



planning, monitoring and evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

TENDER / CALL FOR PROPOSALS TERMS OF REFERENCE / SPECIFICATIONS

Request for proposals for:	Implementation Evaluation of the National Curriculum Statement Grade R to 12 : focusing on the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS)
SCM reference number:	RFP – 15/1358
Closing date and time:	19 October 2015 at 12:00 pm
Compulsory briefing session:	05 October 2015 Time: 10:00 – 11:30 Venue: Union Buildings, Room TBC

1. BID INFORMATION

Information on the format and delivery of bids are contained in the attached bid documents. Please take note of closing date and date of compulsory briefing session (if any).

2. PROPOSAL FORMAT

- **Annexure A** must contain the published terms of reference (this document).
- **Annexure B** must contain the proposal and services offered.
- **Annexure C** must contain a summary of qualifications of employees and past experience.
- **Annexure D** must contain pricing information. Price proposals should be fully inclusive to deliver the outputs indicated in the terms of reference and must be submitted in a separate envelope.
- **Annexure E** must contain all other forms / certificates required (SBDs, Tax clearance certificate etc. – see bid documents).

3. CONDITIONS OF BID

3.1. Administrative compliance

See bid documents

3.2. 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 by the Bid Evaluation Committee against the functional criteria indicated in the Terms of Reference.

Minimum functional requirements: 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 Bid Evaluation Committee members.

The Department reserves the right to call bidders that meet the minimum functional requirements to present their proposals. The Bid Evaluation Committee may decide to amend the scoring assigned to a particular bid based on the presentation made.

3.3. Price evaluation: The PPPFA

See bid documents.

1. Background information and Rationale

In July 2009, the Minister of Basic Education, Minister Motshekga, appointed a panel of experts to investigate the nature of the challenges and problems experienced in the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement and to develop a set of recommendations designed to improve the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement.

The Minister's brief was in response to wide-ranging comments in writing and verbally from a range of stakeholders such as teachers, parents, teacher unions, school management and academics, over several years, on the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement. While there has been positive support for the new curriculum, there has also been considerable criticism of various aspects of its implementation, manifesting in teacher overload, confusion and stress and widespread learner underperformance in international and local assessments. Whilst several minor interventions have been made over time to address some of the challenges of implementing the curriculum, these changes had not had the desired effect.

The panel consequently set out to identify the challenges and pressure points, particularly with reference to teachers and learning quality, to deliberate on how things could be improved and to develop a set of practical interventions.

The panel presented a five-year plan to improve teaching and learning via a set of short-term interventions aimed at providing immediate relief and focus for teachers; and medium and longer-term recommendations with the vision to achieve real improvement in student learning within a five year period.

Part of the recommendations and responses was the repackaged curriculum policy. The result of this is the National Curriculum Statement Grades R-12 (NCS), which stipulates policy on curriculum and assessment in the schooling sector. The NCS builds on the previous curriculum but also updates it and aims to provide clearer specification of what is to be taught and learnt on a term-by-term basis. The NCS gives expression to the knowledge, skills and values worth learning in South African schools. It aims to ensure that children acquire and apply knowledge and skills in ways that are meaningful to their own lives. In this regard, the curriculum promotes knowledge in local contexts, while being sensitive to global imperatives.

The National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 12 comprises the following:

- National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements Grades R – 12 in schools (CAPS) for each approved school subject as listed in the policy document National Senior Certificate: A qualification at Level 4 on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF); (The evaluation will focus mainly on this component).
- The policy document, National policy pertaining to the programme and promotion requirements of the National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 12; and
- The National Protocol for Assessment Grades R – 12

The NCS was gazetted in 2011 and implementation was phased-in across different grades. The NCS was introduced in schools in 2012 for the Foundation Phase and Grade 10; the intermediate phase and Grade 11 in 2013, and the Senior Phase and Grade 12 in 2014.

The past 5 years have been a period of relative stability in curriculum implementation with the senior phase and Grade 12 being the last phase for newly implementing grade of the NCS. Public interest in education, particularly the curriculum, remains a focal area amongst stakeholders including the public, education partners, teacher organisations and other Departments. Research on implementation of the curriculum has been conducted through various platforms and by various institutions including quality assurance evaluations of curriculum statements by UMALUSI completed at the request of the DBE. One of the themes

expressed repeatedly in the Further Education and Training (FET) evaluation report is that, “while the curriculum provides for the development of the full range of cognitive abilities, the actual implementation of these curricula seldom gives sufficient opportunities for the development and practice of the creative, analytic and synthesising skills in the curriculum”, Umalusi (2014). Further research has included the Ministerial Report on Implementation of National Curriculum Statement, amongst others.-

Although the body of research on the curriculum in South Africa has continued to grow, to date, limited information is available about the experiences of schools, especially, teachers, in the implementation of the curriculum.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

To evaluate whether the curriculum has been implemented as specified in the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS) and how implementation can be strengthened.

3. Focus of the Evaluation

3.1 Evaluation Questions

The assignment will assess:

1. To what extent has CAPS been implemented?
2. Do teachers understand CAPS and do they have the necessary capabilities and motivation to implement the National Curriculum Statements according to CAPS and associated policies?
3. Are the support systems to support CAPS implementation working?
4. Is the theory of change working as expected? Based on how the theory of change is working, are we likely to see the planned outcomes of CAPS?
5. Based on the likelihood of achieving the outcomes, is the conceptualisation of CAPS and the systems for implementing it relevant and appropriate for the context it operates in?
6. Are there any gaps and challenges in the CAPS design and content? If any, are they hampering implementation?
7. How should the CAPS design and the systems for implementing it be strengthened?

The questions specified above are the minimum main questions for the evaluation. The service provider is expected to elaborate on these as well as develop sub-questions.

3.2 Potential Users of the Evaluation

The following table indicates potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use them:

Potential Users of the Evaluation	How they will use it?
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Identify improvements to CAPS which DBE needs to take forward
Department of Basic Education	Understand how CAPS is working, suggestions for improving design of CAPS and targeting of funding, and where it is necessary to introduce reforms of the Programme
	Understand how to improve implementation of CAPS, including budget allocations.
Department of Higher Education and	Design of Education Faculty policies, programmes and

Training	interventions including initial teacher education programmes and policies
Other organisations (including universities, SAQA, Teacher Unions, UMALUSI, NGOs, and ETDP SETA amongst others)	Design of Education Faculty policies, programmes and interventions including initial teacher education programmes and policies

3.3 Scope of the evaluation

3.3.1 Time period

The NCS implementation was staggered and therefore the time period for implementation differs per grade. NCS was introduced in schools in 2012 for the Foundation Phase and Grade 10. In 2013, it was then introduced in the intermediate phase and Grade 11, and in 2014, in the Senior Phase and Grade 12.

3.3.2 Components

Although the NCS has three components namely; the National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement Grades R – 12 in schools (CAPS), the policy document and the National Protocol for Assessment Grades R – 12, **this evaluation will focus mainly on the National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), specifically on the implementation in the Foundation Phase and Grade 10.**

A National Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement is a single, comprehensive, and concise policy document, which has replaced the Subject and Learning Area Statements, Learning Programme Guidelines and Subject Assessment Guidelines for all the subjects listed in the National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 12.

Although the focus of the evaluation will be on the implementation of CAPS, by the nature of the design of the NCS, the evaluation will have to reflect on the linkages between the three components.

This evaluation will focus on particular elements of the theory of change including teaching practices, teacher enactment of lessons, learner engagement in exercises as observed in lessons and workbooks, learner assessment and teacher assessment practice, as well as CAPS implementation support mechanisms including teacher training, and the NCS policy documents. In addition, the evaluation should also look at teacher perceptions of the education system.

3.3.3 Geographic coverage

The evaluation will be limited to **four provinces** in South Africa, namely; Gauteng, Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga. The evaluation will furthermore be limited to quintile 1-3 ordinary public schools in South Africa. In line with the staggered implementation of CAPS as indicated above, the evaluation will focus on the Foundation Phase in primary schools and Grade 10.

3.3.4 Outside the scope:

The service provider will not be required to focus on the policy document (National policy pertaining to the programme and promotion requirements of the National Curriculum Statement Grades R – 12) and the National Protocol for Assessment Grades R – 12. The service provider will however have to consider and refer to these policies in evaluating CAPS implementation.

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 revised overall methodology. This forms the basis for initial agreements and expectations in the evaluation.
- **A Literature Review** covering *inter alia*, international expectations and experiences with national school curricula, an overview of curriculum development in South Africa, assessment practices in South African schools, classroom practices in South Africa, and the introduction and implementation of the NCS, focusing on CAPS in recent years, should inform an analytical framework as well as the detailed methodology.
- **Report structure**, detailed methodology, content structure for the final report **final data collection instruments** and other tools designed to measure how the Theory of Change is working.
- **Field work report**.
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/5/25 format (see Action Points) (note there may be 2 versions after comments). This includes proposed changes to the **delivery of CAPS**. A revised theory of change and logical framework should be part of the final report.
- A **workshop** with stakeholders to discuss the draft report. This may be held discuss initial findings and recommendations before the draft report.
- The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic.
- **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. Evaluation approach and methodology

The prospective Service Provider should propose specific methods appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in section 3 above. The minimum requirements and recommendations for the methodology are provided below.

The recommended main component of this implementation evaluation will be qualitative, through a set of case studies amongst a subset of schools as well as semi-structured interviews as specified below. These methods will need to test the theory of change on the programme and result in refinements based on how the programme is currently working. The expected main components of the research are indicated below.

5.1 Document review

There should be a review of strategic programme documents including legislation, frameworks, plans, guidelines, reports, and evaluations/reviews. Specifically, documentation on the content and records of NCS/CAPS training provided by the DBE, PEDs, Districts, and teacher unions should be reviewed.

In addition, a review of selected NCS documents should be completed, the relevant documents for review will be provided by the programme managers. This will include all policy documents including Subject Statements.

5.2 Literature review/benchmarking

A review of international research regarding the implementation of curricula should be conducted. Flowing from this review, the Service Provider should identify several key characteristics and contextual factors that typically determine the effectiveness of curriculum implementation. In addition local and developing country reports of previous evaluations, and literature on the curriculum policy and implementation should be reviewed. This exercise should further develop the draft Theory of Change and provide an analytical framework to inform the case studies and quantitative analysis.

5.3 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews should be conducted with key Programme Managers at the national Department of Basic Education Department, Provincial Departments of Education and districts. In addition interview should also be conducted with subject advisors, School Management Teams including principals, and teachers.

All stakeholders should be asked detailed questions about frequency, coverage and quality of NCS/CAPS training received, focusing on the Foundation Phase and Grade 10.

In addition, particular attention should be given to subject advisors as a key support structure. Questions to be answered include the number of subject advisors nationally, by phase and subject including the quality of support provided.

5.4 Case studies

The proposal should indicate a design for a purposive sample of schools in which to conduct case studies of curriculum implementation. The service provider should include a detailed description of the methodologies to be used in the case studies, including specific qualitative indicators that will be used, and quality control mechanisms. Furthermore, the fieldworkers that will conduct the case studies should be education academics with of at least one person, per school team, who is fluent in the language of instruction in the Foundation Phase in that school in the case of primary schools.

A total of **16 case studies** should be conducted and will be made up of 8 primary schools and 8 high schools. With regard to primary schools, at least 2 case studies should be conducted in each of the selected four provinces. For example, the 2 case studies in each province could be undertaken in different types of schools (urban and rural).

With regard to high schools, 2 case studies focusing on Grade 10 should be conducted in each of the same four selected provinces. The 2 case studies in each province could be undertaken in different types of schools (urban and rural). It is proposed that the high schools where these case studies are conducted should be within the same vicinity as the primary schools selected for case studies. In total, 4 case studies will be conducted in each of the four provinces consisting of 2 primary schools and two high schools per province.

Case studies should delve into: curriculum coverage; cognitive demand of lessons and exercise; adequacy of learning support tools; level of prescriptiveness of the CAPS and whether this is appropriate in different types of schools; experiences using scripted lesson plans to enact CAPS; extent and quality of teacher support received; tests of teacher content knowledge and pedagogical skill; extensive classroom observation.

The case studies should involve at least two full days of school observation at each primary school including *inter alia* lesson observation, review of curriculum planning documents, review of learner workbooks and exercise books, semi-structured interviews with teachers and school managers. The service provider should

observe lessons across grades 1 to 3 for more than 1 teacher per school. In terms of the high school case studies, the focus will be limited to Grade 10.

5.5 Learning processes

One of the key milestones of the evaluation is a number of reflective processes with DBE officials and a stakeholder workshop to reflect on the lessons, emerging findings and how the system can be strengthened.

5.6 Review the theory of change and logical framework of CAPS

5.6.1 An initial theory of change and logical framework of the programme has been developed and the service provider must submit revised versions at the end of the evaluation reflecting the proposed changes to implementation based on the findings of the evaluation. The revised theory of change must form part of the final report.

5.6.2 This will inform recommendations as to how the system should be 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 7 months. The evaluation will start in November 2015 and should be completed by June 2016. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 1** below.

Table 1: Outline project plan and payment schedule

Deliverable	Expected milestones	% payment
Inception Meeting	23 October 2015	
Submission of Inception Report	4 November 2015	
Approved Inception Report	11 November 2015	
Sign SLA	13 November 2015	10%
Submission of Literature Review	To be determined by the service provider	10%
Submission of draft data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools to test out how the theory of change is working		
Approval of final data collection instruments, report structure, analysis plan and other tools		20%
Case study fieldwork, semi-structured interviews		
Fieldwork Report with emerging issues, findings from the fieldwork and quantitative data analysis.		10%
Draft evaluation report for review. This includes proposed changes to the intervention design.	29 April 2016	20%
Workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	12 May 2016	
Revised Draft evaluation report full and 1/5/25 summaries	19 May 2016	
Peer Review of the Report & comments from Steering Committee	26 May 2016	
Final Evaluation Report, Version 1	12 June 2016	
Comments to service provider from Steering Committee and Peer reviewer on Final Report	2 June 2016	
Final report draft 2 submitted	10 June 2016	
Approval of the Report by the Steering Committee	12 June 2016	20%
Power-point Presentation of the Report at DBE top management and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interview transcripts).	30 June 2016	10%

7. Competencies and Skills-set

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

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Demonstrate expertise in curriculum 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 of stakeholders
2 Evaluation leadership	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively. Display strong project management skills, including field coordination and implementation where needed
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 Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice would be an advantage, particularly in middle-income and African countries.
3.2 Research practice	The research team must demonstrate experience and expertise in conducting qualitative case studies in South African schools and must include members with expertise in large scale data analysis of South African education data. Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps. The research team must demonstrate expertise in matters of curriculum policy and implementation.
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	Demonstrate experience in running a project such as this
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

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
	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 co-chaired by the Chief Director for Curriculum Implementation and Monitoring (DBE) and the Chief Director for Strategic Planning, Research and Coordination. The role of Secretariat will be provided by DPME. The Steering Committee will make decisions on project timelines and deliverables, 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;
- 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@presidency-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 **Box 2** below.

Box 2. 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 (eg 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.

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

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 on with electronic and 6 hard copies.

11.1 Key background documents

The following documents may be beneficial for the service provider:

- National Curriculum Statement (NCS) Curriculum and Assessment Statements (CAPS) for the Foundation Phase (Mathematics, Home Language, First Additional Language, Life Skills)
- National Curriculum Statement (NCS) Curriculum and Assessment Statements (CAPS) for the Intermediate Phase CAPS (Mathematics, Home Language, First Additional Language, Second Additional Language, Non-languages)
- National Curriculum Statement (NCS) Curriculum and Assessment Statements (CAPS) for the Senior Phase CAPS (Home Language, First Additional Language, Second Additional Language, Non-languages)
- National Curriculum Statement (NCS) Curriculum and Assessment Statements (CAPS) for the Further Education and Training (FET) Phase CAPS (Home Language, First Additional Language, Second Additional Language, Non-languages)
- The National Policy Pertaining To The Programme And Promotion Requirements Of The National Curriculum Statement Grades R -12
- National Protocol for Assessment Grades R – 12
- Report of the Task Team for the Review of the National Curriculum Statement October 2009.
- School Monitoring Survey, 2011
- Independent Formative Workbook and Textbook Evaluation, 2013
- A comparative study of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) and the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), 2014 by Umalusi

This Revised National Curriculum Statement Grades R-9 , 2002

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

Table 3: Functional evaluation criteria

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
Quality of the Proposal	Demonstrate expertise in curriculum studies and conducting process/systemic evaluations in government or in the private sector	5			10
	Approach, design and methodology for the evaluation, reflecting its complex and political nature	5			10
	Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities)	4			8
	Demonstrated high quality experience in at least 5 related projects undertaken in last 5 years by main contractor and subcontractors, including at least 2 projects that are complex and politically challenging.	4			8
	Knowledge and exposure to	1			2

ANNEXURE A – TOR

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
	international good practice, particularly in the middle-income and African countries.				
	Capacity development element (building capacity in the evaluation team and of partners, especially young evaluators and PDIs)	1			2
	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment:				
1. Overarching Considerations					
1.1. Contextual Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand the relevant sector and government systems in relation to the evaluation and can appropriately relate the evaluation to the current political, policy and governance environments. 	4			8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 30% of team are PDI 	2			4
1.2 Ethical Conduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand ethical issues relating evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants. 	2			4
2. Evaluation Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation to promote commitment and ownership of evaluation. 	4			8
3. Evaluation Craft					
3.1 Evaluative discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use knowledge base of evaluations of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory based models, types, methods and tools) critical thinking, analytical and synthesis 	3			6

ANNEXURE A – TOR

Domain Descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score	Weight X Score	Minimum
	skills relevant to the evaluation, applying this in complex and political sensitive interventions.				
3.2 Research Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps. 	4			8
4. Implementation of Evaluation					
4.1 Evaluation Planning Theory of Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators 	3			6
4.2 Managing Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards 	4			8
4.3 Report writing and communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ability to write constructive, clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable and address the key evaluation questions 	4			8
Total		50			100

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 (jabu@presidency-dpme.gov.za / 0123120158 / 0823409283 but in terms of content issues, please contact Dr Nhlanhla Nduna-Watson, Director: Curriculum Improvement and Implementation, DBE, Tel: (012) 357 4100 email: nduna-watson.n@dbe.gov.za

ANNEXURE B – PROPOSAL AND SERVICES OFFERED

ANNEXURE C – SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS OF EMPLOYEES AND PAST EXPERIENCE

ANNEXURE D – PRICING SCHEDULE

ANNEXURE E – TENDER DOCUMENTS

All documentation included in and referred to in the tender documentation pack (SBDs, tax clearance certificate, B-BBEE certificate etc.) must be attached as Annexure E.