



Department of Basic Education  
Republic of South Africa



The Presidency  
Department of Planning, Monitoring &  
Evaluation

## Terms of Reference for the Implementation Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme

**RFP / Bid number: 14/229**

**Compulsory briefing session**

**Date: 28 August 2014**

**Time: 09:00 – 10:00**

**Venue: Boardroom 288, East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria**

Please note that security procedures at the Union Building can take up to 30 minutes and that positive proof of identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to be granted

**Bid closing date: 12 September 2014, 12h00**

with provision of one electronic and 6 (six) hard copies.

**Date for presentation by shortlisted service providers: 19 September 2014**

**Time: 11:30 – 16:30**

**Venue: Boardroom 288, East Wing, Union Buildings, Pretoria**

Please note that security procedures at the Union Building can take up to 30 minutes and that positive proof of identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to be granted

### 1. Background information and Rationale

In recognition of the critical role of learner and educator well-being in achieving quality educational outcomes, the Department of Basic Education has adopted the Care and Support for Teaching and Learning (CSTL) programme to address barriers to learning. Hunger and malnutrition are amongst the barriers to optimum participation in education. The CSTL has thus identified Nutritional Support, an integral part of the overall strategy of the South African government for poverty alleviation, as one of the nine (9) key priority areas. It is a common adage that effective learning is not possible on an empty stomach; hungry learners are easily distracted and are unable to concentrate in class. It is against this background that the democratic government established the Primary School Nutrition Programme (PSNP) in 1994, which was later, renamed the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) (*Source: National School Nutrition Programme Annual Report 2012/13*).

The first 10 years of its implementation was managed by the Department of Health. However in 2004, the programme was transferred to the then Department of Education. The programme is administered by the Department of Basic Education (DBE) which provides oversight while implementation takes place at school level through management by Education Districts and Provincial Education Departments (PEDs). In addition, partnerships with key partners such as the

business sector and Nongovernmental Organisations (NGOs) have been supported to support the programme (*Source: National School Nutrition Programme Annual Report 2012/13*). The National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) was conceptualised primarily as an educational intervention aimed at enhancing the educational experience of the neediest primary school learners through promoting punctual school attendance, alleviating short term hunger, improving concentration and contributing to general health development. The overall purpose of the programme is to improve the health and nutritional status of the poorest primary and secondary school learners. The programme's specific objectives include:

- a) Contribute to enhanced learning through school feeding;
- b) Strengthen nutrition education in schools in order to promote healthy lifestyles;
- c) Promote sustainable food production initiatives in schools; and
- d) Develop partnerships to enhance the programme.

Since its inception, the NSNP catered only for learners in public primary schools. However, following the 2006 survey by the Fiscal and Finance Committee, it was confirmed that there was a need to expand the programme to secondary schools. School nutrition in secondary schools was first implemented in quintile 1 secondary schools in April 2009, and has been phased in to quintile 2 and 3 public secondary schools in April 2010 and 2011 respectively. (*Source: National School Nutrition Programme Annual Report 2009/10*). For the 2012/13 financial year, the programme targeted a total of 8 892 088 learners in quintile 1 – 3 primary and secondary schools nationally. By the end of the review period, the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP) had reached a total of 9 159 773 learners in 21 400 quintile 1 – 3 primary and secondary schools as well as identified special schools (*Source: National School Nutrition Programme Annual Report 2012/13*).

Meals provided to learners follow the South African Food Based Dietary Guidelines derived from the Department of Health, which provide for a variety of food items including fresh vegetables and fruit. Whilst learners are provided with nutritious meals, the programme also teaches learners and teachers to establish and maintain good eating and lifestyle habits through nutrition education with lesson plans and other Learning and Teaching Support Materials (LTSMs); as well as the establishment of food gardens to supplement the menu in line with South African Food Based Dietary Guidelines and in order to provide learners, teachers and communities with skills to grow their own food contributing towards long-term household food security.

The NSNP is funded through a Conditional Grant that is transferred to provinces according to the Division of Revenue Act (DORA) and other directives from the Department of Basic Education and the National Treasury (Grant Framework 2011/12). The allocation criteria to provinces are based on the poverty distribution table used in the National Norms and Standards for School Funding as gazetted by the Minister of Education on 17 October 2008 where 95% of the allocation is intended to cover expenditure on feeding specifically while 5% of the allocation is intended to cover non-personnel recurrent items that have direct impact on the operation of the programme. The Grant Framework stipulates certain conditions to which provincial departments must adhere (Grant Framework 2014):

- a) Financial Management Requirements: The submission of approved business plans developed in accordance with the stipulated requirements of DoRA for the related financial year and all conditions associated with budgeting and financial management by a public entity as defined in the Public Finance Management Act (PFMA);
- b) Financial Implementation Requirements:
- c) Minimum Feeding Requirement: All learners in the targeted quintile 1 – 3 primary and secondary schools as well as identified special schools on all school days; an average meal

cost per learner per day, inclusive of cooking fuel and honorarium at R2.46 for primary and special schools; and R3.46 for secondary schools.

The NSNP Directorate located in the DBE is responsible for co-ordinating the programme. The Directorate plays a key role in providing strategic direction, leadership, guidance and support as well as programme monitoring and evaluation to ensure that implementation is in line with the DBE strategic goals and adheres to the Conditional Grant Framework.

Other stakeholders include: district managers, circuit co-coordinators, members of the SGBs, school principals, teacher coordinators, volunteer food handlers, gardeners and food suppliers.

Teacher coordinators and principals in the programme are responsible for the management and administration of the programme. The Volunteer Food Handlers (VFHs), mostly parents, prepare the nutritious meals with limited resources; the teachers supervise that learners receive their nutritious meals every school day; and the gardeners assist in growing school vegetable gardens.

The NSNP has also significantly contributed to the local communities in which the participating schools are located. Local people are employed to serve as VHF, and in some instances, as suppliers as well. This appointment of local people contributes to the local economic development (LED).

The NSNP is of great strategic importance, relies on many stakeholders and involves a large financial commitment from government. The Delivery Agreement for Outcome 1: “Improved quality of basic education” to which the Minister of Basic Education is a principle signatory, the Action Plan 2014: Towards the Realisation of Schooling 2025 (Action Plan) as well as the National Development Plan 2030 capture the significance of education and the goals of the department and the sector overall in order to realise the provision of quality education nationally. It is therefore of primary importance to evaluate the effectiveness of this programme and to establish how to improve programme effectiveness. The evaluation is intended to shed light on the extent to which all the various steps and processes are in place so as to ultimately contribute to programme impact.

## **2. Purpose of the evaluation**

The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether the NSNP is being *implemented* in a way that is *likely* to result in significant health and educational benefits to primary school learners. It must be noted that implementation of the programme spans across both primary and secondary school but due to time and resource limitations, this evaluation will focus on primary schools only.

A scoping study found that it would not be possible to conduct an impact evaluation of the NSNP given the difficulty in identifying a comparison group of children who did not receive the programme and yet are otherwise similar to programme beneficiaries. Therefore, this TOR envisages an implementation evaluation to identify how the National School Nutrition Programme is being implemented and what could be the likely impacts of the programme.

## **3. Focus of the Evaluation**

### **3.1 Evaluation Questions**

The evaluation will respond to the following questions:

1. Is the programme implemented as planned?
2. Are operational procedures effective to ensure the timely delivery of food?

3. Are learners receiving quality meals and services?
4. What are the variations of implementation at different sites or by different provinces?
5. Is the programme reaching the intended beneficiaries?
6. Is there evidence that NSNP enhances learning behaviour? (Likely Impact of the Programme)
7. Should NSNP be up-scaled? How can it be strengthened and up-scaled for better impact?
8. Are there other spinoffs of the NSNP?

### 3.2 Potential Users of the Evaluation

The following Table depicts potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use them:

**Table 1: Potential Users of the evaluation**

Potential Users of the Evaluation	How they will use it?
Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	Facilitate and advise on improvements
National Department of Basic Education	Promote accountability and transparency, justification for funding, better inform policy decision making process and introduce reforms of the programme where necessary
Provincial Departments of Education	Promote accountability and transparency, justification for funding, promote the most appropriate procurement model, better inform policy decision making process and monitoring
Department of Health, National Treasury	Provide information on value for money
Department of Social Development	Better inform policy decision making process
Civil Society (including donor organisations and business)	Avoid duplication of research. Inform future research. Assist in the allocation of resources and prioritisation of interventions

### 3.3 Scope of the evaluation

The main objective of the evaluation is to conduct and report on a nationally representative sample survey of quintile 1 -3 primary schools. The sampling frame should include all public primary schools in quintiles 1 – 3, including special schools.

#### 3.3.1 Time period under review

The evaluation will cover the implementation of the NSNP from its inception in 1994 up to end of March 2014 with specific focus on the 2012/ 13 - 2013/2014 financial year.

#### 3.3.2 Themes covered/ not covered

The table below depicts the main themes covered in order to assess the scope of the evaluation. The evaluation is not limited to these themes. The themes may be expanded in order to comprehensively and effectively answer the evaluation questions.

**Table 2: Themes covered/ not covered**

Themes/components covered	Themes/ components not covered
Procurement processes	Impact of NSNP on health status
Delivery of food	Impact of NSNP on test scores or educational attainment
Storage of food	
Preparation of meals	
Nutritional content of meals	
Existence and use of food gardens	
Monitoring by PEDs and district offices	
School planning and timetabling	
Nutrition education	
The eating of meals (and other food at school)	

### 3.3.3 Geographic coverage

A nationally representative sample of quintile 1 -3 primary schools disaggregated by province with a minimum of 270 Primary Schools (at least 30 schools per province). The methodology will include visits to schools, education district offices, and Provincial Education Departments (PEDs), according to the indicated specifications.

## 4 Evaluation plan

### 4.1 Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

The core products expected from the evaluation are the following:

- **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 judging performance.
- Further development of a programme Theory of Change and Logframe (using the DPME Guideline on Planning of New Implementation Programmes as well as Annexure B).
- **A Literature Review** should accompany the inception report and should inform the Theory of Change.
- **Final data collection instruments** and other tools designed to measure aspects of the Theory of Change.
- **Analytical Framework and Analysis plan.**
- Field work report.
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/3/25 format (see Action Points).
- A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report.
- The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/3/25 format, in hard copy and electronic.
- Proposed changes to the intervention design if needed - if the design is found to be inadequate then the evaluators will need to suggest what revisions to the logic model are needed, and the theory of change. The department may then need to redesign the intervention. This may be part of the final report.
- **Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected.
- **A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and other presentations as required.**

## 5. Methodology / Evaluation Approach

The prospective Service Provider should also propose specific methods appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in section 3 above.

It is recommended that the main component of this implementation evaluation should be a national representative sample survey of Primary Schools. Therefore, the main methodologies used will be quantitative analysis of data produced from the survey. Data should thus be collected in such a way that lends itself to quantitative analysis. There will also be scope for some qualitative work to complement the quantitative analysis. For example, interviews with key Programme Managers at the National Department of Basic Education Department, Provincial Departments of Education, District Offices, selected schools and Service Providers may produce qualitative evidence on aspects of programme implementation. Amongst others, the approach should include the following:

### 5.1 Document Review

There should be a review of strategic programme documents including legislations, frameworks, plans, guidelines reports, and evaluations. In addition, a review of an assessments, evaluation and monitoring documents on the programme should be completed.

### 5.2 Literature review/benchmarking:

A review of international research regarding the implementation of school feeding programmes should be conducted. Flowing from this review, the Service Provider should identify several key characteristics and contextual factors that typically determine the effectiveness of feeding programmes. In addition, previous evaluations, and literature on evaluation programs should be reviewed. This exercise should inform the Theory of Change and the survey instruments.

### 5.3 Interviews

Interviews should be conducted with key officials in the DBE; PEDs, district offices and schools; and members of School Governing Bodies.

### 5.4 Sample survey

Conduct a school based survey administered to learners; food-handlers; NSNP coordinator at the school; members of the School Management Team and the School Governing Body. This may also include an inspection of documents and facilities at schools where appropriate. (The Theory of Change should inform the questionnaire development process).

### 5.5 Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis

Analysis of data from the sample survey conducted, other national and provincial data on the NSNP; EMIS; and other relevant data as provided by the DBE or PEDs including the School Monitoring Survey (SMS); and NSNP data available from partners and in the public domain;

### 5.6 Learning processes

- 5.5.1 Reflective processes with DBE officials and a stakeholder workshop to reflect on the lessons, emerging findings and how the system can be strengthened.

### 5.7 Review the Theory Change and Logical Framework of the Nation School Nutrition Programme

- 5.6.1 Propose an initial theory of change and logical framework of the programme and submit a revised theory of change at the end of the evaluations.
- 5.6.2 Recommend how the system should be revised /strengthened. Recommendations should be specific and practical, remembering that an improvement plan will be developed following the evaluation.

## 6. Milestones

The duration of the evaluation will be 8 months. The evaluation will start in October 2014 and should be completed by May 2015. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 3** below.

**Table 3: Outline project plan and payment schedule**

Deliverable	Delivery Date	% payment
<b>Approved Inception Report</b>	October 2014	10%
<b>Service Provider contract signed</b>	October 2014	
<b>Literature review</b> including International Comparative Study	October 2014	
Approved final data collection instruments, analysis plan and other tools	November 2014	10%
Piloting of the tools	November 2014	
Fieldwork –sample survey and interviews	November 2014	
Submission of field work report	February 2015	20%
<b>Draft Consolidated Evaluation Report</b> for review.	March 2015	30%
A <b>workshop</b> with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	March 2015	
Submission of the <b>Final Draft Report full and in 1/3/25 format</b>	April 2015	
<b>Approved final evaluation report</b> (approval by Steering Committee)	May 2015	20%
<b>Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation</b> (including interview transcripts).	May 2015	10%

## 7. Competencies and Skills-set

The following Table of generic competencies is required of the service provider:

**Table 4: Competencies and Skills-set**

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
<b>1 Overarching considerations</b>	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Demonstrate expertise in nutrition studies and the impact thereof; Good knowledge of government systems and practical implementation issues in the relevant sphere of government (may need to specify specific areas in relation to the research focus); High level knowledge of the relevant legislative frameworks in relation to Outcome 1 and with the ability to appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments Perform appropriately in cross-cultural roles with cultural sensitivity and attends appropriately to issues of diversity
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

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
	of stakeholders
<b>2 Evaluation leadership</b>	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively. Display strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation where needed
<b>3 Evaluation craft</b>	
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  Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice would be an advantage, particularly in middle-income and African countries.
3.2 Research practice	Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.  Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps.  Demonstrate expertise in Nutrition
<b>4 Implementation of evaluation</b>	
4.1 Evaluation planning	Demonstrate experience in running a large scale sample survey
4.2 Theory of change	Demonstrate the ability to develop a clear theory of change with quality programme log frames with good programme logic and indicators
4.3 Design	Ability to design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.4 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives in politically sensitive areas on time and to appropriate standards
4.5 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

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

- 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;

- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software; and
- Strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation where needed.

## 8. Service Provider

The service provider should specify the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. **Inclusion of international experts with proven experience would be an advantage** in this evaluation. The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Postgraduate Degree. At least 30% of team should be Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDI).

The team must possess relevant qualification(s), including at least a Postgraduate Degree. The team leader must have at least 15 years' experience including working with government at a high level, and of leading politically sensitive and complex evaluations. He/she may well be an expert in public sector reform, planning or M&E.

## 9. Management Arrangements

The service provider will be managed by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will be chaired by the Chief Director for Strategic Planning, Research and Coordination (DBE). The Steering Committee will make decisions on project timelines, ensure risk management processes are implemented, and address challenges in terms of accessing schools.

### 9.1 Role of Steering Committee

The Steering Committee will:

- a) Report back to their principals on key decisions made by the committee;
- b) Approve the project plan for the evaluation;
- c) Recommend approval of the terms of reference for the evaluation;
- d) Approve peer reviewers and technical resource persons to be co-opted into the steering committee through a formalised process and based on capacities and skills identified by the same;
- e) Evaluate proposals and provide the assessment of these on functionality criteria to the commissioning department (DPME), recommending those who pass the minimum standard. The commissioning department will then complete the selection process;
- f) During the inception phase, review the proposal by the service provider and recommend changes in approach, methodology and format;
- g) Review the inception report, consider comments from peer reviewers, recommend changes if needed, and approve the inception report;
- h) Provide feedback on the methodology of the study, including sampling;
- i) Approve data collection instruments and tools;
- j) Provide feedback on draft reports, including comments from peer reviewers to the service provider, and a workshop with stakeholders if appropriate;
- k) Approve the final report as a satisfactory evaluation report that fulfils the requirements reflected in the terms of reference; and
- l) Provide feedback on recommendations emanating from the reports produced.

### 9.2 Peer Reviewers

National and international peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment. Refer to the DPME Guideline on Peer Reviewers on DPME website for more detail.

### 9.3 Reporting Arrangements

The evaluation project manager to whom the service provider will report is Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME ([jabu@po-dpme.gov.za](mailto:jabu@po-dpme.gov.za) / 0123120158 / 0823409283)

## 10. Structure and Contents of Proposal to be submitted

### 10.1 Structure and contents of proposal

A structure and contents of a proposal required from the service provider is shown in the Box below.

#### Structure of a proposal

The tenderer must provide the following details. Failure to provide this will lead to disqualification.

- 1 Understanding of the outcomes system and its working in practice and the TORs
- 2 Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation (e.g. literature and documentation review, data collection, tools, sample, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the TORs, examples of evaluation questions suggested, process elements)
- 3 Activity-based evaluation plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities – it is particularly important that effort levels for key national and international resources are clear)
- 4 Detailed 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 for each member of the team)
- 7 Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments and PDI/young evaluators)
- 8 Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

#### Attachments

Examples of reports of 2 politically sensitive and complex evaluations undertaken  
 CVs of key personnel  
 Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

## 11. Information for service providers

Service providers are expected to attend a compulsory briefing session. Only service providers that attend the compulsory briefing session may submit proposals.

Short listed candidates will be required to present their proposal to the evaluation committee as part of the selection process.

The following documents may be beneficial for the service provider:

- a) Report on scoping study to evaluate the feasibility of undertaking an impact evaluation of the NSNP and Grade R based on existing data sources – *University of Stellenbosch (Research on Socio-Economic Policy)*, June 2012;
- b) Evaluation of the School Nutrition Programme - National Report for South Africa, May 2008 (*Department of Education and UNICEF*); and
- c) Report on the Evaluation of the National School Nutrition Programme (NSNP), March 2008 (*Public Service Commission*).

The service provider should provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition short-listed candidates will be required to present their proposals as part of the selection process. Tenders should be submitted by **12.00** on the **12<sup>th</sup> of September 2014** with electronic and 6 hard copies.

### **11.1 Key background documents**

A list of key documents will be provided at the bidders briefing meeting.

### **11.2 Evaluation criteria for proposals**

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two main criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors must cover the competences outlined in **section 8** as demonstrated through:

- Quality of proposal; clear expression of how the project will be implemented;
- Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
- Team leaders' levels of expertise;
- Qualifications and expertise of the proposed evaluation team members;
- Inclusion of PDI members in the evaluation team who will gain experience.

### **11.3 Pricing requirements**

All prices must be inclusive of VAT. Price escalations and the conditions of escalation should be clearly indicated. No variation of contract price or scope creep will be permitted. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in these terms of reference

### **11.4 Evaluation of proposals**

#### **11.4.1 Administrative compliance**

Only proposals and quotations that comply with all administrative requirements will be considered acceptable for further evaluation. Incomplete and late bids / quotes will not be considered. The following documentation must be submitted for each quote/bid:

- Documents specified in the tender documents (distributed separately from this ToR)
- Any other requirement specified in the ToR

#### **11.4.2 Functional Evaluation**

Only bids/quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All bids/quotes 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

**Table 5** outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competences outlined in section **8** which will be used in assessing the proposals.

**Table 5: Functional evaluation criteria**

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
<b>The quality of the proposal</b>	<b>Addressing the TORs</b> 1= The requirements of the evaluation not addressed at all. 2= Requirements of the evaluation partially addressed but not convincing. 3= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and convincingly. 4= Requirements of the evaluation addressed well and additional value added	4			8
<b>The quality of the team</b>	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment, with the ability to:				
<b>1 Overarching considerations</b>					
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Understand the relevant sector/intervention and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments  1= Unconvincing that understand the sector/intervention 2= Some understanding of the sector but not deep 3= Good understanding of the sector and how implementation happens 4= Good understanding of the sector nationally and internationally, and can bring international insight	3			6
<b>2 Evaluation leadership</b>	Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders in relation to the following three key role players				
Composition of team	<b>Project manager</b> has experience of managing successfully projects of this size previously (examples and references to be provided) 1= Managed successfully <3 projects or of less than R1m 2= Managed successfully 1-2 projects of R1m and above 3= Managed successfully 3 projects of R1m and above 4= Managed successfully 3 evaluation or research projects of R1m and above	3			6
	<b>Evaluation specialist</b> has experience of undertaking successfully evaluations of this size and nature previously (examples and references to be provided) 1= Undertaken successfully <3 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 2= Undertaken successfully 3-5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Undertaken successfully >5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 4= Undertaken successfully >5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 and with knowledge	4			8

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
	of international best practice (convincing internationally as an evaluator in this type of work)				
	<b>Sector specialist</b> has deep knowledge of the sector 1= Worked in the sector for less than 3 years For all others a minimum of a masters degree plus: 2= Worked in the sector for 3-5 years and a reasonable understanding 3= Worked in the sector for 5-10 years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned 4= Worked in the sector for 10+ years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned as well as international good practice	4			8
PDI role in team	<b>At least 30% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)<sup>1</sup></b> and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation 1= Team consists of less than 30% PDIs and less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs 2= Team consists of 30% PDIs but less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs 3= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company) 4= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs, and one of the specialists above is PDI (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company)	3			9
Capacity development	<b>Capacity development</b> elements and building capacity of government partners, namely: 1= No indication of capacity development 2= Some capacity development included in proposal but not well thought through 3= Well thought through strategy of how they would use junior government staff on the evaluation 4= Interesting/innovative model for building capacity in evaluation of junior and potentially other government staff	3			6
<b>3 Evaluation craft</b>					
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	<b>Demonstrated experience of undertaking quality evaluations (so using evaluation knowledge) relevant to the evaluation.</b> 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work)	4			8

<sup>1</sup> By PDIs we mean Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
	4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 (convincing as an evaluation organisation in this type of work)				
	<p>Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries.</p> <p>1= No international experience available</p> <p>2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project</p> <p>3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight</p> <p>4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or evaluation)</p>	1			2
3.2 Research practice	<p><b>Demonstrated experience of systematically gathering, analysing, and synthesising relevant evidence</b>, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and writing effective research reports.</p> <p>1= Organisation has undertaken successfully &lt;2 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate knowledge of (qualitative or quantitative research)*<sup>2</sup> and are over R500 000</p> <p>2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000</p> <p>3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000</p> <p>4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R1 000 000 (convincing as an organisation undertaking this type of research)</p>	3			6
<b>4 Implementation of evaluation</b>					
4.1 Evaluation planning	<p><b>Approach, design, methodology for the evaluation</b></p> <p>1= Not likely to address the needs of the evaluation</p> <p>2= Some parts of the evaluation addressed satisfactorily but overall not convincing</p> <p>3= Addresses these satisfactorily. Confident the evaluation can be implemented.</p> <p>4= Addresses these satisfactorily. In addition some very interesting approaches suggested for undertaking the evaluation which are likely to increase the use</p>	4			12

<sup>2</sup> Define the nature of research expertise needed depending on the type of evaluation

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimu m
	<p><b>Quality of activity-based plan</b> (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)</p> <p>1= No plan</p> <p>2= Activity-based plan produced but not convincing that the methodology can be delivered using resources proposed</p> <p>3= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology</p> <p>4= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology, and innovative so that more can be delivered</p>	3			9
4.3 Report writing and communication	<p><b>Write clear, concise and focused reports</b> 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</p> <p>1= No examples of writing provided or examples show poor writing skills</p> <p>2= Examples provided show adequate but not good writing skills, but use of evidence is not good</p> <p>3= Examples provided show good reports which demonstrate use of evidence, good logic, and are well-written</p> <p>4= Well-written and punchy reports with good use of info graphics, good summaries, good use of evidence</p>	3			6
Total		43			

Minimum requirement: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (75), based on the average of scores awarded by the evaluation panel members.

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

#### 11.4.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA

Only bids/quotes that meet the minimum required indicated under functional evaluation above will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 evaluation method will be used for bids from R1 million and the 80/20 method will be used for bids/quotes below R1 million. Points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the 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 bids received exceed R1 000 000, the bid will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are within the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received will be evaluated on the 80/20 preference point system.

#### In this bid, the 90/10 preference point system will apply.

In the application of the 90/10 preference point system, if all bids received are equal to or below R1 000 000, the bid will be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are above the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received will be evaluated on the 90/10 preference point system.

## **12. General and special conditions of contract**

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

## **13. Intellectual property**

DPME and DBE will own copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material brought in to the assignment or that owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without the written permission of DPME and DBE.

## **14. Enquiries**

Regarding the evaluation process and commissioning, please contact Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME: Tel. 012 3120158 / Cell: 073 476 3503, E-mail: [jabu@po-dpme.gov.za](mailto:jabu@po-dpme.gov.za) but in terms of content issues, please contact Ms Neo Rakwena, Director: School Nutrition, DBE, Tel: (012) 357 3419 email: [Rakwena.n@dbe.gov.za](mailto:Rakwena.n@dbe.gov.za)

---