

# SCORE SHEET – EVALUATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL/PROVINCIAL/DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN 20\_/\_ – 20\_/20

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

## Notes:

- This template is based on selection for National Evaluations but can be adapted for Provincial and Departmental Evaluations.
- Please do not give intermediate scores

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

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

Overall comment:		
Category total score	50	

## 2 Is it important that it is evaluated in 2017/18 or following 2 years?

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
<b>2.1 Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions are to be taken for which an evaluation is needed?</b> 10= Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2017/18 where key decisions needed – evaluation needs to start asap 8= Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2018/19 where key decisions needed 5= Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2019/20 where key decisions needed 0= Not critical decision point <i>Comment</i>	10	
<b>2.2 Previous evaluations - How recently was this intervention evaluated?</b> 5= If >5 years 0= If <2 years (unless the evaluation proposed is very different) <i>Comment</i>	5	
Overall comment		
Category total score	15	

## 3 How feasible will it be to evaluate this year?

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

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
<b>3.1 Focus of evaluation - Is the object of evaluation clear (policy, programme, plan or project), and are the evaluative questions clear?</b> 10= The evaluation is clear with strong evaluative questions 5= The evaluation has a reasonable focus but could be clarified 0= The evaluation is unclear <i>Comment</i>	10	
<b>3.2 Availability of monitoring data - Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested?</b> 10= Key data is needed and available 5= Key data is needed but will have to be collected 0= Key data is needed but difficult to obtain <i>Comment</i>	15	
<b>3.3 Availability of budget - How assured are we that there is a budget for the evaluation from the department or donors?</b> 10= Full budget available from department/donor but DPME can procure	10	

<b>Criteria</b> <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	<b>Max Score</b>	<b>Score</b>
5= Budget likely or partially available from department, and supplemented by DPME 0= Only budget available is from DPME, or department unwilling for DPME to procure <i>Comment</i>		
<b>Overall comment</b>		
<b>Category total score</b>	<b>35</b>	

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

### Assessors

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

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

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

No.	DECISION AND FEEDBACK	Please tick (X)
1	Yes, evaluation should be considered for the plan for the year requested (2017/18; 2018/19; 2019/20 - circle the year requested). <i>Reasons:</i>	
2	Not recommended for the 2017/18 national evaluation plan but a good idea, and could be considered for national evaluation plan for 2018/19 or 2019/20 (recommend which by circling the year). <i>Reasons:</i>	
3	Not included in the plan and the department needs to strengthen certain aspects (either to implement itself, or to resubmit next year). <i>Reasons and aspects to be strengthened:</i>	
4	Rethink and we suggest these areas need to be revisited (to be indicated) <i>Reasons and areas to be revisited:</i>	

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