



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

DPME Evaluation Guideline 2.2.7

How to develop a Provincial Evaluation Plan

Developed 22 March 2013
Revised: 29 June 2014

Addressed to	Provincial offices of the Premier M&E units of provincial departments
Purpose	The purpose of this guideline is to give practical guidance on how to develop a Provincial Evaluation Plan
Reference documents	National Evaluation Policy Framework Concept for National Evaluation Plan
Contact person	Ian Goldman, Evaluation and Research Unit (ERU), DPME E-mail: ian@po.gov.za Tel: 012 308 1918

1 Introduction

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) focuses on evaluations of strategic and important policies, programmes or projects, which are identified as part of a National Evaluation Plan. It also talks of provinces rolling out the National Evaluation Policy Framework by identifying strategic or important provincial interventions which should be evaluated, and developing Provincial Evaluation Plans (PEPs) to address this. During 2012/13 two provinces have developed PEPs, Gauteng and Western Cape. They have based these on the processes, frameworks and guidelines developed for the national evaluation system, so that provinces do not need to develop guidelines, training etc.

2 Purpose of the Provincial Evaluation Plan

The purpose of a Provincial Evaluation Plan, as for the National Evaluation Plan, is to provide details of evaluations approved by Provincial Cabinet as priority evaluations to undertake over a three year period, which are linked with the budget process.

3 Linkage with the National Evaluation System

- 3.1 As part of the National Evaluation System, a National Evaluation Policy Framework has been approved by Cabinet, guidelines are being developed, a set of standardised types of evaluation have been proposed, as well as standards for evaluations, competences for government staff and evaluators, workshops, training to support the evaluation system etc.
- 3.2 In general it is suggested that provinces formally adopt the National Evaluation Policy Framework, and then use these systems and processes, for which a lot of work has been undertaken drawing on international good practice, and in the development of which provinces have been consulted.
- 3.3 A key focus in the approach in the NEPF is ensuring utilisation, and this means that departments must own the evaluations they are undertaking.

4 Process for agreeing on undertaking a Provincial Evaluation Plan

- 4.1 DPME has run consultative processes to brief provinces about provincial evaluation plans, using the Provincial M&E Forum hosted by DPME. A specific event focusing on provincial evaluation plans was run on 7 March 2013 and 25 February 2014. Through this process

provinces have been invited to consider developing provincial evaluation plans as part of their M&E system, and

- 4.2 Provincial Offices of the Premier should discuss with senior management the possibility of establishing a provincial evaluation system. DPME can make presentations to senior management or provincial EXCO to support this process, and/or provinces which have already developed a provincial evaluation plan can be invited to present. Provinces can also visit Western Cape or Gauteng to learn from their experience.
- 4.3 Offices of the Premier should then develop a document summarising the approach they will undertake in developing a provincial evaluation plan and system. Potentially this can be a customisation of the Concept developed for a National Evaluation Plan where the role of the Office of the Premier substitutes for the role of DPME, in which case this is an easy document to produce. This will require reflecting on:
- What amount the Office of the Premier may be prepared to offer to support departmental evaluations, eg R100-200 000 per evaluation (total cost likely to be R400 000+);
 - What number of evaluations they should propose for each year. It is suggested to start small and increase, eg 2-3, rising perhaps to 5 per year;
 - What criteria will be used for selection eg how “important” interventions to evaluate will be defined. For example the criteria of “large” in the national evaluation plan which applies to programmes of >R500 million, could be reduced to >R50 million.
- 4.4 This Concept should be workshopped with departments, notably those departments that are already undertaking evaluations. Copies of the Western Cape Concept and the Gauteng Provincial Evaluation Framework are available on the DPME website.
- 4.5 The Concept for a Provincial Evaluation Plan and System should be approved by senior management of the provinces, and EXCO. It is suggested that the National Evaluation Policy Framework is also tabled for approval by EXCO, so that the province adopts the systems developed to support the National Evaluation System.
- 4.6 Responsibility for leading the system should be allocated to a unit within the Office of the Premier, either in strategic planning, M&E or research. All these units should be involved in the system. In time a person with evaluation experience should be appointed to lead the system. DPME has developed competences in this regard.
- 4.7 A provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group should be formed, bringing together the skills and capacities available in the province to support the system. A sample Terms of Reference is attached in **Annex 1**.
- 4.8 An audit of evaluations conducted within the previous 5 or so years should be conducted, to build on the existing work already undertaken. These should be quality assessed and then made available. Discussions are underway with DPME as to whether DPME should hold a repository of all provincial as well as national evaluations. DPME is quality assessing all evaluations in this repository and has developed a quality assessment system for doing this.

5 Process for developing a Provincial Evaluation Plan

- 5.1 Once the Concept has been approved, the Evaluation Technical Working Group (ETWG) should meet and launch the call for evaluations for the three years. The suggested set of steps and timing for this to link with the budget process is:

Table 1: Action plan for developing the 2013/14+2 National Evaluation Plan

	Action	Responsible	When
De vel	1. Call for proposals for evaluations agreed at senior management	OoP	April 2014
	2. Letters sent to provincial DGs, including concept note format	OoP	April 2014
	3. Half day briefing workshops with departments to deepen	OoP/Depts	April/May 2014

	Action	Responsible	When
	understanding on the National Evaluation Policy Framework, the Concept for the Provincial Evaluation Plan		
	4. Meeting between OoP/Planning Commission/Treasury to consider priority evaluations	OoP	May 2014
	5. Tentative agreement in departments about priority evaluations and allocations of funds in the MTEF	Depts	June 2014
	6. Deadline for departments to include evaluations in their 3 year budgets	Depts	June 2014
	7. Workshopping of draft concept notes for evaluations with departments	OoP/Depts	July 2014
	8. Evaluation Technical Working Group discusses draft concept notes with departments	ETWG/Depts	July 2014
	9. Deadline for concept notes to be submitted	Depts	31 July 2014
Selection and refining	10. Proposals reviewed by ETWG and recommendations made for X evaluations for 2014/15, 2015/16 and 2016/17.	ETWG	Early August 2013
	11. Scoping workshops for each evaluation where wider stakeholders help to guide the appropriate focus and scope of the evaluation	Depts/OoP	Aug/Sept 2014
	12. Training of programme manager/M&E staff for each evaluation recommended for 2014/15 and draft TORs produced for evaluations.	DPME/OoP/Depts	September 2014
	13. Design clinic with evaluation experts to review theory of change, evaluation purpose, questions and methodology and refine TORs	OoP/Depts	October 2014
	14. Provincial Evaluation Plan (PEP) drafted	OoP	November 2014
	15. PEP submitted to provincial EXCO for approval	OoP	Late November
Start-up	16. TORs finalised for evaluations and Steering Committees established	Depts/DPME	Jan 2015
	17. Procurement undertaken	DPME/Depts	Feb 2015
	18. Contracts awarded and inception meetings	DPME/Depts	March 2015

6 Format of a Provincial Evaluation Plan

- 6.1 There is no prescribed format for a Provincial Evaluation Plan. However it should incorporate at least the following elements:
- An introduction to the process followed to develop the Plan including the criteria for selection;
 - An outline of the approved evaluations, indicating a background to the intervention being evaluated, what the evaluation will focus on, and what methodology is likely to be used.
- 6.2 The National Evaluation Plan, Western Cape and Gauteng Evaluation Plan provide models which can be drawn from to develop a localised version.

7 Role of the Office of the Premier (OTP)

- 7.1 The Office of the Premier is the custodian of the provincial M&E system, and so should lead on the provincial evaluation system. The OTP should establish an Evaluation Technical Working Group to support the system.
- 7.2 The OTP with the ETWG should then:
- Initiate the decision by EXCO as to whether the province wishes to take forward a provincial evaluation system;
 - Request support from DPME in establishing the system;
 - Develop and update on an on-going basis the systems for the provincial evaluation system, starting with the Concept;

- Carry out an audit of existing evaluations undertaken in the province, and maintain the inventory on an on-going basis;
- Manage the process for developing and undertaking evaluations, including developing and monitoring Improvement Plans arising from evaluations;
- Quality control all evaluations undertaken for the Provincial Evaluation Plan;
- Ensure that EXCO and senior management provincially and within departments is fully aware of the system;
- Ensure that part of implementation programme budgets are being allocated to regular evaluations;
- Ensure that the learnings from evaluation findings are implemented in Improvement Plans and are used for planning, budget and other decision-making;
- Decide on modalities for dissemination of evaluation results;
- Disseminate evaluation results upon completion of provincial evaluations.

8 Role of DPME in supporting Provincial Evaluation Systems

- 8.1 Part of DPME's role is to ensure that evaluations are undertaken systematically across government to improve performance and accountability. As part of developing the national evaluation system, Offices of the Premier have been consulted as systems and guidelines emerge.
- 8.2 As such DPME will assist provinces in the development of provincial evaluation systems. This support can include:
- Presentations to EXCO or senior management around the national evaluation system;
 - Supporting provinces in developing their Concept for a Provincial Evaluation Plan, and in taking forward the call for evaluations in the first year;
 - Making available all the guidelines and systems developed as part of the national evaluation system;
 - Making available the evaluations conducted already or planned to be conducted;
 - Ensuring that all systems, including software, can be customised for use by Offices of the Premier;
 - Providing initial training to Offices of the Premier and departments. Rolling out the training further will be the responsibility of the OoPs;
 - Potentially there could be shared services provided by DPME for all provinces, such as quality assessment of evaluations. **Annex 2** is a Responsibility Matrix for provincial evaluation systems.

9 Sharing learnings around implementing provincial evaluation systems

- 9.1 Offices of the Premier should provide on-going feedback to DPME on learnings emerging from the rollout of the system in the province, to refine the national evaluation system, and to ensure that learnings are shared with other provinces. They should invite DPME and other provinces to participate in key activities.
- 9.2 The Provincial M&E Forum will be used to share learnings, potentially with special sittings to enable in-depth sharing.
- 9.3 In addition provincial representatives sit on the national Evaluation Technical Working Group and so participate in the development and rollout of the national system.



Dr Sean Phillips
Director-General
The Presidency: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation
Date: 29 June 2014

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Provincial Evaluation Technical Working Group

1 Background

The National Evaluation Policy Framework was adopted by Cabinet on 23 November 2011. This envisages the development of a government-wide evaluation system, led by DPME nationally, and Offices of the Premier in provinces. Evaluation Technical Working Groups are envisaged at national and provincial levels so that the system is owned by government as a whole, and draws on the range of expertise available across government. This is important to ensure that the evaluation system is high quality and is likely to lead to use.

2 Objective

To support the establishment, operation and effectiveness of a provincial evaluation system.

3 Specific tasks

- 3.1 Develop/review plans for rollout of the evaluation system.
- 3.2 Develop/review specific methodological inputs for the evaluation system, eg Concept for a Provincial Evaluation Plan, competencies, standards, guidelines.
- 3.3 Select evaluations for the three year and annual evaluation plans based on inputs from departments.
- 3.4 Review the technical quality of evaluations conducted under the provincial evaluation plan, ensuring the overall system is working well.
- 3.5 Members act as the evaluation champions within their respective organisations, and are likely to be involved in steering committees of individual evaluations relevant to their departments.
- 3.6 In time specific task teams may emerge on specific issues, eg impact evaluations, and these may involve other people.

4 Members

Consistent members are needed, not delegates. These should cover:

- OoP – key staff involved with evaluation
- Centre of government departments – Provincial Treasury, provincial COGTA
- Evaluation specialists from departments. These members may change on an annual/two yearly basis to ensure that there is broad involvement across government
- External evaluation experts/partners – universities, other.

5 Roles

- Chair and secretariat: Office of Premier.

6 Meetings

- Will meet as needed, based on key milestones in the system, but likely to be a day a month for the first 6 months, then every two months

Annex 2: Responsibility matrix for provincial evaluation systems

The objective of the matrix is to clarify the roles played by different stakeholders and structures in the provincial evaluation system.

Stakeholder or structure	Key role	Members	Further information
Office of Premier	Champion for evaluation system in the province. Support the system Develop the provincial evaluation plan and take to HoD forum and EXCO Support training in evaluation for provincial staff Part-fund evaluations Secretariat for evaluation steering committees Issue request for Participate in development of the national system Assist provincial departments to prepare departmental evaluation plans	M&E Unit, strategy or research unit (should be at least one person as an evaluation specialist)	Section 7 of Guideline on PEPs
Provincial HoD meeting	Approve the concept note for the evaluation system Act as champions for evaluation across the province and within their depts. Recommend the PEP prior to submission to EXCO	Provincial HoDs	
EXCO	Provide political oversight and support for evaluation. Approve the Provincial Evaluation Plan Consider evaluation reports Ensure that blockages identified by evaluations are addressed		
Evaluation Technical Working Group	Support the evaluation system in the province Agree systems for the province Select evaluations for the provincial plan	M&E/research staff from departments with skills or an interest in the evaluation system	Annex 1 of PEP Guideline
Panel of evaluation service providers	Group to which calls for proposals are sent (so a restricted tender)	Group of organisations (universities, research institutions, consultants) selected through a tender process as having evaluation expertise. Could be an agreement between provincial DG and DG DPME to use the DPME panel	
Evaluation Steering Committee (for each evaluation)	Oversight of the specific evaluation process, including approving TORs, selecting service provider (as bid adjudication committee), reviewing instruments, approving reports.	Custodian dept (chair) OoP (secretary) Other departments involved in the specific programme being evaluated	Template on DPME website

Stakeholder or structure	Key role	Members	Further information
		Potentially external experts or stakeholders	
Custodian department	Propose evaluations (developing evaluation concept notes) for consideration for the PEP "owner" of the specific policy/programme being evaluated Chair Steering Committee (see above) Consider findings in management structures Provide Management Response to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation Lead on the improvement plan to address the findings (with other stakeholders needed)		Guideline on management response Guideline on Improvement Plan
Provincial Treasury	Participate in provincial ETWG Participate in evaluation steering committees (at least in development of TORs and reading final reports) Ensure funds available from programme budgets for evaluation		
DPME	National custodian of the government-wide evaluation system Development of standards, guidelines, training Support for national evaluations Support provinces to develop the provincial evaluation system Quality assessment of some provincial evaluations		Section 6 of Guideline on PEPs
National Evaluation Technical Working Group	Support development of government-wide evaluation system	M&E/research staff from national departments with skills or an interest in the evaluation system Representatives from provinces with PEPs	TORs for ETWG

Annex 3: Version of Concept Note Template for motivating for an evaluation in the national or provincial evaluation plan

This concept motivates why a particular intervention is a priority for evaluation under the National Evaluation Plan. It is not a plan for the evaluation which will be done later.

Part A: Key contact details

Name of proposed evaluation		Year proposed to be implemented	201_-201_
Organisation proposing evaluation	<i>Could be suggested by a central government institution but custodian will normally be an implementation department, or possibly a central department if cross-government.</i>		
Department that is custodian (and will implement the improvement plan arising from the evaluation)	<i>Should not be exclusively the responsibility of a state-owned enterprise, If several departments, then list these here, and suggest who would coordinate</i>		
Programme Manager		Title	
Telephone		Email	
M&E person		Title	
Telephone		Email	
Other key departments/agencies involved in the intervention			

Part B: Background to the intervention being focused on

Note this section is **not about the evaluation**, but the **policy/plan/programme** that the evaluation proposes to focus on.

Specific unit of analysis of the evaluation (should be a policy, plan, programme or project)	<i>Eg ECD Policy, X programme, Y project etc</i>
Give some background to the intervention	
Summary description of the intervention	
The problem or opportunity the intervention focuses on	<i>For example the National School Nutrition Programme focuses on disadvantaged learners coming to school without having eaten which undermines their ability to learn</i>

Objective or outcomes of the intervention (specify which)	<i>These should not be general but should be taken from the original programme plan, policy document etc.</i>		
Key components of the intervention (eg outputs in a logframe or programme plan)	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
Is there a logframe?	<i>If yes please attach</i>		
Programme document	<i>Please attach the key programme document describing the specific programme or policy to be evaluated, along with its indicators, and theory of change.</i>		
Duration and timing of the intervention	<i>Started (or proposed to start)</i>		<i>Ends</i>

Part C: Motivating for the evaluation of this intervention being considered in the National Evaluation Plan

Why is this evaluation a priority for the National Evaluation Plan? Note the evaluation does not have to score high on all of these.

How is this linked to the 14 outcomes?
<i>Show how this links to specific outputs/suboutputs in the delivery agreement.</i>
How is this linked to the National Development Plan
<i>Be specific of how this links to specific sections and recommendations in the National Development Plan (give page number).</i>
Innovative
<i>Is the intervention innovative (eg testing out a new model of service delivery)? Note this is not a requirement and many interventions that are not innovative still need to be evaluated. Is it important to do an evaluation to learn the lessons which can be applied more widely?</i>

How large is the intervention?			
Budget for intervention (not for the evaluation) for 2014/15 financial year	R	Estimated total budget for the intervention (over 3 year MTEF period)	R
			Period
Nos of people directly affected or enrolled (eg service users, beneficiaries...)	<i>If this does not directly serve citizens, then it should be a measure of coverage, eg if the proposed evaluation is of whether to lease buildings or to own, then this could be the number of buildings covered.</i>		

Is this an area of substantial public interest?
<i>This is not about whether the intervention is important but if it is very much in the public eye and if so how this is shown. Write here some common sense observations here – evidence will be sought from the number of related complaints to the Presidential Hotline, a measure of concern.</i>
Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions need to be taken, and when?
<i>Please indicate any key decision points the evaluation needs to feed into eg proposals for expansion, decisions whether to continue. When will these decisions be taken?</i>

Part D: Details on the evaluation proposed

In this section you give some idea on the type of evaluation being proposed, **not the intervention that the evaluation is focusing on**. Note we want to understand what you are trying to get out of the evaluation, but are not expecting you to know what methodology is needed.

Key focus of the evaluation	<i>For example the evaluation may only focus on part of a programme or policy</i>
Type of evaluation	<i>Write here one or more of the options below. Some evaluations can combine these. Look at the Guidelines on the different evaluation types available here: http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/evaluationsSite/Pages/Guidelines.aspx</i>
Diagnostic	Analyses the situation, brings out root causes, considers options. Used prior to design or replanning an intervention
Implementation	Used during implementation to understand how the intervention is working and how it can be strengthened
Cost effectiveness	To understand how cost effective the intervention is – often combined with implementation or impact
Impact	To understand what impact the intervention has had and why. Note this often needs either existing data or to collect data (expensive) on what are the impacts of people impacted by the intervention, and similar people not impacted by the programme. Do you have this data?
Synthesis	Rather than undertaking primary data collection this synthesises data from across a range of existing evaluations.

Suggested purpose of the evaluation	<i>Look at the Guideline on TORs for how to define the purpose – available at http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/evaluationsSite/Pages/Guidelines.aspx</i>
What are the main evaluative questions you will be asking (maximum 5) – use the Guideline on TORs to help you think these through, or the guidelines on specific evaluation types.	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

What credible monitoring data or existing evidence can be used, including on background and previous documented performance, or current programme situation. This is very important if you would like to undertake an impact evaluation and you need to answer this in some detail.

If you want to do an impact evaluation do you have data on impact, including existing external databases (StatsSA, NIDS, etc). You should not invest in primary data collection on variables which government is already collecting data on through other means. If little evidence exists then an impact evaluation will be difficult and you may need to undertake an implementation evaluation initially. Alternatively you are likely then to have to collect the data, which may be expensive.

Make some general comments here but then fill in the table below:

Do you have any data on?	Data available	Source/s	Custodian of data	Contact person and email or telephone	Quality/reliability/verifiability of data as well as limitations in terms of data availability, readiness, relevance, timeliness and access pertaining to this evaluation
Impacts on the target population					
Outcomes (eg changes in behaviour or systems)					
Outputs (the things you deliver, eg people trained, groups with community gardens with fencing and water)					

Likely duration (months)	<i>Indicate when the evaluation needs to start and when to end</i>
How recently was this intervention evaluated – if not for a long time then it is a higher priority	<i>Date and type of evaluation and what it focused on (attach copy to this submission)</i>
Do you have an estimate for what the evaluation may cost?	<i>If you are not sure discuss with DPME around likely cost.</i>
What budget for the evaluation has been allocated by the department or donors – note this must come from existing budgets	<i>You are expected to at least half-fund the evaluation. DPME may be able to fund all in exceptional circumstances</i>

Part E: Approval by sponsoring department(s)

Name of DG or relevant DDG of custodian department	
Signature	
Name of DG or relevant DDG of partner department	
Signature	
Name of DG or relevant DDG of partner department	
Signature	

Annex 4: Example of a Score Sheet for assessing Evaluation Proposals for the National or Provincial Evaluation Plans

Name of department	
Evaluation title	
Evaluation type	Diagnostic, design, implementation, impact, economic, synthesis (Please circle – can be more than one)
Year evaluation requested	

1 Is the intervention a national priority and we need to focus on it?

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
National Priority why this is a national priority in terms of the following 4 criteria. <i>Note it does not have to satisfy all criteria.</i>		
1.1 Linked to 14 outcomes being proposed in the MTSF (and especially top 5) and/or a section of the NDP Directly linked to an output of one of the top 5 outcomes or relevant section of the NDP = 20 Directly linked to an output of one of the other 9 outcomes/NDP=15 Addresses a small part of one of the 14 outcomes/NDP = 10 Is not part of the 14 outcomes/NDP but otherwise a priority of government =5 Is not part of the 14 outcomes or national priority=0 <i>Comment</i>	20	
1.2 Innovative – is the intervention testing out new approaches and so learning is key? Very innovative, or a key area in an outcome where there is confusion/lack of clarity/ or not much is known=10 Quite innovative, or an area of an outcome where some is known but it would benefit from an evaluation=5 Not innovative or an area where quite a lot is known=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
1.3 Large (>R500m over MTEF period and in terms of footprint) Very large (>R1000m, or targeted to cover >10% of the population)=10 Large (R500-R999m, targeted to cover 5-9% of the population)=5 Small <R499m=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
1.4 Substantial public interest (where possible drawn from analysis of the Presidential Hotline) Continuously in the media or many complaints in hotline=10 Regularly in the media and significant number of complaints in hotline=5 Not very much in the public eye=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
Overall comment		
Category total score	50	

2 Is it important that it is evaluated in 2015/16 or the following two years?

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
2.1 Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions are to be taken for which an evaluation is needed? Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2015/16 where key decisions needed=15 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2016/17 where key decisions needed=10 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2017/18+ where key decisions needed=5 Not critical decision point=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
2.2 Previous evaluations (if any) - How recently was this intervention evaluated? If >5 years, score 5, if less than 2 years score zero (unless the evaluation proposed is very different) <i>Comment</i>	5	
Overall comment		
Category total score	15	

3 How feasible will it be to evaluate this year?

Note these questions are not killers, and may just mean that the evaluation will take more work

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
3.1 Focus of evaluation - Is the object of evaluation clear (policy, programme, plan or project), and are the evaluative questions clear? The evaluation is clear with strong evaluative questions=10 The evaluation has a reasonable focus but could be clarified=5 The evaluation is unclear=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
3.2 Availability of monitoring data - Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested? Key data is needed and available=10 Key data is needed but will have to be collected=5 Key data is needed but difficult to obtain=0 <i>Comment</i>	15	

Criteria <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
3.3 Availability of budget - How assured are we that there is a budget for the evaluation from the department or donors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full budget available from department/donor = 10 • Budget likely or partially available from department, and supplemented by DPME = 5 • Only budget available is from DPME = 0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
Overall comment		
Category total score	35	

AGGREGATE/ OVERALL SCORE	Max score	Score	%
Importance of the intervention	50		
Important that done in the 3 years	15		
Feasibility of doing evaluation this year	35		
Total (maximum 100)			
Recommendation by assessors (please put cross)	Appropriate for NEP	Not appropriate for NEP but dept should do	Needs rethinking

Assessors

<hr/> Signed <i>Name</i> Member : ETWG Date:	<hr/> Signed <i>Name</i> Member : ETWG Date:	<hr/> Signed <i>Name</i> Member : ETWG Date:
<hr/> Signed <i>Name</i> Member : ETWG Date:	<hr/> Signed <i>Name</i> Member : ETWG Date:	<hr/> Signed <i>Name</i> Member : ETWG Date:

FINAL DECISION AND FEEDBACK TO THE DEPARTMENT BY THE EVALUATION TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

(to be completed after the assessment based on overall decisions of the ETWG)

No.	DECISION AND FEEDBACK	Please tick (X)
1	Yes, evaluation should be considered for the plan for the year requested (2014/15; 2015/16; 2016/17 - circle the year requested). <i>Reasons:</i>	
2	Not recommended for the 2014/15 national plan but a good idea, and could be considered for national plan 2015/16 or 2016/17 (recommend which by circling the year - will not need to be resubmitted). <i>Reasons:</i>	
3	Not included in the plan and the department needs to strengthen certain aspects (either to implement itself, or to resubmit next year). <i>Reasons and aspects to be strengthened:</i>	
4	Rethink and we suggest these areas need to be revisited (to be indicated) <i>Reasons and areas to be revisited:</i>	

Signed on behalf of DPME:	<p>_____</p> <p>Signed Dr Ian Goldman Head: Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME Date:</p>
---------------------------	---