planning, monitoring & evaluation
Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DPME Evaluation Guideline No 2.2.1
How to develop Terms of Reference for Evaluation Projects

Created 29 June 2012
Updated: 20 December 2016

Addressed to	Government departments who are undertaking evaluations (programme managers and M&E staff).
Purpose	The purpose of this Guideline is to give practical guidance on how to develop terms of reference for evaluations.
Policy reference	This guideline should be read in conjunction with the National Evaluation Policy Framework approved by Cabinet on 23 November 2011 (available on the DPME website).
Main changes in this version	1. Moved purpose and questions into Section 2: Focus of the evaluation 2. Revisions to the evaluation questions 3. PDI requirement increase from 30% to 40% 4. Added functional criteria on ethical issues in the evaluation 5. Added an example of Technical Working Group TORs
Contact person for this guideline	Jabu Mathe, Evaluation and Research Unit (ERU) E-mail: jabu@dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0158

Introduction

These guidelines are designed to apply across government. We refer here to the role of 'evaluation custodian'. In evaluations under the National Evaluation Plan, the evaluation custodian is the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME). In evaluations under Provincial Evaluation Plans this is the Office of the Premier. In departmental evaluations this is the M&E Unit. In municipalities this is likely also to be the M&E Unit.

This Guideline provides an outline of the key issues to be covered in evaluation terms of reference, although specific methodologies will depend on the object, type and purpose of the specific evaluation. It is part guideline, part template, and so can be edited to produce the TORs.

Action Points:

- It is very important that terms of reference are drawn up jointly by the M&E/Research Section, the managers of the intervention in question, and other key stakeholders (where relevant). The evaluation custodian must play a central role in developing TORs for all evaluations.
- Where there is a need to clarify the purpose and approach of the evaluation, and what is already available from existing research, prior to drawing up the TORs it may well be appropriate to hold a workshop with researchers to discuss what research is available, and what still needs to be answered
- In all cases it is a good idea to have an initial scoping meeting with the main stakeholders to draw up key elements of the TORs. This means before TORs are drafted there is a consensus on the purpose, key questions, what is in and out of scope, and key overarching issues around methodology
- For a very complex evaluation such as an impact evaluation, a scoping study may be needed by a specialist to see what is really possible with the data available. This may lead to a substantial reorienting of the evaluation.

Developing the TORs is a critical stage where the information needs for the evaluation are clarified, an outline methodology developed to answer those information needs, and where the key stakeholders in the intervention can agree what they want to get out of the evaluation. This will be revisited during the inception stage where there is interaction between the evaluator and the steering committee, and where the service provider is likely to suggest improvements to the methodology.

The suggested contents of the TORs include:

1 Background information and rationale
2 The focus of the evaluation
3 Evaluation design
4 Evaluation plan
5 Budget and payment schedule
6 Management arrangements
7 The proposal to be submitted
8 Information for service providers
9 Intellectual property rights
10 Special and general conditions of contract
11 Enquiries

We go through these sections in turn.

See also "Writing Terms of Reference for an Evaluation: A How-to-Guide", Independent Evaluation Group, World Bank, from which elements of this Guideline are drawn[1].

Title of the evaluation

This must specify the evaluation object and type of evaluation, e.g. "Impact evaluation of the Child Support Grant" or "Diagnostic review of the ECD Sector".

1 Background information and rationale

1.1 Background to the intervention being evaluated

This section covers a brief description of the intervention (policy, plan, programme or project), its development and priorities. It should not be longer than 2 pages. This should include the following elements amongst others:

- Evidence of the need for the intervention, the societal problem/issue the intervention is supposed to address or the needs of the citizens that led to the development of this intervention.
- The legislative/ policy framework/strategy used by government to address the situation.
- A brief description of the intervention, its scope, its beneficiaries.
- How the intervention falls within the mandate(s) of the department(s) (where applicable).
- An outline of the outcomes of the intervention (or short purpose statement), the main outputs and activities expected to have contributed to the outcome, and the key indicators for these. If there is a logical framework for the intervention, then annex this.
- What is the main theory of change that underpins the intervention? If a theory of change has been clearly defined, annex this.
- The participants, partners and stakeholders involved.

[1] http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEVACAPDEV/Resources/ecd_writing_TORs.pdf

- The duration of the intervention and the current implementation stage (where are we with the implementation e.g. 4th year).
- Highlights of progress towards achievement of planned outcomes.
- The reason why an evaluation of the intervention is being done at this time, and any decisions that may be made using the results of the evaluation.

2 The focus of the evaluation

2.1 Purpose of the evaluation

This section answers the question: What is it that we want to understand about the intervention? Table 1 shows the generic questions each type of evaluation aims to answer. The main questions may be about impact level, outcome level, output level or how activities and outputs are leading to outcomes and impacts. There is likely to be a high level question, e.g. Is the child support grant leading to sustained impacts on the levels of education and longer term benefits for children.

Some examples of purpose statements for each type of evaluation are also shown in Table 1. These take the question and turn it into a summary of what you want to achieve.

Table 1: Core question (purpose) for each type of evaluation

Typical questions	Example, rephrased as purpose	Type of evaluation
What is the current situation and root cause of the problem?	To assess the current situation of malnutrition in South Africa and the root cause of the problem.	Diagnostic
Is the logic of the intervention design robust and likely to work?	To review the likely success of the design of the National Integrated Plan for Early Childhood Development (ECD) and how the design can be strengthened.	Design
Is the intervention being implemented as specified (and in some cases are the outcomes being achieved), and why?	To assess whether the Business Process Services scheme is being implemented as specified (and in some evaluations you may ask are the outcomes being achieved), and to explain the performance.	Implementation
How have beneficiaries' lives changed as a result of the intervention?	To assess whether the child support grant is leading to sustained impacts on the levels of education and longer term benefits for children.	Impact
What are the costs in relation to the benefits? Is the programme providing value for money?	To assess the costs in relation to the benefits of early childhood development centres, compared to home-based provision.	Economic
What is the evidence from all evaluations related to the topic in question?	To assess what is emerging from all evaluations undertaken of programmes addressing contact crimes and the implications for the future.	Evaluation synthesis

There will be sub-questions and the types of questions determine the type of evaluation that will be appropriate. These more detailed questions are covered in the next section.

2.2 Evaluation questions

This section indicates the detailed evaluation questions which are being asked (which provide the detail within the overall core question), and for which answers are sought. They need to be high level and few and will be elaborated in more detail later as the methodology is developed. They need to be signed off in the inception phase. These questions need to be seen as appropriate by stakeholders. In general questions are likely to cover issues such as:

1. What is the theory of change underlying the intervention and is it working?
2. What results have been achieved? (effectiveness, impact, cost/effectiveness).

3. Does the intervention appear to be effective and efficient in achieving the strategies in the National Development Plan (NDP)/MTSF? If not, how can it be refined to strengthen this?
4. Have the right things been done? (addresses relevance, effectiveness)
5. Have things been done well? (efficiency, effectiveness)
6. Can you attribute the results to the intervention? (attribution/contribution compared to counterfactual)
7. How do the results compare with an alternative intervention to achieve the same objective? (relative effectiveness, impact, cost/effectiveness)
8. How are other government programmes/policies/ procedures affecting achievement of programme results?
9. Are the results sustainable?
10. How could the intervention be strengthened in the future?

Please note that the above questions are some of the likely main questions for the evaluation. The service provider is expected to develop further sub-questions of the above in developing the evaluation framework. In addition, further questions will be added based on the analytical framework and theory of change.

Action Points:

- Limit the number of high level questions to 4-7. All too often terms of reference try to cover too much and so evaluations are difficult to implement.

In table 2 we use these questions as "orientation" of the evaluation. Annex 2 contains some real examples of evaluation purpose and questions from NEP evaluations.

Table 2: Relating evaluation type and core question to sub questions

Example Purpose of the Evaluation[2]	Type of evaluation	Typical Sub-questions
To assess the current situation of malnutrition in South Africa and the root cause of the problem.	Diagnostic	What is the extent of malnutrition in the country, and for who? What are the root causes of the problem? How does the situation and South Africa's response compare to other countries? What programmes are currently being undertaken to address the problem? What is recognised as best practice in this area? Are other government programmes/policies/ procedures hindering or helping achievement in this area? What options should be considered for addressing the problem, bearing in mind the interventions currently in place? What are the advantages and disadvantages of these?
To review the likely success of the design of the National Integrated Plan for Early Childhood Development (ECD) and how the design can be strengthened.	Design	What are the intended outcomes and how is the Plan designed to achieve them? Does the theory of change seem realistic/plausible? Are the outputs appropriate and complete and likely to result in the outcomes being achieved? Are the assumptions realistic and not killers? Is there clear evidence that the intervention will manage these appropriately? Are the indicators appropriate and SMART? Is there a monitoring and evaluation plan?
To assess whether the Business Process Services scheme is being implemented as specified (and in some	Implementa tion	Is the scheme reaching the target population? Has the scheme been implemented as planned? Is implementation meeting the planned targets/milestones? Are the assumptions proving to be realistic and manageable in practice?

[2] Adapted from: John M. Owen, *Program Evaluation: Forms and Approaches* (3rd edn.; New York ; London: Guilford Press, 2007) xx, 298 p.

Example Purpose of the Evaluation[2]	Type of evaluation	Typical Sub-questions
evaluations you may ask are the outcomes being achieved), and to explain the performance		How can we fine-tune the scheme to make it more efficient or effective? Is the implementation strategy likely to lead to intended outcomes?
To assess whether the child support grant is leading to sustained impacts on the levels of education and longer term benefits for children.	Impact	What are the intended and unintended impacts on the target group? Can you attribute the changes to the intervention or are they due to other factors? How do differences in implementation affect intervention outcomes? Is the intervention more effective for some participants than for others? How do the results compare with an alternative intervention to achieve the same objective? Are the results sustainable?
To assess the costs in relation to the benefits of early childhood development centres, compared to home-based provision.	Economic	What have been the outcomes and impacts of the programmes, intended and unintended? What have been the costs of running each of the programmes? How cost-effective has each programme been? How does provision at ECD centres compare to home-based provision in terms of benefits, in terms of costs, and in cost-benefits? Should we be expanding one of these rather than the other?
To assess what is emerging from all evaluations undertaken of programmes addressing contact crimes and the implications for the future.	Evaluation synthesis	Internationally, what is the evidence on the major drivers of contact crimes? Internationally, what is the evidence on what interventions work, for whom and when? How are outcomes in the different studies influenced by the context and mechanisms? What research or evaluation is still needed to fill in gaps, or to decide appropriate intervention strategies?

Box 2 shows an example from the Evaluation of Nutrition Interventions addressing Children under 5, one of the evaluations in the 2012/13 National Evaluation Plan. As can be seen these have been made specific for the programme in question. Other examples are in **Annex 2**.

Box 2: Example of purpose and evaluation questions drawn from an Implementation evaluation of Nutrition Interventions addressing Children Under 5.

Purpose of the evaluation

The evaluation will focus on identifying the critical system and implementation issues inhibiting or enabling people's access to, and the scaling-up of, nutrition-related interventions targeting children from conception to below the age of five.

Key questions to be addressed

1. *Do relevant policies exist for these interventions, have they been adopted by appropriate departments/levels of government, are they funded, and are they coherent across sectors??*
2. *To what extent are nutrition interventions from different agencies reaching under 5 children across the country (from secondary data and facility monitoring)?*
3. *What interventions are being implemented effectively, what aren't?*
4. *Why are some interventions not being implemented effectively and efficiently and what is needed to strengthen and sustain them?*
5. *Are there some changes needed to ensure that high impact interventions are prioritised (and there is international evidence of which should be high impact interventions)*
6. *What institutional arrangements are currently in place and needed within and across departments and agencies to improve the effectiveness of nutrition interventions*

It is critical that these questions are well thought through and can be answered with the type of data and resources that are available. Ideally an evaluability assessment should have been done. The evaluation questions will dictate what sort of evaluation is needed, and the type of methodology, instruments and analysis which is appropriate to answer them.

It would be useful to get peer reviewers to provide feedback on these, if they can be contracted prior to awarding the contract. However, peer reviewers may also be people likely to bid for the evaluation in which case you can only contract them once you know the successful bidder.

2.3 Intended users and stakeholders of the evaluation

This should indicate key potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use it. It is a good idea to draw up a table identifying each of the users and how they might use it. This will help in the communication process later. The following diagram depicts potential users of the evaluation results and how they may use them:

Table 3: Example of the potential users of the Implementation evaluation of the Effectiveness of Environmental Governance in the Mining Sector

Potential Users of the Evaluation	How they will use it?
Department of Environmental Affairs	• For reviewing regulations of financial provision and mine closure • Legislative reform • For developing and reviewing guidelines • Setting norms and standards • Capacity building • Improve co- ordination between stakeholders • Reduce the mining related liabilities to the State • Enforce the environmental provisions • To inform the departmental M&E function • To report on the relevant outcomes
Department of Mineral Resources	• To promote sustainable mining • To assist in the effective implementation of the financial provision • To improve decision–making on mining applications • To enforce the environmental provisions • To improve capacity building • To Improve co-ordination between stakeholders • To Reduce the mining related liabilities to the State • To inform the departmental M&E function • To report on the relevant outcomes
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	• Improving environmental management in mining communities • To monitor the management of the reducing of mining related environmental liabilities to the state
Parliament/ Portfolio committees	To monitor progress of departments with respect to implementing the environmental governance of the mining sector
Chamber of mines	For information purposes

2.4 Scope of the evaluation

This section describes what to focus on in the evaluation (and so what not to cover). This should include:

- **Time period** of the intervention to focus on (eg from 2005-2010);
- Intervention **components** to be covered by the evaluation (eg in relation to nutrition this could be a focus on primary health care and not clinical interventions);
- Geographic and institutional **coverage** of the evaluation, in broad terms;
- Sector and **thematic areas** (eg the overall evaluation may focus on the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme, but the evaluation concentrates on the agricultural aspects);
- Any other key issues that you wish to cover that are not already indicated by the evaluation questions (eg we are interested to see how x is covered);
- Other issues that are **outside the scope** of this particular evaluation and should not be considered.

The table below can be used to indicates specific components that are in-scope and out of scope:

Table 4: Example of in-scope and out of scope components from Economic Evaluation of the Incremental Investment into the SAPS Forensic Services

In Scope	Out of Scope
Forensic Services – issues covered by the incremental investment	Forensic Services – issues covered by the incremental investment
Aspects outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project	Aspects outside the scope of the Forensic Services CJS project
Dependency on Technology Management Services for IT solutions	Dependency on Technology Management Services for IT solutions
TMS services to other SAPS Divisions and clients	TMS services to other SAPS Divisions and clients

3 Evaluation design

This section covers the approach, design and key elements of the methodology to be used by the evaluation team. For specific guidance refer to the Guideline for the specific type of evaluation being considered which will be developed in 2013. The approach should reflect the extent to which the issue in question is well understood or complex and emergent. It should also reflect how ownership, capacity and learning will be built in the main stakeholders to maximise the likelihood of the use of evaluation results.

It is important to provide an overall approach to the evaluation design, with the minimum level of methodology expected. It is important to provide enough background so that the people producing proposals are able to interpret what you want to achieve and apply their expertise to suggest an evaluation design. This is likely to be one of the best ways you can see their expertise. In addition, during the inception phase this methodology will be refined once there has been direct interaction with the service provider, and the revised methodology will be in the inception report and form the basis for contractual agreement on what is to be covered. Some key areas to describe here are:

Box 3: Methodologies

Methodologies may include quantitative/qualitative/mixed methods eg:

- Document review/analysis of programme/project records,
- Interviews;
- Research synthesis;
- Participatory methodologies with citizens/key stakeholders/partners;
- Econometric and statistical analysis;
- Identification strategy and selection of counterfactual (for impact evaluations)
- Case studies

1. The overall methodological framework (see Box 3).
2. Any literature and document review expected.

3. Expected data collection and analysis methods and plan, including whether there is already a comparison group, or one needs to be included.
4. How participatory the evaluation is expected to be?
5. The likely sample size and geographical focus, e.g. urban/rural.
6. Other relevant data which should be used (e.g. from StatsSA or the National Income Dynamics Study).
7. The level of rigour expected and realistic with the resources available. Will a rapid survey with a convenience sample be enough, or is a thorough study needed with high levels of statistical confidence? How do you ensure rigour all the way from design through to final report? This will need to be higher for an impact evaluation (and with the same rigour for baseline and final impact evaluation).
8. Meetings or consultations expected with particular stakeholder groups (including those commissioning the evaluation).
9. How you will address skills transfer of stakeholders and PDI evaluators?

You need to provide enough detail for the service provider to be able to plan, cost and for bids to be comparable. However, you do want to allow for creativity by the service provider.

Action Points:
- Provide some indication of the sample expected e.g. provinces to be covered, strong/weak units to be covered, numbers of service points, and if a survey – the minimum number of respondents and the actors who need to be interviewed.

4 Evaluation plan

4.1 Products/deliverables expected from the evaluation

A description of the product(s) that the evaluation owner/commissioning organisation(s) wants to see and the format, if appropriate. The core products may include the list below, depending on the complexity of the evaluation. The ones which will be in all evaluations are shaded:

- **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;
- Development of draft theory of change and logical framework for the intervention if this does not already exist (using the DPME Guideline on Planning of New Implementation Programmes). For NEP evaluations the service provider will be provided with an existing theory of change. The evaluation should test this theory of change.
- Literature review, document review, international benchmarking (you need to be clear on the requirements);
- Report structure, analysis plan, final data collection instruments and other tools;
- Other technical or process reports, e.g. piloting report[3], field work report[4], case study reports;
- **Draft evaluation report** for review, full and in 1/5/25 format (see Action Points);
- A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the emerging findings or draft report;
- The **final evaluation report**, both full and in 1/5/25 format, in hard copy and electronic;
- The final report should include a **revised theory of change and logframe**, including proposed changes to the intervention design. The department may then need to redesign the intervention.
- **Provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation** (including interviews) when data is collected. Note this data may need to be anonymised. Full transcripts of interviews are not required.

[3] You may wish to have a report on a piloting of tools and sampling prior to the rollout of the data collection.

[4] If data collection is a major component of the evaluation and takes an extended time, you may want to include a fieldwork report to provide for interim payment.

- **A PowerPoint or audio-visual presentation of the results plus photographs** from the evaluation process and intervention being evaluated.

In addition, if there are components which justify separate reports, these may be required (e.g. individual school reports, district reports, provincial reports and national report). If a standard format is required (apart from the 1/5/25 page) this should also be specified here.

Action Points:
- The 1/5/25 rule for evaluation reports should apply to all Government Departments i.e. a one-page policy summary of implications for policy, a three to four-page executive summary of the whole report and a 25-page main report (Arial 11 point, single space, exclusive of appendices). There is likely also to be a long report or a series of short reports on findings. The 1/5/25 is what will be distributed widely, but the long report will also be posted onto the website. DPME has a report template which should be considered for all evaluation reports.

Note the evaluation should also have a broader project plan including the activities happening beyond the evaluation report (e.g. development of management response and improvement plan), as well as activities that the department may need to do (e.g. briefing Minister). A template for the evaluation project plan is available on the DPME website and is attached in **Annex 3**.

4.2 Activities

You may want to specify here the activities required to undertake the project, which will make it easier for the service provider to draw up the proposal. You may also want to specify the roles that the custodian or commissioning department will play (eg contact provincial departments to ensure they are supportive of the evaluation). Make clear any meetings expected between the service provider and the evaluation commissioner.

4.3 Time frame for the project

Set out a timeframe for the evaluation process making clear the duration of the assignment, including the milestones shown in Table 3 and the expected start and finish of the assignment. We have put an example of expected milestones from an actual evaluation.

Table 5: Outline project plan and example of payment schedule (check against deliverables, those in bold will be present in all evaluations - make it clear whether these are based on submission or approval)

Deliverable	Expected milestones[5] for a 8 months evaluation	% payment if 8 months evaluation	% payment if 18 month evaluation
Approval of Inception Report		10%	10%
Submission of draft theory of change and logframe (if NEP the ToC will have been done prior)		10%	
Submission of literature review		10%	10%
Approval of report structure, analysis plan, final data collection instruments and other tools			10%
Submission of other technical or process reports, eg field work report		10%	30%
Submission of draft evaluation report for review, full and in 1/5/25 format (see Action Points)		30%	20%

[5] There is an opportunity to change the expected timeframes at the inception phase. See Annex 3 for an example.

Deliverable	Expected milestones[5] for a 8 months evaluation	% payment if 8 months evaluation	% payment if 18 month evaluation
Possibly a workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report			
Approval of the **final evaluation report**		20%	10%
Proposed changes to the intervention design if needed - this may be part of the final report			
Submission of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation (including interviews) when data is collected (see Annex 1)			
Submission of powerpoint or audiovisual presentation of the results		10%	10%
Project closure meeting			

5 Budget and payment schedule

Make clear where funding is coming from, which may be from more than one source. Set out the payment schedule as per the examples in Table 5 (these are suggestions) for shorter and longer evaluations. For longer-term evaluations potentially involving extensive fieldwork, the benchmarks should be identified allowing payment that is more often, but smaller amounts.

In NEP evaluations, the budget available for the evaluation is indicated in the National Evaluation Plan. This is also true in some PEP and DEP Evaluations. Service providers must be mindful of this amount when they develop their proposals. Make sure the scope is realistic for the amount available.

6 Management Arrangements

6.1 Role of steering committee

Evaluations should have a steering committee comprising the main departments and agencies involved in the intervention in question, and the evaluation custodian. For example, for those in the Provincial Evaluation Plan this will include the OTP and in regards to the Departmental Evaluation Plan this will include the M&E Unit. The steering committee should approve the inception report, the terms of reference and other main deliverables, prior to payments. In many cases this will need to be referred to the DGs in question for final approval. It should be made clear which department is commissioning the evaluation. For NEP evaluations it is preferred that DPME should commission the evaluation, regardless of where funding is coming from. For evaluations following the National Evaluation System the programme manager from the relevant department should chair the Steering Committee, not the M&E specialist, with the evaluation custodian providing the secretariat. A template for terms of reference of a steering committee is available on the DPME website and is attached in Annex 4. Comments by the steering committee on deliverables should be consolidated and synthesized by the secretariat (the evaluation custodian) and forwarded to the service provider.

A Technical Working Group (TWG) is needed where there is a lot of technical complexity, or to do deal with practical issues quickly such as instruments, to avoid overburdening the steering committee. The Technical Working Group will carry out some of the specific tasks indicated in the Terms of Reference as a technical forum for the completion of the evaluation. Members will be requested to prepare documentation, present progress reports and other related work to the Steering Committee. The TWG can reduce the work load for the steering committee which may be important.

6.2 Reporting arrangements

Indicate who the evaluation project manager from the commissioning department will be, to whom the service provider will report.

Action points:

- A high quality evaluation is more likely to be achieved when the steering committee, programme manager, M&E specialist and evaluator work together effectively. It is not sufficient to leave the evaluator to their own devices and wait for milestones on reports. Development of a good working relationship is essential with regular communication and feedback throughout the life of the evaluation. This also requires keeping key policy-makers informed so they know what to expect and are comfortable with what is emerging, or are aware that a challenging result may emerge.

7 The proposal to be submitted

7.1 Structure of proposal

A potential structure of a good proposal is shown in Box 4.

Box 4: Potential structure of a proposal

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

1 Understanding of the intervention 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) also indicating clearly who are PDI evaluators
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). This must make clear who is playing the role of project manager, evaluation specialist and sector specialist. These will each be considered in their own right although roles may be combined)
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). This should include how thorough editing will be carried out, a recurring problem in many evaluations.

Attachments
Examples of two related evaluation reports undertaken.
Letters from departments with a reference for work undertaken indicating the work carried out, date, value and whether the work was satisfactory. This should include contact details for follow up
CVs of key personnel
Completed supply chain forms, tax clearance etc.

7.2 Evaluation team

Here details are provided on the number of evaluators expected to be part of the team, their areas of expertise and their respective responsibilities. Three key roles must be defined (although they may not be three separate people) and may have varying levels of effort:

- Project manager – responsible for overall project management and quality control as well as liaison with client;
- Evaluation specialist – able to bring specialist knowledge of evaluation methodology (and not just research)
- Sector specialist – with in-depth knowledge of the sector and able to bring this insight to ensure that the richness of the sector is explored and meaningful recommendations derived.

The staff also needs to show that between them they understand implementation realities of government in this sector.

The team leader must have at least fifteen years' relevant experience, including working with government at a high level, and of leading sensitive and complex evaluations. He/she must also have a relevant post-graduate qualification, preferably a Master's degree or/and a PhD. In addition, he/she must have experience in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). Team leader should demonstrate high quality experience in at least 5 related projects undertaken in last 5 years by main contractor and subcontractors

Indicate how skills transfer will be undertaken to departments involved in the evaluation, as well as PDI/young evaluators. In many cases even where evaluation is largely undertaken by an external service provider, it would be highly beneficial if some staff of the commissioning departments participate extensively, although care would need to be taken in key interviews which might be biased if a government staff member participates. This will be particularly relevant for implementation evaluations, where the way the intervention is operating is the key factor to understand. Clearly there can be a tension with independence which needs to be considered carefully, and for outcomes and impact evaluation this is more important. This approach is highlighted in the National Evaluation Policy Framework as "joint evaluation". Indicate who are the key contacts from departments who will be playing an active role in the evaluation and the roles they will play.

7.3 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 some of these competencies (see 8.4.2):

Domain/descriptor	**Demonstrated ability to**
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 14 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments
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	
2.1 Project management	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively and efficiently, and manage the project effectively to completion in a way which delivers high quality evaluations and builds trust of stakeholders.
2.2 Composition of the team	Strong project manager, evaluation specialist, and sector specialist (not necessarily three people) as well as other relevant team members for the specific assignment
2.3 Involvement of PDIs	At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)[6] and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation (shown in the activity table)
2.4 Capacity development	Meaningful capacity development to departmental staff as agreed with the relevant departments
3 Evaluation craft	

[6] By PDIs we mean people of Black, Indian, and Coloured ethnicity. For example, if a team consists of 10 members, 4 of them should be PDIs, and 40% of the workload.

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
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 use evidence appropriately to inform findings and recommendations.
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, and drawing appropriate findings and recommendations.
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes 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 on time and to appropriate standards
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports 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
Total	

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

- Are 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.

8. Information for service providers

The service providers should be asked to provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition, they should be given opportunities for clarification (eg a compulsory bidders briefing); any format requirements and length; mode of transmission of proposals; number of copies expected (if hard copy).

Provide the date and time for the compulsory briefing, proposal submission date and time, and the date bidders will be expected to present their proposal (if relevant). You may also indicate the expected date the assignment starts (may be the date of first briefing during the inception phase). The latter is important if the evaluators are to mobilise quickly.

8.1 Key background documents

If any key documents are available that are relevant, provide the titles and ensure these are provided to the service providers. These could be programme documents, previous evaluations etc. Otherwise indicate where these are available. These may be provided only at the compulsory briefing if it is not desired to circulate widely.

8.2 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 include:

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

The supply chain forms should be attached to the TORs including the detailed evaluation criteria and scores.

8.3 Pricing requirements

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

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 Administrative compliance

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

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

8.4.2 Functional Evaluation

Only bids/quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) can be considered during the functional evaluation phase. All bids/quotes should be scored against the functional criteria indicated below. A generic table showing scoring is included providing a link to the competencies:

Weight allocation	Scoring system
1 – Value adding requirement (minimum score of 2) 3 – Important requirement (minimum score of 6) 5 – Essential requirement / integral part of project (minimum score of 15)	1 – Does not comply with the requirements 2 – Partial compliance with requirements 3 – Full compliance with requirements 4 – Exceeds requirements

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score(out of 4)	Weight x score	Minimum
1	**The quality of the proposal**	**Addressing the TORs** 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	5			*15*
	The quality of the team	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment, with the ability to:				
	Overarching considerations					
2	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
3	Ethical issues	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants. 1= No evidence of awareness of ethical issues 2= Basic addressing of ethical issues (informed consent) 3= Adequate addressing of ethical issues 4= Ethical issues comprehensively addressed				
	Evaluation leadership	Lead an evaluation team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders in				

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score(out of 4)	Weight x score	Minimum
		relation to the following three key role players				
4	Composition of team	**Project manager** 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
5	Composition of team	**Evaluation specialist** 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 of international best practice (convincing internationally as an evaluator in this type of work)	5			15
6	Composition of team	**Sector specialist** 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	5			15

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score(out of 4)	Weight x score	Minimum
7	PDI role in team	**At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)**[7] and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation 1= Team consists of less than 40% PDIs and less than 40% of person-days allocated to PDIs 2= Team consists of 40% PDIs but less than 40% of person-days allocated to PDIs 3= Team consists of at least 40% PDIs, at least 40% of person-days allocated to PDIs (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company) 4= Team consists of at least 40% PDIs, at least 40% 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
8	Capacity development	**Capacity development** elements and building capacity of government partners, namely: 1= No indication of capacity development 2= Some capacity development included in proposal but not well though 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
	Evaluation craft					
9	Evaluative discipline and practice	**Demonstrated experience of undertaking quality evaluations (so using evaluation knowledge) relevant to the evaluation.** 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	5			15

[7] By PDIs we mean Blacks, Indians, and Coloureds. For example, if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score(out of 4)	Weight x score	Minimum
		R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 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)				
10		**Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice**, particularly in middle-income and African countries. 1= No international experience available 2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project 3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight 4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or evaluation)	1			2
11	Research practice	**Demonstrated experience of systematically gathering, analysing, and synthesising relevant evidence**, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and writing effective research reports. 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate knowledge of (qualitative or quantitative research)*8 and are over R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research) * and are over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research) * and are over R500 000 4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 evaluations or research projects which	3			6

[8] Define the nature of research expertise needed depending on the type of evaluation

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score(out of 4)	Weight x score	Minimum
		demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R1 000 000 (convincing as an organisation undertaking this type of research)				
	Implementation of evaluation					
12	Evaluation planning	**Approach, design, methodology for the evaluation** 1= Not likely to address the needs of the evaluation 2= Some parts of the evaluation addressed satisfactorily but overall not convincing 3= Addresses these satisfactorily. Confident the evaluation can be implemented. 4= Addresses these satisfactorily. In addition some very interesting approaches suggested for undertaking the evaluation which are likely to increase the use	5			*15*
13		**Quality of activity-based plan** (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities) 1= No plan 2= Activity-based plan produced but not convincing that the methodology can be delivered using resources proposed 3= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology 4= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology, and innovative so that more can be delivered	3			9
14	Report writing and communication	**Write clear, concise and focused reports** 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= No examples of writing provided or examples show poor writing skills 2= Examples provided show adequate but not good writing skills, but use of evidence is not good 3= Examples provided show good reports which demonstrate use of evidence, good logic, and are well-written	3			6

No	Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Score(out of 4)	Weight x score	Minimum
		4= Well-written and punchy reports with good use of infographics, good summaries, good use of evidence				
	Total		47			

(Criteria must be objective / measurable and linked to requirements specified in ToR)

Minimum requirement: Service providers should be required to meet the minimum scores 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.

Action points:

- Be careful about using a 3 as a minimum on one element – as if some evaluators score a 2, the service provider can be eliminated just from the one score being below the minimum. So use a 3 as a minimum judiciously where it is absolutely essential that the service provider is at least a 3.

8.4.3 Price evaluation: The PPPFA

Only bids/quotes that meet the minimum score required indicated under the functional evaluation above can be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 evaluation method must be used for bids from R1 million and above and the 80/20 method for bids/quotes below R1 million. A decision has to be taken as to whether the evaluation will be above or below R1 million, and so whether an 80/20 or 90/10 should be applied. 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.

In the application of the 80/20 preference point system, if all bids received exceed R1 000 000, the bid has to be cancelled. If one or more of the acceptable bid(s) received are below the R1 000 000 threshold, all bids received have to be evaluated on the 80/20 preference point system.

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.

9. Intellectual property rights

Evaluation material is highly sensitive. The ownership of the material generated during the evaluation shall remain with the commissioning department or commissioning unit within a department. However, evaluations that are part of the national evaluation plan will be made publically available, unless there are major concerns about making them public. In general, publication of results in journals is to be welcomed, but only after the reports have been to Cabinet/Provincial EXCO/ top management, and subject to permission by the commissioning department/commissioning unit within a department to ensure that confidential information is not used. In referencing the evaluation reports, they should be referenced as e.g. DPME/DSD (2016) and not in the name of the service provider.

10. General and special conditions of contract

Make it clear that awarding of the final contract is subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

11. Enquiries

Clarify who is the contact for enquiries.

Signed

Mr Tshediso Matona
Acting Director-General
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
Date:

Annex 1: Requirements for metadata

A metadata should accompany any datasets produced. It should include, amongst other issues, the following:

1. Explanation of what format the data is in and how one might convert the data into another format if needed (eg from Excel to Stata).
2. Description of the data: What the units of analysis are, how many variables (columns) there are, etc.
3. Data structure: Description of whether the data is contained in a single data file or in several data files. If there are separate data files there should be an explanation of how to merge the various data files (eg what unique identifiers should be used to merge the data files).
4. Explanation of variable labelling and how the variable names correspond to the questionnaires.
5. A discussion about the weights. Which weights should be used when doing various types of analysis?
6. Data quality issues. Are there any variables that should be treated with caution due to reliability issues?
7. A discussion of non-response and what procedures were followed to deal with it, if any (eg imputation).
8. A discussion of coding: What coding was used to identify "unspecified", "don't know", "Not Applicable, etc.
9. Derived variables: Are there any derived variables (eg minimum infrastructure standards combining water, electricity, toilets, etc)? How were these calculated?

Annex 2: Examples of evaluation purpose and evaluation questions

An implementation evaluation of the land reform recapitalization and development programme

1. Purpose of the Evaluation

Provide strategic information on the implementation of the RADP since its inception in 2010, stakeholders' effectiveness during the implementation of the programme and compile lessons learned and recommendations. The evaluation will provide the Department and the intended beneficiaries of RADP with information and recommendations on how to improve the implementation of this program in line with its targets and objectives.

2. Key evaluation questions

The evaluation will respond to the following key questions:
2.1. Are the two interventions (strategic partnership and mentorship) effective in developing the projects?
2.2. Does the programme effectively develop the intended beneficiaries to participate in commercial production?
2.3. Is the programme reaching its targeted beneficiaries?
2.4. Was the RADP designed appropriately for the achievement of its objectives?
2.5. Are the resources used efficiently? Is the value for money being obtained?

Impact/Implementation Evaluation of the of Support Programme for Industry Innovation (SPII)

1. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of SPII and to determine how the beneficial impacts can be strengthened.

2. Key Evaluation Questions

Impact Questions

2.1. What is the impact of SPII on the innovation activity in South Africa?
2.2. What impact does SPII have on economic development through technology transfer and technology development?
2.3. Do industry partners realise a significant return on investment (ROI) from SPII in terms of profitability, skills development, and sustainability? After how long is the ROI realised?
2.4. Does South Africa realize a significant return on investment from SPII against the cost of delivering the programme in terms of:
- Economic growth and empowerment;
- Skills development and Job creation (Rate);
- Taxable revenue;
- Competitiveness;

2.5. What happens to the Intellectual Property from completed SPII projects?
- To what extent are they commercialized, if not, why?
- To what extent are benefits realized in South Africa, if not, why?

2.6. Is SPII still relevant when considering other instruments in the innovation landscape?
2.7. What factors in the South African context enable or constrain the beneficial impact of SPII, including the long term sustainability of those impacts?
2.8. How can the beneficial impacts of SPII be strengthened?

Annex 3: Example of the Project Plan using example of the Implementation Evaluation of Nutrition (2012/13)

Activity / deliverable	Who	By when
Review panel for coverage for this evaluation	Health/DPME	3 August 2012
Letter confirming co-funding agreement by custodian department submitted to DPME	Health/DPME	3 August 2012
Approval of the Terms of Reference (ToRs), peer reviewers and shortlisted service providers	Steering Committee	20 Aug 2012
Call for proposals from shortlist of service providers from evaluation panel	DPME (Commissioning Department)	21 Aug 2012
Briefing with service providers	Steering Committee	27 Aug 2012
Proposals received	DPME	19 Sept 2012
Presentations by 3 shortlisted service providers	Technical Group	26 Sept 2012
Recommendation of service providers passing quality threshold	Steering Committee	27 Sept 2012
Supply chain selects service provider	DPME supply chain	28 Sept 2012
Successful bidder notified	DPME	1 Oct 2012
Service provider contract signed and work starts	DPME/Service provider (SP)	8 Oct 2012
Briefing session for the selected Service Provider	DPME & Health+	9 Oct 2012
Inception Report submitted	Service Provider	16 Oct 2012
Review of the inception report and recommend areas needing change prior to circulation to SC and PR	DPME	
Review of the inception report by the Peer Reviewer	Peer Reviewer	To be confirmed in SP proposal
Incorporation of comments from Peer Review and Steering Committee	Service Provider	
Literature review	Service Provider	
Review of the literature review report and recommend areas needing change prior to circulation to SC and PR	DPME	
Report structure, analysis plan and final data collection instruments and other tools	Service Provider	
Possible pilot of instruments	Service Provider	
Intermediate reports e.g. case study reports	Service Provider	
Review of the intermediate reports and recommend areas needing change prior to circulation to SC and PR	DPME	5 days after submission
Draft full evaluation report (with 1 page policy implications and 5 page executive summary)completed for review	Service Provider	15 Mar 2013
Review of the draft evaluation report and recommend areas needing change prior to circulation to SC and PR	DPME	5 Days after submission
Workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report	Service Provider	26 Mar 2013
Brief principals on the draft report	All departments	
Peer Review of the Report & comments from Steering Committee	Peer Reviewer & Steering Committee	29 Mar 2013
Final Report version 1	Service Provider	12 Apr 2013
Comments to service provider from Steering Committee and Peer reviewer on Final Report	Steering Committees/peer reviewers	19 Apr 2013
Final report draft 2 submitted	Service provider	1 May 2013
Present final report to MINMEC	Department	
Steering Committee to approve final report	Steering Committee	3 May 2013
Management Response requested from DGs	DPME	6 May 2013
Management response from DGs	DGs	20 May 2013
Improvement plan drafted in a workshop	Steering Comm	31 May 2013
Report with improvement Plan and Management Response submitted into Social Protection Cabinet Committee system	DPME	June 2013
Report on dept and DPME website	Depts & DPME	2 May 2013
Communication to stakeholders	Depts & DPME	June 2013

Annex 4: Outline Terms of Reference for Evaluation Steering Committees

All evaluations under the National Evaluation Plan are a partnership between at least a custodian department and DPME, and potentially other departments. A coordination mechanism is needed to oversee the evaluation, which is a Steering Committee, which takes the responsibility for ensuring the quality of the evaluation and approving evaluation reports. This outline provides the general guideline for the terms of reference of Steering Committees, which should be adapted for specific evaluations. Even when the DPME is not co-funding the evaluation the steering committee will still need to be set up in this way and carry out functions outlined in these ToRs.

Steering Committees may cover more than one evaluation, and for some evaluations, a technical or management group may also need to be established to liaise with the service provider on an ongoing basis and deal with technical detail, such as considering research instruments. A separate TOR is available for this if needed. Below is an example of TORs for the CAPS Evaluation.

Terms of Reference for the steering committee for the Implementation Evaluation of the Curriculum and Policy Statements (CAPS)

The following are terms of reference for the Evaluation of the Implementation Evaluation of the Curriculum and Policy Statements (CAPS) which has been included in the 2015/16 National Evaluation Plan.

1. Objective of the Steering Committee

To oversee and take decisions on the overall evaluation of the CAPS.

1. Specific tasks

(Some of these tasks may be undertaken and overseen by the technical working group which will comprise of representatives from DPME and DBE programme managers and the M&E unit)

2.1 Review and approve the Project Plan for the evaluation.
Review and approve the TORs for the evaluation.
2.2 Suggest, review and approve peer reviewers.
2.3 During the inception phase review the proposal by the service provider and recommend changes.
2.4 Review the inception report, consider comments from peer reviewers, recommend changes if needed, and approve the inception report.
2.5 Provide feedback on draft reports, including comments from peer reviewers to the service provider.
2.6 Participate in a workshop with stakeholders if appropriate.
2.7 Review and approve the final report as a satisfactory evaluation report that is technically sound and factually correct.
2.8 Recommend approval or not of specific recommendations emerging from the report. DBE will then produce a management response which will indicate any concerns they have around content, and will then work with DPME on developing an Improvement Plan and on communicating the results of the evaluation.

3. Steering Committee Members

Institution	Members Details
DBE	**Chair:** 1. Mr Suren Govender; Chief Director: Curriculum Implementation and Monitoring **Members:**

Institution	Members Details
	2. Ms Carol Nuga Deliwe; Chief Director: Strategic Planning, Research and Coordination 3. Dr Nhlanhla Nduna-Watson; Director: Curriculum Implementation and Quality Improvement (FET) 4. Dr Jenny Joshua; Director: Curriculum Implementation and Quality Improvement (GET) 5. Ms Marie-Louise Samuels; Director Early Childhood Development 6. Ms Elspeth Khembo; Project Manager: Mathematics, Science and Technology 7. Dr Stephen Taylor; Advisor: Office of the Director-General 8. Mr Justice Libago; Acting Director: Research Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation 9. Ms Nompumelelo Mohohlwane; Assistant Director: Research Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation
The Presidency; Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	**Secretariat:** 10. Mr Jabu Mathe; Director: Evaluation & Research Unit 11. Ms Lungiswa Zibi; Evaluation Officer: Evaluation & Research Unit **Other member(s):** 12. Dr Thabo Mabogoane; Deputy Director-General: Outcome Facilitator – Outcome 1: Education 13. Alternate: Ms Nomveliso Khaile; Outcomes Manager – Outcome 1: Education 14. Mr John Kruger; Sector Specialist: Education National Planning Commission Secretariat
Members who will be included in special meetings	Umalusi, ETDP-SETA and other education sector stakeholders as determined by the Steering Committee.

The quorum will consist of 50% plus 1 member (7 members) from the Steering Committee members.

4. Technical Working Group

The Technical Working Group will carry out some of the specific tasks indicated in the Terms of Reference as a technical forum for the completion of the evaluation. Members will be requested to prepare documentation, present progress reports and other related work to the Steering Committee. Individual members of the TWG will be invited to the Steering Committee Meetings as required. Members are as follows:

Institution	Members Details
DBE	Ms Florence Modipa (Policy Development) Ms Veena Maharaj (MST) Ms Chintha Maharaj (GET) Ms Marie Schoeman (INCLUSIVE EDUCATION) Ms Cheryl Weston (FET) Ms Nompumelelo Mohohlwane (RCME) Dr Stephen Taylor (ODG)
The Presidency; Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Mr Jabu Mathe; Director: Evaluation & Research Unit Ms Lungiswa Zibi; Evaluation Officer: Evaluation & Research Unit Ms Nomveliso Khaile; Outcomes Manager

TWG meetings will be convened by the Secretariat and chaired by DPME (Mr Mathe)

5. Bid Evaluation Committee

The Bid Evaluation Committee will evaluate proposals and provide the assessment of these on functionality criteria to the commissioning department, recommending those who pass the minimum standard. The commissioning department will then complete the selection process. Make comments on the proposal of the winning bidder and participate at the inception meeting

Institution	Members Details
DBE	1. Ms Marie-Louise Samuels: Director: Early Childhood Development 2. Ms Elspeth Khembo: Project Manager – MST 3. Dr Stephen Taylor, Advisor: Office of the Director-General 4. Mr Justice Libago, Acting Director: Research Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation
The Presidency; Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	4. Mr Jabu Mathe; Director: Evaluation & Research Unit 5. Ms Nomveliso Khaile; Outcomes Manager 6. Mr John Kruger; Sector Specialist: Education National Planning Commission Secretariat

BEC chairperson to present findings to the Steering Committee and attend meetings as per request.

5. Roles

The Co-Chairpersons will alternate the chairing of the steering committee meetings, whilst DPME will provide the secretariat services.

Role	Tasks
(DBE)	• Chair steering committee meetings; • Ensure a formal letter and other communication goes to relevant provincial departments or other stakeholders to ask for support and access for the service provider; • Brief principals and ensure that the emerging findings and implications are shared in appropriate management forums; • Read and comment on time on all products of the evaluators; and • Possibly convening a workshop of stakeholders to consider the findings.
DPME	• Provide secretariat for the steering committee. This entails: ➢ Consulting with the chair to draft meeting agendas ➢ Producing minutes of meetings (which should be issued within 2 days) and ensuring these are signed ➢ Production and monitoring of the Project Plan ➢ If commissioning, provide financial reports to the Steering Group ➢ Circulate agendas and key reports at least 3 days before meetings • Contract and make payments to the service provider based on recommendations from the steering committee as well as satisfaction with deliverables. • Ensure that the evaluation follows the evaluation policy framework and guidelines • Read and comment on time on all products of the evaluators • Manage and co-ordinate the tasks of the Technical Working Group as well as the Bid Evaluation Committee. • Pay for peer reviews, workshops, and travel costs for content experts brought in to assist

Role	Tasks
Other members	• Attend Steering Committees; • Brief principals and ensure that the emerging findings and implications are shared in appropriate management forums; • Read and comment on time on all products of the evaluators
TWG	• Attend Steering Committees; • Provide technical guidance; • Prepare documents on behalf of Steering Committee; • Present progress reports to Steering Committee
Bid Evaluation Committee	• Participate in compulsory briefing session; • Review proposals; • Assess proposals on functionality criteria of the commissioning department; • Recommend a bidder who passes the minimum standards; • Comment on the proposal of the winning bidder; • Attend the Inception meeting

5. Meetings

The Steering Committee will meet as needed for the assignment. Key meetings based on milestones in the project plan are likely to include:

1) Approval of ToRs and the project plan for the evaluation;
2) Appointment of a bid adjudication committee;
3) Appointment of Peer reviewers;
4) Review and approval of the inception report;
5) Review and provision of substantive feedback on the draft report;
6) Review and approval of the final report;
7) Recommend approval of recommendations emerging from the final report; and
8) Develop the Improvement Plan with other stakeholders.