient and effective ways is crucial to good performance and for the successful attainment of goals and objectives. However, with the application of technology and total quality efforts to boost efficiency, are we in danger of losing effectiveness? This article outlines the difference between efficiency and effectiveness, and explains why it is important to strike a balance between the two when implementing and monitoring projects.

**Definitions**

A good starting point is to understand the difference between efficiency and effectiveness:

---

**Efficiency:** getting things done by producing satisfactory results with an economy of effort and minimum waste.

**Effectiveness:** getting things done well, no matter what it takes (i.e. having the power to produce a desired result).

---

These definitions clearly show a distinction that has implications for organisations at strategic, departmental, team and individual employee levels. These implications come from the challenge of balancing efficiency and effectiveness. A person can be very efficient at what they are doing but still not achieve the desired results because they are not doing the right things. This is where effectiveness comes in, i.e. having the desired result. Once the desired result has been identified, the individual tasks that need to be completed in order to achieve this result can be isolated, evaluated and completed efficiently. This seems obvious enough, but in reality many organisations do not follow this simple principle when implementing and monitoring projects.

**Conflicts between efficiency and effectiveness**

Project managers are constantly under pressure to be as efficient as possible in order to keep costs low. As a result of this pressure, they can place too much emphasis on issues such as reducing...
process time, and do not spend enough time on what is best for the project. The following scenario helps to illustrate the conflict between efficiency and effectiveness.

---

**Scenario**

An internet retail business decides to put in place a project to target new markets. This involves sending out a variety of different promotional materials to different areas. The project manager decides that the process of producing the materials is taking too long, because there is an additional checking process in place to ensure that the materials are accurate before being dispatched. The employees responsible for the accuracy check have been falling behind (due to the large number of materials), which has led to a backlog.

The project manager decides to eliminate this check in the name of efficiency. He believes that the materials can be dispatched faster and that they can save some of the project budget by cutting the job of the accuracy checker. These results are a real advantage for the project.

However, the downside of eliminating this accuracy check is a considerable increase in the number of incorrect materials being dispatched. The impact of this is a lack of confidence in the capabilities of the organisation and fewer than expected new customers.

The above scenario clearly shows how doing the right thing can be so easily overshadowed by doing things right. What is often seen as being efficient can have a detrimental impact on the project. For this reason, it is important to encourage efficiency, but at the same time ensure that the level of service and quality is not significantly diminished.

**Striking a balance**

Having a good balance between effectiveness and efficiency is crucial for any project. In the scenario above, the organisation may have had a competitive advantage because it was dispatching higher quality materials than its competitors. When the organisation took the decision to save money by eliminating the accuracy check and cutting jobs, it lost that competitive advantage. Any savings made from streamlining processes in the name of efficiency were incurred again, several times over.

During a project, team members need to constantly seek out new and better ways of doing things right in order to become more efficient. However, it is just as important that any decisions taken with regard to improving efficiency are weighed up against the impact that these new efficient processes/systems will have on employee morale, customer service and quality. When a project manager makes a bad decision about efficiency, this can have a seriously negative impact on any or all of these three factors.

Balancing effectiveness and efficiency is not an easy matter. But it is important to stay focused on the long-term impact of all decisions taken with regard to efficiency. Individuals and organisations often do a lot of things very efficiently, but can lose sight of their goals and the bigger picture. **Efficiency** is the last thing needed in order to achieve these goals – the tasks that will be **effective** in getting them there should come first.
Criterion 1.3 is somewhat clumsily worded asking you to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of control methods used to monitor, rather than just asking you to assess the monitoring methods. Essentially ILM want you as a manager to consider whether the monitoring methods you have in place to judge progress in meeting targets and objectives are efficient i.e. they deliver the information with least use of time and resources and effective, i.e. they give you accurate and relevant data and/or information in relation to those targets and objectives.

An inefficient monitoring method might involve 3 people or people in 3 different parts of the organisation monitoring the achievement of a particular objective or target whilst an efficient method might involve just one person or perhaps having an automated process that generated monthly reports.

In order to be able to make such judgements you need to analyse specific monitoring/control methods in relation to specific targets and objectives importantly in your own area of responsibility if you are a middle manager or your own area of work activity if you are aspiring to that role.

Monitoring and control methods might include:

- Monitoring of budget spent compared to that profiled at a particular point in time
- Records of consumables used compared to that planned at agreed points in time
- Analyses of progress with the achievement of SMART objectives at relevant points in time
- Records of the amount of staff time consumed compared to that planned for given tasks/projects

You need ask yourself:

- What tasks, services, products, outputs, or outcomes, objectives and targets are we responsible for?
- How do we control/monitor them?
- What resources (people, time, machinery, money) are utilised to monitor them?
- Based on a judgement of the technique in relation to resources consumed and data/information provided are the techniques/processes efficient and or effective or not? Why?

Some management thinkers differentiate between outputs and outcomes with outputs generally relating to efficiency and outcomes roughly to effectiveness. The slide extract below is from a Leadership Foundation management training module on ‘Setting objectives’ (5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of control methods used to monitor the achievement of targets and objectives in own area of responsibility</td>
<td>• Control methods used to monitor the achievement of targets and objectives in own area of responsibility are merely described with no assessment to make a judgement as to efficiency or effectiveness</td>
<td>• Control methods used to monitor the achievement of targets and objectives in own area of responsibility are assessed and a judgement made as to efficiency and effectiveness, although the criteria used for making the judgement may be limited or subjective</td>
<td>• Control methods used to monitor the achievement of targets and objectives in own area of responsibility are assessed and a judgement made as to level of ability using a range of objective criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking research papers published as an example, getting 10 papers published in a 2 star journal might be regarded as efficient but would be ineffective if the target was to get two papers published in a 4 star journal. Similarly for attracting research grants – being a researcher able to submit 10 research grants might, on the face of it, appear more efficient than one who only submits 2 applications but if out of the ten submitted only 2 are accepted then it is arguably much less efficient than the researcher who submits 2 and is awarded 2. However, if we take grant income into account and the person who writes 10 and has 2 accepted earns £1 million in income but the person who writes 2 and has 2 accepted achieves on £500,000 then you might argue that the first research is, actually, more effective.

I won’t labour the point but clearly in terms of results there is a need to strike a balance between resources consumed/time taken and results, but for AC 1.3, ILM want you to talk about control methods/monitoring procedures. It would be legitimate to ask both researchers what their grant application strategy was and whether they thought it could be modified or improved but from the point of view of controlling and monitoring such activity at which points in the process would you do it to be efficient and effective? You might do it at the following process points:

- When information on grant availability is provided to researchers you could monitor them and selectively channel invitations to particular researchers
- When drafts of applications were in the early stages they could be monitored by an experienced researcher
- When drafts of applications were finalised (but optimistically some time before the submission date) the applications could be scrutinised and refined to maximise chances of success
When applications are accepted or rejected the reasons for this could be monitored and used to inform earlier stages in the process (and monitoring) in future

And so on.

Thinking about such issues in relation to your own area of responsibility ILM want you to present an analysis of how efficient and effective you believe the control/monitoring methods are (in relation to the achievement of targets and objectives) and then make a judgment of local ‘ability’ using a range of objective criteria, for example how many person hours it takes to monitor 3 researchers, or 3 projects, whether the level of monitoring is needed, what benefits or otherwise the monitoring and control brings and whether it represents good value for effort/money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is no implicit or explicit evidence that improvements to organisational efficiency and effectiveness in own area of responsibility are implemented, or are being implemented</td>
<td>• Implicit or limited explicit evidence is provided that improvements to organisational efficiency and effectiveness in own area of responsibility are implemented, or are being implemented</td>
<td>• A range of explicit evidence is provided that improvements to organisational efficiency and effectiveness in own area of responsibility are implemented, or are being implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ILM’s logic here is that in conducting the analyses of the efficiency and effectiveness of the delegation of responsibilities and control and monitoring methods you will have identified opportunities to implement operational improvements in your own area of responsibility. If you are in a middle manager role then this can be a very constructive part of the assessment process as not only will you generate a narrative in relation to this criterion but you should be able to come up with some specific action points that will improve the efficiency and/or effectiveness of your part of the organisation. If you are not currently in a management role you will need to write a recommendation about what could be improved if you were in charge or what you would recommend to the actual middle manager should be changed and improved.

You can’t talk in a vague way here – you need to make specific recommendations and support these recommendations with the findings already discussed in the assessment i.e. a range of explicit evidence or incorporate new but relevant evidence to support your points if this is not obvious in your assessment to this point. ILM’s wording of, “are implemented, or are being implemented,” is once again clunky and implies that action is already taking place rather than might occur in the future. In the real world, it is possible that things that you would like to do as a middle manager have not yet occurred so you could creatively write the account as if they were to satisfy AC 1.4. Alternatively, you can write it as a firm plan with definite timescales, outcomes and monitoring points to satisfy ILM’s, “are being implemented,” wording.

The first four criteria constitute almost 75% of the available marks meaning that ILM expect you to put most effort and provide most detail in relation to learning outcome 1 (AC’s 1.1,1.2,1.3 and 1.4).
AC 2.1
Evaluate own ability to manage effectively and efficiently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Own ability to manage effectively and efficiently is not evaluated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Own ability to manage is merely described with no evaluation using appropriate criteria or feedback from others to provide recommendations for improving effectiveness and efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Own ability to manage effectively and efficiently is evaluated to provide recommendations for improving effectiveness and efficiency, although the criteria or feedback from others used may be limited or subjective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Own ability to manage effectively and efficiently is evaluated using a range of objective criteria and feedback from others to provide recommendations for improving effectiveness and efficiency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can look at this criterion in two ways – are you an efficient and effective manager and, as a manager, do you preside over an efficient and effective operation and in both cases, how do you know? What feedback have you received? Have you devised objective criteria against which your performance can be evaluated? What are they?

To undertake this evaluation you need to have some model in mind about what constitutes and effective and efficient manager or management. A very early notion from Henri Fayol (Cole and Kelly, p.24) is still relevant today:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fayolian criterion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Time spent</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forecasting and planning</td>
<td>How often do you do this?</td>
<td>How much time do you spend?</td>
<td>Do you achieve the results you wish(expect? Why/not?</td>
<td>How do you know? Self-review? Feedback from others? Activity records?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising/delegating to others/projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling/monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another framework that you might draw on to organise your thinking is that of Mintzberg (1971) and his classification of managerial activities and roles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial activities</th>
<th>Associated roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal – supporting information and decision-making activities</td>
<td>Figurehead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information processing</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disseminator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spokesman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making</td>
<td>Improver/changer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disturbance handler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resource allocator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Mintzberg, 1971

ILM level 5 – Researchers into Management

How much time do you spend on such activities and in such roles? Is it enough, is it too much? How well do you deliver them? Have you the appropriate skills? How well do you delegate such activities to others and draw upon their expertise? Is it the best use of your time in particular cases to do it yourself or to delegate/get others to do it? How do you know? What have you been told and by whom?

Unless you already have a lot of un-solicited feedback upon which to draw as evidence of your ability that can be regarded as satisfying objective criteria, you’ll need to canvas a number of people who know what you are capable of using a self-designed or already available survey. If you’re not currently working as a middle manager you’ll need to ask for feedback on your general abilities as they relate to management, as opposed to specific feedback on your management approach now.

Some examples of survey instruments that might be use to gather feedback will be made available to you. The main point to be clear about is what do you believe constitutes efficient and effective management in your local work area? And, assuming all is not perfect, based on the feedback and consideration of objective criteria what recommendations might you offer for improving efficiency and effectiveness?

AC 2.2  Implement changes in own management style in order to manage more efficiently and effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• There is no implicit or explicit evidence that changes in own management style are, or are being, implemented, or the changes in own management style are not focused on effectiveness and efficiency or the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implicit or limited explicit evidence is provided that changes in own management style focused on effectiveness and efficiency and based on the evaluation are, or are being, implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A range of explicit evidence is provided that changes in own management style focused on effectiveness and efficiency and based on the evaluation are, or are being, implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ILM believe that in addressing AC 2.1 you will have discovered areas for improvement and be able to write about then to satisfy criterion 2.2. ILM are very keen on action plans and a short action plan listing areas for improvement in your management style, how they were identified, what you intend to do to address them and by when should work.

Whether in a middle management role or not specific examples and answer that link back to earlier parts of the text (especially 2.1) are needed to make this part real.

- What areas for improvement in your management style have you identified that will increase your efficiency and effectiveness as a manager, or the efficiency and effectiveness of the management process that you control?
- On what evidence is this view based? (e.g. feedback from peers, own manager)
- What actions will you take to address these areas for improvement?
- How and when will you monitor progress and test achievement?
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Appendix 1. ASSIGNMENT TASKS i. Managing for efficiency and effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre Number</th>
<th>Centre Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner Registration No</td>
<td>Learner Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TASK**

The purpose of this unit is to develop understanding and ability to manage efficiently and effectively as required by a practising or potential middle manager.

**NOTE**

An ILM Assessment Task provides an opportunity to relate your learning directly to your current organisation. It is recommended that you discuss the assignment with your line manager to explore and agree how the task could be used to support the needs of your employer (as well as evidencing your learning as part of completing your ILM qualification).

If you are not currently working within an organisation, then you may complete this task in relation to an organisation with which you are familiar. This could include experience working in a voluntary capacity.

The nominal word count for this assignment is 2500 words: The suggested range is between 2000 and 3000 words, however individuals have different writing styles, and there is no penalty if the word-count range is exceeded.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please use the headings shown below when writing up your assignment</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Additional Guidance/Considerations for Those Not Currently in a Management Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be able to assess the organisation’s ability to manage efficiently and effectively to achieve targets and objectives</strong></td>
<td>• Assess own organisation’s ability to translate vision, mission and strategic goals into operational objectives with realistic and measurable targets (20 marks)</td>
<td>This question is asking about the extent to which higher level strategic direction and aspirations in the organisation are cascaded and operationalised through the setting of local objectives, performance indicators and targets. So key issues are does a cascade exist through the various levels, University to Faculty, to School to Research Group. Are clear objectives set locally arising from these, does a local operational plan exist, to what extent are local operational objectives SMART and what kinds of local performance indicators or KPIS are in place in support of this. Overall how would you rate the success of this approach in your local area? In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You are then required to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the control methods used to monitor the achievement of targets and objectives in own area of responsibility, and then implement improvements to organisational efficiency and effectiveness in own area of responsibility.

| • Assess own organisation’s ability to efficiently and effectively delegate responsibilities for the achievement of targets and objectives (20 marks) |
| • Assess the efficiency and effectiveness of control methods used to monitor the achievement of targets and objectives in own area of responsibility (20 marks) |

making your assessment please make explicit the criteria you are using to make a judgement e.g. clarity – is it clear that this is done, consistency is it done for every aspect of the work and across all departments, regularity – is the process well established and reviewed and updated

This is about the extent to which responsibility for attaining local targets in support of the bigger institutional goals has been made explicit to individuals and managers. How clear is it within your area who is responsible for ensuring that local targets and goals are achieved. How is that responsibility reinforced and reviewed. Here again please make explicit the criteria you are using in making your assessment of the current situation, clarity, consistency, regularity and so on.

This relates to the methods used to assess progress with local targets and objectives. How for example is this integrated with individual review, objectives and job and role descriptions? Is the local operational or project plan regularly reviewed and updated. If the management controls reveal shortfalls in performance how are things put back on track? Here again please make explicit the criteria you are using in making your assessment of the current situation, clarity, consistency, regularity and so on.

Remember – efficiency is how well resources are used to produce results or outputs, effectiveness is the quality of outcomes, results or outputs according to the plan. If you are not in a management position identify ways in which improvements in organisational efficiency and effectiveness could be made in your area, by whom and by when – additionally what evidence would you be looking for to identify that these changes would be working. If you are in a management position identify improvements you have made to organisational efficiency and effectiveness and give some evidence of how you know they are working.
**Be able to evaluate own ability to manage efficiently and effectively**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>If you are in a management position elicit feedback from others to help you reflect on your existing abilities to manage efficiently and effectively – be specific about the different aspects that this involves. If you are not currently in a management position use a combination of personal critical reflection based on what you have learnt on the course, and more general feedback from others on your potential to manage efficiently and effectively. Be clear about potential areas for development and identify what you need to do differently to develop your ability to manage effectively and efficiently. You must demonstrate here that you have obtained feedback from others – be clear about what feedback and from whom. If you are not currently in a management position set out how you will make changes to develop your ability to manage efficiently and effectively – the steps you will take etc and what evidence you would be looking for to say that the changes would be successful. If you are in a management position – identify changes you have made and evidence that these have been successful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate own ability to manage effectively and efficiently (16 marks)</strong></td>
<td>By submitting I confirm that this assessment is my own work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement changes in own management style in order to manage more efficiently and effectively (12 marks)</strong></td>
<td>Ensure that you append this declaration to your assignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By submitting I confirm that this assessment is my own work