



planning, monitoring & evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Draft Evaluation Guideline No 2.2.2?

Integrating a transformative equity criterion in evaluations for promoting transformative systemic change

Addressed to	Government departments and entities (<i>schedule I & II</i>) who are undertaking evaluations (programme managers and M&E staff) as well as evaluators of government programmes and policies.
Purpose	The purpose of this guideline is to provide guidance to evaluators and commissioners of evaluation on how to apply an equity criterion into the life-cycle of evaluations.
Policy reference	These guidelines support the objectives of the National Development Plan Vision 2030, and should be read in conjunction with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Evaluation Policy Framework, 2019 • Gender Responsive Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Auditing Framework 2018 • DPME Evaluation Guideline No 2.2.1 – How to develop Terms of Reference for Evaluation Projects¹. • DPME Guidelines on specific evaluation types 2.2.10-2.2.15
Contact person	Evaluation Unit (DPME) E-mail: Evaluations@dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0204

¹ <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/pages/guidelines-other-resources>

Contents

PART A: BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND FRAMEWORK FOR THE GUIDELINE.....	3
1 Introduction.....	3
2 Purpose of the guideline.....	4
3 What is meant by transformative equity?	4
4 Equity criterion and explanation	6
5 Equity principles.....	8
5.1 Principles supporting the application of equity in evaluations	8
5.2 Applying equity principles as the commissioner.....	9
5.3 Applying equity principles as an evaluator	10
6 Applying the equity criterion in different types of evaluations.....	11
PART B: INTEGRATING EQUITY INTO EVALUATION PROJECTS: Commissioning, Designing and Undertaking Evaluations	11
7 Commissioning of the evaluation	11
7.1 Determining the transformational equity scope in evaluation.....	11
7.2 Step 1: Stakeholder identification and engagement processes	12
7.2.1 Identifying stakeholders	12
7.2.2 Developing stakeholder engagement mechanisms	13
7.3 Step 2: Elements to consider in developing Terms of Reference that consider equity	14
7.3.1 Determining the purpose and scope of evaluation project.....	15
7.3.2 Identification of stakeholders	17
7.3.3 Determining the evaluation questions.....	17
7.3.4 Evaluation design.....	21
7.3.5 Methodology issues	22
7.3.6 Budget considerations	24
7.3.7 Service provider competencies.....	24
8 Evaluation management and implementation	25
8.1 Managing evaluations	25
8.2 Evaluation plan.....	25
8.3 Field work.....	25
8.4 Data Analysis	26
8.5 Validation of findings	26
9 Bringing equity into the follow-up to the evaluation.....	27
9.1 Improvement plan and progress report	27
9.2 Communicating results of the evaluation	27
10 Case studies - applying the equity criteria	28
10.1 Economic intervention - Smallholder farming.....	28
10.2 Social intervention - National School Nutrition Programme	31
10.3 Equity-focused intervention - Social housing	32
Annexes.....	35
Annex 1: References	35
Annex 2: The purpose of the six types of evaluation.....	36
Annex 3: Possible adjustments to evaluator competences in TORs to address issues of equity	37

PART A: BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND FRAMEWORK FOR THE GUIDELINE

1 Introduction

South Africa is the most unequal country in the world.² The history of apartheid and colonialism has left deep-rooted injustices and inequalities in access to and ownership of services, resources and assets. Socio-economic research demonstrates how the policies and systems that were established during apartheid continue to affect availability and accessibility of quality education, infrastructure, basic services, and employment and markets across different segments of society (Makgetla, 2020; Leibbrandt, 2021). Social, economic and environmental inequalities negatively affect the social fabric of society and undermine social cohesion, thereby threatening the full development and stability of the country.

The South African government has pledged to pursue a unified and equitable society in which human dignity and rights are upheld for all its citizens, as promulgated in the Constitution and expressed in the National Development Plan 2030 (NDP). The NDP 2030 acknowledges key development challenges including inadequate infrastructure, spatial divides, and persistent poverty. These development challenges reflect paradigms for understanding how inequality and inequities manifest and are reproduced. Recent research into the persistence of economic inequality in South Africa argues that inequality exists along different dimensions, including geographic location, mechanisms of possession of wealth and assets, and availability and quality of services (Makgetla, 2020).

The National Evaluation Policy Framework 2019-2024 (NEPF) presents the government's commitment to evaluation as a mechanism for achieving the transformational national development agenda. The NEPF makes clear reference to how planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of government interventions should adopt an inclusive approach, particularly for women, youth and persons with disabilities, as part of its transformative effort. However, a recent evaluation of the national evaluation system highlighted that many evaluations struggled to adequately incorporate an equity focus, and did not adequately address issues affecting women, youth, persons with disabilities, and other marginalised groups. While the NEPF provides some guidance for where and how issues of equity should be considered within the life-cycle of an intervention, a detailed guideline on equity in evaluation is needed to further support the framework.

The current OECD/DAC evaluation criteria that guide most evaluations undertaken globally and which are promoted in the NEPF (2019) do not explicitly cover equity either. In revising the criteria, the DAC suggest that the issues of equity and inclusion can be covered in other domains such as relevance, effectiveness and impact. However, criteria are key guideposts for conducting evaluations, as they guide the questions that are developed, reflect and operationalise the priorities and values under investigation (NEPF, 2019). Therefore, without an explicit criterion on transformative equity, evaluators and commissioners of evaluation may overlook key questions and steps to ensure that issues of equity and equality are adequately and purposefully evaluated. We use the term "transformative equity," emphasising that reaching equity requires a transformation of systems and structures, both of the evaluand and of the evaluation approach.

² Based on World Bank assessments of the Gini coefficient, which is a measure of income distribution across segments of society and is used to demonstrate levels of inequality, South Africa has the highest level of inequality, at 0.69 out of a scale of 0-1.

This guideline was developed through a collaborative process involving the South African M&E Association (SAMEA), representatives from DPME, Department of Social Development (DSD), National Development Agency as well as independent evaluators, researchers, and civil society representatives³. The guideline provides more specific guidance for how equity can be considered as an evaluation criterion and how it can be applied broadly, across all sectors and interventions. The first part of the guideline provides an overview of the transformational equity criterion and the ways it can be integrated into evaluation designs and questions. From section 7 we use the structure of the DPME guideline on terms of reference to provide explanation as to how equity can be applied during commissioning and implementation.

2 Purpose of the guideline

The purpose of this guideline is to inform evaluators and commissioners of evaluation⁴ on how to incorporate the new transformational equity criterion and lens when planning and conducting evaluations to ensure that evaluations assess the extent to which interventions under review address the national commitment to redress inequalities that affect different sections of society. These guidelines were developed with the intention that any evaluation, regardless of evaluand objectives or evaluation type, can integrate transformational equity as one of the different lenses by which the evaluand is assessed.

As such, the guideline elaborates on the following:

- What is meant by transformational equity and the role of evaluation in promoting transformation;
- The transformational equity criterion: description and dimensions;
- The principles guiding transformational equity and how these principles can be adopted and applied by commissioners and evaluators
- How transformational equity can be applied to different types of evaluation;
- How transformational equity can be mainstreamed into the planning, commissioning, design, undertaking of, and follow-up use of evaluations;
- Provides some case studies and practical examples for expanding the scope of evaluations to include the transformational equity criterion.

It is noted that this not a standalone guideline and must be read in conjunction with other relevant DPME guidelines, notably the guideline on developing evaluation TORs.⁵

3 What is meant by transformative equity?

In proposing an evaluation criterion on transformative equity, it is important to first define equity and equality, which are often conflated. However, there are important differences between the two constructs that must be made explicit. *Equality* is understood as a state of affairs in which all individuals, groups or areas receive the same set of benefits or have same exposure to opportunity regardless of their current position of privilege or need. Giving every child in a grade 8 class a medium-sized t-shirt would be a very simple example of equality. On the other hand,

³ Contributors include: Jen Norins; Thandolwethu Lukuko; Zulaikha Brey; Ian Goldman; Sinenhlanhla Tsekiso; Oliver Zambuko; Desiree Jason; Simon Baloyi; Khethani H; Josephilda Nhlapo-Hlope; Stellah Masombuka; Nwabisa Mgcotyelwa-Ntoni; Chantelle Van Der Byl; Phathiswa Dlova; Friddah Kutumela; Neva Makgetla. The basic elements of the guideline were developed in a SAMEA hackathon in October 2021. It also draws from a Western Cape Guideline on Equity.

⁴ Across different sectors including state & non-state actors and funders/donors

⁵ See <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/pages/guidelines-other-resources>.

equity recognises that systems have been purposefully designed to benefit some individuals, groups or areas over others and that these entities require differentiated interventions so that they can equally benefit or participate. Using the t-shirt example, children's sizes are noted and a range of t-shirt sizes procured so that each child received a t-shirt that appropriately fits her.

Box 1: The extent of inequality in South Africa

The persistent inequalities in South Africa are not only economic, but also reflect inequities between races and ethnicities, between genders, between geographic regions, and are evident in the availability and quality of services and programmes and in environmental concerns. For example, Africans have higher rates of joblessness and earn the lowest wages when they are employed, compared to other race groups. The mean real earnings between 2011 and 2015 amongst employed black Africans was only R6 899 per month, compared to R9 339 among Coloureds, R14 235 among Indians/Asians, and R24 646 per month among whites. African youth (15 -34 years) bear the brunt of the unemployment problem, with almost one in every second young person unemployed. Statistics SA echoes this, finding 59,5% of youth unemployed (StatsSA, 2021).

Causes of inequality speak to long established systems and infrastructure that have yet to be appropriately transformed and thereby replicate inequities. Within the education system, poor infrastructure in public schools including lack of basic facilities, quality teaching and learning materials, and well qualified teachers negatively impact on children's ability to learn effectively, thereby generating huge divides in the educational preparedness. At the core of the country's health challenge lies the dual and unsustainable health system, characterised by high costs of care in the private sector, which in 2019 catered for only 17.2 percent of the population with medical aid, and a public sector that provides for care for the majority (82.8%). There has been an increase in households receiving services (water, sanitation, electricity, and solid waste). However, the reliability and sustainability of supply of services have been severely affected due to a neglect of maintenance and refurbishment of infrastructure in many municipalities.

Social, economic and environmental inequalities are becoming increasingly evident in recent years, leading to social, economic, political and environmental instabilities, as manifest in the Marikana strikes and resultant deaths of mineworkers in 2012, the social unrest in KwaZulu-Natal in 2021, and the "fees must fall" movement that started in 2015. The COVID-19 pandemic over 2020 and 2021 further exposed the depth and breadth of these structural inequalities and strengthened the need to redress the causes of inequity for a more just and equal society. Therefore, addressing systemic inequities in South Africa is a necessary step to promoting true equality, and to achieve equity, systems need to be transformed so that the structural biases of power and ownership are redressed.

Evaluation can play a critical role in this transformation. American evaluation theorist Ernest House argues that evaluation can be used to either shift or maintain existing repressive structures because "it is used to determine 'who gets what' and that ... evaluation's primary purpose [is] namely to promote social justice" (Christie and Alkin, 2013, 38). Zenda Ofir affirms the transformative role of evaluation in promoting more equitable development in Africa, noting that "as evaluation [continue to] shift from being donor-driven to being driven from within Africa, it is important to ensure the expertise required to evaluate efforts to address some of the most serious challenges faced by the continent" (Ofir, 2012, 8-9) including systemic inequities. The urgency to better address equity in evaluations also aligns with African philosophies and the growing thinking on Made in Africa evaluations, which recognize the need to incorporate shared knowledge systems and communal relational understandings of wellbeing (Chilisa, 2012, 34-36).

4 Equity criterion and explanation

This guideline proposes that the South African evaluation system incorporate an evaluation criterion called “Transformative Equity”. By including “transformative,” the criterion underscores the assumption that reaching equity requires a transformation of systems and structures, both of the evaluand and of the evaluation approach.

The criterion for transformational equity requires intentional consideration of five dimensions, which are: (1) **Population/populace:** *Who* benefits, who loses; (2) **Cause and effect:** *How* is the intervention responding to inequality; (3) **Spatial:** *Where* - which areas benefit or lose from interventions; (4) **Content and intention:** *What* do interventions actually do in relation to inequality; and (5) **Temporal:** *When* should this criterion be applied. These dimensions are expanded upon below in Table 1. It is important to note that these dimensions are often intersecting and iterative.

Table 1: Dimensions of Transformative Equity

Criterion	Transformative equity
Definition	The extent to which an intervention's objectives, design, implementation and impact address systemic inequities and promote a more inclusive society
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By including “transformative,” the criterion underscores the assumption that reaching equity requires a transformation of systems and structures, both of the evaluand and of the evaluation approach. Systemic inequities refer to the ways systems have been established and maintained that perpetuate inequities. In South Africa, the persistent social inequities are remnants of the system of apartheid and levels of inequality as measured by the GINI coefficient are now the highest in the world. Transformative equity considers five dimensions: (1) Population/ populace: <i>Who</i> benefits, who loses; (2) Cause and effect: <i>How</i> is the intervention responding to inequality; (3) Spatial: <i>Where</i> - which areas benefit or lose from interventions; (4) Content and intention: <i>What</i> do interventions actually do in relation to inequality; and (5) Temporal: <i>When</i> should this criterion be applied.

Dimension 1: Population/populace: *who* benefits, who loses?

The “*Who*” dimension requires evaluators and other stakeholders to reflect on which segments of the population are targeted by an intervention and those which are not, as well as to examine who benefits and who loses from the intervention (whether intentional or not) and how the consequences of an intervention, expected or unexpected, affect groups differently. Critical in the context of transformative equity is the intentional inclusion of individuals/groups who are disempowered by the initiative, historically marginalised or otherwise disempowered or voiceless. The examination of “*who*” depends greatly on the focus of the intervention and requires an intentional awareness of issues of power and inclusion.

Within the South African context, there are specific segments of the population already identified as priorities for many social development interventions. These include: African women, children and young people, NEETS (young people not in education, employment or training), persons with disabilities. Attention to the intersections between different categories is critical, e.g. rural African women or young African trans-persons.

Dimension 2: Cause and effect: *how* does inequity play out, how is the intervention responding, and how evaluations should be designed to be transformative

Under the “how” dimension, evaluators and other key stakeholders should consider what systemic factors are at play that perpetuate social and economic inequities, and the extent to which an intervention adequately addresses those issues.

Examples of systemic factors that perpetuate social and economic inequities include inequalities in the ownership and control of assets (e.g. ownership of businesses, capital stock, land), large disparities in wages between sectors, and disparities in quality of education between schools in former homelands and former all-white schools. These systemic factors are remnants of the apartheid system that continue to influence access and distribution of wealth, jobs and services.

In understanding how interventions are responsive to equity issues, evaluations should focus on examining the extent to which the intervention was delivered in a manner that was relevant to the needs and expectations of the different target groups and the flexibility of the intervention to provide differentiated components depending on location or group need, and the extent to which it seeks to change the structural issues which disempower.

For evaluations to assess the extent to which an intervention has influence in transforming society, the evaluation questions, design and management have to take account of the specific dynamics in which inequities are played out in the given context, and the differential experiences and needs of the different groups involved. Evaluators and commissioners of evaluation should be attentive to the dynamics of power that are at play in how interventions are funded, designed and implemented; how evaluations are carried out and evaluators are perceived; and in how evaluation results are presented and used.

For example, an evaluation of a road-works plan that intersects multiple communities will need to ensure that evaluation tools are usable with low-literacy communities as well as with business owners in the main town, so that both groups are equally included in the evaluation process.

Dimension 3: Spatial: *where*, e.g. which areas benefit or lose from interventions?

The “Where” dimension focuses on spatial and geographic contexts (including land, space and quality of the environment), the extent to which the intervention is experienced in different areas, and the extent to which the intervention is able to redress the causes of inequality that result from these geographic contexts. The differential effects of interventions play out in different communities such as rural, informal settlements, formalised peri-urban townships, traditional formal urban centres. A particular problem faces former homelands, which are some of the poorest parts of South Africa.

The Where dimension recognizes that different locations or areas provide greater or lesser opportunity for people in terms of education, economic, mobility and transportation, health and environment, and neighbourhood quality, due to multiple reasons including historic factors, geographic location, and available environmental resources. It also asks how the intervention sought to address the geographical issues which disadvantage, e.g. designing appropriate services for rural areas.

Dimension 4: Content and intention: *what* do interventions actually do? To what extent do interventions contribute to the progressive change for a more equal or equitable South Africa?

While some interventions have explicit objectives promoting equity or inclusion – e.g. a youth employment programme – the transformational equity criterion urges that every intervention is assessed to determine alignment of objectives and results with the national priorities of equity and social inclusion. Therefore, the “What” dimension urges evaluators and other key stakeholders to consider the choice of intervention, its design and implementation approach to consider if the design and implementation approach adequately match a transformative objective.

Specifically, the “What” dimension urges evaluators and other key stakeholders to consider the extent to which

the intervention is meeting specific transformational objectives that seek to redress social and economic inequities; to differentiate between interventions that make a deliberate and concerted effort to address issues of equity versus those that lightly glance over it; and whether interventions seek only to address symptoms but not the root cause for the problem.

The What dimension requires reviewing the existing theory of change or developing a theory of change through engagement with designers/implementers/ participants, in order to determine the driving objective of intervention.

Dimension 5: Temporal: *when* should this criterion be applied?

The “When” dimension urges evaluators and other key stakeholders to consider the value of this criterion in various contexts throughout an intervention’s life-cycle:

- Diagnostic evaluation – before the intervention is implemented
- Implementation/formative evaluations – during implementation
- Outcome/impact/summative evaluations – after a period of implementation

(See Table 2: Equity-focused evaluation questions by evaluation type for further guidance)

5 Equity principles

5.1 Principles supporting the application of equity in evaluations

Applying an equity lens to evaluation requires an acknowledgement of and continual referencing to a set of supporting principles, as well as conscious efforts to include equity-focused questions into each step of the evaluation process.

These guidelines propose the following supporting principles that evaluators and commissioners of evaluation should reflect on and undertake during the evaluation process:

a) Awareness of power: Power dynamics are hugely influential in the implementation of interventions and in their evaluation. Power differentials exist between intervention and target; between evaluator and commissioners; between funder and recipient; and between evaluator and respondents. To integrate equity into the evaluation process, intentional awareness of and mitigating steps against these dynamics is required. Evaluators, commissioners, and funders must be prepared to explicitly search for how power manifests in the intervention, and share ownership of the evaluation process such that study participants and others invested in the intervention have the opportunity to participate in and influence evaluation design, interpretation of findings and evidence-based decision-making.

b) Ubuntu: Ubuntu emphasises a relational way of being that acknowledges interdependencies between all things, living and non-living, material and spiritual (See Box 2 for more on African relational perspectives). In applying ubuntu to evaluation planning, implementation and use, evaluators and commissioners of evaluation are urged to give space to the perspectives of all stakeholders and consider the multiple and interconnected ways of knowing and ways of being that will influence how an intervention is experienced and how values are determined (Chilisa, 2015, and Billman, 2019).

Box 2: African relational perspectives

“In most African communities... evaluation of wellness of one another involves a person asking the other about their wellness, the wellness of their children and those related to them including non-living things. The I/We relationship with its emphasis on a connection of human-beings to non-living things reminds us that evaluation of projects from the African perspective should include a holistic approach that links the project to the sustainability of the environment. Evaluation of development programmes in Africa is about the contribution of projects to the quality and wellbeing of the people and from the everyday practice of the Africans, the wellbeing of relatives and those around including things is as important as one’s wellbeing. Thus an African will usually say they are not that well because a relative is not well.” (Chilisa, 2015, 22-23)

c) Inclusivity: Inclusivity can be defined as “the practice or policy of providing equal access to opportunities and resources for people who might otherwise be excluded or marginalised, such as those having physical or mental disabilities or belonging to minority groups.”⁶ In the context of evaluation, inclusivity reflects the intentional inclusion of the multiple identities and geographies that are affected (directly or indirectly) by a given intervention and ensure adequate representation of these identities and geographies in the different phases of the evaluation. Processes need to be established to ensure that those who may have been previously marginalised from evaluation processes or have had less voice are given the opportunity to contribute to the process meaningfully. For example, community stakeholders must be equal partners, not merely as sources/objects of data or token representatives on “advisory councils.” Inclusivity also means the priorities, interests, voices, insights, and concerns of stakeholders are solicited and reflected upon from the conception stage through to delivering the evaluation findings.

d) Fairness and respect of human dignity: In the evaluation process, evaluators and commissioners of evaluation are urged to uphold impartiality, and to treat all stakeholders with the same level of respect. Fairness supports inclusivity and requires that those representing less powerful stakeholder groups have equal opportunities to make voices heard or to review and respond to evaluation findings. Access to basic services such as water and sanitation or decent wage employment are examples of practices that respect human dignity. In the evaluation process, evaluators and commissioners of evaluation should consider both the extent to which the intervention under evaluation and the actual practice of evaluation supports and promotes human dignity.

In the next sections we distinguish the implications for commissioners and evaluators.

5.2 Applying equity principles as the commissioner

The Commissioner has a responsibility to stimulate equity in the process of commissioning and managing evaluations. This implies:

- Creating an *inclusive* environment where those affected by the intervention can meaningfully input into the evaluation process (e.g. by being on the steering committee, or by being consulted or involved in the evaluation). This should include ensuring that the *interests of less powerful groups* (e.g. landless or subsistence farmers viz small-scale commercial farmers) are safeguarded in the evaluation process and ensuring that meetings facilitate inputs from less powerful groups. For some meetings, this may require use of local languages, groups meeting separately, or establishing active rules of engagement to facilitate equity in contributing to meetings (e.g. all participants are asked their views at particular points). In some cases, creating inclusive environments means

⁶ Oxford Dictionary

bringing in civil society organisations that represent these groups or advocate around these groups or issues.

- Creating an environment that encourages a *creative thinking environment* i.e., appreciating everyone's contributions, promoting equality of input, encouragement of everyone's contributions, quality of attention to all, a relaxed environment that creates feelings of ease, accepting emotions and feelings which may emerge, using information to inform, encouraging diversity of thinking, and using incisive questions to unpack underlying root causes.⁷
- Welcoming *divergent views* to enrich the debate while also facilitating a process of coming to agreement.⁸
- Ensuring the evaluation team is *diverse in background and experience* and demonstrate commitment to the principles of transformative equity.

5.3 Applying equity principles as an evaluator

The evaluator has a responsibility for promoting and upholding equity throughout the evaluation process. Evaluators need to specifically look for how power plays out in the intervention, and to be conscious of who gains, who loses, and the contextual factors at play. The ethical mandate required of evaluators incorporates and supports the equity principles; by ensuring informed consent, privacy and confidentiality of evaluation participants, evaluators respect participants' human dignity. In addition, adopting equity principles requires evaluators to engage in a process of ongoing self-reflection and adjustment, including a willingness to question and adapt traditional evaluation methods in order to ensure meaningful inclusion of a broad range of stakeholders, particularly historically excluded populations. This implies:

- Self-reflecting on own biases and position of privilege, and transparency of how these biases may influence the evaluation process;
- Considering the application of evaluation theories or methodologies that are inclusive and participatory, e.g. participatory evaluation or empowerment evaluation;
- Appreciating the specific features/principles of our African context, particularly the importance of relationships, the appreciation of material and non-material interactions, and the connection to spiritual, and acknowledgement of multiple ways of knowing.
- Creating safe spaces for all stakeholders to be honest about how power is manifested, ensuring that less powerful groups are treated fairly and respectfully and given the opportunity to input to the evaluation and voice their experiences and opinions without intimidation. This requires the facilitation skills to be able to create a creative and inclusive process. For some meetings this may require use of local language, groups meeting separately, or active rules of engagement for promoting equitable contribution in meetings (e.g. all people are asked their views at particular points).
- Upholding ethical practice and ensuring that evaluation participants have full understanding of their rights as an evaluation participant.

⁷ <https://www.timetothink.com/thinking-environment/the-ten-components/>

⁸ An example of this is in this video of the Diagnostic Review of Violence Against Women and Children <https://youtu.be/JFZdnEOWARA> and this policy brief https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/id/e627b871-2636-4369-a5c8-79074f22bd56/Government%20Commissioned%20Evaluation_Building%20a%20culture%20of%20evidence%20infor%20med%20policy.pdf

6 Applying the equity criterion in different types of evaluations

A key function of evaluation criteria is to guide the types of questions being asked in the evaluation. An overarching question posed by the equity criterion is “To what extent does the intervention support transformational systems change that redresses societal inequities?”. Other evaluation questions are required to expand upon this question, along the dimensions described above and in accordance with the different types of evaluations that may be applied, as described in the NEPF. The NEPF identifies six specific types of evaluation that are typically used within the public sector: Diagnosis (or diagnostic), Design, Implementation, Outcome, Impact, Economic and Synthesis. These can be normal full length or rapid evaluations, although impact evaluations are more difficult to do rapidly. These evaluations occur at different stages of an intervention’s life-cycle – prior to an intervention, during implementation (formative), and after implementation (summative) – and for different purposes. There are DPME guidelines for each type of evaluation available (see guidelines 2.2.10-15).⁹ Each evaluation type requires a different set of evaluation questions, relevant to the phase in the intervention’s life-cycle.¹⁰

PART B: INTEGRATING EQUITY INTO EVALUATION PROJECTS: Commissioning, Designing and Undertaking Evaluations

7 Commissioning of the evaluation

7.1 Determining the transformational equity scope in evaluation

In the process of identifying priority interventions for evaluation, e.g. in national, provincial or district evaluation plans, consideration should be given to interventions that have significant implications for transformational changes in equity (e.g., the basic income grant), for broadening socio-economic benefits across the population, and the extent to which they address the needs of marginalised or historically disenfranchised people or areas. Note, not all interventions will address equity – for example evaluating an advanced technology programme, or South Africa’s involvement in space, may have broader justifications that are not specifically related to equity. However, such programmes can have implications for equity; for example, satellite observation of weather can benefit small and large-scale farmers if mechanisms are established for involving their perspectives and sharing data

As with all evaluations, decisions need to be made about the nature and scope of the evaluation – in this case, specifically the nature and extent of the inclusion of transformational equity considerations in the evaluation terms of reference (ToR), design and implementation. This is addressed in detail in terms of scope in the ToR below. At this point it is important to think of this in overall terms. The application of the transformational equity criterion in the evaluation of interventions does not follow a one-size-fits-all approach. This recognises that different factors affect what is possible including:

- The timeframe and resources available to undertake the evaluation;
- The type of evaluation that is being undertaken (diagnostic, implementation, outcome, impact, economic etc);
- Whether the intervention operates at local, provincial and/or national levels;

⁹ Available at <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/pages/guidelines-other-resources>

¹⁰ Annex 2 has more detail on each type of evaluation. There is also a specific guideline on each type of evaluation available at <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/pages/guidelines-other-resources>.

- Whether any equity considerations have been explicitly incorporated into the objectives and design of the intervention, or its theory of change;
- The availability of relevant sources of data and expertise (e.g. regarding resource use);
- The extent to which those managing the intervention are already aware of and have data on the outcomes and impacts of the intervention.

Preparing for an evaluation project involves a number of steps as outlined in the NEPF and other relevant guidelines. These steps typically include establishing:

- Establishing mechanisms for engaging with stakeholders in oversight capacities such as steering committees;
- Drafting a terms of reference (TOR) that outlines context of the evaluation and expectations for the evaluation undertaken; identifies the purpose and focus of the evaluation; determines the key evaluative questions; identifies intended users and their use of results; suggests possible methodologies; suggests likely evaluation team skills needed;
- Overseeing the supply chain process itself, including the expected competences.

Across each step, the equity dimensions (e.g., Population; Cause and Effect; Spatial; Content and Intent; and Temporal) and guiding principles (e.g., Inclusivity, Representativeness, Ubuntu) should be considered and clearly stated in process documentation. In this section each step will be explained with specific reference to equity.

7.2 Step 1: Stakeholder identification and engagement processes

7.2.1 Identifying stakeholders

As in any evaluation process, there are multiple role players who each has a responsibility to uphold and promote equity in the evaluation process (see Table 2). In addition, intentional and meaningful engagement of diverse stakeholders remains critical to the success of evaluations and the usefulness of the evidence they produce. In this section, the roles and responsibilities of the different role players and mechanisms for engagement are explained as initial steps in preparing for evaluations.

Table 2: Responsibilities of different role players in the evaluation process

Role player	Responsibilities
Commissioners of evaluation	Commissioners of evaluation have the responsibility for defining the terms of reference, obtaining suitable evaluators, overseeing the evaluation process, and ensuring that the results of the evaluation are disseminated in a transparent manner and integrated into improvement plans. All of these need to promote an equity agenda. In the transformational equity context, commissioners need to ensure that the evaluation processes are inclusive, representative, and responsive to the broad range of stakeholders. In the private sector, commissioners of evaluation may also include funders.
Technical working group (TWG)	The TWG oversees the day-to-day management of the evaluation and often includes the M&E people from the custodian department, and if a national or provincial evaluation, from DPME or the Office of the Premier. As with the commissioners, the TWG must advocate for equity at each step of the evaluation

Role player	Responsibilities
	process.
Steering Committee	The steering committee provides overall guidance to evaluations and are the mechanism for approving evaluation deliverables such as TORs, final reports etc. Steering committees ensure key stakeholders have a strong role in guiding the evaluation, as described in Section 6.2. External funders are usually represented on the steering committee.
Evaluation team:	The evaluation team includes the evaluation manager in the evaluation service provider, the evaluation specialist and sector specialists.
Peer reviewers	Peer reviewers consider the process as well as the product of evaluations. Peer reviewers normally include a content and methodology specialist.

The evaluation is managed by a smaller technical working group (TWG) and the Steering Committee, which have different roles and responsibilities guided by Terms of Reference. The TWG aims to address the technical aspects of the assessment and reports to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is key for the governance and approving of all key deliverables for the project.

The evaluation manager is responsible for ensuring that evaluation ethics and standards are met by the evaluator(s), tracks adherence to equity criteria and monitors progress. Supporting the evaluation team should not interfere with the independence of the evaluation process in ways that could jeopardise the evaluation's impartiality.

7.2.2 Developing stakeholder engagement mechanisms

In addition to these oversight bodies, engaging broader stakeholder groups must be planned to ensure adequacy and relevance of the evaluation design and overall use of evidence. The NEPF talks about utilisation-focused evaluation¹¹ and the national evaluation system (NES) has been designed with this in mind.

In applying the transformative equity criterion to evaluations, those involved in managing and implementing the evaluation ought to recognise the power differentials between the different stakeholder groups and ensure that mechanisms are established that support representation and meaningful engagement by them. This can be achieved through conducting a stakeholder analysis (See Box 3: Stakeholder Analysis). It is particularly critical to establish mechanisms that provide opportunity to all the relevant voices and not just the loudest or biggest/most influential.

There are different mechanisms for engaging with a broad range of stakeholders. These include:

- *Pre-meetings* where a wide range of stakeholders are brought together to discuss what is needed in the evaluation, prior to developing the TORs;¹²
- *Steering committees*, which manage evaluations;
- *Reference groups*, which are often larger and include a more diverse set of stakeholders to provide advice and feedback on evaluation design, implementation and findings;
- *Peer reviewer systems*;

¹¹ Page 14 of the NEPF talks about utilization focus.

¹² This was done for example with the 2013 evaluation of Nutrition Interventions for Children Under Five and allowed prioritisation of the key issues which needed to be looked at.

- *Community dialogues*, involving affected parties;
- *Stakeholder validation meetings*, which test out emerging findings and recommendations.

Across these different engagement processes, it is critical that there is meaningful representation of all relevant voices, and that care is taken in the structure of these processes such that the different groups have equal opportunity and space to provide inputs and express opinions on the direction of the evaluation design or interpretation of evaluation findings. Consideration needs to be taken as to how best to overcome deep-seated norms and assumptions that might affect the quality of participation for some groups. For example, while a local traditional leader speaks on behalf of his community, his understanding of community needs may still primarily reflect the perspectives of males, as males are often considered decision-makers in many communities and the needs of females are deemed less important. The onus is on the commissioner, the Steering Committee and the evaluation team to establish opportunities for voices that are often overlooked to be considered, and with respect.

Box 3: Stakeholder analysis

A *stakeholder analysis* enables planners and evaluators to identify the different relevant individuals and groups and determine their level of influence and interest in an evaluation. Some stakeholders have high levels of influence and limited interest, while others have low levels of influence but high levels of interest. Some individuals or groups can potentially derail an intervention or evaluation process if they are not well managed. Therefore, it is critical to engage these different stakeholders in meaningful ways that are responsive to their needs and expectations. Engaging stakeholders, including those with who could potentially block implementation, on the evaluation steering committee or other advisory groups ensures ownership and progress. It is equally important that stakeholders from less powerful or relevant marginalised groups are also represented, and that evidence relating to their issues is included in discussions. For example, on an evaluation of smallholder farmers, including a farmers' association that mainly represents larger farmers does not ensure that the needs and experiences of subsistence farmers are recognized in the planning and implementation of the evaluation.

To establish responsive and equitable *engagement processes*, facilitation skills are needed for those chairing meetings that go beyond the typical bureaucratic approach to meetings. For example, to integrate equity into stakeholder meetings, facilitators need to create conducive and safe environments, establish intentional meeting rules with participants such as equal time allotments given to representatives from each group during discussions, and ensure that multiple means of engagement are possible. Other ways of achieving equitable processes for engagement could be to ensure that where this is needed, meeting documentation is provided in multiple formats and languages as relevant to the groups represented.

7.3 Step 2: Elements to consider in developing Terms of Reference that consider equity

As noted in the NEPF, a terms of reference (TOR) is a key document that guides the design and implementation of an evaluation. The TOR specifies the evaluation's purpose or objectives, scope, existing context, expected deliverables, envisioned methodological approach, key questions to inform the evaluation methodology, the evaluation team's expected expertise and composition, and implementation arrangements, including advisory bodies and modes of communication. In the case of integrating transformative equity into an evaluation, the TOR also needs to clearly reference the inclusion of target populations on advisory bodies, the composition of evaluation teams to ensure their representativeness and expertise, expected processes with engaging with multiple stakeholder groups, and expectations for how results will be disseminated and utilized. Additionally, the TOR should describe expected processes for engaging with

stakeholders that ensures representativeness, responsiveness and awareness of power dynamics.

The DPME Evaluation Guideline No 2.2.1 provides further guidance for the development of TORs and how the document should be structured, including a description of the purpose, scope, and objectives of the evaluation; the methodology to be used; the resources and time allocated; reporting requirements; and any other expectations regarding the evaluation process and products. We go through these in turn in the following sections.

7.3.1 Determining the purpose and scope of evaluation project

Applying an equity lens to the development of a TOR requires that the purpose and scope are clearly defined, the equity intention is identified, and that the methodology and expected deliverables are responsive to the particular equity context in question. Table 3 indicates how the purpose could be adapted to consider equity, depending on the type of evaluation.

Table 3: Adapting the evaluation purpose to include equity considerations

Type	Timing	Typical core question in the purpose ¹³	Possible adapted core question, if a focus on equity is required
Diagnostic	At key stages prior to design or planning	<i>Assessing context prior to intervention design</i> What is the current situation/root cause of the problem and possible interventions to address it?	What is the current situation and root cause of the problem, <i>what systemic inequities (e.g. between groups and locations) contribute to that problem, and what are possible interventions to address it?</i>
Design	Prior to implementation, or after an intervention has been designed	<i>Assessing the intervention design</i> Is the logic of the intervention design robust and likely to work?	Is the logic of the intervention design robust and likely to work <i>and how will it contribute to transformational equity?</i>
Formative/ Implementation/ process	Once or several times during the intervention	<i>During intervention</i> Is the intervention being implemented as specified, are the outcomes likely to be achieved, and why?	Is the intervention being implemented as specified, are the outcomes likely to be achieved and why, <i>and is the intervention likely to result in changes in the equity dimensions?</i>
Outcome/ Impact/ (Summative)	Designed early on, Baseline implemented early, impact checked at key stages	<i>At key stages</i> Have short-term outcomes ¹⁴ or medium-term outcomes ¹⁵ been achieved as a result of the intervention?	Have short-term outcomes ¹⁶ or medium-term outcomes ¹⁷ been achieved as a result of the intervention, <i>and what have been transformative equity outcomes, intended or unintended?</i>
Impact	At completion of intervention	<i>At the completion of intervention</i>	How have beneficiaries' lives changed as a result of the

¹³ And in almost all cases this would also include: and how can the intervention be strengthened?

¹⁴ Changes in capacity and systems

¹⁵ Changes in behaviour or performance

¹⁶ Changes in capacity and systems

¹⁷ Changes in behaviour or performance

Type	Timing	Typical core question in the purpose ¹³	Possible adapted core question, if a focus on equity is required
		How have beneficiaries' lives changed as a result of the intervention? What have been the intended/unintended impacts of the intervention on the intended beneficiary organisation?	intervention, <i>and have there been impacts on systemic inequity?</i> What have been the intended or unintended impacts of the intervention on the intended beneficiary organisation(s), and how do these relate to transformational equity?
Economic	Can be at all stages	What are the costs in relation to the benefits? Is the programme providing value for money?	What are the costs in relation to the benefits? What are the social costs of inaction? Is the programme providing value for money?
Synthesis	After a number of evaluations are completed	What is the evidence from all evaluations related to the topic in question?	What is the evidence from all/multiple evaluations related to the topic in question <i>in relation to transformational equity?</i>

In some evaluations the link with equity is implicit. For example, the purpose of the Impact and Implementation Evaluation of the Social Housing Programme¹⁸ was:

... to assess the extent to which the social housing programme is contributing to urban restructuring (integrating and revitalising neighbourhood spatially, socially and economically) and providing affordable quality rental accommodation to the target market and thus generating value for money, and to assess the sustainability of the delivery model. The evaluation will contribute to the rental housing policy revision process.

In contrast, the purpose statements for an outcome evaluation of the Export Marketing Investment Assistance Incentive programme (EMIA)¹⁹ did not clearly integrate questions of equity. The original purpose for this evaluation was:

This evaluation will provide: (1) Strategic information by determining if EMIA is achieving its objectives and (2) Operational information by examining where, how and why its implementation achieves/ does not achieve the best results). Lessons from the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance.

Guided by Dimension 2: *How* and Dimension 4: *What*, the purpose of the planned evaluation ought to clearly identify the equity intention of the intervention and/or the evaluation and try to unpack how systems are empowering and disempowering different groups. Using the EMIA programme as an example, a rephrased purpose statement could be:

This evaluation will provide: (1) Strategic information by determining if EMIA is achieving its objectives, (2) who is benefiting from the programme and in what ways, (3) who is not benefiting from the programme and what are the broader social implications, and (4) how and why its

¹⁸ <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/evaluations/519>

¹⁹ <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/evaluations/434>

implementation achieves/ does not achieve outcomes for different target groups in a way that broadens the social benefit. Lessons from the evaluation will be used to improve programme performance.

Similarly, defining the scope provides an opportunity to specify the different target groups or geographical areas that are to be included, and why, linking the evaluation to Dimension 1: Who and Dimension 3: Where.

Section 10 shows case examples of how the purpose and questions could be redirected to address equity.

Re issues of scope look at section 7.1.

7.3.2 Identification of stakeholders

Section 7.2.1 discusses the importance of involving stakeholders. The TOR should outline the key stakeholders of the intervention (including beneficiaries) and identifies their role in the evaluation and their potential use of the evaluation results in the context within which they operate. The outline must consider multiple segments of the population, as outlined in the dimensions.

Additionally, the TOR should describe expected processes for engaging with stakeholders that ensures representativeness, responsiveness and awareness of power dynamics. The TOR should provide clear guidance regarding the inclusion of target populations on advisory bodies, and the composition of evaluation teams to ensure their representativeness and expertise.

Throughout the development of the TOR and the implementation of the evaluation, commissioners and evaluation teams should be asking themselves: Are we including people with diverse abilities, ages, classes, cultures, ethnicities, families, incomes, languages, locations, races, and sexualities, in the different processes?

7.3.3 Determining the evaluation questions

In developing the evaluation questions, it is important to consider the context and the reality of the evaluand. While evaluation questions are often linked to the DAC criteria (e.g., relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, coherence and sustainability), a key to integrating transformative equity into any evaluation is the intentional inclusion of the equity dimensions into the evaluation questions that guide the evaluation. Table 4 provides examples of the types of evaluation questions that incorporate an equity lens, based on the specific evaluation type being sought. Note synthesis can draw on the other evaluation types. As noted in the DPME guidelines on developing a TOR for evaluation projects, it is recommended that the number of evaluation questions are limited, so a selection would be needed of which questions are most relevant.

When developing evaluation questions, the commissioner and TWG need to consider who is benefitting and not benefitting, how systems have been set up to perpetuate inequity, where inequity is manifesting, and what the contribution of the intervention is toward transforming the system towards greater equity.

Table 4: Equity-focused evaluation questions by evaluation type²⁰

Type	Possible adapted purpose	Equity-focused evaluation questions (and in brackets where these relate to the six DAC criteria, or CEH)
Diagnostic	What is the current situation and root cause of the problem, <i>what systemic inequities (e.g. differences between groups and locations) contribute to that problem, and what are possible interventions to address it?</i>	<p>What are the equity needs/ problems that the intervention aims to address (<i>how</i>)? Has sufficient attention been paid to the way in which the experienced needs/ problems may differ between population groups (<i>who</i>) or geographic locations (<i>where</i>), and how the problem manifests (<i>how</i>)?</p> <p>What are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the current situation, and how can they be leveraged (strengths/opportunities) or addressed (weaknesses/threats) to address inequality or inequity (<i>how</i>)?</p> <p>What are the potential ways that the needs/ problem could be addressed (<i>what</i>)? How will these solutions address the needs/ problems of various population groups (<i>who</i>), in geographic locations (<i>where</i>), and contexts (<i>how</i>)?</p>
Design	Is the logic of the intervention design robust and likely to work <i>and how will it contribute to transformational equity?</i>	<p>How does the design of the intervention address societal inequities and the need for transformational equity? (<i>what</i>)? Was equity considered in the intervention design (log frame, activities etc.)? What, if any, are the assumptions made in the design of the programme? (<i>how</i>)</p> <p>In the consultation of intervention design, was there strong and inclusive stakeholder engagement which included all the target groups most marginalised/ (<i>who</i>, diversity of stakeholders)?</p> <p>Were the different options for addressing the root causes clear and is there evidence that these options are appropriate for different target groups, as well as those who might also have unintended impacts (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>)?</p> <p>Is there a clear Theory of Change explaining the causal mechanism for achieving the desired outcomes and impacts (<i>what</i>)? Does the theory of change demonstrate how the intervention aims to facilitate equity and not perpetuate benefits accruing to the powerful (<i>how, what</i>)?</p> <p>Is the target group of the intervention clear and is it clear who benefits and who loses (<i>who</i>)?</p> <p>Are different population groups (<i>who</i>) or geographic locations (<i>where</i>) able to participate appropriately and fairly?</p> <p>Do M&E systems capture disaggregated data for various population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>) to allow for equity analysis?</p>

²⁰ Note that each of these evaluations may be applied independently or combined, but evaluation questions may be relevant to several different types of evaluations

Type	Possible adapted purpose	Equity-focused evaluation questions (and in brackets where these relate to the six DAC criteria, or CEH)
Formative/ Implementation/ process	Is the intervention being implemented as specified, are the outcomes likely to be achieved and why, and is the intervention likely to result in changes in the equity dimensions?	<p>How is the implementation of intervention working in practice and how does this relate to the theory of change – how does implementation differ between population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>)? Why? (<i>effectiveness</i>)</p> <p>Have different population groups (<i>who</i>) or geographic locations (<i>where</i>) been able to participate in the programme appropriately and fairly? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>What has been the level of participation/collaboration between key stakeholders in the implementation of the programme? To what extent has the participation or collaboration between stakeholders demonstrated objectives of transformative equity/principles of inclusion, representativeness, and respect? (<i>what</i>) (<i>effectiveness</i>)</p> <p>What factors influence the way the programmes are implemented (<i>how</i>)? What power dynamics are at play (<i>how</i>)? (<i>effectiveness</i>)</p> <p>What are the strengths/enablers and weaknesses/constraints of the programme? How can the strengths / opportunities be leveraged or weaknesses/ threats mitigated to transform inequitable systems (<i>how</i>)? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>How might the programme be implemented differently between population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>) to address inequality or inequity? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>Is disaggregated data collected for different population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>) to allow for substantive equity analysis?</p> <p>Are equity considerations reflected in the implementation of the intervention?</p> <p>Whose interests are prioritised, and whose neglected? What mitigations are in place to counter inequities?</p>
Outcome (Summative)	Have short-term outcomes ²¹ or medium-term outcomes ²² been achieved as a result of the intervention, and what have been transformative equity	<p>What short and medium term outcomes are emerging (<i>what</i>)? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>What have been emerging equity outcomes, intended or unintended? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>How do these the emerging outcomes match the theory of change for how the intervention was intended to promote equity (<i>what</i>)? How do these outcomes differ between population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>)? Why are the reasons/ explanations for these differences? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>For whom (<i>who</i>), in what ways (<i>how</i>) or geographic locations and in what circumstances (<i>where</i>) is the</p>

²¹ Changes in capacity and systems

²² Changes in behaviour or performance

Type	Possible adapted purpose	Equity-focused evaluation questions (and in brackets where these relate to the six DAC criteria, or CEH)
	<i>outcomes, intended or unintended?</i>	<p>intervention working? For whom did the intervention not produce the intended results (<i>who</i>) and why? (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>How much did intended and unintended beneficiaries benefit (<i>who</i>)? Which population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>)? (<i>impact</i>)</p> <p>Are these systemic, in that will they make a lasting change to these root causes of inequality and inequity? (Appropriate for systemic evaluations only) (<i>effectiveness/impact/sustainability</i>)</p> <p>What are the unintended outcomes/consequences that have emerged (positive and negative), if any? (<i>what</i>), Did the programme unintentionally/ indirectly benefit/disadvantage one group or location over others? (<i>who</i>) (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>How much of the impact can be attributed to the intervention across different components, population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>)? (<i>impact</i>)</p>
Impact (Summative)	<p>How have beneficiaries' lives changed as a result of the intervention, and have there been impacts on systemic inequity?</p> <p>What have been the intended/unintended impacts of the intervention on the intended beneficiary organisation(s), and how do these relate to transformational equity?</p>	<p>In what ways are beneficiaries and other stakeholders (including vulnerable individuals, groups or communities) impacted with regard to social, economic or environmental equity considerations? (<i>impact</i>)</p> <p>To what extent do the outcomes address the symptoms of inequality and inequity (<i>what</i>)? Are they systemic and sustainable, in that will they make a lasting change for the beneficiaries of intervention? (Appropriate for evaluation of individual interventions) (<i>sustainability</i>)</p> <p>To what extent do the outcomes address the root causes of inequality and inequity (<i>what</i>)? Are they sustainable, in that will they make a lasting change to these root causes of inequality and inequity? (Appropriate for systemic evaluations only) (<i>effectiveness/impact</i>)</p> <p>In what way has the social system changed as a result of the intervention?</p> <p>What further transformative equity impacts can we foresee happening?</p> <p>Is it possible to identify a counterfactual (a comparable population that did not benefit from the intervention)? Using this, how much of the impact can be attributed to the intervention across different components, population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>) and contexts (<i>how</i>)?</p>
Economic	<p>What are the costs in relation to the benefits? What are the social costs of inaction? Is the programme providing value for money?</p>	<p>What is the social/benefit-cost ratio for different options (in social/monetary terms)? Is it different for different population groups (<i>who</i>), geographic locations (<i>where</i>), and contexts (<i>how</i>)? (<i>impact</i>)</p> <p>What proportion of the expenditure on a programme is going to services to final beneficiaries (<i>who, how</i>)? (<i>efficiency</i>) To what extent does it differ for population groups (<i>who</i>) or geographic location (<i>where</i>)? (<i>effectiveness/efficiency</i>)</p> <p>What is the net social benefit resulting from a programme (<i>what/how</i>)? How should this be viewed from an equality and equity lens? (<i>impact</i>)</p>

7.3.4 Evaluation design

As per the DPME TOR guidelines, a TOR should provide sufficient information about the expected evaluation design to properly enable the service provider to draft a viable proposal and later a detailed methodology. When applying the equity criterion to evaluation planning and implementation, commissioners, the TWG, and evaluators should ensure that the evaluation design is inclusive, representative and responsive; looks at system effects; and takes care to manage the power dynamics between groups which may emerge in the evaluation.

The evaluation design must enable the evaluator to accomplish the purpose of the evaluation, and in the process to assess the nature and extent of the intervention's impact on equity. It should also enable evaluators to identify which practices or activities can be strengthened in light of their positive or negative impacts on equity and those which need to be adapted or phased out. Key elements of design include whether the evaluation is mixed method/quantitative or qualitative; case study²³; ethnographic; empowerment²⁴; realist²⁵ or whether a theory-based approach²⁶ will be used (testing out the theory of change).

The design part of the TOR should specify the extent of participatory methods expected and should allow for and state expectations for intentional inclusion of diverse stakeholders and take account for historical inequities of power and access to resources.

Therefore, in determining the proposed methodology, commissioners and the TWG ought to take the following considerations:

- How will system issues of empowerment and disempowerment be analysed?
- How will different populations be included in the data collection process? Are we including people with diverse abilities, ages, classes, cultures, ethnicities, families, incomes, languages, locations, races, and sexualities?
- How will power differentials between different groups be managed so that inclusivity and fairness are achieved?
- Are we erecting barriers that may exclude a diversity of people? How do we ensure against such exclusionary actions?
- Are our data collection strategies appropriate for diverse groups and diverse contexts, including providing for preferred modes of communication? This question requires consideration of issues such as language, accessibility and technical literacy.
- How will the power differentials between evaluators and participants be managed so that bias is minimized? Specifically, consideration should also be given to the different manner in which respondents may respond to being interviewed by male or female, younger or older, black or white interviewers. This potential bias underscores why it is critical for evaluation teams to be diverse, and for evaluation teams to engage in on-going self-reflection of their own biases and assumptions.

As part of the specifications for the evaluation design, the TOR provides guidance on the expected sample and the data collection and analysis approaches. When applying the equity criterion to

²³ Eg see Yin, (1994)

²⁴ https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/plan/approach/empowerment_evaluation

²⁵ <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/realist>

²⁶ <https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/theory-based%2520evaluation>

the sample, the TOR ought to state the expectations for including representatives from targeted beneficiaries as well as other stakeholders or groups that may be affected parties, even if not directly benefitting from the intervention. To the extent possible, all evaluations should include key target populations as part of sample, including women, young people, persons with disabilities, and those from historically disenfranchised communities. In addition, the evaluation design should specify expectations regarding the potential need for multiple data collection approaches and tools to ensure that all stakeholder groups are equally and meaningfully engaged.

7.3.5 Methodology issues

Table 5 explores how the basic research methods may be adapted to cover elements related to transformational equity.

Table 5: How different methods can be used to explore transformational equity aspects

Method	Potential application
Literature review	The inclusion of equity-related references into the broader literature review for the evaluation should include well-selected resources that provide research evidence about the impacts of/link between the type of intervention and equity dimensions. This should serve to contextualise and legitimise the equity dimension of the evaluation. If a synthesis is being done then this element becomes more formalised in terms of method, especially if the results of many studies are to be included, in which case a systematic searching and screening process is needed. ²⁷
Document review	As with the literature review, key national/provincial/local equity-related policies, plans and strategies should be highlighted briefly in order to contextualise/legitimise the equity component of the evaluation, to assist with understanding policy context, and later to determine policy relevance and appropriateness when evaluation analysis is undertaken and conclusions reached.
Content analysis	As part of the document review during the inception phase, intervention documents – e.g. project/programme proposal, ToR, progress reports – can be searched for any terms relating to equity, inequality, power relations, spatial differentiation, marginalised groups, etc. in order to ascertain the nature and extent of any reference to equity-related considerations.
Secondary data	It is key to have disaggregated data by gender, age, ethnicity, location etc which allow for a differentiated view on who is benefiting and who is losing. This might include population data, e.g. from the census, as well as intervention-produced data.
Development of theory of change	Developing the theory of change of the intervention is a key moment to explore how this takes equity issues into account, or not, and to explore what assumptions and linkages may need to be considered to cover equity issues. This is critical if a theory-based evaluation design is considered
Stakeholder analysis	It may be useful to conduct a stakeholder analysis, to analyse different stakeholders, the power and influence they have, their interests, and potentially how they are

²⁷ As is used for systematic reviews. Look at DPME guideline on synthesis <http://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/images/gallery/Guideline%202.2.15%20Evaluation%20Synthesis%20accepted%2014%2003%2020.pdf>

Method	Potential application
	affected or affect equity. ²⁸ This would include establishing who the key policy/programme/project/service delivery informants are – these are usually the custodians, managers, implementers, and major stakeholders who are involved in day-to-day oversight and implementation.
Key informant interviews	Key informants should be able to provide valuable insights into the nature and extent of equity-related awareness within the intervention sphere/among intervention actors, and whether any equity considerations form part of the official intervention design and/or informally as part of intervention activities and practices. This assessment should go beyond simple ethnic issues to look at deeper systemic issues. These informants could also help to begin to identify which stakeholders/beneficiaries are or are likely to be impacted by equity considerations, those who are in a position to facilitate or obstruct changes in relation to CEH, etc.
Focus group discussions	Aside from the fact that group discussions can be very helpful as a way of discussing with several stakeholders at once, they can also provide the evaluator with insight into dynamics and power relations within a particular stakeholder/beneficiary grouping.
Workshops/participatory exercises	These can be used as core methods for working with intervention implementers/managers as well as beneficiary groups during the inception phase of the evaluation to ascertain (1) levels of awareness/understanding about equity-related issues; (2) who has power or not in influencing the intervention activities; (3) what practices have been implemented to address this; 4) what equity outcomes are being experienced or anticipated. At a later stage of the evaluation (e.g. as part of communicating findings), workshops could be held with the same groupings again in order to communicate recommendations, brainstorm ideas, provide training around what practices/changes could be introduced in order to reduce/mitigate negative equity impacts and make positive contributions.
Participatory research exercises	These could be undertaken with community members/beneficiary groups to understand how equity and power-related issues affect their lives, where these are occurring, and to build community ownership of the research process. ²⁹
Direct observation	Directly observing day-to-day activities of the intervention could provide very useful insights and data about equity-related activities and practices.
Surveys	Additional questions could be included in surveys to cover questions such as are equity considerations considered, happening or anticipated, as well as changes in power relations. Surveys also allow for data collection on broader demographic data which can be useful in analysing data in relation to the <i>who</i> dimension.
Cost analysis	All too often evaluations do not pick up cost data, while they may pick up benefit data. Both are needed if cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness considerations will be included. ³⁰

²⁸ Some resources on stakeholder analysis are here

<https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/stakeholder%20analysis>

²⁹ The International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) has published many articles around this, including toolkits.

³⁰ Tulloch (2019) explores identifying costs. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19439342.2019.1684342>. There is also a DPME guideline on economic evaluation <http://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/images/gallery/Guideline%202.15%20Economic%20Guideline%20%204%2003%2020%20docx%20%20-%20Copy.pdf>

It is quite possible that the intervention being evaluated has not collected relevant equity-related data, which affects the evaluability of these aspects. If widespread data is not available there may need to be purposive sampling, for instance to identify examples where positive/zero/negative equity consequences have been found, and to explore what has happened and the causal factors in those instances. This would be useful in a formative way to suggest why particular equity effects may be happening, or point to how designs can be improved, but would not be quantitative data saying 'overall this intervention is having a negative impact of X% on Y'.

7.3.6 Budget considerations

Adding an equity lens to evaluations may come with additional costs due to the need to engage a broader range of stakeholders, and the need to translate data collection tools and evaluation products into multiple formats and languages so as to be inclusive and responsive.

In the TOR it is therefore critical to specify the required processes that integrate the equity criterion into the evaluation and those processes that are preferred. In addition, the scope, overarching evaluation design, and plans for post evaluation community engagement should match the available budget.

7.3.7 Service provider competencies

The description of the desired evaluation team should clearly state the types of competencies, experience and diversity needed on the team so that the evaluation team is representative and able to understand system dynamics and respond effectively to the issue at hand.

Ideally, to best support the integration of the equity criterion to evaluation, the evaluation team should demonstrate a keen understanding of the equity dynamics present in the intervention and context and take intentional steps to ensure inclusivity, representation, and responsiveness in the different evaluation steps. To ensure an equity-focused evaluation, at least one sector specialist should come from a human-rights based approach.

Evaluation teams can respond to equity in the following ways:

- *Project manager*: Responsible for overall project management, quality control and client liaison. It is important that this person has a strong understanding of equity-focused evaluations and demonstrates self-awareness of their power in relation to the evaluand and evaluation participants, as well as their own values in relation to the issue at hand.
- *Evaluation specialist*: A person with strong knowledge of evaluation theory and practice; ideally this person has experience in responsive evaluation approaches that ensure inclusivity and representativeness, and that are insightful in exploring issues of power and access to resources.
- *Sector Expert*: A person or persons with strong sector knowledge and experience; ideally sector experts have experience in engaging with diverse stakeholders, and in understanding how issues of power play out in the sector, who benefits and who loses.

8 Evaluation management and implementation

8.1 Managing evaluations

As noted above, the evaluation is managed by a technical team and the Steering Committee, which have different roles and responsibilities guided by the TOR. The technical team aims to address the technical aspects of the assessment and reports to the Steering Committee. The Steering Group is key for the governance and approving of all key deliverables for the project. It is ultimately the responsibility of the Steering Committee and technical team to ensure that evaluations incorporate a transformational equity lens. The evaluation service provider is responsible for developing an evaluation plan and methodology that responds to the specifications of the commissioner, but also, regardless, upholds the principles of transformative equity.

8.2 Evaluation plan

The inception phase is the key initial phase of the evaluation process as it serves as a road map for the entire evaluation process. The inception phase is an opportunity to further clarify the ToR and any areas of uncertainty in relation to the scope. The inception phase also provides an opportunity to clarify the process, technical concerns, resource requirements and time frame for deliverables. It is also important to discuss the accessibility of the information and the data, and alternative methods if data is unavailable. The expected output from this phase is an inception report and expanded evaluation plan.

Under methodology, special consideration of data collection instruments and protocols is required so that they promote the equity principles of inclusivity, respect, fairness and awareness of power. Integrating equity into data collection tools requires an examination into the way questions are presented, to ensure that the language is accessible and respectful. For example, questions on a data collection tool should use locally recognised symbols or terminology and be sensitive to potentially different meanings that males and females, younger or older people might ascribe to the same terms. Additionally, data collection protocols will need to reflect local contexts and be designed so that less-empowered groups feel empowered to speak freely. Consideration of data collection processes should also account for location and methods, e.g. interviews vs. online surveys. Such considerations include whether it is best to collect data individually or in groups, whether groups should include only people of the same sex or mixed-sexes, same age or mixed age groups, or whether groups should also be stratified by age, geographical location, economic status etc. In the case of using online methods for data collection, such as online surveys, evaluation teams must consider how to include those with limited access to ICT, those who with low literacy, or who would otherwise be excluded from the chosen methodology.

8.3 Field work

The way in which the data collection process is implemented in the field has great implications for the quality of data obtained. Evaluators will need to be attuned and responsive to factors that might influence involvement of different groups in the evaluation process due to their access of resources and perceived position of power. Socio-cultural norms may also affect the engagement of different groups, e.g. persons in a community discussion may not want to contradict the opinion voiced by a community elder out of respect for that elder's position in the community.

In the field, the evaluation team requires a range of interpersonal and adaptive skills to ensure

that the planned processes are followed and that the principles of inclusivity, fairness and respect are upheld. Therefore, evaluation teams need to consider the extent to which they are providing adequate space for expression of multiple ways of relating and knowing?

Skills required include trust-building and relational skills to foster spaces in which participants feel comfortable to share experiences and perspectives. They also include discernment and flexibility, such that field workers can identify when respondents are withholding information due to social norms of the specific setting and modify the data collection approach (e.g. provide a separate meeting area or time for female farmers apart from males dominating the discussion).

8.4 Data Analysis

When conducting data analysis, the evaluators should ensure that the views of all who participated in the evaluation are well covered and appropriately represented. The lead evaluator should ensure that applied data analysis techniques do not exclude views that are contrary to the objectives of the programme, nor should exclude views of the more marginalised or excluded. The selection of the data analysis techniques and instruments should be inclusive and transparent to all. The lead evaluator should allow the opportunity to be assisted by anyone with a better data analyses technique in the community to utilise their expertise if it could advance objectives of the study and ensuring equity.

Results should be analysed by key disaggregated groups, as dictated by the evaluation questions. This includes analysis by gender, age groupings, regions, income levels or other ways of describing issues of equity.

In the analysis process, the evaluation team can ask themselves the following questions:

- Are you using a transformational paradigm or a positivist paradigm? What are the reasons for the choice? Are we trying to empower the beneficiaries/marginalised in the process?
- Cover the specific dimensions of the criteria:
 - (1) Population/populace: Who benefits, who loses;
 - (2) Cause and effect: How is the intervention responding to inequality;
 - (3) Spatial: Where - which areas benefit or lose from interventions;
 - (4) Content and intention: What do interventions actually do in relation to inequality; and
 - (5) Temporal: When is the criterion being applied.
- So for example how are you analysing the needs of different groups? How are you determining the outcomes and how they affect different groups? Do you have explanations as to why there may be difference outcomes?
- Scale of unintended outcomes/consequences discovered (positive/negative), experienced by different groups/location/ circumstances.

Although it is important that the evaluation design, methodology, and analysis remain as rigorous as possible so that findings are evidenced-based. Evaluators and funders should always balance quantitative results with qualitative data in order to reflect and honour the diversity of community perspectives, so that the evidence is as robust as possible.

8.5 Validation of findings

It is important that the evaluation findings and recommendations are validated by stakeholders. This can be in the form of a validation workshop, in which case the participants should be carefully selected to include groups differently affected by the intervention, as well as stakeholders with a

diversity of views around this. The process should encourage participation by these groups and meaningful interaction with the findings and potentially making recommendations.

Evaluators often produce generic recommendations, which stakeholders can help to make more pointed and implementable. It is often good practice to workshop the recommendations with the Steering Committee so as to make the recommendations most implementable and action-oriented.

9 Bringing equity into the follow-up to the evaluation

9.1 Improvement plan and progress report

Once the evaluation report is endorsed by the evaluation Steering Committee (which includes the commissioning department), an improvement plan should be developed to ensure the use of the evaluation results and recommendations. This is accomplished through workshopping the findings and recommendations with stakeholders at a planning session to develop the improvement plan. The same considerations of involvement of beneficiaries, stakeholders etc applies to the improvement plan workshop where the proposed actions to address the findings and recommendations are developed. To address power relations, it may also be necessary to convene subgroups to allow for discussions in different languages, and to ensure that representatives of beneficiaries feel empowered to contribute.

The improvement plan must also be context specific and inclusive of actions to address inequity within the boundaries of the intervention. As per the NEPF, the improvement plan should be time bound and tracked for progress. It must be inclusive of information about the activity that needs to be done, by who, how, and by when.

9.2 Communicating results of the evaluation

In keeping with the principles of inclusivity and participation, it is of utmost importance that results from evaluations are shared with the public, particularly beneficiaries and those affected. Therefore, communication of evaluation results should be factored into the evaluation budget. This is often a problem in government evaluations where there is insufficient communication capacity in departments to take on the extensive engagement to get full value from the evaluation.

Communication of evaluation results ought to be conducted in a manner that is accessible and meaningful to stakeholders and provide them opportunity to contribute effectively and provide feedback. Different means of communication can be used with beneficiaries and stakeholders, depending on their location and accessibility to information including virtual and face to face meetings and workshops, print, mass media (particularly local and community radio), and social media platforms for youth. Previous considerations of technological access and literacy apply. Presentations of results ought to be provided to stakeholders in multiple formats, such as briefs, written reports, and presentations, formal as well as informal, so that all participants have the opportunity to learn about what was found as a result of the data collected. For example, evaluation products released online may exclude some key stakeholders due to the digital divide, and long technical report are not necessarily accessible to community groups.

In view of the power dynamics within communities, commissioners and evaluators must also consider the key gatekeepers who will enable or block communication efforts. Community members may be able to take the findings from the data analysis and develop their own follow-

up interventions, and this feedback is very useful in refining an evaluation report or preparing an improvement plan.

10 Case studies - applying the equity criteria

These case studies are intended to show how the TORs for an evaluation could be adjusted to take on equity considerations, taking evaluations which have been completed and seeing how the TOR could be adjusted. Note this is not endorsing the basic TOR (for example there were too many questions in the Smallholder evaluation TOR).

We use evaluations of three types of interventions

- An economic intervention which could be transformative from an equity perspective - Smallholder farming;
- A social intervention – National School Nutrition Programme;
- And an example of an intervention explicitly targeting equity – Social Housing Programme.

The purpose is to draw on what is being proposed above and link back to existing evaluations to demonstrate retrospectively how the equity criterion could have been applied. Note it is not suggested that all these additional questions would be taken on, but they give an idea of the possible questions that could be included in these specific examples.

10.1 Economic intervention - Smallholder farming³¹

Table 6: Applying the equity guideline to the Diagnostic Evaluation of the Government Supported Small Holder Farmer Sector

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on CEH (in italics)
1.2 Purpose of the evaluation	
This evaluation will synthesis the lessons from relevant existing evaluations to develop the basis (diagnostic) for a coherent overall policy framework to support smallholder farmers	This evaluation will synthesise the lessons from relevant existing evaluations to develop the basis (diagnostic) for a coherent overall policy framework to support smallholder farmers <i>that strengthens both their productivity and contributes to the development of equitable and sustainable rural communities.</i>
2 Focus of the Evaluation	
2.1 Evaluation Questions	

³¹ The TORs, reports and quality assessment are available here <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/evaluations/520>

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on CEH (in italics)
<p>2.1.1 Focus - How are smallholder farmers defined within these programmes? How has this affected the design, development, implementation, and coordination of these programmes (positively or negatively)? What definitions of smallholder farmers should we use going forward (ranging from household gardening to small-scale commercial)?</p>	<p>2.1.1 Focus - How are smallholder farmers defined within these programmes? <i>Who is considered a smallholder farmer, and who is not? What are the gender and power dynamics in these definitions/populations?</i> How have the definitions/categorisation of smallholder farmers affected the design, development, implementation, and coordination of these programmes (positively or negatively)? What definitions of smallholder farmers should we use going forward (ranging from household gardening to small-scale commercial)?</p>
<p>2.1.2 Objectives and measures of effectiveness and sustainability - What are the objectives of the different programmes. How should we view success/impact – sustainable farmers, income, food security, environmental issues? Which smallholder farmers have been addressed, which have been successful, which not and why? What evidence is there of impact on these target groups? How much did this cost per success unit?</p>	<p>2.1.2 Objectives and measures of effectiveness and sustainability - What are the objectives of the different programmes? <i>To what extent did the intervention specifically identify transformative equity in their objectives?</i> How should we view success/impact in these programmes – sustainable farmers, income, food security? Which smallholder farmers have been addressed, which have been successful, which not and why? <i>What evidence is there of impact on these target groups in regards to issues of systemic barriers that lead to inequities in wealth?</i> How much did this cost per success unit?</p>
<p>2.1.3 What evidence was used - To what extent and in what manner has research and development informed the development of these programmes or what alternative approaches is current research suggesting? (Including looking at studies in other African and other middle-income countries with which RSA can compare).</p>	<p>No alterations</p>
<p>2.1.4 Services - What services/interventions are provided and to whom and what is the underlying theory of change? What processes do smallholder farmers follow to access programmes (between and within the departments)? How are services for different commodities addressed (cash crop; livestock, horticulture, forestry & fisheries) by smallholder farmers? What are the lessons learnt? Should support programmes be customised according to commodities?</p>	<p>2.1.4 Services - <i>What services/interventions are provided and to whom? How do these services/interventions differ across different groups/regions? What contributes to these variations? What is the underlying theory of change and to what extent does it include systemic-level changes in land distribution, infrastructure, availability of supports etc that would enable greater equity in the sector? Who determined the services/interventions that would be available to smallholder farmers? To what extent has there been inclusive stakeholder engagement in the different interventions?</i> What processes do smallholder farmers follow to access programmes (between and within the departments)? How are services for different commodities addressed (cash crop; livestock, horticulture, forestry & fisheries) by smallholder farmers? What are the lessons learnt? Should support programmes be customised according to commodities?</p>
<p>2.1.5 Success factors - What are the key success factors and shortcomings of current</p>	<p>2.1.5 Success factors - What are the key success factors and shortcomings of current programmes e.g. market</p>

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on CEH (in italics)
programmes e.g. market access, insurance. How far did they manage for risks such as foot and mouth, climate change etc.?	access, insurance. How far did they manage for risks such as foot and mouth, <i>climate and ecosystems health; high inflation rates affecting costs of production etc.?</i>
2.1.6 What support is needed for different target groups? To what extent does everyone who accesses land want/know how to farm? What change is needed in target groups, selection criteria, and services for these target groups? Are different theories of change needed for different groups and what should they be so as to ensure the likelihood of sustained and cost-effective improvements in productivity, income, environmental sustainability and cost-effectiveness of support programmes?	2.1.6 What support is needed for different target groups? To what extent does everyone who accesses land want/know how to farm? What change is needed in target groups, selection criteria, and services for these target groups? Are different theories of change needed for different groups and what should they be so as to ensure the likelihood of sustained and cost-effective improvements in productivity, income, promotion of <i>climate and ecosystems health, greater equity and development in rural communities</i> , and cost-effectiveness of support programmes
2.1.7 Institutional arrangements - What coordination structures exist to ensure integrated support across departments and stakeholders including the private sector? What lessons emerge around the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional arrangements, administrative processes and procedures?	2.1.7 Institutional arrangements - What coordination structures exist to ensure integrated support across departments and stakeholders including the private sector? What lessons emerge around the strengths and weaknesses of the institutional arrangements, administrative processes and procedures? <i>To what extent do these structures ensure inclusivity and awareness of differential power dynamics at play between smallholder farmers and others in the agricultural sector?</i>
2.1.8 Efficiency - What lessons emerge around the effectiveness and efficiency of resources used by these programmes, including the skills of staff and infrastructure, and how this should be revised going forward?	
2.1.9 Managing risks - What do we need to do to address risks and improve the resilience of smallholder farmers?	2.1.9 Managing risks - What do we need to do to address risks and improve the resilience of smallholder farmers, <i>including their ability to manage income shocks and climate related shocks?</i>
2.1.10 Proposed approach going forward - Based on the above what should be the key target groups going forward, and the approach and types of services provided for each? Who should provide these services? What institutional mechanisms will be needed and what resourcing? How should the current suite of interventions be changed to address these? What does this imply for the roles to be played by key actors including DAFF, DRDLR, provincial departments of agriculture, private sector, NGOs?	2.1.10 Proposed approach going forward - Based on the above, who should be the key target groups going forward, <i>attending to key priority populations and capacity/interest levels; and what approaches and types of services should be provided for each to secure their livelihoods in a manner that supports development of vibrant, equitable and sustainable communities?</i> Who should provide these services? What institutional mechanisms will be needed and what resourcing? How should the current suite of interventions be changed to address these? What does this imply for the roles to be played by key actors including DAFF, DRDLR, DFFE, provincial departments of agriculture/environment, private sector, NGOs?

10.2 Social intervention - National School Nutrition Programme³²

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on Transformational Equity
2 Purpose of the evaluation	
The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess whether the NSNP is being implemented in a way that is likely to result in significant health and educational benefits to primary school learners.	The main purpose of the evaluation is to examine how the NSNP is being implemented across the country, and the likely health and educational outcomes for school learners, <i>notably for poorer schools and the most vulnerable learners.</i> ³³
3 Focus of the Evaluation	
3.1 Evaluation Questions	
1. Is the programme implemented as planned?	
2. Are operational procedures effective to ensure the timely delivery of food?	2. Are operational procedures effective to ensure the timely delivery of food? <i>How do these differ across the different regions of the country and in poorer vs better resourced schools? What are the contextual factors that are at play in the timely delivery of food?</i>
3. Are learners receiving quality meals and services?	3. Are learners receiving quality <i>and healthy</i> ³⁴ meals? <i>Does the quality of meals differ across the different regions of the country or by quintile group? What factors are at play that explain variation in the quality of meals served to learners?</i>
4. What are the variations of implementation at different sites or by different provinces?	4. <i>How does</i> implementation vary at different sites or by different provinces? <i>What are the broader contextual factors that contribute to these variations (e.g. quality of infrastructure, presence of local farms or availability of water resources; what are the differences between schools in urban, peri-urban and rural areas)?</i>
5. Is the programme reaching the intended beneficiaries?	5. Is the programme reaching the intended beneficiaries? <i>What are the experiences of different beneficiaries in different areas of the country? Who is not benefitting from the programme but should?</i>
6. Is there evidence that NSNP enhances learning behaviour? (Likely Impact of the Programme)	
7. Are there other spinoffs of the NSNP	7. Are there other spinoffs of the NSNP, <i>particularly for disadvantaged learners, schools and provinces?</i>
8. Should NSNP be up-scaled? How	8. <i>How can the NSNP be strengthened to better impact</i>

³² <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/evaluations/528/documents/6f7ea0c6-ce75-4852-b5cf-db83ef46eb65>

³³ Note this could be in learning outcomes and in relation to school completion, which is a predictor of further education and employment. For example see Awad. 2020. From school to employment; the dilemma of youth in Sub-Saharan Africa <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2020.1778492>

³⁴ Quality and healthy would need to be defined, and this could include for example food free from pesticides.

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on Transformational Equity
can it be strengthened and up-scaled for better impact?	<i>learners' health and development? How can the NSNP be expanded while ensuring broader positive impacts on the persistent inequities in the education system?</i>
	<i>9. How is the NSNP contributing to broader national goals of equitable development?</i>

10.3 Equity-focused intervention - Social housing³⁵

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on Transformational Equity
2 Purpose of the evaluation	
The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which the social housing programme is contributing to urban restructuring (integrating and revitalising neighbourhood spatially, socially and economically) and providing affordable quality rental accommodation to the target market and thus generating value for money, and assess the sustainability of the delivery model. The evaluation will contribute to the rental housing policy revision process.	
3 Focus of the Evaluation	
3.1 Evaluation Questions	
Impact	
1. To what extent have the social housing projects that have been implemented contributed to the achievement of spatial, economic and social restructuring policy goals?	1. To what extent have the social housing projects that have been implemented contributed to the achievement of spatial, economic and social restructuring policy goals? <i>How does this differ by region? Is there evidence that tenants are able to use social housing as a springboard to improve their livelihoods?</i>
Implementation questions	
2. How have Restructuring Zones (RZ) been identified by municipalities and which factors/ criteria determine the identification of a RZs and is this in line with the specified criteria? • Have the published RZs also been identified as	2. How have Restructuring Zones (RZ) been identified by municipalities and which factors/ criteria determine the identification of a RZs and is this in line with the specified criteria? <i>What equity-related criteria have</i>

³⁵ <https://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/evaluations/519/documents/18236361-dc20-4b52-8843-4e61dbaf94b8>

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on Transformational Equity
<p>urban restructuring/regeneration/revitalisation areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the structuring of public roles and responsibility and the finance in the agreed restructuring zones offered incentives to private finance? What planning has gone into these areas about tipping markets (getting the right level of investments) such that they produce the desired medium term private commercial and residential investment? 	<p><i>been used?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the published RZs also been identified as urban restructuring/regeneration/revitalisation areas? <i>What equity-related criteria have been used?</i> How has the structuring of public roles and responsibility and the finance in the agreed restructuring zones offered incentives to private finance? What planning has gone into these areas about tipping markets (getting the right level of investments) such that they produce the desired medium term private commercial and residential investment <i>and overcome skewed and unequal housing markets?</i>
<p>3. To what extent have SHIs developed capacity to deliver at scale and build a financially viable model?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the requirements and rigour of the SHRA SHI accreditation been adequate to address their viability? Are SHIs in the RCG subsidised projects building up reserves (maintenance and equity) as required and according to the results of the project viability assessment? What are the reasons in case of deviations? What measures are put in place to support SHIs in the sector and how effective are these? What is the relation with the municipality/local authorities and have annual performance agreements been implemented? What are the average vacancy, rent arrear levels and bad debt write offs over the past 12 months and what is the related loss of income? 	<p>3. To what extent have SHIs developed capacity to deliver at scale and build a financially viable model?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As to the left plus: <i>How do rent arrears and bad debts relate to socio-economic profiles of renters?</i>
<p>4. Is the programme able to respond to the complex and growing need for affordable rental in SA and to what extent are the tenants satisfied with the product?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How effective has the programme been in reaching its targeted population? What was the income mix just after the project was implemented and what is the income mix at this point in time? What were the rent levels just after completion and what are the rent levels at this point in time? Which factor(s) determine the rental increase per SHI? What is the turn-over in the RCG subsidised 	<p>4. Is the programme able to respond to the complex and growing need for affordable rental in SA and to what extent are the tenants satisfied with the product?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As to the left plus: <i>How does this relate to tenants socio-economic profile?</i>

Original TOR	Possible changes to take on Transformational Equity
<p>projects and what are the reasons of former tenants to vacate the units?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the percentage of tenants paying a different rental price for the same unit? • What is the impact of the rental increase on the affordability especially for the primary target market? 	
<p>5. How effective have been the monitoring and oversight system for social housing programme and how can this be strengthened?</p>	<p>5. How effective have been the monitoring and oversight system for social housing programme and how can this be strengthened? <i>Is this picking up adequately the socio-economic profiles of tenants?</i></p>
<p>Value for money</p>	
<p>6. Is the programme generating value for money?</p>	<p>6. Is the programme generating value for money? <i>What are the cost benefits for renters with different socio economic profiles?</i></p>

Annexes

Annex 1: References

- Billman, J. A. H. 2019. *Tackling wicked problems in the field of evaluation* (Order No. 27546258). Available from ProQuest Central. (2334693674). Retrieved from <https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/tackling-wicked-problems-field-evaluation/docview/2334693674/se-2?accountid=10612>
- Chilisa, B. 2015. A Synthesis Paper on Made in Africa Evaluation Concept. Commissioned by AfrEA.
- Christie, C. A. and Alkin, M. C. 2013. An evaluation theory tree. In Alkin, M. C. (ed) 2013. *Evaluation Roots: A Wider Perspective of Theorists' Views and Influences*. 2nd Edition. (pp 11-57). Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications Inc. Chapter available through Research Gate: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333392751_AN_EVALUATION_THEORY_TREE_-_2012_most_updated_version
- Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation. 2019. National Evaluation Policy Framework 2019-2024. Office of the Presidency. Pretoria. Available: <https://www.dpme.gov.za/keyfocusareas/evaluationsSite/Evaluations/National%20Policy%20framework%20Nov%202019.pdf>.
- Leibbrandt, M. 2021. The human tragedy of South Africa's inequality. New Frame. <https://www.newframe.com/the-human-tragedy-of-south-africas-inequality/> accessed 13 November 2021
- Makgetla, N. 2020. Inequality in South Africa: An Overview. Working Paper. Trade & Industrial Policy Strategies (TIPS). Pretoria.
- National Planning Commission. 2012. National Development Plan 2030: Our future - make it work. <https://www.gov.za/documents/national-development-plan-2030-our-future-make-it-work>
- Ofir, Z. 2012. Forward. African thought leaders forum on evaluation for development Expanding thought leadership in Africa. (pp 6-11). The Bellagio Conference Proceedings.
- Patton, M. Q. 2021. Evaluation Criteria for Evaluating Transformation: Implications for the Coronavirus Pandemic and the Global Climate Emergency. *American Journal of Evaluation*. 42 (1):53-89. doi:10.1177/1098214020933689
- StatsSA. 2021. Statistical Release P0211. Quarterly Labour Force Survey. Quarter 1: 2021. Available: <http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0211/P02111stQuarter2021.pdf>
- Yin, R. K., 1994. *Case Study Research Design and Methods: Applied Social Research and Methods Series*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Annex 2: The purpose of the six types of evaluation

Type	Overview
Diagnostic	Defined as preparatory research (ex-ante evaluations), these evaluations are conducted when there is an intention to implement an intervention, to direct the design (or redesign) of a policy, project, programme or plan. It explores the current situation, the problems and opportunities to be addressed, the root causes and consequences, including those that the intervention is unlikely to deliver, and the likely effectiveness of different interventions or policy options.
Design	Design evaluations review the theory of change, inner logic, and consistency of a programme to assess whether the design of the intervention is as robust as possible, and the likelihood maximised that it will make a significant difference to the target beneficiaries, efficiently and sustainably.
Implementation/ process	An assessment of programme delivery, strategies, procedures and processes, implementation evaluations are an essential part of effective programme management and are used to understand how a policy, plan or programme is working, and how the efficiency and efficacy of operational processes may be improved.
Outcome/ Impact	Impact evaluations aim to measure changes in outcomes (and the well-being of the target population) that are attributable to a specific intervention by assessing the causal linkages between an intervention and identified changes, usually comparing with a counterfactual
Economic	This evaluation assess the viability of a project based upon economic and social welfare improvements (not financial viability). It: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identifies which of competing interventions/ components of programmes maximise outcomes; - Identifies winners and losers amongst different stakeholder groups, including assessing the equity and pro-poor; - Determining efficient budgetary allocations given resource constraints
Synthesis	These evaluations focus on synthesizing results of a spectrum of evaluations, in order to generalize findings across government/ programmes etc. It helps explain It can explain how, and under what conditions, what type of programmes do (and do not) work

Annex 3: Possible adjustments to evaluator competences in TORs to address issues of equity³⁶

Table 3: Proposed adjustments to DPME competences

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
1 Overarching considerations	
1.1 Contextual knowledge and understanding	Have knowledge of relevant sectors and government systems in relation to the 14 priority outcomes and can appropriately relate the evaluation to current political, policy and governance environments. Understand how issues of power and equity play out in relation to the sectors the intervention covers.
1.2 Ethical conduct	Understand ethical issues relating to evaluation, including potential or actual conflict of interest, protecting confidentiality/anonymity, and obtaining informed consent from evaluation participants.
1.3 Interpersonal skills	Lead an evaluation and its processes using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders, and active participation by beneficiaries and where relevant non-beneficiaries and those affected by the intervention
2 Evaluation leadership	
2.1 Project management	Lead and manage an evaluation team effectively and efficiently, and manage the project effectively to completion in a way which delivers high quality evaluations and builds trust of stakeholders.
2.2 Composition of the team	Strong project manager, evaluation specialist, and sector specialist (not necessarily three people) as well as other relevant team members for the specific assignment
2.3 Involvement of PDIs	At least 40% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs) ³⁷ and they must play a meaningful role in the evaluation (shown in the activity table). The team must also be representative in terms of the groups affected by the intervention.
2.4 Capacity development	Meaningful capacity development to departmental staff as agreed with the relevant departments
3 Evaluation craft	
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	Use knowledge base of evaluation (theories, models including logic and theory-based models, types, methods and tools), critical thinking, analytical and synthesis skills relevant to the evaluation, and use evidence appropriately to inform findings and recommendations.

³⁶ Drawn from the Guideline on Developing TORs

³⁷ By PDIs we mean people of Black, Indian, and Coloured ethnicity. For example if a team consists of 10 members, 3 of them should be PDIs.

Domain/descriptor	Demonstrated ability to
3.2 Research practice	Design specific research methods and tools that address the evaluation's research needs, including identifying intended and unintended effects. This may include qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods.
	Systematically gather, analyse, and synthesise relevant evidence, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and drawing appropriate findings and recommendations.
4 Implementation of evaluation	
4.1 Evaluation planning	
Theory of change	Develop clear theory of change with quality programme logframes with good programme logic and indicators
Design	Design and cost an appropriate and feasible evaluation with appropriate questions and methods, based on the evaluation's purpose and objectives.
4.2 Managing evaluation	Manage evaluation resources to deliver high quality evaluations and related objectives on time and to appropriate standards
4.3 Report writing and communication	Write clear, concise and focused reports that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key evaluation questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other
Total	

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

- Are team players and analytical and lateral thinkers;
- Have excellent communication skills with the ability to listen and learn;
- Have good facilitation skills for strategic thinking, problem solving, and stakeholder management in complex situations, including soliciting views from underrepresented and less empowered groups;
- Have the ability to work under consistent and continuous pressure from varied sources, yet be able to maintain a supportive approach; and
- Have excellent computing skills including detailed knowledge and use of: Word, Excel, Power Point, Microsoft Project or similar compatible software.