



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



basic education

Department:
Basic Education
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Terms of Reference for the Implementation Evaluation of the Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme

Request for Proposals/Bid Number: Evaluation number 14/14XX

Date: 06 February 2014 (Thursday)

Time: By Close of Business

Compulsory briefing session

Date: 10 February 2014 (Friday)

Time: 12h00-13h30

Venue: Boardroom 164, West Wing, Union Buildings Government Avenue, Pretoria.

Deadline for submission of proposals:

12h00 (Central African Time) on Friday, **21 February 2014**, with provision of one electronic and SIX hard copies.

Presentation by shortlisted candidates:

Date: Monday **03 March 2014**

Time: 09h00-15h30

Venue: Boardroom 282, East Wing, Union Buildings Government Avenue, Pretoria.

Please note that positive proof of identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to the Union Buildings. Arrival 30 minutes before presentation appointment is advised due to security procedures.

Bid Award Notification Deadline:

Date: Wednesday **05 March 2014**

6 February 2014

Table of Contents

1.	Background information and rationale.....	4
1.1.	Background to the evaluation being evaluated.....	4
1.2.	Purpose of the evaluation.....	6
2.	The focus of the evaluation	7
2.1.	Evaluation Questions	7
2.2.	Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation (FLBP)	10
2.3.	Scope of the Evaluation	11
3.	Evaluation Design.....	12
4.	Evaluation plan.....	13
4.1.	Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation	13
4.2.	Activities.....	14
4.3.	Timeframe for the project	14
4.4.	Evaluation team	15
4.5.	Competencies and skills-set required	16
5.	Budget and payment schedule	17
6.	Management Arrangements.....	18
6.1.	Role of Steering Committee.....	18
6.2.	Reporting Arrangements.....	18
6.3.	Peer review	18
6.4.	Quality assessment	18
7.	Proposal to be Submitted	19
7.1.	Structure of the Proposal.....	19
7.2.	Evaluation Team.....	19
8.	Information for Service Providers.....	20
8.1.	Key background documents.....	20
8.2.	Evaluation criteria for proposals (DPME).....	20
8.3.	Pricing requirements.....	20
8.4.	Evaluation of proposals.....	21
8.4.1.	Evaluation of proposals: Administrative compliance	21
8.4.2.	Evaluation of proposals: Functional evaluation (DPME).....	21
8.4.3.	Price evaluation: The PPPFA	24
9.	Intellectual property rights	25

10.	General and specific conditions of contract	25
11.	Enquiries	25

Index of Tables

Table 1.	Likely use of the evaluation results by different stakeholders	11
Table 2.	Outline project plan and payment schedule	15
Table 3.	Service Provider Competencies to be Assessed.....	17
Table 4.	Functional evaluation criteria to be applied in assessing the proposals	24

1. Background information and rationale

1.1. Background to the evaluation being evaluated

This document sets out the terms of reference for a design and implementation evaluation of the Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme (FLBP).

The purpose of the Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme is to ensure that the basic education sector responds adequately to the supply and demand needs for high quality teachers in nationally-defined priority areas. The Programme falls within the mandate of the Department of Basic Education (DBE), as a key deliverable as indicated in the Strategic Plan 2011-2014 and the Action Plan to 2014. Goal 14 of the Action Plan to 2014 compels the Department to: “attract in each year a new group of young, motivated and appropriately trained teachers into the teaching profession”. The FLBP, therefore, is designed to achieve the following goals:

1. To attract quality students; and ensure that students are trained in identified priority areas
2. To contribute substantially to the supply of adequately trained teachers with a focus on rural and poor schools.

The objectives of the Programme are:

- To employ efficient and effective recruitment mechanisms to attract quality students (aged 30 and below) to become teachers in identified priority areas;
- To increase the number of first-time enrolments by 10% year on year;
- To provide financial assistance to South African youth with academic potential to enter and complete tertiary studies in teacher education programmes;
- To ensure a satisfactory completion rate of funded students ;
- To ensure that Funza Lushaka graduates are placed appropriately in schools.

The bursary programme was established in 2007. It is managed by the Department of Basic Education and is administered financially by the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) on behalf of the DBE. The Department collaborates closely with Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in order to ensure proper selection of students, and to manage the disbursement of funds to qualifying students. The selection criteria are merit-based, and provincial education departments (PEDs) are involved to ensure that bursary funding is directed to priority areas and subject.

Beneficiaries of the Programme are students enrolled in Bachelor of Education (Bed) and Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) programmes at HEIs. Students enrolled for other Bachelor degrees such as Bachelor of Science (BSc), Bachelor of Commerce (BCom) or Bachelor of Agriculture (BAgric) may also be recruited into a PGCE qualification. In general, beneficiaries are students recruited from schools, unemployed youth, unemployed graduates, and students studying at universities who decide to change to the teaching profession. During the period 2007-2012, a total of 48,292 bursaries were awarded at a total cost of more than R1,9 billion, as at the end of the 2012/2013 financial year. This translates into more than 23,000 students in total, funded by the FLBP since its inception, at an average cost of R39,000 per funded student.

A total number of 11,450 students were funded by the Programme in 2012, at a cost of R671 million. Funding in 2013 increased to R893 million, that translates into 14,500 bursaries in the year alone. The combined cost of university fees and accommodation increased between 8% and 10% (on average) annually, and this has partly offset the increased funding received from National Treasury. The average value of the bursaries awarded in 2012 was R56,696-R66,000. The outputs of the bursary programme are measured against the number of qualified teachers in the following priority areas:

- **Foundation Phase** (Grades R-3): Foundation Phase specialisation: specialization in an African Language.
- **Intermediate and Senior Phase** (Grades 4-6 and 7-9 respectively): With a teaching major in one of the following: African languages; English; Mathematics; Natural Sciences; and Technology.
- **FET phase** (Grades 10-12): With a teaching major in one of the following: Accounting; African languages; Economics; English; Geography; Mathematics; Mathematical Literacy; Agricultural Sciences; Life Sciences; Physical Sciences; Agricultural Technology; Civil Technology; Electrical Technology; Mechanical Technology; Information Technology; Computer Applications Technology; as well as Engineering Graphics and Design.

In 2012 the Department introduced a recruitment campaign aimed specifically at districts, and schools in rural areas. The idea was to produce a substantial number of graduates who would take up employment, and alleviate the shortage of scarce skills in schools located in rural areas. The recruitment process was strengthened through general advocacy and web-based campaigns.

The Programme is of significant importance to the education sector and the general South African public. Given the shortage of teachers in key subjects such as Maths, Physical Science and Accounting, as well as in the Foundation Phase, it is important to assess the extent to which the Funza Lushaka Bursary Scheme addresses this problem. An evaluation of the Programme five years after its inception is critical, therefore, in light of the political pressure on the education sector, and mass public scrutiny of education nearly 20 years into the new democracy. Decisions regarding the future of the Programme should, therefore, be taken on the basis of sound evidence.

1.2. Purpose of the evaluation

Evaluation is a specialist discipline utilizing well-established concepts and methodologies in a body of knowledge developed over the last three decades. Service providers must ensure that evaluation-specific terms and concepts are interpreted appropriately in the professional execution of the evaluation assignment.

The overall **purpose** of the evaluation is to evaluate the effectiveness of the FLBP. The results of the Programme are to be assessed against its main intended outcomes. The Evaluation must identify programme strengths and weaknesses, and to make recommendations to enhance the FLBP.

This includes (a) appropriateness of its current design, (b) assessment of Programme results to date, (c) assessment of FLBP implementation, including its management and administrative systems, processes and procedures, (d) assessment of FLBP sustainability, with an emphasis on programme sustainability, and (e) make recommendations for programme improvement/enhancement, including those regarding the future measurable impact assessment of the FLBP.

The results of the Programme are to be assessed against its main intended outcomes:

- An increased number of students recruited and funded in initial teacher education programmes;
- A satisfactory completion rate of Funza Lushaka bursars;
- The placement of qualified bursars in rural and poor schools;
- Increased supply of qualified teachers in the identified priority areas and phase specialization.

2. The focus of the evaluation

2.1. Evaluation Questions

The implementation evaluation is focused on implementation relative to programme objectives, assessment of the current design of the FLBP and validation of the underlying Theory of Change, with a view to improving design and implementation in the new Financial Year.

The **key evaluation questions** to be answered in this evaluation are:

1. What are the **measurable results** of the FLBP, specifically with regards to supply, and placement of FLBP-sponsored teachers? To what extent has the FLBP been effective in achieving its major goals, objectives and intended outcomes? Have recruitment strategies been effective?
2. Is the **design** of the FLBP appropriate, and to what extent is the intervention design consistent with education sector priorities and policies, and partnerships with all key stakeholders?
3. To what extent has the FLBP been **efficient** in its implementation, with specific reference to administration and management arrangements?
4. How **sustainable** is the FLBP? What key **insights, lessons, and recommendations** are offered, with a view on the possible scaling up of the FLBP?

In order to address and answer each of the key evaluation questions detailed above, the following **guide questions** are to be used. These questions are to be confirmed during the inception phase of the evaluation between the FLBP Evaluation Steering Committee and the Service Provider, and are to be used as a guide for the evaluation.

The intention is to evaluate the bursary programme in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The key evaluative questions are:

1. To what extent is the **design of the Programme** relevant, appropriate, and technically sound? Guide questions:

- **Programme Design:** is the programme design relevant and appropriate in terms of national priorities, education sector context and policy, and institutional environment? Is the design of the programme conceptually clear, and coherent? Does the programme have a logframe, and does it comply with standards for technical good practice? What is the underlying Theory of Change (TOC) of the programme?
- **Selection criteria and procedures:** Is there a clear relationship between the Programme objectives and the selection criteria (priority areas)? Is there any conflict between any of the objectives or selection criteria?
- **Monitoring:** Is there an appropriate framework for collection of data towards assessment of the impact of the Programme (and, where appropriate, the particular contributions of stakeholders of FLBP).

2. What are the **measurable results** of the FLBP, specifically with regards to supply, and placement of FLBP-sponsored teachers? To what extent has the FLBP been effective in achieving its major goals, objectives and intended outcomes? Have recruitment strategies been effective? Guide questions:

- To what extent have the **goals and objectives** of the FLBP been achieved during the period 2007-2012 (Number of students recruited in priority areas, number funded in ITE programmes in priority areas; Number of students completed within a satisfactory time frame; Number of graduates placed in public schools generally and specifically in rural and poor schools; Contribution of FLBP to the supply of qualified teachers in identified priority areas and phase specialization in public schools and rural and poor schools particularly, as compared to total supply)? What were the main outputs? What were the results (outcomes) of the programme?
- **Effects of non-funding:** How did applicants fare that did not qualify for re-award in terms of completing their studies (completed by self-funding, picked up the bursary again and completed, changed to other programmes or dropped out);
- **Effects of non-placement:** How did unplaced graduates fare in terms of finding employment (public schools, SGB posts in public schools, private schools, other places in the education sectors or outside)?
- **Stakeholders:** what are stakeholders' views on the Programme, and do these vary for various stakeholders or beneficiaries?
- **Management, Coordination and collaboration:** How do stakeholders perceive their roles and responsibilities in managing the Programme efficiently?
 - DBE (overall management, administration, coordination and collaboration).
 - HEIs (selection, bursary funds, student support, specialization in subject combinations that match priority areas; tracking academic progress).
 - NSFAS (approval for awards, student contracts, disburse funds to HEIs and report).
 - PEDs (placements, monitor non-placement, track employment record, sharing good practices, report).
 - DHET (their role in management of the Funza Lushaka bursary programme? Implementation Protocol; design of initial teacher education programmes; overall teacher supply to meet the demands for scarce skills; collaborative structures, including the DBE, DHET and NSFAS Committee; Dean's Forum and the Provincial Teacher Education and Development Committees (PTEDCs))
 - Students
 - Newly-placed teachers.
- Are **any changes needed** to the objectives to strengthen the Programme in future and what implications would they have for Programme design and change management?

3. In relation to all of the **core “business” processes** of the Programme, to what extent has the Programme been **efficient**? Have the management and administrative arrangements underpinning programme implementation been appropriate? Guide questions:

- **Management and Administration:** What have been the primary management and administrative structures, mechanisms, processes, and procedures? Were these appropriate to deliver an effective programme? To what extent did they function efficiently?
- **Recruitment and Selection:** What recruitment strategies are in place and how effective are they in reaching the target population (youth from rural and poor areas)? District-based recruitment – Registration process in HEIs and issue of promissory letter; mechanisms in place to ensure that recruited students go back to teach in their districts. What were the main outcomes of the recruitment strategy? Was there alignment between the recruitment and selection processes?
- **Funding:** What systems are in place to ensure that bursary funds are efficiently managed and utilized?
- To what extent did the various **stakeholders** contribute to the administration of bursary funds and achievement of Programme outcomes? (DBE allocate funds to HEIs and approve bursary award lists and send them to NSFAS; NSFAS sign Agreements with students, disburse funds to HEI per DBE approved lists and Report; HEIs allocate funds to students and Report to DBE/NSFAS). Were these processes effective? Efficient?
- To what extent were the **funding arrangements** sufficiently flexible and able to identify and deal with emerging challenges (convenience for students, managing declines by students, HEI claims on time, etc) during programme implementation?
- To what extent did **beneficiaries** (funded students) **utilize funds** efficiently towards attainment of outcomes)?
- **Training/Students’ profile:** What is the completion rate of the bursars in terms of numbers, bursary funds spent, throughput rate, dropout rate, student profile in the bursary programme and maintaining subject specialization within defined priority areas; student support (academic, accommodation, etc) and communication with students in HEIs?
- **Graduation:** How effective is the process of completion of placement forms, compilation of a placement database by DBE and making it available to PEDs on time?
- **Placement:** What placement processes are in place and how effective are they (Coordination by DBE; placement mechanisms in PEDs (match to vacant posts, applying for a post; placement within specified time frame)? Is the placement period for graduates realistic?
- **Accountability and monitoring:** What processes are in place for monitoring and how effective are they (tracking students during their study period in HEIs and graduates once placed)?
- **Departmental processes and resources:** To what extent does the DBE manage and coordinate processes and ensure adequate resources (human and physical)?

- **Beneficiaries:** What is the attitude of Funza Lushaka awardees with regard to receiving money to support their studies and serving in schools (Funding, academic activities; specialization in priority areas; conditions of schools, qualification subjects versus priority needs of the school; support at schools; completion of the obligatory service period and remaining in the teaching profession)?
- **Cost-effectiveness:** Has the strategy been cost-effective in terms of the amount spent and the outputs achieved? Was there value for money in terms of the proportion of funds dedicated towards teacher supply in priority areas?
- **Key Results:** what are key results for the programme based on available data? What are the key observable trends? What gaps exist in the data? If so, what recommendations are offered for data-related processes – collection, capturing, storage, access, strategic use, etc.?

4. How sustainable is the FLBP? What key insights, lessons, and recommendations are offered, with a view on the possible scaling up of the FLBP? Guide questions:

- **Sustainability:** What is the assessment of the FLBP in terms of programme sustainability and financial sustainability? To what extent are effective partnerships with stakeholders included in the assessment?

2.2. Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation (FLBP)

The main user of the evaluation results will be the DBE. The DBE be able develop and implement strategies to improve on the management of the Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme.

The evaluation results will also be useful to other departments including the National Treasury, the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation, the Department of Higher Education and Training, as well as the National Student Financial Aid Scheme, and Provincial Education Departments.

Users may make use of the evaluation results as follows:

- Reprioritise bursary funds allocation.
- Improve implementation of the programme.
- Strengthen collaborative structures and cooperation.
- Initiate effective and efficient monitoring mechanisms.

The key potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use it are shown in Table 1 below.

Stakeholder	Likely Use of the Results of the Evaluation
DBE, especially... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Teacher Education, Education • Human Resource Planning, Provisioning and Monitoring • Strategic Planning and Reporting • Research Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation 	Improved Oversight, Better Information and baselines to inform policy and strategic decisions, better management of the programme, better information for up-scaling of programme
Provincial Education Departments (PEDs)	Promote accountability and transparency, Improved management of- and participation in- programme implementation, Improved aspects of the design of the programme
Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) especially Teacher Education	Improved sectoral coordination, inputs towards the enhancement of the quality of teacher education, promote accountability and transparency
Higher Education Institutions (represented by the Deans' Forum)	Improved engagement between HEIs and the DBE, improved quality of teacher training, improved recruitment and allocation of funds
National Financial Aid Scheme	Improved efficiency in financial and administrative processes of the programme, improved monitoring and reporting
National Treasury	Improved funding arrangements for the programme, including transfer of funds.

Table 1. Likely use of the evaluation results by different stakeholders

2.3. Scope of the Evaluation

This evaluation entails a systematic assessment of the programme performance of the Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme over a 5-year period (2007/2008-2012/2013). The overall purpose of the assignment is to evaluate the effectiveness of the programme. Programme results are to be assessed against its main intended outcomes. The evaluation should focus on all of the core “business processes” of the FLBP, and provide an assessment with clear recommendations in each case. The evaluation will include a survey and other standard methods typically used in implementation evaluations.

The effective delivery of the programme depends on a number of stakeholders. All major stakeholders must be engaged. The DBE is responsible for overall management, coordination and monitoring as the funder. The NSFAS administer bursary funds and work closely with HEIs to ensure that students receive financial support. Provincial Education Departments (PEDs) play a key role to ensure that teacher graduates are placed. The processes and mechanisms employed are intricate and demand management and coordination structures. Accountability and monitoring is very critical. Efficient communication mechanisms must be in place for bursary awardees to understand the expectations of the Programme. This evaluation will provide recommendations that will lead to the development of improved management at all levels of implementation.

3. Evaluation Design

Evaluation design details the service provider's systematic plan to undertake the evaluation. The design of an evaluation is not to be confused with the type of evaluation (in this case, an implementation evaluation). Evaluation design defines the methodological approach and specific methodology to be employed: type of evaluation (design, implementation, diagnostic, impact) and, data collection methods and a statistical analysis plan. In this proposal submission, the service provider is expected to specifically outline and discuss its approach to implementation evaluation measurement of programme performance of the FLBP. Related to this, a multi-method approach will be used to evaluate assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and emerging impact of the FLBP.

The service provider will employ a methodology that includes qualitative and quantitative data. While the final methodology will be a result of discussion between the Evaluation Steering Committee and the successful applicant, the use of standard methods/techniques employed in evaluations, such as random sampling, interviews, focus groups and questionnaires, etc. are suggested.

The sample size and geographical focus will be the outcome of the discussions between the service provider and DPME/DBE officials. Please take note of the information contained in section 1 in this TOR:

- Further details and information about the FLBP required by the service provider can be accessed on the DPME website at <http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/dpmewebsite/admin/Images/ProductDocuments/Infomation%20Guide%20on%20ITE.PDF>.

- The minimum sample for the survey component of the evaluation will be specified during the compulsory briefing, scheduled for 10 February 2014. Full details of the approach and methodology to be employed by the service provider must be provided in its bid submission, including an accompanying detailed evaluation plan. The evaluation plan is to contain information on what data is to be collected, where, how many per province, etc. normally on the basis of the evaluation research design.
- A literature review should reflect on the seminal thought in the sector, provide a comparative analysis of similar bursary programmes conducted internationally, stipulating the key lessons drawn from design and implementation.
- A systematic review of the design and the assumptions made by the theory of change must also be conducted. In the event that the FLBP does not have a programme logframe, it is expected that the service provider will produce a draft for approval.
- All aspects of FLBP implementation are to be covered in the evaluation as specified in this TOR. Amongst other things, the service provider will use relevant data from all stakeholders and in relation to each of the core business processes of the programme.
- It is expected that the survey and all other methods combined to assess programme implementation will be evenly balanced in terms of emphasis in methodology – 50:50.

4. Evaluation plan

4.1. Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

1. **Inception report** by the service provider as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised evaluation plan, overall evaluation design and detailed methodology and content structure for the final report. This forms the basis for assessing performance;
2. **Literature Review** (includes all relevant documentation);
3. **Theory of Change**, and **FLBP Programme Logframe** (standard format),
4. **Data Collection and Analysis Plan; Data Collection Instruments;**
5. Monthly **Progress Reports**, on all aspects of the evaluation;
6. **Draft Evaluation Report** for review: **Full** (up to 150 pages maximum) and in **1/3/25 format** (a one page policy summary of implications for policy, a three-five page executive summary of the whole report, and a 25 page executive report)
7. **Microsoft Powerpoint Presentation** of the essence of the report to a Stakeholder Validation Workshop: involving programme stakeholder representatives, the Technical Working Group and the Evaluation Steering Committee to discuss the draft report;
8. The **Final Evaluation Report, Full** (up to 150 pages maximum) and in **1/3/25 format**⁵, in hard copy and electronic formats;

⁵ The 1/3/25 page evaluation report should be readily understood by the intended audience(s) and the form of the report appropriate given the purpose(s) of the evaluation. It contains a 1 page policy summary, a 4-5 page executive summary and a 25 page main report. The executive summary provides an overview of the report, covering all the sections and highlighting the main findings, conclusions, recommendations and any overall lessons. Key evidence is included in the 1/3/25 report so it is authoritative. Full references (reference list) should be provided as an annex to these reports.

9. **Datasets, Metadata and Survey Documentation** (including interviews) collected and/or produced during the evaluation.
10. A **PowerPoint and/or Audiovisual Presentation** of the results.

4.2. Activities

As indicated above the main activities involved in the evaluation include:

1. Inception phase including inception meeting, revisions to methodology and proposal, outline report contents, finalisation of SLA, and the inception report and revised proposal to be approved by the Steering Committee.
2. Analysis of current data available and any implications for the design of the survey moving forward.
3. Produce the literature review, and articulate its implications for the evaluation of the Funza Lushaka Bursary Programme.
4. Design of the survey methodology and instruments, as well as data analysis plan.
5. Piloting of the survey instruments with DBE (FLBP).
6. Piloting of the interview/focus group methodology.
7. Revisions to the survey instruments and data analysis plan.
8. Finalisation of survey instruments as well as instruments for interviews/focus groups.
9. Roll out of the survey by the service provider.
10. Data-Collection: undertaking of the interviews/focus groups by the service provider.
11. Analysis of the data.
12. Writing of the draft report.
13. Presentation to- and discussion of the draft report with- stakeholders.
14. Finalisation of the draft report.

4.3. Timeframe for the project

The indicative timeframe for the evaluation is six months in total, including non-billable time. The table below shows draft milestones and expected start and finish of the evaluation assignment, assuming the TORs are approved by February 2014, and procurement is completed by end-February 2014; the indicative start date is 07 March 2014.

Deliverable	Indicative Milestones	Payment (% of overall budget)
1. Start date and inception meeting	07 March 2014	
2. Approval of inception report , SLA and revised proposal	14 March 2014	10%
3. Submission of Literature review	25 March 2014	-
4. Submission of Theory of Change, and FLBP Programme Logframe	28 April 2014	10%
5. Approval of report structure, final data collection and analysis plan; final data collection instruments	28 April 2014	10%
6. DBE (FLBP) provides full dataset		
7. Four Monthly Progress Reports	Mar-Jun 2014	-
8. Approval of draft evaluation report , full and in 1/3/25 format (see Action Points)	27 June 2014	40%
9. Microsoft Powerpoint Presentation to Stakeholder Validation Workshop	11 July 2014	5%
10. Approval of the final evaluation report	01 August 2014	20%
11. Approval of all Datasets, Metadata and Survey Documentation (including interviews) when data is collected	15 August 2014	-
12. Approval of Powerpoint or audiovisual presentation of the results	15 August 2014	5%
13. Project closure meeting	29 August 2014	-

Table 2. Outline project plan and payment schedule

4.4. Evaluation team

The evaluation team is expected to include an expert on large scale surveys (for example, a statistician) as well as the expertise to handle a qualitative study which answer questions to indicate how the FLBP can be strengthened.

The service provider should indicate how skills transfer will be undertaken to departments involved in the evaluation, as well as PDI/young evaluators. The service provider should specify the number of team members (experts), their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. **Inclusion of national experts with proven experience will be a significant advantage** in this evaluation. The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Masters Degree.

The team leader must have at least 15 years 'experience including working within the development/government sector at a high level, and of leading politically sensitive and complex evaluations. He/she must be an expert in monitoring and evaluation, with significant competency in job promotion/employment creation, development and social protection.

The team must consist of content experts in the following key areas, namely:

- Education, specifically Initial Teacher Education, Education Human Resource Planning, Provisioning and Monitoring, Strategic Planning and Reporting
- Mass bursary programmes.

These experts must have experience of dealing with Government in these sectors at a high level, and be familiar with the processes of development planning and evaluation in these sectors. In sum, the team must include a(n initial) teacher education expert, public sector bursary programme expert, methodologist (statistician), as well as an evaluation expert. Please note that at least 30% of the consulting team must be PDIs.

The team must demonstrate a strong understanding of the outcomes system and its implementation in Government.

4.5. Competencies and skills-set required

The competencies for evaluation are summarised from the Evaluation Competencies available on the DPME website. The service provider will be assessed against these competencies (see 8.4.2):

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	<p>An excellent understanding of the importance of the education sector and issues of teacher supply and demand, in a rural and poor context of South African schools.</p> <p>An excellent knowledge of the management and administration of large scale bursary programmes.</p> <p>An excellent understanding and knowledge of the relevant public sector policy landscape (specifically National development Plan and Department of Education's Action Plan 2014 towards the Realisation of Schooling 2025).</p>
	<p>Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity.</p> <p>At least 30% of the consulting team must be PDIs.</p>
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders
2 Evaluation leadership	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively
3 Evaluation craft	
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation and apply this in high-level, complex and politically sensitive evaluations, in quality, time and budget
3.2 Research practice	<p>Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.</p> <p>Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps.</p>

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes (standard format) with good programme logic and indicators
Design	Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives in politically sensitive areas on time and to appropriate standards
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, constructive, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other

Table 3. Service Provider Competencies to be Assessed.

Furthermore, it is important that service providers nominated exhibit the following skills and attributes:

- Team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder management in complex situations;
- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and
- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software.

5. Budget and payment schedule

The payment schedule is indicated as part of Table 2 above.

6. Management Arrangements

6.1. Role of Steering Committee

A Steering Committee will be established comprising the main departments and agencies involved in the intervention in question (DBE, DHET, PEDs, NSFAS, HEIs) which will be chaired by DBE, and the secretariat provided by the DPME. The steering committee will approve the inception report, the terms of reference, and other main deliverables, prior to payments.

A Technical Working Group will be formed of key technical staff from DBE and DPME to deal with issues such as design of research instruments, etc. or to deal with practical issues quickly.

6.2. Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager from DBE will be Gerrit Coetzee. The project will be commissioned by the DPME and the evaluation manager will be Antonio Hercules, to whom the service provider will report.

6.3. Peer review

Two peer reviewers will be appointed by the DPME, one on content issues, and another on methodology. The names will be provided to the Steering Committee.

6.4. Quality assessment

Once the final evaluation report has been approved, the evaluation will be quality assessed by independent assessors, using a methodology based on the national evaluation standards. These standards and an example of the quality assessment can be found on the DPME website.

7. Proposal to be Submitted

7.1. Structure of the Proposal

The evaluation proposal should cover the following components with respect to the bidder. Failure to comply will lead to disqualification.

1. Understanding of the evaluation and the Terms of Reference.
2. Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation. This should include some description of the literature intended for review. A plan should be presented of the data and methodologies envisaged for analysis. Finally, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the Terms of Reference can be proposed.
3. Activity-based plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities).
4. Activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT).
5. Competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references).
6. Team (team members, roles and level of effort).
7. Capacity development elements (building capacity of officials in the Department).
8. Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality).
9. The following must be attached:
10. Example of a related evaluation report undertaken;
11. CV's of key personnel; and
12. Completed supply chain forms, tax clearance, etc.

7.2. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team must meet the requirements detailed in section 4.4 above, and cover the competencies outlined in section 8.4 below. There must be sufficient capacity in the consulting team to undertake the work in the specified period. Service providers are required to sub-contract in specialized skills where these are specified for execution of the evaluation. The service provider will also need to specify how it will ensure skills transfer where specified, and the PDI component in its team. The service provider will specify the number of team members, their identities, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities and billable time allocations within the team project plan.

8. Information for Service Providers

The service provider will provide a proposal submission following the structure above. In addition short-listed candidates will be required to present their proposal to the FLBP Bid Evaluation Committee as part of the selection process, following the DPME's standard procurement procedures. Tenders must be submitted by **12h00 on 21 February 2014**, in the form of an electronic version on CD, and six (6) hard copies.

8.1. Key background documents

The following documents and/or sources of information will be beneficial for the service provider:

- Monthly Reports From Stakeholder Institutions: DBE directorates, DHET directorates, NSFAS, 22 HEIs, 9 PEDs, and National Treasury
- Correspondence, reports and other FLBP programme documentation
- Research undertaken by DBE, DHET, DoE
- School-level: school management and teachers
- Any other relevant material from StatsSA, and HSRC
- Beneficiaries: bursary holders and placed graduates
- Any other reports, research and documentation, including the Minister's Investigation.

8.2. Evaluation criteria for proposals (DPME)

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. There are two main criteria for evaluating proposals: functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors must cover the competencies and skills-set outlined in section 16.4 below as demonstrated through:

- Quality of proposal;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
- Team leader's levels of knowledge and expertise;
- Qualifications and expertise of the evaluation team.

8.3. Pricing requirements

All prices must be inclusive of 14% Value Added Tax (VAT). All prices should be valid for at least three months from the proposal closing date. Price escalations and the conditions of escalation should be clearly indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted. Proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in this ToR.

The amount tendered in the proposals to undertake the evaluation shall be broken down into a Professional Fee portion and an Expenses Portion. However, the overall amount tendered (the Professional Fee portion plus the Expenses portion) shall be used in the overall proposal evaluation process.

The cost of preparing proposals, attending compulsory briefing sessions in Pretoria and making audiovisual presentations of the proposals in Pretoria (all prior to the successful service provider being appointed) is for the service provider's own account.

8.4. Evaluation of proposals

There are three stages in selection – ensuring bids comply with administrative requirements, checking that functionally the proposal is adequate to do the job, and lastly the price is acceptable.

8.4.1. Evaluation of proposals: Administrative compliance

Only proposals that comply with all the administrative requirements will be considered acceptable for further evaluation in the subsequent functional evaluation phase. Incomplete and late proposals will not be considered.

The following documentation must be submitted in support of each proposal:

- Documents specified in the request for proposals documents (distributed separately from this ToR); and
- Any other requirement specified in the ToR.

8.4.2. Evaluation of proposals: Functional evaluation (DPME)

Only proposals that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable proposals) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All proposals will be scored as follows against the function criteria indicated below:

- 1 – Does not comply with the requirements
- 2 – Partial compliance with requirements
- 3 – Full compliance with requirements
- 4 – Exceeds requirements.

The table below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competences outlined in Section 9 above which will be used in assessing the proposals. Proposals should clearly address the project description and the functional evaluation criteria. Short-listed service providers should also structure their proposal and audio-visual presentations accordingly (where appropriate) to aid the proposal evaluation process.

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight x score	Min. weighted score
Section A: Quality of the Proposal	1. Understanding of the workings of government in general and the Outcomes approach in particular (specifically Outcome 1 “quality basic education”).	3			6
	2. Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation.				
	3. Quality of activity-based plan aligned with activities and deliverables.				
	4. Quality of team composition and their roles and quantified level of effort, including the inclusion of a methodology expert (statistical), expert on teacher education, education sector expert, bursary programme expert and evaluation expert.	2			6
	5. Demonstrated high-quality experience in at least 5 related projects undertaken in last 5 years by the service provider and any of its subcontractors.	1			2
	6. Expert knowledge and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African Countries.	1			2
	7. Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner government departments and Black, disabled, youth and female evaluators).				
Section B: Competencies					
Overarching Considerations					
Contextual knowledge and understanding	8. An excellent understanding of the importance of the education sector and issues of teacher supply and demand, in a rural and poor context of South African schools.				
	9. An excellent knowledge of the management and administration of large scale bursary programmes.	2			6
	10. An excellent understanding and knowledge of the relevant public sector policy landscape (specifically National development Plan and Department of Education’s Action Plan 2014 towards the Realisation of Schooling 2025).				
	11. Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity.	2			6
	12. At least 30% of the consulting team must be PDIs.				

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight x score	Min. weighted score
Ethical conduct and interpersonal skills	<p>13. Understand ethical issues relating evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.</p> <p>14. Demonstrated experience in leading an evaluation using facilitation and learning approaches to promote ownership and build capacity amongst stakeholders of evaluations and evaluations results.</p> <p>15. Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity.</p>	2			4
Evaluation Leadership	16. Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation to promote commitment and ownership of evaluation.	2			6
	17. Strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation where needed.	1			2
Evaluation Craft					
Evaluative discipline and practice	18. Expert knowledge of evaluation methodologies such as quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, tools and techniques and experience in designing and applying them.	1			2
Research practice	19. The ability to systematically gather, analyse and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality and spotting gaps.	2			6
Implementation of Evaluation					
Evaluation planning	20. Ability to develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators	2			4
	21. Ability to design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.	2			6
Managing evaluation	22. Ability to manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards	1			2

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight x score	Min. weighted score
	23. Demonstrated experience of building ownership of evaluations and evaluations results, working in ways in which builds capacity and commitment among stakeholders.				
Report writing and communication	24. Ability to write clear, concise and focused reports (using the 1/3/25 rule) that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other.	1			2

Table 4. Functional evaluation criteria to be applied in assessing the proposals

Minimum requirements: Service providers that submit acceptable proposals and scored at least the minimum weighed score for each element as well as the minimum total weighted score of 75% based on the average of total weighted scores awarded by the evaluation panel members.

Proposals should clearly address the project description and the functional evaluation criteria mentioned above.

8.4.3. Price evaluation: The PPPFA

Only proposals that meet the minimum requirements under the functional evaluation section above will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 evaluation method will be used for proposals above R1,000,000 and the 80/20 evaluation method will be used for proposals below R1,000,000. Points will be awarded to service providers for attaining the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment (B-BBEE) status level of contribution in accordance with the table contained in SBD 6.1 (see attached bid documents).

In the application of the 80/20 preference point system, if all proposals received exceed R1,000,000 then the request for proposals will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable proposals received are below the R1,000,000 threshold then all proposals received will be evaluated on the 80/20 preference point system.

In the application of the 90/10 preference point system, if all proposals received are equal to or below R1 000 000 then the request for proposals will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable proposals received are above the R1 000 000 threshold then all proposals received will be evaluated on the 90/10 preference point system.

In relation to this evaluation the **90/10 preference point system will apply.**

9. Intellectual property rights

The intellectual property of all deliverables lies with the DBE and DPME. All documents and other products should be treated as confidential, and should not be passed on to a third party.

The material compiled by the service provider for the DBE and DPME may not be used in any form or for any purpose other than the purpose stipulated in the agreement.

If the service provider wishes to use such material in any other form or for any other purpose, including, but not limited to, workshops, media releases and the like, it must submit to the DBE and DPME a written motivation for such use. The departments will request approval from the designated officer in whom copyright vests. Only once the designated officer has granted written approval will the departments convey such written approval to the service provider and will the service provider have permission for such usage.

Evaluation material is highly sensitive. The ownership of the material generated during the evaluation shall remain with DBE (FLBP) and DPME. However, evaluations that are part of the national evaluation plan will be made publically available, unless there are major concerns about making them public.

10. General and specific conditions of contract

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the signing of a service level agreement between the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in the Presidency and the successful service provider.

11. Enquiries

Evaluation process and commissioning:	Content:
Antonio Hercules The Presidency, Department of Performance Monitoring & Evaluation (DPME) Office: 012 312 0164 Cell: 071 491 7488 Email: antonio@po-dpme.gov.za	Gerrit Coetzee Department of Basic Education (DBE) Initial Teacher Education Office: 012 357 3380 Call Centre: 0800 202 933 E-mail: Coetzee.G@dbe.gov.za
