



How to develop a Departmental Evaluation Plan

Created: July 2015

Revised: November 2020

Addressed to	National Departments, Provincial Departments, Municipalities and Public Entities.
Purpose	To provide guidance for developing and managing departmental/organizational evaluation plans and systems.
Reference documents	National Evaluation Policy Framework 2019 Concept for National Evaluation Plan
Contact person for this guideline	Evaluations Unit, DPME E-mail: Evaluations@dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0162

1. INTRODUCTION

The National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF), 2019 focuses on evaluations of strategic policies, programmes and projects, which are identified as part of a National Evaluation Plan (NEP). Similarly, departments are also required to develop Departmental Evaluation Plans (DEPs). A DEP is a plan that consists of evaluations identified by departments¹. Provinces are also required to develop their Provincial Evaluation Plans (PEP) (as per Provincial Evaluation Plan Guidelines).

The purpose of this guideline is to give practical guidance for developing and managing departmental/organizational evaluation plans. This is a guideline and it is not meant to be prescriptive. It should be read along with the (NEPF, 2019). 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.

¹ DPME, National Evaluation Policy Framework, 2019

2. PURPOSE OF THE DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN

The purpose of a Departmental Evaluation Plan, is to provide details of evaluations approved by departmental EXCO/top management to be undertaken over a five-year period linked to the strategic plan and the MTSF. The evaluations are linked with the planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the Departments.

3. LINKAGE WITH THE NATIONAL AND PROVINCIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

- 3.1 As part of the National Evaluation System (NES), a National Evaluation Policy Framework, 2019 has been developed to guide evaluations. The NEPF further proposes a set of standardised types and approaches to evaluation. In supporting the implementation of the NEPF, various evaluation guidelines, competencies for government staff and evaluators, workshops, training to support the evaluation system etc. have been developed.
- 3.2 The 2019 - 2024 NEPF reinforces South African government's commitment to the principles of inclusiveness and the cross-implementation of different evaluation approaches and methodologies in ways that promote this inclusivity. Therefore, the current policy achieves this objective by incorporating different strategies including the following elements: integrating state-owned entities (SOEs) into the NES; ensuring that the policy takes into account gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) priorities relating to women, the development needs of youth and the concerns of persons with disabilities as well as other vulnerable groups in society when undertaking evaluation projects; and devolving an all-encompassing evaluation capacity development approach which aims to empower the State in the effective implementation of evaluations.
- 3.3 A key focus in the NEPF is ensuring utilisation of evaluation findings, and this means that departments, municipalities and public entities must own the evaluations they are undertaking.

4. LINKAGES WITH PROGRAMME PLANNING, STRATEGIC PLANNING, ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLAN (APP) AND M&E FRAMEWORK

4.1 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.

4.2 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.

4.3 Annual Performance Plans (APPs)

The development and review of the APPs should also take into account the development and implementation of DEPs. The Framework for Strategic and Annual Plans (FSAPPs) requires departments to indicate how evaluation results are incorporated into their APPs. The implementation of the DEPs should also be linked to the budget process of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF).

4.4 M&E Framework

The development of the DEP should also consider the priorities that have been identified in the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework of the department. This will ensure that commitments that are in the framework also 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 execution of evaluations that will be in the DEP.

4.5 Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing (GRPBMEA) Framework

The mainstreaming of gender equality and women's empowerment considerations into all the component of the DEP is essential. The DEP should ensure that evaluations are gender-responsive with an explicit focus on women's rights or women's empowerment, or which particularly targets women. However, gender-responsive evaluations can also be employed in any kind of project or programme that seeks to contribute to social impact, irrespective of whether or not they specify gender-sensitive objectives.

5. MANAGEMENT AND CO-ORDINATION

- 5.1 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, Gender Unit, CFO, Internal Audit, M&E staff. Refer to Annex 2 for the suggested Terms of Reference for a Departmental Evaluation Working Group.
- 5.2 In cases where there is no evaluation system the departmental M&E / Evaluation unit should make presentations to EXCO/Manco/ executive authority to secure senior management support and to discuss the significance of the evaluation system. Furthermore, public entities with similar challenges are encouraged to partner with their accounting institution and develop their joint Departmental Evaluation Plan.
- 5.3 The Departmental Evaluation Working Group (DEWG) should meet and develop identification and selection criteria for evaluations in the next five years, informed by this guideline for developing Departmental Evaluation Plans.

- 5.4 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.
- 5.5 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/Executive authority. 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.
- 5.6 The draft Departmental Evaluation Plan is presented at Manco/Exco/executive authority for endorsement and signed off by the Accounting Officer.
- 5.7 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.
- 5.8 The suggested set of steps and timing for this to link with the budget process is shown in Table 1 below (page 5). Note that there will be no time to develop the DEP and implement it in the same financial year so the Guideline includes a proposed process for developing the DEP in a year preceding the actual implementation of the DEP in previous financial. 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 / evaluation unit to cover this evaluation capacity.

6. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF EVALUATIONS

The NEPF sets the following generic criteria for identifying evaluations to be included in Evaluation Plans across the different spheres of Government:

Alignment to the key priorities of government	Impact of the intervention
Alignment with the planning cycle of government	Performance of the intervention
Achieving gender equity through the intervention	Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable/ marginalised groups
Periodicity of evaluations	Projected time for completing an evaluation
Budget availability to undertake evaluations	Public interest and/or media attention

- 6.2 According to the NEPF, priority evaluations are identified by an oversight structure that is the custodian of M&E System i.e. Departmental Evaluation Technical Working Group (DETWG) which is made up of representatives from the: CFO, Audit Office, Gender Focal Point, M&E, Strategic Planning and Policy Units.

6.2 Additionally, in times of possible national disasters such as pandemics which may result in budget cuts (both operational and compensation of employees) and necessitating a change in the way evaluations are undertaken, an additional criterion is proposed in order to prioritise evaluations in the midst of the disaster and government departments may be faced with capacity (financial and human) constraints. See the table below:

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
Practicality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation subject and questions can be successfully investigated under the current environment of the national disaster Availability and accessibility of data and information to enable rapid evaluation
Stakeholder commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is demand for evidence at the Departmental EXCO There is clearly defined intended use of the evaluation results by custodian Unit
Estimated cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation study will cost less than R300,000
Availability of external resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External resources guaranteed or can be made available before the commencement of the evaluation.

7. PROCESS OF DEVELOPING A DEP

Table 1: Processing for developing a DEP

	Action	Responsible	Ideally
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	M&E/Evaluation Unit in Dept	March
	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
	3. Workshopping of draft concept notes for evaluations with programme managers	Evaluation Unit in Dept	May
	4. DEWG or Evaluation Unit discusses draft concept notes with relevant programmes	DEWG / Evaluation Unit in Dept	May
	5. Deadline for concept notes to be submitted	Branches	May
Selection and refining	6. Proposals reviewed by DEWG or Evaluation Unit and recommendations made to EXCO/MANCO for X evaluations for five years.	DEWG / Evaluation Unit in Dept	May
	7. Deadline for branches to include evaluations in their 5 year budgets	Branches	June
	8. Departmental Evaluation Plan drafted	Evaluation Unit in Dept	June
	9. DEP submitted to departmental EXCO for approval	Evaluation Unit in Dept	June
	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
	11. If possible training of programme manager/evaluation staff for each evaluation recommended for and to draft TORs produced for evaluations. DPME has developed standard courses available through different service providers.	Evaluation Unit in Dept	Sept
Start-up	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
	13. TORs finalised for evaluations and Steering Committees established	Evaluation Unit in Dept	Jan
	14. Procurement undertaken or planning of internal evaluation	Evaluation Unit in Dept	Feb
	15. Contracts awarded (if external) and inception meetings	Evaluation Unit in Dept	March
	16. DEPs are submitted to the relevant custodian of the evaluation system in the spheres of government (i.e. DPME, OTP, COGTA etc)	Evaluation Unit in Dept	

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 five-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 5 years and status on the use of the evaluation recommendation;
- 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 Evaluation or 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 (DEWG) 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.
- 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/OTP² 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;

² For national departments this would be DPME, for provincial the Office of the Premier (OTP)

- 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 (refer to Guideline for Improvement Plans);
- Undertake quality control of all evaluations undertaken for the Departmental Evaluation Plan – note DPME may be able to support independent quality assessment;
- 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 depending on the size of the budget of the unit;
- 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/OTP will assist national/provincial 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 3 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 evaluation plans of national and provincial departments to avoid duplication" National departments do not have any direct role at the level of Provincial Evaluation Plans but can work with their provincial counterparts on alignment of DEPs in areas of concurrent functions;
- 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 LESSONS AROUND IMPLEMENTING DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION SYSTEMS

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

Signed



Mr Robert Nkuna
Director-General
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
Date: 03/11/2020

FORMAT FOR A DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN: 2020 – 2025

Foreword by the Accounting Officer

Contents

1	Introduction	1	7	Detailed concepts for evaluations (and research) for 2020	7
	1.1 The main functions of the Department ... of.....	1		7.1 Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme...	7
	1.2 Department's approach to evaluation (and research).....	1		7.2 Evaluation 2.....	8
	1.3 The National Evaluation System.....	1	8	Key implementation issues.....	8
2	Purpose of the Departmental Evaluation Plan (DEP).....	2		8.1 Capacity to undertake the evaluations...	8
3	Linkages to wider evaluation plans and systems.....	2		8.2 Institutional arrangements.....	8
	3.1 Linkage to (national or provincial) evaluation plans.....	2		8.3 Funding of the evaluations in the Plan...	9
	3.2 Linkage to planning.....	2		8.4 Follow-up to the evaluations.....	10
	3.3 Link to the departments M&E framework	2		8.5 Next steps once the plan is approved....	10
4	Departmental evaluation system.....	2			
	4.1 Resources & structure of the department to support evaluation.....	2			
	4.2 Departmental evaluation cycle.....	2			
5	Departmental evaluations (and research) undertaken in the last 5 years	3			
6	Summary of evaluations (and research) proposed for 2020 to 2025	4			
	6.1 Criteria and process used for selection for the Departmental Evaluation Plan.....	4			
	6.2 Summary of evaluations proposed for the Departmental Evaluation Plan Error! Bookmark not defined.				

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?) PLAN FOR 2020-2025

Executive summary

1. Introduction

1.1 The main functions of the Department of...

Introduce the main functions of the department⁴

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 e.g. 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/PEP⁵ they will be monitored by DPME/OTP. In principle evaluations are made public, tabled in the legislature and on 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.

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 five-year period, which are linked with the budget process.

⁴ Note the text in this template in italics are instructions – not the actual text for the plan

⁵ Where a choice needs to be made they are highlighted in yellow

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 7 priorities 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	March
Writing workshop for concept notes	M&E	May
Concept notes received	M&E	May
Concept notes prioritised/selected	M&E	May
Meet with Exco to agree	M&E	May
Departmental evaluation plan drafted	M&E	June
DEP submitted to EXCO for approval	M&E	June
Evaluation included in budgets	DDG/PM	June
DEP signed off by DG / HOD	DG/HOD	End July
Possibility of scoping workshop to discuss focus of evaluation	M&E	August
Capacity building workshop	M&E	September

Phase 2: Undertaking the evaluation (assuming external)			
	Action	Responsibility	Timeline
	Terms of Reference completed	Programme manager	January
External SPs	Call for proposals from service providers out	SCM	February
	Bidders briefing	Programme manager	February
	Bids received	SCM	February
	Bidders presentation	SCM/ Programme manager/M&E	March
	Service provider selected	Bid Committee	March
	Service provider appointed	DDG/PM	March
	Inception report submitted (for an internal evaluation this will still be needed but may be different)	Evaluator	March
	Draft report	Evaluator	September
	Stakeholder validation workshop	Programme Manager	September
	Final report	Evaluator	November
	Final report approved	Steering Committee	November

Phase 3: Follow-up		
Action	Responsibility	Timeline
Management response	DDG/PM	January
Recommendations workshopped and improvement plan developed	DDG/PM	March
Communication plan developed	DDG/PM	March
Improvement plan signed off	DG/HOD	March
Recommendations included in budget	DDG/PM	June
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 20_/_ to 20_/_?

Table 2: Example of table from DSD

	Title (include type of evaluation in the title)	Focus (purpose) of evaluation/ research	Status	Date of Completion	How the evaluation was used: implementation of findings (progress)
Programme 2: Comprehensive social security					
Child and family benefits	Impact evaluation of the Child Support Grant		Completed		
	Update of Social Assistance beneficiary profile		Planned		
Programme 3: Welfare services					

	Title (include type of evaluation in the title)	Focus (purpose) of evaluation/research	Status	Date of Completion	How the evaluation was used: implementation of findings (progress)
Welfare services	The beneficiary satisfaction survey				
Substance abuse	An evaluation of Ke Moja programme		Completed		
Social Crime Prevention	An evaluation study on causes of decrease in the number of children diverted since the implementation of the Child Justice Act, 2008		Planned		
Families	An evaluation of services rendered to families within the social sector		Completed		
ECD	Diagnostic Review of the early childhood development programme		Completed		

6. Summary of evaluations (and research) proposed for 2020/21 to 2024/25

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 (e.g. for a diagnostic evaluation), from the outset (e.g. doing a baseline for an impact evaluation), during to see how it is working (e.g. 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:
 - Aligned to the 7 government priorities and linked with the MTSF (and especially top 5)
 - Linked to provincial growth and development plan and /or departmental strategic plan
 - Impact of the intervention
 - Alignment with the planning cycle of Government:
 - Public Interest and / or media attention
 - Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable / marginalised groups
 - Achieving gender equity through interventions
 - Performance of the intervention

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. Focus of the evaluation;
5. Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable groups;
6. Performance of the intervention;
7. Impact of the intervention;
8. Have not been evaluated recently;
9. 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?
10. Ideally have monitoring data that can be used including background and previous documented performance, current programme situation;
11. Have a potential budget for evaluation from the department, DPME or donors.

6.2 Summary of evaluations proposed for the Departmental Evaluation Plan

Table 3 summarises the evaluations that are proposed for the five 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 2020/21 to 2024/25

Branch/ champion	Name of intervention to be evaluated	Title of evaluation (include the type)	Proposed Methodology	NEP/ PEP/ DEP	Commissioned or internal	Years of implementation			Key motivation for this evaluation including scale (e.g. budget, beneficiaries)	Linkages to other evaluations	National Outcome(s) the intervention links to
						2020/ 21	2021/ 22	2022/ 23			
2020/21											
DC's Office: Tim Dladla, Impact Assessment	Business Process Services Programme ⁶	Implementation/ 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	Commissioned	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 - SPIL and THRIP.	
2021/22											
2022/23											

⁶Note this evaluation actually happened in 2012/13 and is just included here as an example

7. DETAILED CONCEPTS FOR EVALUATIONS FOR 2020/21

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.

7.1 Implementation/design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme⁷

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.

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?)
- 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 fit 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.

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.

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 established 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 evaluation⁹ 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):

⁹Note DPME has a template for the TOR of an evaluation steering committee

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)
2021/22					
Business Process Services Programme	Implementation/ design evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme	1 000 000		1 000 000	
2021/22					
Business Process Services Programme	Impact evaluation of the Business Process Services Programme	3 000 000	1 500 000		1 500 000 (Jobs Fund)

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 May. Confirmation of those selected will be by June, and approval by EXCO is sought by XXX

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, e.g. 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, e.g. 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	<p>Champion and technical support for the NES</p> <p>Development of standards, competences, guidelines, training courses. Quality assessment of evaluations</p> <p>Convening of national ETWG</p>	DPME	
Office of Premier ¹⁰	<p>Provincial champion for evaluation system</p> <p>Support the system</p> <p>Develop the provincial evaluation plan and take to HoD forum and EXCO</p> <p>Support training in evaluation for departmental staff</p> <p>Part-fund provincial evaluations</p> <p>Secretariat for provincial ETWG</p> <p>Issue request for provincial evaluations</p> <p>Participate in development of the national system</p> <p>Assist departmental departments to prepare departmental evaluation plans</p>	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	<p>Champion for departmental evaluation system</p> <p>Support the system</p> <p>Support training in evaluation for departmental staff</p> <p>Part-fund evaluations</p> <p>Secretariat for DEWG</p> <p>Issue call for departmental evaluations</p> <p>Assist branches to prepare concept notes</p> <p>Develop the departmental evaluation plan and take to EXCO</p> <p>Participate in development of the national/provincial system</p>	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	<p>Approve the Call for the evaluation system</p> <p>Provide political oversight and support for evaluation.</p> <p>Approve the Departmental Evaluation Plan</p> <p>Consider evaluation reports</p> <p>Ensure that blockages identified by evaluations are addressed</p>		
Departmental Evaluation Working Group	<p>Support the evaluation system in the department</p> <p>Agree systems for the department</p> <p>Select evaluations for the departmental plan</p>	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	Template on DPME website

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 external experts or stakeholders	
Custodian branch	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)		Guideline on management response Guideline on Improvement Plan
Finance	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		
National Evaluation Technical Working Group	Support development of government-wide evaluation system	M&E/research staff from national departments with skills or an interest in the evaluation system Representatives from provinces with DEPs	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 Departmental Evaluation Plan. It is not a plan for the evaluation which will be done later.

Part A: Contact details

Name of proposed evaluation		Year proposed to be implemented	202_ - 202_
Branch proposing Evaluation	Could be suggested by a strategic section but custodian will normally be an implementation branch, or possibly a strategic unit if cross-department.		
	Should not be exclusively the responsibility of a state-owned enterprise, if several branches/departments, then list these here, and suggest who would coordinate		
Programme Manager		Title	
Telephone		E-mail	
M&E person		Title	
Telephone		E-mail	
Other key departments/ agencies involved in the intervention			

Part B: Background of the intervention

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)	E.g. ECD Policy, X programme, Y project etc.		
Departmental situational analysis prior to the intervention being introduced			
Give some background to the intervention			
Summary description of the intervention			
The problem or opportunity the intervention focuses on	For example, the National School Nutrition Programme focuses on disadvantaged learners coming to school without having eaten which undermines their ability to learn		
Objective or outcomes of the intervention (specify which)	These should not be general but should be taken from the original programme plan, policy or strategy document etc.		
Key components of the intervention (e.g. outputs in a log frame or programme plan)	1		
	2		
	3		
	4		
Is there a log frame? (Yes or No)	If yes please attach		
Programme document	Please attach the key programme document describing the specific programme, policy, plan or strategy to be evaluated, along with its indicators, and theory of change.		
Duration and timing of the intervention	Started (or proposed to start)		Ends

Part C: Motivating for the evaluation of the intervention to be considered in the National Evaluation Plan

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

Criteria
Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.
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 Aligned to the National Priorities (7 government priorities) and linked to the MTSF, departmental strategic plan as well Directly linked to two or more of the 7 priorities Directly linked to one of the 7 priorities Addresses a small part of one of the 7 priorities Is not part of the 7 priorities but otherwise a priority of government Is not part of the 7 priorities Comment
1.2 Impact of the intervention: Is the intervention having intended contribution to the intervention's programme life cycle? Intervention contribute to the programme life cycle Intervention does not contribute to the programme life cycle Comment

<p>1.3 Public Interest and / or media attention: (where possible drawn from analysis of the Presidential Hotline)</p> <p>Continuously in the media or many complaints in hotline</p> <p>Regularly in the media and significant number of complaints in hotline</p> <p>Not very much in the public eye</p> <p>Comment</p>
<p>1.4 Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable / marginalised groups: Does the identified evaluation consider how programme intervention target the needs of vulnerable groups (either intentionally or unintentionally) to provide an indication of how issues relating to identified groups were planned for or how such groups have benefited from the programme or policy being evaluated?</p>
<p>1.5 Achieving gender equity through interventions: Is the evaluation engendered to ensure that gender equality considerations are addressed across the evaluation and that the differential impact of interventions on women and men are appropriately measured and assessed?</p>
<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>
<p>1.6 Performance of the intervention: Is this a weak performing or best performing intervention to improve and promote learning and future implementation?</p> <p>Weak performing interventions</p> <p>Best performing interventions score</p>

<p>If a provincial department, how is this linked to the, Provincial Growth and Development Strategies (PGDS) and Departmental Strategic Plan</p>
<p>Be specific of how this links to specific sections and recommendations in the PGDS or Departmental Strategic Plan (please also refer to relevant page number).</p>

How large is the intervention?			
Budget for intervention (not for the evaluation) for financial year	R	Estimated total budget for the intervention (over 5-year MTEF period)	R Period
Number of people directly affected or enrolled (e.g. service users, beneficiaries...)	If this does not directly serve citizens, then it should be a measure of coverage, e.g. if the proposed evaluation is of whether to lease buildings or to own, then this could be the number of buildings covered.		

Part D: Details on the evaluation proposed

In this section you are requested to 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	For example, the evaluation may only focus on part of a programme/ policy, plan or project
Evaluation Approach (rapid/traditional)	
Type of evaluation	e.g. Diagnostic/Implementation/Cost Effective, Outcome, Impact, Synthesis or Sectoral Reviews Note: Write here one or more of the options below. (Some evaluations can combine these). Refer to Guidelines on the different evaluation types available on the DPME Website:
Diagnostic	Analyses the situation, brings out root causes, considers options. Used prior to design or re-planning an intervention
Implementation	Used during implementation to understand how the intervention is working and how it can be strengthened
Cost effectiveness	To understand how cost effective the intervention is – often combined with implementation or impact
Outcome	To measure the degree to which the program is having an effect on the target population's wellbeing and/or behaviours. Outcome evaluations help determine whether or not the intended benefits of a programme are actually achieved (i.e. whether or not the programme is able to meet its intended purpose)
Impact	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?
Synthesis	Rather than undertaking primary data collection this synthesises data from across a range of existing evaluations.
Sectorial Reviews	A mechanism through which support to public expenditure programmes can be better coordinated; a means of improving aid effectiveness by improving the efficiency and effectiveness with which all resources are used, and accounted for, in the sector.

Suggested purpose of the evaluation	Refer to the DPME Guideline on TORs for how to define the purpose – available on the DPME Website
--	---

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

Availability of scientific evidence (e.g. monitoring data, researches, case studies, systematic review, experts' opinions etc)
 Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested?
 Key evidence is needed and available
 Key evidence is needed but will have to be collected
 Key data is needed but difficult to obtain
 comment

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:

Please complete 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 (e.g. changes in behaviour or systems)					
Outputs (the things you deliver, e.g. people trained, groups with community gardens with fencing and water)					

Likely duration (months)	Indicate when the evaluation needs to start and when to end
How recently was this intervention evaluated – if not for a long time then it is a higher priority	
How recently was this intervention evaluated – if not for a long time then it is a higher priority	Date and type of evaluation and what it focused on (attach copy to this submission)
Do you have an estimate for what the evaluation may cost?	If you are not sure discuss with DPME around likely cost.
What budget for the evaluation has been allocated by the department or donors – note: this must come from existing budgets	You are expected to at least contribute 75% of the budget for the evaluation. If in the NEP then DPME will part fund.

Part E: Approval by sponsoring Department

Name of relevant Deputy Director General (DDG) of custodian branch:	
Signature:	
Name of DG or relevant DDG of Custodian department:	
Signature:	

ANNEX 5: SCORE SHEET FOR ASSESSING EVALUATION PROPOSALS FOR THE DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION PLAN (DEPARTMENT TO ADAPT)

Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) Score Sheet

Purpose: To be used for assessing Evaluation Proposals for the National Evaluation Plan (Provinces/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 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 Aligned to the National Priorities (7 government priorities) and linked to the MTSF, departmental strategic plan as well Directly linked to two or more of the 7 priorities = 15 Directly linked to one of the 7 priorities=10 Addresses a small part of one of the 7 priorities = 7 Is not part of the 7 priorities but otherwise a priority of government =5 Is not part of the 7 priorities = 0 Comment	15	
1.2 Impact of the intervention: Is the intervention having intended contribution to the intervention's programme life cycle? Intervention contribute to the programme life cycle = 10 Intervention does not contribute to the programme life cycle = 0 Comment	10	
1.3 Public Interest and / or media attention: (where possible drawn from analysis of the Presidential Hotline) Continuously in the media or many complaints in hotline=5 Regularly in the media and significant number of complaints in hotline=3 Not very much in the public eye=0 Comment	5	

Criteria <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
1.4 Inclusion of issues related to vulnerable / marginalised groups: Does the identified evaluation consider how programme intervention target the needs of vulnerable groups (either intentionally or unintentionally) to provide an indication of how issues relating to identified groups were planned for or how such groups have benefited from the programme or policy being evaluated?	10	
1.5 Achieving gender equity through interventions: Is the evaluation engendered to ensure that gender equality considerations are addressed across the evaluation and that the differential impact of interventions on women and men are appropriately measured and assessed? Yes = 10 No = 0	10	
1.6 Performance of the intervention: Is this a weak performing or best performing intervention to improve and promote learning and future implementation? Weak performing interventions = 10 Best performing interventions score = 0	10	
Overall comment		
Category total score	60	

2. Is it important that it is evaluated in the next financial year or the next four financial years?

Criteria <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
2.1 Is the intervention at a critical stage where decisions need to be taken or where solutions are required immediately? Critical stage/decision reached by end of the next financial year (2022/23) where key decisions needed=10 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2023/24 where key decisions needed= 5 Critical stage/decision reached by end of 2024/25 where key decisions needed=3 Not critical decision point=0 Comment	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). Periodicity of evaluations: the interventions have not had a major evaluation for the past 3 years. Comment	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 <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
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=5 The evaluation has a reasonable focus but could be clarified=3 The evaluation is unclear=0 Comment	5	

Criteria <i>Indicative meaning of scores is indicated to give the range.</i>	Max Score	Score
3.2 Evaluability of the Programme Is there an evaluability assessment for the programme? Evaluability analysis undertaken = 5 Evaluability analysis not undertaken? = 0 Comment	5	
3.3 Availability of scientific evidence (e.g. monitoring data, researches, case studies, systematic review, experts' opinions etc) Is there sufficient evidence to undertake an evaluation, especially if an impact evaluation is requested? Key evidence is needed and available=5 Key evidence is needed but will have to be collected=3 Key data is needed but difficult to obtain=0 Comment	5	
3.4 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 Comment	10	
Overall comment		
Category total score	25	

AGGREGATE/ OVERALL SCORE	Max score	Score	%
Importance of the intervention	60		
Important that it is done in the 5 years	15		
Feasibility of doing evaluation this year	25		
Total (maximum 100)			
Recommendation by assessors (please put cross)	Appropriate for NEP	Not appropriate for NEP	Needs rethinking

Assessors

Signed <i>Name</i> Member: EAC Date:	Signed <i>Name</i> Member: EAC Date:	Signed <i>Name</i> Member: EAC Date:
Signed <i>Name</i> Member: EAC Date:	Signed <i>Name</i> Member: EAC Date:	Signed <i>Name</i> Member: EAC Date:

FINAL DECISION AND FEEDBACK TO THE PROGRAMME BY THE EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EAC)

(To be completed after the assessment based on overall decisions of the EAC)

No.	DECISION AND FEEDBACK	Please tick (X)
1	Yes, evaluation should be considered for the plan for the year requested (– for a four year circle the year requested). <i>Reasons:</i>	
2	Not recommended for the 2022/23 National Evaluation Plan but a good idea, and could be considered for National Evaluation Plan 2023/24 or 2024/25 (recommend which by circling the year - will not need to be resubmitted). <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>	

Signed on behalf of EAC:	<p>_____</p> <p>Signed X Head: Evaluation, Evidence and Knowledge Systems Date:</p>
--------------------------	---