



The Presidency
 Republic of South Africa
 Department: Planning, Monitoring
 and Evaluation

DPME Evaluation Guideline 2.2.16

How to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan

Developed: 1 July 2015

Revised: 13 July 2015

Addressed to	National and provincial departments and public entities
Purpose	To give practical guidance for developing and managing departmental/organizational evaluation plans and systems.
Reference documents	National Evaluation Policy Framework Concept for National Evaluation Plan
Contact person	Ian Goldman, Evaluation and Research Unit (ERU), DPME E-mail: ian@presidency-dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0155

1 Introduction

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) focuses on evaluations of strategic and important policies, programmes or projects, which are identified as part of a National Evaluation Plan. It also talks of Offices of the Premier and departments rolling out similar plans. By 2015/16 five provinces had approved Provincial Evaluation Plans (PEPS). Some national and provincial departments have also developed Departmental Evaluation Plans (DEPs). Both provinces and departments have based their plans on the processes, frameworks and guidelines developed for the national evaluation system, so they do not need to start from the scratch but to customise the national system in their respective spheres of operation.

Evaluation is a fundamental component of the standard operating procedures of Departments. Typically Government goes about its work through cycles of planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and reporting, and now also evaluation. Besides its importance in the lifecycle of departments, evaluation can also be used to inform ongoing strategic management and decision-making of policy implementation, programmes and projects.

This is a guideline and it is not meant to be prescriptive. A template is attached for a possible structure of a DEP, but departments may want to adapt it. Departments may also want to include both their evaluation and research agenda, as for example DHET has done.

2 Purpose of the Departmental Evaluation Plan

The purpose of a Departmental Evaluation Plan, as for the National and Provincial Evaluation Plans, is to provide details of evaluations approved by departmental EXCO/top management as priority evaluations to undertake over a three year period, which are linked with the budget

process. National departments relate to the DPME, whereas provincial departments relate to the Office of the Premier in the given province.

3 Users of the guideline

Any stakeholder in national and provincial departments and public entities can use the guideline Table 1 below, provides the list of potential key users of the guideline.

Table 1: Users of the Guideline

Users/stakeholders of the guideline	Needs/priorities	concerns
Programme managers (PMs)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To understand the importance of evaluation and that it is developmental and constructive rather than punitive 2) To understand the importance of the process/cycle and why evaluations need to be budgeted for 3) Restating/linking the NEPF 4) Clarifying the link between PEPs, DEPs and the NEPs, the NES and NEPF 5) Understanding the link with the evaluation MPAT standard and Performance Agreements 6) Clarifying their role in the system 7) Clarity on government evaluation discourse 8) 	Consolidation, bedding down evaluations Negative perceptions of evaluation Communicating evaluation results
M&E/policy/research units – evaluation commissioners and managers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) As PMs plus 2) Understand the process of developing a DEP 	
Senior managers	As PMs	
Evaluators	As PMs	
Training institutions/academics	As PMs plus providing a training resource	
Researchers /academics	As PMs plus providing a training resource	

4 Linkage with the National and Provincial Evaluation System

- 4.1 As part of the National Evaluation System, a National Evaluation Policy Framework has been approved by Cabinet, guidelines have been developed, a set of standardised types of evaluation have been proposed, as well as standards for evaluations, competences for government staff and evaluators, workshops, training to support the evaluation system etc.
- 4.2 In general it is suggested that departments formally adopt the National Evaluation Policy Framework, and then use these systems and processes in the development and implementation of the Departmental Evaluation Plan
- 4.3 A key focus in the approach in the NEPF is ensuring utilisation, and this means that departments must own the evaluations they are undertaking.

5 Linkages with programme planning, strategic planning, APP and MPAT, M&E framework

- 5.1 *Programme Planning*
Evaluation is a critical element in the programme planning process. Embedding the practice of evaluation in the programme cycle will ensure that evaluations inform planning and budgeting. This will assist in improving performance throughout the programme cycle.
- 5.2 *Strategic Planning*
Evaluations form an integral part of the strategic management processes of the department. Therefore, the DEP must be developed as part of the strategic planning process and must be informed by the priorities of the department as outlined in the strategic plan.
- 5.3 *Annual Performance Plan (APP)*
The development and review of the APPs should also take into account the development and implementation of DEPs. The implementation of the DEPs should also be linked to the budget process of the MTEF.
- 5.4 *Management Performance Assessment Tool (MPAT)*
It has become an MPAT requirement for all national and provincial departments to have a formalised and structured evaluation process. All departments will be required to develop a DEP that will outline the extent of capacity, organisation and implementation of evaluations that inform programme, policy, plans and system design.
- 5.5 *M&E Framework*
The development of the DEP should also take into account the priorities that have been identified in the M&E framework of the department. This will ensure that commitments that are in the framework should inform the content of the DEP. The monitoring data from the M&E framework should form the basis of the evaluations of the interventions that are in the DEP. The baseline data to be collected through reports from the framework should provide data that will be essential for the executions of evaluations that will be in the DEP.

6 Process of developing a Departmental Evaluation Plan

- 6.1 Key to the successful implementation of the departmental evaluation plan is to put in place an evaluation system. This includes the establishment of a Departmental Evaluation Working Group (DEWG) to oversee the evaluation system and support it across the department. The DEWG should include relevant officials such as policy/planning unit, programme managers, CFO, M&E staff. Refer to Annex 2 for the suggested Terms of Reference for a Departmental Evaluation Working Group.
- 6.2 In cases where there is no evaluation system the departmental M&E/ Evaluation unit should make presentations to EXCO/Manco to secure senior management support and to discuss the significance of the evaluation system and the expectations in terms of MPAT evaluation standards 1.3.2.
- 6.3 The Departmental Evaluation Working Group (DEWG) should meet and develop the call for evaluations for the three years, informed by this guideline for developing Departmental Evaluation Plans and the MPAT evaluation standard 1.3.2. The call should be considered at a EXCO/Manco meeting which formally calls for proposals for potential evaluations from the branches.
- 6.4 The M&E unit should organise consultative workshops with branches to engage on the potential areas for evaluation and assist them to develop concept notes. The template to develop concept notes is attached as Annex 4.
- 6.5 The Concept notes are presented at the DEWG for technical inputs and refinement and for initial selection. The motivations for potential evaluations are then discussed and agreed at Manco/Exco. Then the departmental plan is drafted which incorporates information from the concept notes. See Annex 1 for a proposed format for the Departmental Evaluation Plan. The M&E unit in consultation with the DEWG will be responsible for the development of the Departmental Evaluation Plan.
- 6.6 The draft Departmental Evaluation Plan is presented at Manco/Exco for endorsement and signed off by the Accounting Officer.
- 6.7 The Terms of Reference for the approved evaluations are developed and steering committees for the evaluations are established and the required training is also provided for key programme and M&E staff that will be involved in the evaluation.
- 6.8 The suggested set of steps and timing for this to link with the budget process is shown in Table 1. Note there is not time to implement the full process in developing the 2016/17 Plan and so the Guideline includes a proposed abbreviated process for implementing in 2015 to develop the 2016/17 Plan. This will be removed for the 2017/18 Plan. Note evaluation could be part of M&E Unit, part of planning or research. It depends where the evaluation capacity is in the department. We use M&E unit/evaluation unit to cover this evaluation capacity.
- 6.9 More work is needed nationally to consider how the DEP fits with the PEP and NEP for each year and to align the cycles. This will be done in time for the starting the process for the 2017/18 Plan.

Table 1: Action plan for developing the 2016/17+2 National Evaluation Plan

	Action	Responsible	Ideally	DEP 2016/17 process
Development and submission of concepts	1. Meeting of EXCO/MANCO to consider priority evaluations (supported by evaluation staff) and discussion on process for concept note submissions including concept note format	Evaluation Unit in Dept	March 2015	No concept note for this year, just email requesting names of programmes to evaluate
	2. Half day briefing workshops with branches/units within departments to deepen understanding of the National Evaluation Policy Framework, the Concept for the Departmental Evaluation Plan	Evaluation Unit in Dept	April 2015	Skip
	3. Workshopping of draft concept notes for evaluations with programme managers	Evaluation Unit in Dept	1 May 2015	Skip
	4. DEWG or Evaluation Unit discusses draft concept notes with relevant programmes	DEWG / Evaluation Unit in Dept	Mid May 2015	31 August 2015
	5. Deadline for concept notes to be submitted	Branches	20 May 2015	skip
Selection and refining	6. Proposals reviewed by DEWG or Evaluation Unit and recommendations made to EXCO/MANCO for X evaluations for 2016/17, 2017/18 and 2016/17.	DEWG / Evaluation Unit in Dept	End May 2015	5 September 2015
	7. Deadline for branches to include evaluations in their 3 year budgets	Branches	June 2015	September 2015
	8. Departmental Evaluation Plan drafted	Evaluation Unit in Dept	Mid June 2015	10 Sept 2015 as a simple version without the 1.5 pager on each evaluation
	9. DEP submitted to departmental EXCO for approval	Evaluation Unit in Dept	End June 2015	15 Sept 2015 simple version
	10. Possibility of scoping workshops for each evaluation where wider stakeholders help to guide the appropriate focus and scope of the evaluation	Evaluation Unit and relevant Programme Manager	Aug/Sept 2015	October 2015
	11. If possible training of programme manager/evaluation staff for each evaluation recommended for 2015/16 and to draft TORs produced for evaluations. DPME has developed standard courses available through different service providers.	Evaluation Unit in Dept	September 2015	October 2015
	12. Possibility of design clinic with evaluation experts to review theory of change, evaluation purpose, questions and methodology and refine TORs	Evaluation Unit in Dept	October 2015	November 2015
Start-up	13. TORs finalised for evaluations and Steering Committees established	Evaluation Unit in Dept	Jan 2016	Jan 2016
	14. Procurement undertaken or planning of internal evaluation	Evaluation Unit in Dept	Feb 2016	Feb 2016
	15. Contracts awarded (if external) and inception meetings	Evaluation Unit in Dept	March 2016	March 2016

8 Format of a Departmental Evaluation Plan

Annex 1 is an indicative template for a Departmental Evaluation Plan. It should incorporate at least the following elements:

- A cover page with the name of department, logo, contact person and must specify the three year cycle
- Foreword by the Accounting Officer
- Content and glossary pages
- Executive summary
- An introduction to the Departmental Evaluation System
- An outline of the process followed to develop the Plan including the criteria for selection;
- A summary/ progress update of evaluations undertaken in the past 3 years;
- An outline of the proposed/approved evaluations, indicating a background to the intervention being evaluated, what the evaluation will focus on, what methodology is likely to be used, and resource implications.
- The process of follow-up to the evaluations

9 Role of the Evaluation Unit within the department

9.1 The M&E unit is likely to be the custodian of the departmental evaluation system, and so should lead on the departmental evaluation system and act as a champion for evaluation within the department. The unit should establish a departmental Evaluation Working Group to support the system.

9.2 The evaluation/M&E unit with the DEWG should then:

- Initiate the decision by management as to whether the department wishes to take forward the evaluation system and ensure alignment with the MPAT evaluation standard;
- Ensure that executive and senior management of the department is fully aware, understand and commits to the system;
- Ensure the evaluation unit is well resourced and skilled to manage the implementation of the evaluation system;
- Request support from DPME/OTP¹ in accessing resources such as guidelines and training to support the system;
- Develop and update on an on-going basis the systems for the departmental evaluation system, starting with the Call/Concept;
- Issue a call/concept for evaluations and assist branches to prepare concept notes;
- Develop and manage the Departmental Evaluation Plan;
- Perform the secretariat function for the DEWG;
- Develop an inventory of existing evaluations already undertaken in the department, and maintain the inventory on an on-going basis;
- Manage the process for developing and undertaking evaluations, including developing and monitoring Improvement Plans arising from evaluations;
- Undertake quality control all evaluations undertaken for the Departmental Evaluation Plan – note DPME may be able to support independent quality assessment;

¹ For national departments this would be DPME, for provincial the Office of the Premier (OTP)

- Ensure that part of implementation programme budgets are being allocated to regular evaluations;
- Evaluation Units could part-fund evaluations in the DEP and possibly fund evaluation capacity development ;
- Ensure that evaluations are planned in line with the programme life cycle and aligned with the departmental planning processes (Strategic plan, annual plans, etc.);
- Ensure evaluation steering committees are established for each evaluation for purposes of oversight and project management;
- Ensure that the learnings from evaluation findings are implemented in Improvement Plans and are used for planning, budget and other decision-making;
- Decide on modalities for, and encourage wider dissemination of evaluation results;
- Ensure that the types of evaluation proposed are appropriate and balanced
- Ensure that evaluation data sets are centrally stored for access (information management).

10 Role of OTP in supporting evaluation systems for provincial departments

- 10.1 The Office of the Premier (OTP) champions evaluations in the province. Part of OTP's role is to ensure that evaluations are undertaken systematically across the province to improve performance and accountability. As part of developing the provincial evaluation system, provincial departments should have been consulted as systems and guidelines emerge.
- 10.2 As such OTP will assist provincial departments in the development of departmental evaluation systems. This support can include:
- Presentations to senior management around the provincial evaluation system;
 - Supporting provincial departments in developing their Concept for a Departmental Evaluation Plan, and in taking forward the call for evaluations;
 - Making available all the guidelines and systems developed as part of the provincial evaluation system;
 - Ensuring that all systems, including software, can be customised for use by provincial departments;
 - Facilitate evaluation training and skills development to provincial departments
 - Monitor implementation of improvement plans for evaluations in the PEP;
 - Could part-fund evaluations prioritised in the PEP
 - Annex 3 is a Responsibility Matrix for departmental evaluation systems.

11 Role of DPME in supporting Departmental Evaluation Systems

- 11.1 Part of DPME's role is to ensure that evaluations are undertaken systematically across government to improve performance and accountability. As part of developing the national evaluation system, Offices of the Premier and departments have been consulted as systems and guidelines emerge.
- 11.2 As such DPME will assist national departments in the development of departmental evaluation systems. This support can include:
- Presentations to senior management around the national evaluation system;
 - Supporting national departments in developing their Concept for Departmental Evaluation Plan. Making available all the guidelines and systems developed as part of the national evaluation system;

- Making available the evaluations conducted already or planned to be conducted;
- Ensuring that all systems, including software, can be customised for use by national departments;
- Providing guidance to departments on sources of training to departments; Facilitate sharing of best practices at National and Provincial M&E Forums and other relevant platforms.
- Potentially there could be shared services provided by DPME for all departments, such as quality assessment of evaluations. Annex 2 is a Responsibility Matrix for departmental evaluation systems.

12 Role of national departments in supporting concurrent functions

- Ensure alignment between provincial and national evaluation systems;
- Ensure alignment between provincial and national evaluation plans to avoid duplication;
- Facilitate capacitation of provincial departments' evaluation units;
- Ensure provinces participate in the DEWG or evaluation steering committees and vice versa;
- Support implementation of improvement plans at provincial level

13 Sharing learnings around implementing departmental evaluation systems

- 13.1 Offices of the Premier and departments should provide on-going feedback to DPME on learnings emerging from the rollout of the system, to refine the national evaluation system, and to ensure that learnings are shared across the country. 13.2 The Departmental M&E Forum can be used to share learnings, potentially with special sittings to enable in-depth sharing.
- 13.3 In addition departmental representatives sit on the national Evaluation Technical Working Group and so participate in the development and rollout of the national system.

Ms Nolwazi Gasa
Acting Director-General
The Presidency: Planning Monitoring and Evaluation
Date: 1 July 2015

**Annex 1: Template for
Departmental Plan**



THE PRESIDENCY
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Format for a Departmental Evaluation Plan 2016/17 – 2017/18

Foreword by the Accounting Officer

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	The main functions of the Department of.....	1
1.2	Department's approach to evaluation (and research)	1
1.3	The National Evaluation System.....	1
2	Purpose of the Departmental Evaluation Plan (DEP)	2
3	Linkages to wider evaluation plans and systems	2
3.1	Linkage to (national or provincial) evaluation plans	2
3.2	Linkage to planning	3
3.3	Link to the departments M&E framework.....	3
4	Departmental evaluation system	3
4.1	Resources & structure of the department to support evaluation.....	3
4.2	Departmental evaluation cycle.....	3
5	Departmental evaluations (and research) undertaken in the last 3 years	4
6	Summary of evaluations (and research) proposed for 2016/17 to 2015/16	5
6.1	Criteria and process used for selection for the Departmental Evaluation Plan	5
6.2	Summary of evaluations proposed for the Departmental Evaluation Plan.....	5
7	Detailed concepts for evaluations (and research) for 2016/17	7
7.1	Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme....	7
7.2	Evaluation 2	8
8	Key implementation issues	8
8.1	Capacity to undertake the evaluations	8
8.2	Institutional arrangements	8
8.3	Funding of the evaluations in the Plan.....	9
8.4	Follow-up to the evaluations.....	10
8.5	Next steps once the plan is approved.....	10

Glossary

3ie	International Institute for Impact Evaluation
DEP	Departmental Evaluation Plan
DEWG	Departmental Evaluation Working Group
DPME	Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
ERU	Evaluation and Research Unit, DPME
NEP	National Evaluation Plan
NEPF	National Evaluation Policy Framework
PEP	Provincial Evaluation Plan

Departmental Evaluation (and Research?)² Plan for 2016/17

Executive summary

DRAFT

² Note the department may want to have a combined evaluation and research plan, as with DHET, or keep these separate. Either way there should be a plan for both. In the rest of the template (and research) is added in some cases to remind of this. It could also be added in other cases. So where these are combined where we write DEP you may want to use DERP.

1 Introduction

1.1 The main functions of the Department of....

Introduce the main functions of the department³

1.2 Department's approach to evaluation (and research)

Outline the approach to evaluation (and research) in the department.

1.3 The National Evaluation System

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF) was approved in November 2011 and set out the approach in establishing a National Evaluation System for South Africa. It seeks to ensure that evaluation is applied systematically to inform planning, policy-making and budgeting, so contributing to improving government's effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The purpose of promoting evaluation is:

- Improving policy or programme **performance** (evaluation for learning) - providing feedback to managers;
- Improving **accountability** for where public spending is going and the difference it is making;
- Improving **decision-making** eg on what is working or not-working;
- Increasing **knowledge** about what works and what does not with regards to a public policy, plan, programme, or project.

A National Evaluation Plan summarises the evaluations to be taken forward as national priorities. Provinces are also developing Provincial Evaluation Plans (PEPs) to support provincial priorities, and national and provincial departments are developing departmental evaluation plans (DEPs). Some evaluations in departmental evaluation plans may also be proposed for support under provincial or national evaluation plans.

In all cases departments and provinces are using the guidelines and minimum standards as part of the National Evaluation System (NES). The rest of this section summarises some key elements of the NES. There are 18 guidelines developed by DPME which support each of the different stages.

Evaluations can focus on policies, plans, programmes, projects, systems. The general term used is an intervention, which can be any of these. There is considerable emphasis on independence and quality, so that evaluations are credible. This happens through the use of steering committees; if external, evaluators selected from a panel, peer reviewers; role of departmental evaluation staff to ensure quality; independent quality assessment on completion (supported by DPME). Evaluations (and research) may be done externally through contracted service providers (more credible as distanced from management), or internally through departmental evaluation staff. If done internally it is very important that systems are put in place to ensure they are not unduly influenced by management, who may not like the findings.

Once completed reports are tabled at top management/EXCO, and improvement plans are developed and monitored, so that there is follow-up. If they are departmental they will be monitored by the department. If also part of the NEP/PEP⁴ they will be monitored by DPME/OTP. In principle evaluations are made public, tabled in the legislature and on

³ Note the text in this template in italics are instructions – not the actual text for the plan

⁴ Where a choice needs to be made they are highlighted in yellow

departmental websites, although in some cases they may be kept confidential. In general as they are using public funds the reports should be available to the public.

The main types of evaluation are:

- **Diagnostic** – to understand the problem, the root causes and options (should be conducted prior to designing a new intervention);
- **Design** evaluation – to assess whether the design of the intervention is robust and likely to work;
- **Implementation** – to understand how the intervention is working (often checking the theory of change), and whether it is likely to reach the outcomes;
- **Impact** evaluation – focusing on what outcomes or impacts are happening as a result of the intervention. This is difficult to do as you need to separate changes happening due to other factors. Impact evaluations should be designed in from the inception of an intervention, so the right data is collected, if appropriate a random sample is identified of people receiving the intervention to compare with those not receiving it, and in many cases a baseline is carried out on those receiving/not receiving it.
- **Economic** evaluation – looking at cost-benefits or cost-effectiveness.

Note these types can be combined eg a quantitative impact evaluation will usually also have a qualitative implementation evaluation to understand why changes are happening, and could also have an economic evaluation to assess costs and benefits.

Once the evaluation is completed, an official management response to the recommendations should be obtained from management, and an improvement plan drawn up, implementation of which is then monitored for at least two years to ensure that changes are being made.

The DEP will be rolled annually, with the timing linked to the budget process to enable budgeting for evaluations, at the same time as considering any to submit to be considered for the multiannual National/Provincial Evaluation Plan.

2 Purpose of the Departmental Evaluation Plan (DEP)

The purpose of the Department of X's Evaluation (and research) Plan is to provide details of evaluations approved by the department as priority evaluations to undertake over a three year period, which are linked with the budget process.

3 Linkages to wider evaluation plans and systems

3.1 Linkage to (national or provincial) evaluation plans

Departmental evaluations may also be part of national/provincial evaluation plans, in which case they are also identified as provincial/national priorities, and part-funded by the Office of the Premier/DPME, who are partners throughout the evaluation. Criteria for selection include their importance in terms of the 14 outcomes of the medium-term strategic framework (MTSF), as well as provincial/departmental priorities.

Where the functions are concurrent discuss possible linkages with provincial/national departments' evaluations, as well as across departments.

3.2 Linkage to planning

Evaluations are used to inform planning and budgeting. This includes the development of the department's strategic plan and annual performance plan. *Indicate how here.*

3.3 Link to the departments M&E framework

If you have a departmental M&E Framework summarise it here. Show how this is used to guide the selection of evaluations for the DEP.

4 Departmental evaluation system

4.1 Resources and structure of the department to support evaluation

Describe the overall evaluation (and research) capacity of the organisation, the financial and human resources.

4.2 Departmental evaluation cycle

The annual cycle for developing the evaluation plan is shown in Table 1 below. Note for the first year the cycle has had to be shortened to fit in with the MPAT assessment process.

Table 1: Unpacking the evaluation cycle

Phase 1: Preparing the DEP		
Action	Responsibility	Timeline
Call for proposals	M&E	1 March 2015
Writing workshop for concept notes	M&E	1 May 2015
Concept notes received	M&E	20 May 2015
Concept notes prioritised/selected	M&E	30 May 2015
Meet with Exco to agree	M&E	30 May Y-1
Departmental evaluation plan drafted	M&E	Mid June 2015
DEP submitted to EXCO for approval	M&E	End June 2015
Evaluation included in budgets	DDG/PM	30 June 2015
DEP signed off by DG / HOD	DG/HOD	End July 2015
Possibility of scoping workshop to discuss focus of evaluation	M&E	August 2015
Capacity building workshop	M&E	September 2015

Phase 2: Undertaking the evaluation (assuming external)			
	Action	Responsibility	Timeline
	Terms of Reference completed	Programme manager	January 2016
External SPs	Ccall for proposals from service providers out	SCM	1 February 2016
	Bidders briefing	Programme manager	8 February 2016
	Bids received	SCM	22 February 2016
	Bidders presentation	SCM/ Programme manager/M&E	8 March 2016
	Service provider selected	Bid Committee	8 March 2016
	Service provider appointed	DDG/PM	15 March 2016
	Inception report submitted (for an internal evaluation this will	Evaluator	29 March 2016

Phase 2: Undertaking the evaluation (assuming external)			
	Action	Responsibility	Timeline
	still be needed but may be different)		
	Draft report	Evaluator	30 September 2016
	Stakeholder validation workshop	Programme Manager	30 September 2016
	Final report	Evaluator	15 November 2016
	Final report approved	Steering Committee	30 November 2016

Phase 3: Follow-up		
Action	Responsibility	Timeline
Management response	DDG/PM	15 January 2017
Recommendations workshopped and improvement plan developed	DDG/PM	31 March 2017
Communication plan developed	DDG/PM	31 March 2017
Improvement plan signed off	DG/HOD	31 March 2017
Recommendations included in budget	DDG/PM	30 June 2017
Improvement Plan implemented		2 years following approval of Improvement Plan

5 Departmental evaluations (and research) undertaken in the last 3 years

Summarise the evaluations (and research) undertaken in the last 3 years (one paragraph on each). For those who have not completed any previously say so.

How does this relate to the overall portfolio of the department? Are there key areas that are missing?

Are there key interventions which are due for evaluations over the 3 years from 2013/14 to 2015/16?

Table 2: Example of table from DSD

	Title (include type of evaluation in the title)	Focus (purpose) of evaluation/ research	Status	Date of Completion	Implementation of findings (progress)
Programme 2: Comprehensive social security					
Child and family benefits	Impact evaluation of the Child Support Grant		Completed	2011/2012	
	Update of Social Assistance beneficiary profile		Planned	2012/2013	
Programme 3: Welfare services					
Welfare services	The beneficiary satisfaction survey			2012/2013	
Substance abuse	An evaluation of Ke Moja programme		Completed	2011/2012	
Social Crime Prevention	An evaluation study on causes of decrease in the number of children diverted		Planned	2012/2013	

	Title (include type of evaluation in the title)	Focus (purpose) of evaluation/ research	Status	Date of Completion	Implementation of findings (progress)
	since the implementation of the Child Justice Act, 2008				
Families	An evaluation of services rendered to families within the social sector		Completed	2011/2012	
ECD	Diagnostic Review of the early childhood development programme		Completed	2011/2012	

6 Summary of evaluations (and research) proposed for 2016/17 to 2015/16

6.1 Criteria and process used for selection for the Departmental Evaluation Plan

This section should summarise the criteria used for selecting evaluations. The criteria used for the NEP are in Box 1 and may be useful as a basis. Note also you should consider new interventions where evaluations should be planned prior (eg for a diagnostic evaluation), from the outset (eg doing a baseline for an impact evaluation), during to see how it is working (eg an implementation evaluation) and after some time an impact evaluation (which may well build on a baseline at the beginning of the intervention). A score card is attached in the Guideline which should be adapted for the criteria.

Box 1: Criteria used for selecting evaluations for the NEP

1. Interventions are a departmental **priority**:

- Linked to the 14 outcomes, and the top five priority ones have precedence;
- Large (with a programme budget of over R500m or with a wide footprint, covering over 10% of the population);
- Strategic, where it is important to learn.

Additional features to be considered include those interventions that:

2. Are **innovative** and where learning is important;
3. Are from an area where there is a lot of **public interest**;
4. Have a **theory of change**/logical framework. At this stage there are no minimum standards for implementation programmes so evaluations are not excluded if this is not the case;
5. Have not been evaluated recently;
6. Are at a **critical stage** where decisions are to be taken for which an evaluation is needed, and so it is important that it is evaluated now?
7. Ideally have **monitoring data** that can be used including background and previous documented performance, current programme situation;
8. Have a **potential budget** for evaluation from the department, DPME or donors. This is particularly important for 2012/13 where the Evaluation Plan has been developed late for the budget cycle. In future it will be developed at the same time.

6.2 Summary of evaluations proposed for the Departmental Evaluation Plan

Table 3 summarises the evaluations that are proposed for the three financial years covered by this Plan, those which are submitted for the National Evaluation Plan and those which are undertaken internally. These should be budgeted for in the budgets or the respective programmes.

Table 3: Summary of proposed evaluations (and research) for 2016/17 to 2018/19

Branch/ champion	Name of intervention to be evaluated	Title of evaluation (include the type)	Proposed Methodology	NEP/PEP /DEP	Commis sioned or internal	Years implementation of			Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (eg budget, beneficiaries)	Linkages to other evaluations
						2016/ 17	2017/ 18	2018/ 19		
2017/18										
DG's Office: Tim Ddladla, Impact Assessment	Business Process Services Programme ⁵	Implementatio n/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme	A mixed method will be used consisting of literature review, review of the theory of change and logical framework, cost-effectiveness analysis, interview with internal and external stakeholders and site visits.	NEP	Commis sioned	X			The South African government introduced a Business Process Outsourcing & Off-shoring (BPO&O) incentive programme in July 2007. The revised BPS Incentive Scheme Programme aims to attract investment and create employment in South Africa as a whole through off- shoring activities, and became effective in January 2011. It is envisaged that the Programme will result in the creation of a total number of 15 149 jobs over 3 years and support 22 firms in the 2011/12 financial year. The intervention is linked to outcomes 4 and 5. The three year budget is R754 million from 2012/13 to 2014/15	Evaluations have also happened in the NEP of other incentive programmes – SPII and THRIP.
2017/18										
2018/19										

⁵ Note this evaluation actually happened in 2012/13 and is just included here as an example

7 Detailed concepts for evaluations for 2016/17

Provide some detail on each evaluation you think should be undertaken in the first year of the plan. If you think it will take too long, you may want to leave out this section. You may want to adapt this format. For 2016/17 as the time is too short, it is suggested you drop this section as there is not time to develop full concept notes which would inform this section.

7.1 Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme⁶

Submitted for NEP/PEP/DEP: NEP

Implementing Branch: Incentives

Background to the evaluation

The South African government introduced a Business Process Outsourcing & Off-shoring (BPO&O) incentive programme in July 2007. During the period July 2007 to March 2010, the incentive resulted in the creation of at least 6,000 new jobs and attracted R303 million in direct investment. A systematic review of the BPO&O incentive programme was undertaken with the private sector and has resulted in a revised Business Process Services (BPS) Incentive scheme, which became effective in January 2011. While there was a programme review in 2010, there is still a need to evaluate the implementation mechanisms of the revised BPS incentive scheme as a way of improving on the take-up of scheme, which will in turn lead to faster job creation by the benefiting firms.

Importance of the evaluation

The BPS Incentive Scheme Programme aims to attract investment and create employment in South Africa as a whole through off-shoring activities. It is envisaged that the Programme will result in the creation of a total number of 15 149 jobs over 3 years and support 22 firms in the 2011/12 financial year.

The evaluation is linked to outcome 5: “*A skilled and capable workforce to support an inclusive growth path*” and output 5.3: “*Increase access to occupationally-directed programmes in needed areas and thereby expand the availability of intermediate level skills*”. The Monyetla Work Readiness Programme is utilised by the BPS to provide work-readiness training and placement for entry level agents within South Africa’s growing BPS industry. The programme is also directly linked to Outcome 4: “*Decent employment through inclusive growth*”. The evaluation will give an indication on the extent to which the above outcomes are being achieved. The current budget estimate of the programme is R754 724 000 for the next three years from 2012/13 to 2014/15.

Purpose of the evaluation

This evaluation will provide strategic information on whether the grant is achieving its policy goals; operational information on where, how and why its implementation achieves the best results, and show how its performance can be improved.

Type of evaluation Implementation and will include design and economic evaluations

Key questions to be addressed

- 1 Are the objectives of BPS being achieved?
- 2 Is the design of the programme supporting the achievement of programme objectives?
- 3 What is the current rate of job creation through the BPS scheme? (Why are jobs being created at this rate?)

⁶ Note this has been adapted to be useful as an example and is not necessarily a true picture of the real evaluation

- 4 What is the absorption rate of the Monyetla graduates by the firms that took up the BPS incentive scheme?
- 5 How cost-effective and competitive is South Africa's BPS programme relative to those of competing countries?
- 6 How can the programme be up-scaled for greater impact and what are the barriers to growing BPS in South Africa?

Principal audience Senior management of the department – to consider whether the programme is working and how to improve the programme.

High-level methodology

This should give a feel and not be in detail. It should also indicate whether the evaluation will lead to a follow up evaluation e.g. if it is a baseline for an endline which needs to be done five years later.

A mixed method consisting of literature review, review of the theory of change and logical framework, cost-effectiveness analysis, interview with internal and external stakeholders and site visits.

Change management strategy

This should indicate how this fits into the change management process of the intervention, specific decision processes around the intervention etc. If there are specific structures that it relates to e.g. an existing committee, also indicate that here.

Over the period 2016/17 to 2018/19 the dti is planning to review all its incentive programmes, to check if they are working and how to strengthen them. The BPS is the first of these and all others will be undertaken over the next three years as part of this comprehensive review.

Resource implications

Indicate the key resources requirements, including financial (with source), and any key human resource requirements, particularly if this is being done internally. If a follow up evaluation is required e.g. baseline/endline then indicate what budget is required for which year for follow-up.

The evaluation will cost R1 million, funded by DPME. An impact evaluation should be conducted in 2018/19 based on the revisions planned for the scheme which is likely to cost around R3 million.

Timing and duration

Again indicate for both this evaluation and if there is a follow-up.

The duration of the evaluation will be 9 months. It will start in April 2016 and should be completed by January 2017. An impact evaluation should be conducted in 2018/19.

7.2 Evaluation 2

8 Key implementation issues

8.1 Capacity to undertake the evaluations

Add evaluation capacity issues/requirements etc to implement the plan, indicating what needs to be done over the period.

8.2 Institutional arrangements

Discuss institutional issues such as establishing of a Departmental Evaluation Technical Working Group, Steering Committees for each evaluation. It is important to make clear how evaluations will be linked to the strategic agenda and planning and budgeting processes. Also the evaluations and their improvement plans should be included in the performance agreements of relevant staff. There may be a departmental panel of service providers or the department may use a national panel.

A departmental evaluation (and research) working group (DEWG) will be established⁷ to support evaluations in the department, so that it is seen as a department-wide initiative, not just the responsibility of the M&E or Evaluation Unit. This will include senior members of the evaluation unit, two programme managers (X and Y), and X as a representative from Planning/Policy Unit. It should be chaired by X, the Chief Director of Planning/Policy.... The role of the DEWG will be to support the departmental evaluation (and research) system, monitoring how it is working, select evaluations for the plan and recommend to management, and provide feedback to management on any changes needed. It will also seek to make the link to planning, hence the importance of a key manager from the Planning/Policy Unit leading. The TORs are in Annex 1.

Steering Committees will be established for each evaluation. These can be existing committees where they exist, but if so they should have sufficient time to supervise the evaluation.⁸ They should be chaired by the programme manager as the key owner of the evaluation, with the evaluation unit providing the secretariat, preparing for meetings, doing minutes etc.

An evaluation panel will be used to select external service providers to undertake evaluations. This is a group of organisations (universities, research institutions, consultants) selected through a tender process as having evaluation expertise.

There could be an agreement between departmental HoD and DG DPME to use the DPME panel, or a provincial panel.

Performance agreements of programme managers as well as evaluation staff must include both the conducting of specific evaluations as well as the improvement plans. The members of the DEWG should also have this in their performance agreements.

8.3 Funding of the evaluations in the Plan

DPME/OTP has an average of R750 000 to support evaluations in the National/Provincial Evaluation Plans. Otherwise funding comes from the department, or donors. The proposed funding is shown in the table below (and the departmental allocations have been submitted in the MTEF process):

Table 4: Summary of budget needed for evaluation (and research)

Name of intervention	Title of evaluation	Approx budget (R)	Source of funds		
			Dept	DPME/ Province	Other (specify who)
2016/17					
Business Process Services Programme	Implementation/ design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme	1 000 000		1 000 000	
2018/19					
Business Process Services Programme	Impact evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme	3 000 000	1 500 000		1 500 000 (Jobs Fund)

⁷ This is not obligatory but departments may find a structure like this helpful.

⁸ Note DPME has a template for the TOR of an evaluation steering committee

8.4 Follow-up to the evaluations

The stress in the National Evaluation System is to ensure that evaluations are used to improve performance. All evaluations should have Improvement Plans which are sent to senior management. These will be monitored by the department, or DPME/OTP if in the PEP/NEP.

The relevant branch/programme manager will be expected to report every 6 months, sending the report to the M&E section.

Successful implementation of improvement plans should be in the performance agreements of relevant programme managers

8.5 Next steps once the plan is approved

The evaluations to be considered for the National/Provincial Evaluation Plan must be submitted by 31 May. Confirmation of those selected will be by 30 June, and approval by EXCO is sought by 30 November 2012.

Annex 2: Terms of Reference for Departmental Evaluation Working Group

1 Background

Departmental Evaluation Working Groups are envisaged so that the system is owned by the department as a whole, and draws on the range of expertise available across the department. This is important to ensure that the evaluation system is seen as strategic, owned by management, is of high quality and is likely to lead to use.

2 Objective

To support the establishment, operation and effectiveness of a departmental evaluation system.

3 Specific tasks

- 3.1 Develop/review plans for rollout of the evaluation system.
- 3.2 Develop/review specific methodological inputs for the evaluation system, eg Call for a Departmental Evaluation Plan, competencies, standards, guidelines.
- 3.3 Select evaluations for the three year and annual evaluation plans based on inputs from branches.
- 3.4 Review the technical quality of evaluations conducted under the departmental evaluation plan, ensuring the overall system is working well.
- 3.5 Members act as the evaluation champions within their respective branches, and are likely to be involved in steering committees of individual evaluations relevant to their branches.
- 3.6 In time specific task teams may emerge on specific issues, eg impact evaluations, and these may involve other people.

4 Members

Consistent members are needed, not delegates. These should cover:

- M&E/Evaluation Unit – key staff involved with evaluation
- Strategic branches – Planning/Policy/Finance
- Programme managers - these members may change on a two yearly basis to ensure that there is broad involvement across the department. Ideally involve those programme managers who have been involved in an evaluation and so understand and are likely to be champions for the system.
- External evaluation experts/partners – universities, other. The department may want to involve external experts.

5 Roles

- Chair: Planning/Policy
- Secretariat: M&E or Evaluation Unit.

6 Meetings

- Will meet as needed, based on key milestones in the system, but likely to be a day a month for the first 6 months, then every three months.

Annex 3: Responsibility matrix for departmental evaluation systems

The objective of the matrix is to clarify the roles played by different stakeholders and structures in the departmental evaluation system.

Stakeholder or structure	Key role	Members	Further information
DPME	Champion and technical support for the NES Development of standards, competences, guidelines, training courses. Quality assessment of evaluations Convening of national ETWG	DPME	
Office of Premier ⁹	Provincial champion for evaluation system Support the system Develop the provincial evaluation plan and take to HoD forum and EXCO Support training in evaluation for departmental staff Part-fund provincial evaluations Secretariat for provincial ETWG Issue request for provincial evaluations Participate in development of the national system Assist departmental departments to prepare departmental evaluation plans	M&E Unit, strategy or research unit (should be at least one person as an evaluation specialist)	Section 7 of Guideline on DEPs
M&E/Evaluation Unit in department	Champion for departmental evaluation system Support the system Support training in evaluation for departmental staff Part-fund evaluations Secretariat for DEWG Issue call for departmental evaluations Assist branches to prepare concept notes Develop the departmental evaluation plan and take to EXCO Participate in development of the national/provincial system	M&E Unit, strategy or research unit (should be at least one person as an evaluation specialist)	Section 7 of Guideline on DEPs
Departmental EXCO meeting	Approve the Call for the evaluation system Provide political oversight and support for evaluation. Approve the Departmental Evaluation Plan Consider evaluation reports Ensure that blockages identified by evaluations are addressed		
Departmental Evaluation Working Group	Support the evaluation system in the department Agree systems for the department Select evaluations for the departmental plan	Policy/Planning, M&E/research staff, programme managers	Annex 1 of DEP Guideline
Panel of evaluation service providers	Group to which calls for proposals are sent (so a restricted tender)	Service providers including universities, consultants	
Evaluation Steering Committee (for each evaluation)	Oversight of the specific evaluation process, including approving TORs, selecting service provider if external (as bid adjudication committee), reviewing instruments, approving reports.	Custodian branch (chair) M&E/evaluation unit (secretary) Other departments involved in the specific intervention being evaluated Potentially	Template on DPME website

⁹ Where a provincial department

Stakeholder or structure	Key role	Members	Further information
		external experts or stakeholders	
Custodian branch	<p>Propose evaluations (developing evaluation concept notes) for consideration for the DEP “owner” of the specific policy/programme being evaluated Chair Steering Committee (see above) Consider findings in management structures Provide Management Response to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation Lead on the improvement plan to address the findings (with other stakeholders needed)</p>		<p>Guideline on management response Guideline on Improvement Plan</p>
Finance	<p>Participate in departmental EWG Could participate in evaluation steering committees (at least in development of TORs and reading final reports) Ensure funds available from programme budgets for evaluation</p>		
National Evaluation Technical Working Group	Support development of government-wide evaluation system	<p>M&E/research staff from national departments with skills or an interest in the evaluation system Representatives from provinces with DEPs</p>	TORs for ETWG

Annex 4: Concept Note Template for motivating for an evaluation in the departmental evaluation plan

This concept motivates why a particular intervention is a priority for evaluation under the National Evaluation Plan. It is not a plan for the evaluation which will be done later.

Part A: Key contact details

Name of proposed evaluation		Year proposed to be implemented	201_-201_
Branch proposing evaluation	<i>Could be suggested by a strategic section but custodian will normally be an implementation branch, or possibly a strategic unit if cross-department.</i>		
Branch that is custodian (and will implement the improvement plan arising from the evaluation)	<i>Should not be exclusively the responsibility of a state-owned enterprise, If several branches/departments, then list these here, and suggest who would coordinate</i>		
Programme Manager		Title	
Telephone		Email	
M&E person		Title	
Telephone		Email	
Other key departments/agencies involved in the intervention			

Part B: Background to the intervention being focused on

Note this section is **not about the evaluation**, but the **policy/plan/programme/system** that the evaluation proposes to focus on.

Specific unit of analysis of the evaluation (should be a policy, plan, programme, project or system)	<i>Eg ECD Policy, X programme, Y project etc</i>
Give some background to the intervention	
Summary description of the intervention	
The problem or opportunity the intervention focuses on	<i>For example the National School Nutrition Programme focuses on disadvantaged learners coming to school without having eaten which undermines their ability to learn</i>

Objective or outcomes of the intervention (specify which)	<i>These should not be general but should be taken from the original programme plan, policy document etc.</i>		
Key components of the intervention (eg outputs in a logframe or programme plan)	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
Is there a logframe?	<i>If yes please attach</i>		
Programme document	<i>Please attach the key programme document describing the specific programme or policy to be evaluated, along with its indicators, and theory of change.</i>		
Duration and timing of the intervention	<i>Started (or proposed to start)</i>		<i>Ends</i>

Part C: Motivating for the evaluation of this intervention being considered in the Departmental Evaluation Plan

Why is this evaluation a priority for the Departmental Evaluation Plan? Note the evaluation does not have to score high on all of these.

How is this linked to the 14 outcomes/MTSF?
<i>Show how this links to specific outputs/suboutcomes in the MTSF.</i>
If a provincial department, how is this linked to the Provincial Development Plan and departmental strategic plan
<i>Be specific of how this links to specific sections and recommendations in the Provincial Development Plan or departmental strategic plan (give page number).</i>
Innovative
<i>Is the intervention innovative (eg testing out a new model of service delivery)? Note this is not a requirement and many interventions that are not innovative still need to be evaluated. Is it important to do an evaluation to learn the lessons which can be applied more widely?</i>

How large is the intervention?			
Budget for intervention (not for the evaluation) for 2015/16 financial year	R	Estimated total budget for the intervention (over 3 year MTEF period)	R Period
Nos of people directly affected or enrolled (eg service users, beneficiaries...)	<i>If this does not directly serve citizens, then it should be a measure of coverage, eg if the proposed evaluation is of whether to lease buildings or to own, then this could be the number of buildings covered.</i>		

Is this an area of substantial public interest?
<i>This is not about whether the intervention is important but if it is very much in the public eye and if so how this is shown. Write here some common sense observations here.</i>
Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions need to be taken, and when?
<i>Please indicate any key decision points the evaluation needs to feed into eg proposals for expansion, decisions whether to continue. When will these decisions be taken?</i>

Part D: Details on the evaluation proposed

In this section you give some idea on the type of evaluation being proposed, **not the intervention that the evaluation is focusing on**. Note we want to understand what you are trying to get out of the evaluation, but are not expecting you to know what methodology is needed.

Key focus of the evaluation	<i>For example the evaluation may only focus on part of a programme or policy or system</i>
Type of evaluation	<i>Write here one or more of the options below. Some evaluations can combine these. Look at the Guidelines on the different evaluation types available here: http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/evaluationsSite/Pages/Guidelines.aspx</i>
Diagnostic	<i>Analyses the situation, brings out root causes, considers options. Used prior to design or replanning an intervention</i>
Implementation	<i>Used during implementation to understand how the intervention is working and how it can be strengthened</i>
Economic	<i>To understand how cost effective the intervention is – often combined with implementation or impact</i>
Impact	<i>To understand what impact the intervention has had and why. Note this often needs either existing data or to collect data (expensive) on what are the impacts of people impacted by the intervention, and similar people not impacted by the programme. Do you have this data?</i>
Synthesis	<i>Rather than undertaking primary data collection this synthesises data from across a range of existing evaluations.</i>

Suggested purpose of the evaluation	<i>Look at DPME's Guideline on TORs for how to define the purpose – available at http://www.thepresidency-dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/evaluationsSite/Pages/Guidelines.aspx</i>
What are the main evaluative questions you will be asking (maximum 5) – use the Guideline on TORs to help you think these through, or the guidelines on specific evaluation types.	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

What credible monitoring data or existing evidence can be used, including on background and previous documented performance, or current programme situation. This is very important if you would like to undertake an impact evaluation and you need to answer this in some detail.

If you want to do an impact evaluation do you have data on impact, including existing external databases (StatsSA, NIDS, etc). You should not invest in primary data collection on variables which government is already collecting data on through other means. If little evidence exists then an impact evaluation will be difficult and you may need to undertake an implementation evaluation initially. Alternatively you are likely then to have to collect the data, which may be expensive.

Make some general comments here but then fill in the table below:

Do you have any data on?	Data available	Source/s	Custodian of data	Contact person and email or telephone	Quality/reliability/verifiability of data as well as limitations in terms of data availability, readiness, relevance, timeliness and access pertaining to this evaluation
Impacts on the target population					
Outcomes (eg changes in behaviour or systems)					
Outputs (the things you deliver, eg people trained, groups with community gardens with fencing and water)					

Likely duration (months)	<i>Indicate when the evaluation needs to start and when to end</i>
How recently was this intervention evaluated – if not for a long time then it is a higher priority	<i>Date and type of evaluation and what it focused on (attach copy to this submission)</i>
Do you have an estimate for what the evaluation may cost?	<i>If you are not sure discuss with DPME around likely cost.</i>
What budget for the evaluation has been allocated by the department or donors – note this must come from existing budgets	<i>You are expected to at least half-fund the evaluation. If in the PEP or NEP then OTP or DPME will part-fund</i>

Part E: Approval by sponsoring branch(es) and partner departments

Name of relevant DDG of custodian branch	
Signature	
Name of HoD or relevant DDG of partner department	
Signature	
Name of DG or relevant DDG of partner department	
Signature	

Annex 5: Score Sheet for assessing Evaluation Proposals for the Departmental Evaluation Plan (department to adapt)

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

1 Is the intervention a national (and provincial) priority and we need to focus on it?

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
National Priority why this is a national priority in terms of the following 4 criteria. Note it does not have to satisfy all criteria.		
1.1 Linked to 14 outcomes being proposed in the MTSF (and especially top 5)¹⁰ as well Directly linked to a suboutcome of one of the top 5 outcomes = 20 Directly linked to an output of one of the other 9 outcomes=15 Addresses a small part of one of the 14 outcomes = 10 Is not part of the 14 outcomes but otherwise a priority of government =5 Is not part of the 14 outcomes or national priority=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
1.2 Linked to provincial growth and development plan and /or departmental strategic plan Directly linked to PGDS/strategic plan = 20 Partially linked to PGDS/strategic plan =15 Addresses a small part of PGDS/strategic plan = 10 Is not part of the PGDS but is in dept strat plan =5 Is not part of the PGDS/strategic plan =0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
1.3 Innovative – is the intervention testing out new approaches and so learning is key? Very innovative, or a key area in an outcome where there is confusion/lack of clarity/ or not much is known=10 Quite innovative, or an area of an outcome where some is known but it would benefit from an evaluation=5 Not innovative or an area where quite a lot is known=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
1.4 Large (>R500m over MTEF period and in terms of footprint) Very large (>R1000m, or targeted to cover >10% of the population)=10 Large (R500-R999m, targeted to cover 5-9% of the population)=5 Small <R499m=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	

¹⁰ If a provincial department add a row for provincial priorities

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
1.5 Substantial public interest (where possible drawn from analysis of the Presidential Hotline) Continuously in the media or many complaints in hotline=10 Regularly in the media and significant number of complaints in hotline=5 Not very much in the public eye=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
Overall comment		
Category total score	50	

2 Is it important that it is evaluated in 2016/17 or the following two years?

Criteria	Max Score	Score
<i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>		
2.1 Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions are to be taken for which an evaluation is needed? Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2016/17 where key decisions needed=15 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2017/18 where key decisions needed=10 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2018/19+ where key decisions needed=5 Not critical decision point=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
2.2 Previous evaluations (if any) - How recently was this intervention evaluated? If >5 years, score 5, if less than 2 years score zero (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>		
3.1 Focus of evaluation - Is the object of evaluation clear (policy, programme, plan or project), and are the evaluative questions clear? The evaluation is clear with strong evaluative questions=10 The evaluation has a reasonable focus but could be clarified=5 The evaluation is unclear=0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
3.2 Availability of monitoring data - Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested? Key data is needed and available=10 Key data is needed but will have to be collected=5 Key data is needed but difficult to obtain=0 <i>Comment</i>	15	
3.3 Availability of budget - How assured are we that there is a budget for the evaluation from the department or donors? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full budget available from department/donor = 10 • Budget likely or partially available from department, and supplemented by DPME/province = 5 • Only budget available is from DPME/province = 0 <i>Comment</i>	10	
Overall comment		
Category total score	35	

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

Assessors

_____ Signed <i>Name</i> Member : DEWG Date:	_____ Signed <i>Name</i> Member : DEWG Date:	_____ Signed <i>Name</i> Member : DEWG Date:
_____ Signed <i>Name</i> Member : DEWG Date:	_____ Signed <i>Name</i> Member : DEWG Date:	_____ Signed <i>Name</i> Member : DEWG Date:

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

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

No.	DECISION AND FEEDBACK	Please tick (X)
1	Yes, evaluation should be considered for the plan for the year requested (2016/17; 2017/18; 2018/19 - circle the year requested). <i>Reasons:</i>	
2	Not recommended for the 2016/17 departmental plan but a good idea, and could be considered for departmental plan 2017/18 or 2018/19 (recommend which by circling the year - will not need to be resubmitted). <i>Reasons:</i>	
3	Not included in the plan and the branch 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>	

Signed on behalf of DEWG:	_____ Signed X Head: eg Planning/Policy Date:
----------------------------------	---

