The Presidency, Republic of South Africa
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Research

Draft Terms of Reference for a Feasibility Study on Professionalisation of Evaluation in South Africa

Request for Proposals: RFP 14/413

Compulsory briefing session
Date: **13 November 2014**
Time: **10:00 – 11:30**
Venue: **Room 282, East Wing, Union Building, Government Avenue, Pretoria**

Closing date for submission of proposals: 28 November 2014, 12:00
with provision of one electronic and 6 hard copies.

Date for presentation by shortlisted candidates: 4 December 2014
Time: 09:30 – 14:30
Venue: Room 288, East Wing, Union Building, Government Avenue, Pretoria

Please note that security procedures at the Union Building can take up to 30 minutes and that positive proof of identity (RSA identity document) is required for entrance to be granted

1.   Background and Rationale

1.1   Background

Evaluators in South Africa and throughout the world remain deeply divided on issues of self-regulation and autonomy that are critical ingredients of professionalisation of evaluation. In South Africa, the first concrete step towards professionalisation of evaluation was the signing of the Memorandum of Understand between the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA) and the Department of Performance, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) in the Presidency on 2 February 2012. The two organisation agreed to collaborate amongst others, on working towards professionalization of evaluation in South Africa, co-organising capacity building and learning activities, setting evaluation standards and competencies, dissemination of M&E by reaching a wider group of M&E practitioners and encouraging citizens-based monitoring and evaluation. Building on this initiative, the SAMEA Board has established a Portfolio Committee on Capacity Building and Professionalisation of Evaluation, to advise the Board on the route for Professionalising evaluation in South Africa.

Similar debates are taking place internationally. Currently Canada is well-known for having taken advanced measures to professionalise evaluation through a standardised accreditation process. In the same vein, several Regional Evaluation Associations are

establishing Thematic Working Groups (TWGs) on Professionalisation of Evaluation. Amongst others, the proposed European Evaluation Society's (EES) Thematic Working Group on Professionalisation of Evaluation is designed to identify and promote the collective actions needed within Europe to professionalise evaluation by expanding the supply of high quality evaluation education and training; accelerating the harmonization of ethical, quality and competency standards; increasing the autonomy of evaluation practice and exploring the feasibility of designation and accreditation.[1]

The term professionalisation could be contrasted from the terms, profession, professionalism and professional.[2]

➢ *Profession refers to a* vocation, line of work, career, occupation.
➢ *Professionalism refers to:*

   (1) Professional standards – the skill, competence, or character expected of a member of a highly trained profession.
   (2) Following the activity for gain – the following of an activity for financial gain rather than as an amateur.
➢ *Professional refers to an expert, certified, trained,* specialized, qualified, skilled, practised

Based on the above definitions, professionalisation of evaluation *is defined as the process of continuous movement towards a greater measure of various professional characteristics and professionalism in the one who is practising evaluation.[3]* Professionalisation must be distinguished from improving capacity to generate and use evaluation which is already well underway, both through training providers, NGOs and government, as well as the development of standards and competences (which has already happened to extent). Levels of professionalization for South Africa could include:

1) Agreement on a set of **competencies**
2) Developing **specialist skills** according to the set of competencies and through different pathways

3) **Credentialisation**: Demonstrates having the minimum of competencies required
4) **Certification:** Successfully has passed the professional examination requirements
5) **Licence**: Legally authorised to practice the research profession

1.2   Basic Theory of Change for Professionalising Evaluation

The basic theory of change is that if evaluation is professionalised, then qualified and recognised evaluators will lead the evaluation function. If evaluators are qualified and recognised, then evaluation as a practice will gain in terms of quality, rigour, use, credibility, access to available broad talent pool, increased training opportunities and enhanced self-responsibility of evaluators for continuing improvement of evaluation skills.

---

[1] *Robert Picciotto, EES Board member, Professionalisation of Evaluation TWG. www.europeanevaluation.org*

[2] David Molapo, Conference Paper "Evaluation of Public Policy: Issues and Challenges for Benin." 14, 15 and 16 June 2010, Cotonou, Benin, borrowing from the Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat

[3] Ibid

See **Figure 1** below for the simple illustration of the Theory of Change for Professionalising Evaluation and **Figure 2** for basic elements of Professionalization.

Figure 1: **Theory of Change for Professionalising Evaluation (Courtesy: Jean Quesnel)**

Figure 2: **Basic elements of Professionalization (Courtesy: Jean Quesnel)**

Some of the pre-requisites for professionalization include expanding the supply of high quality evaluation education and training; adopting country-level research competencies, norms and standards; increasing the autonomy of evaluation practice; improving ethics

through a formal code of conduct ensuring that those involved in research follow prescribed research principles and exploring the feasibility of designation and accreditation.[4]

Figure 3: Basic Gears for professionalising Evaluation (Courtesy: Jean Quesnel)

The successful bidder will consider the above and other literature to develop a conceptual framework that will inform the study.

DPME has already developed standards for evaluation which are applied to government evaluations, as well as competences for government staff managing evaluations, programme managers and evaluators. One of the aspects of this assignment will be to understand whether it is appropriate to extend these as wider standards and competences in South Africa.

2.   Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to explore the most appropriate route for professionalising evaluation in South Africa and to develop a roadmap for implementation of professionalization.

The intention is to increase the supply of competent evaluators in a developmental context, and to support their continuous   professional developmental and implementation of the code of ethical practice. It should consider the implications for key sectors such as government, civil society, academia and the private sector.

3.   Key Research Questions

1)   Who are the stakeholders in the evaluation landscape? What roles are they playing?
2)   What is the demand for evaluations? Who undertakes them? Who trains evaluation system participants? What is the quality of the product that is produced?

---

[4] Presentation by Jean Quesnel, at the launch of EvalPartners Forum, Chiang Mang, Thailand, 12 /12/ 2012

3) How influential are the evaluations? How is this likely to change in the next 10 years?
4) What pathways have different countries chosen to professionalizing evaluation and what lessons have emerged from this?
5) What are the different approaches to professionalization happening in South Africa and what are the emerging lessons?
6) What would be the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to professionalizing evaluation in South Africa? What might be the unintended consequences?
7) What form of professionalizing evaluation would be most appropriate for South Africa and what roadmap should be envisaged?
8) Given the form proposed above, what implementation strategies are recommended? This should address:
   (i) The roles and responsibilities of various role players
   (ii) The roles SAMEA and DPME should play
   (iii) The institutional arrangements for each implementation phase.
   (iv) Management arrangements and resource implications for implementing the roadmap.

4. Intended Users and Stakeholders of the Research

The following diagram depicts potential users of the research results and how they may use them:

Potential Users of the Research	How they will use it?
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation and centre of Government Departments (e.g. OPSC, Treasury, DPSA)	To determine the path towards professionalising evaluation in South Africa
South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA)	To critically consider the advantages and disadvantages of professionalising evaluation for practitioners. To determine the path towards professionalising evaluation in South Africa
Oversight institutions (PSC, AGSA)	To determine how to strengthen oversight function
SAQA and DHET	To explore the feasibility of designation and accreditation
Academic Institutions	Expand the supply of high quality evaluation education and training
Private Sector, consultants	To assess skills required to improve evaluation practice
Civil Society	To assess skills required to improve evaluation practice
Donors and foundations	To help guide their decision-making around support to and funding of evaluation

5. Scope of the Study

- The research should respond to questions in section 3 above.
- The international review should focus in particular on Canada, Colombia, Mexico, Chile, Benin and Uganda.

6. Products/Deliverables

The service provider is expected to deliver the following products:
- **Inception Report** as a follow-up to the proposal with a revised research plan, overall research design and detailed methodology and content structure for the final report. This forms the basis for judging performance;
- **Situational analysis,** covering Questions 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the Key Research Questions.
- **Benchmarking Study**, which addresses Question 4 of the Key Research Questions
- A **workshop with stakeholders** to discuss the Theory of Change, the options identified and to help craft the Roadmap.
- **Draft Research Report** for review (including a proposed Theory of Change).
- The **final Research Report**, both full and in 1/5/25 format, with recommendations, including a **Roadmap[5]** / change management plan to guide the implementation of the theory of change / conceptual framework for Professionalising Evaluation in South Africa
- The service provider will need to review the following**.**
- **A Power-point or audio-visual presentation of the results.**

7. Methodology

Service providers are expected to recommend appropriate methodology that will respond to the research questions in **section 3** above. This should include:

7.1 Situational Analysis:

The situational analysis will be based on a review of secondary data and interviews with key informants.

7.2 Benchmarking

The benchmarking exercise should include the countries mentioned in Section 5 above and their review their respective pathways for professionalising evaluation. This will entail document reviews and 2 – 3 telephonic interviews with informants in each country.

7.2 Stakeholder workshops

Facilitate a 2-day stakeholder workshop focusing on questions 4 and 5 and a 1-day workshop to test the proposals and build consensus on them.

8. Milestones

The duration of the research will be 3 months. The research will start in **December 2014** and should be completed by **March 2014**. The service provider should produce the project plan indicating the milestones against the deliverables in **table 2** below.

---

[5] This should include proposals for how the DPME's standards and competencies could be widened to apply nationally.

Table 2: Outline project plan and payment schedule

Deliverable	Delivery Date	% payment
Approved Inception Report	December 2014	
Service Level Agreement signed		10%
Literature review, Situational Analysis and Benchmarking		20%
Mid-term report		
Draft Research Report (full) for review.		30%
A workshop with stakeholders to discuss the draft report		
Submission of the Final Draft Report full and in 1/5/25 format		
Approved final research report (by the Steering Committee)		30%
Power-point presentation of the results and provision of all datasets, metadata and survey documentation	15 March.2015	10%

8.1 Level of Effort

The proposed level of effort is as follows:

Inception Report	5 days
Situational Analysis:	10 days
Benchmarking:	20 days
Analysis and review:	5 days
First Stakeholder workshop:	6 days
Drafting report:	10 days
Second workshop:	4 days
Revising and finalise reports:	5 days

Note that the costs of hosting the consultative workshops will be covered by DPME.

9. Research Team

In all likelihood, a two-person team would be best for this assignment. One team member should be an experienced evaluator with a well-developed understanding of what is required to deliver high-quality research. One of the team members should also be very familiar with evaluation **capacity** development. The team should be very familiar with the South African research landscape. International experience and knowledge would be an advantage.

10.   Management Arrangements

10.1   Role of Steering Committee and Reference Group

A Steering Committee has been established comprising of key stakeholders, which will be responsible for overseeing the whole research including approving the inception report and other main deliverables.

10.2   Peer Reviewers

National and international peer reviewers will be contracted to support the assignment.

10.3   Reporting Arrangements
The research project manager to whom the service provider will report is Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME.

11.   Structure and Contents of Proposal to be submitted

11.1   Structure and contents of proposal

A structure and contents of a proposal required from the service provider is shown in **Box 2** below.

Box 2. Structure of a proposal

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

1   Understanding of the South African Evaluation system and its working in practice and the TORs

2   Approach, design and methodology for the research (eg literature and documentation review, data collection, tools, sample, suggestions for elaboration or changes to scope and methodology as outlined in the TORs, examples of research questions suggested, process elements)

3   Activity-based research plan (including effort for different researchers per activity and time frame linked to activities – it is particularly important that effort levels for key national and international resources are clear)

4   Detailed activity-based budget (in South African Rand, including VAT)

5   Competence (include list of related projects undertaken of main contractor and subcontractors, making clear who did what, and contact people for references)

6   Team (team members, roles and level of effort for each member of the team)

7   Capacity development elements (building capacity of partner departments and PDI/young evaluators)

8   Quality assurance plan (to ensure that the process and products are of good quality)

Attachments

Examples of reports of 2 complex research projects undertaken

CVs of key personnel

Completed supply chain forms attached herewith (including updated tax clearance)

---

12.   Information for service providers

The service provider should provide a proposal following the structure above. In addition short-listed candidates will be asked to come and present their proposals as part of the selection process. Tenders should be submitted by 12.00 on 27 November 2014 with one electronic and six hard copies.

12.1   Key background documents

A list of key documents will be provided at the bidders briefing meeting.

12.2   Evaluation criteria for proposals

This refers to the criteria for assessing the received proposals and the scores attached to each criterion. There are standard government procurement processes. Two main criteria are functionality/capability and price. Functionality/capability factors must cover the competences outlined in **section 8** as demonstrated through:

     o   Quality of proposal;

> o Service provider's relevant previous experience including of any subcontractors;
> o Qualifications and expertise of the proposed research team members.

12.3 Pricing requirements

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

12.4 Evaluation of proposals

12.4.1 Administrative compliance

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

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

12.4.2 Functional Evaluation

Only bids/quotes that comply with all administrative requirements (acceptable bids) will be considered during the functional research phase. All bids/quotes will be scored as follows against the function criteria indicated below:

1 – Does not comply with the requirements
2 – Partial compliance with requirements
3 – Full compliance with requirements
4 – Exceeds requirements

Table 3 below outlines the functional evaluation criteria as applied to the competences outlined in section **8** which will be used in assessing the proposals.

Table 3: Functional Evaluation criteria

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minim um
The quality of the proposal	**Addressing the TORs** 1= The requirements of the research not addressed at all. 2= Requirements of the research partially addressed but not convincing. 3= Requirements of the research addressed well and convincingly. 4= Requirements of the research addressed well and additional value added	4			*8*
The quality of the team	Team demonstrate the following key competences related to this assignment, with the ability to:				
1 Overarching consideration s					
1.1 Contextual	Understand the relevant sector/intervention and	3			6

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minim um
knowledge and understanding	government systems in relation to the research and can appropriately relate the research to current political, policy and governance environments 1= Unconvincing that understand the sector/ intervention 2= Some understanding of the sector but not deep 3= Good understanding of the sector and how implementation happens 4= Good understanding of the sector nationally and internationally, and can bring international insight				
2 Research leadership	Lead an research team effectively to project completion, using facilitation and learning approaches, to promote commitment and ownership of stakeholders in relation to the following three key role players				
Composition of team	**Project manager** has experience of managing successfully projects of this size previously (examples and references to be provided) 1= Managed successfully <3 projects or of less than R1m 2= Managed successfully 1-2 projects of R1m and above 3= Managed successfully 3 projects of R1m and above 4= Managed successfully 3 research or research projects of R1m and above	3			6
	Research specialist has experience of undertaking successfully research projects of this size and nature previously (examples and references to be provided) 1= Undertaken successfully <3 research projects of a similar nature and over R500 000 2= Undertaken successfully 3-5 research projects of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Undertaken successfully >5 research projects of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 4= Undertaken successfully >5 research projects of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 and with knowledge of international best practice (convincing internationally as an evaluator in this type of work)	4			8
	Sector specialist has deep knowledge of the sector	4			8

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
	1= Worked in the sector for less than 3 years For all others a minimum of a masters degree plus: 2= Worked in the sector for 3-5 years and a reasonable understanding 3= Worked in the sector for 5-10 years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned 4= Worked in the sector for 10+ years and a strong understanding of the sector and the intervention concerned as well as international good practice				
PDI role in team	**At least 30% of team are Previously Disadvantaged Individuals (PDIs)[6]** and they must play a meaningful role in the research 1= Team consists of less than 30% PDIs and less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs 2= Team consists of 30% PDIs but less than 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs 3= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company) 4= Team consists of at least 30% PDIs, at least 30% of person-days allocated to PDIs, and one of the specialists above is PDI (either staff or could be a joint venture with a BEE company)	3			9
Capacity development	**Capacity development** elements and building capacity of government partners, namely: 1= No indication of capacity development 2= Some capacity development included in proposal but not well though through 3= Well thought through strategy of how they would use junior government staff on the research 4= Interesting/innovative model for building capacity in research of junior and potentially other government staff	3			*6*
3 Research craft					
3.1 Evaluative discipline and practice	**Demonstrated experience of undertaking quality research projects (so using research knowledge) relevant to the research**. 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 research projects of a similar nature and over	4			8

---

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

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minim um
	R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 research projects of a similar nature and over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 research projects of a similar nature and over R500 000 (convincing as an evaluator in this type of work) 4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 research projects of a similar nature and over R1 000 000 (convincing as an research organisation in this type of work)				
	Knowledge of and exposure to international good practice, particularly in middle-income and African countries. 1= No international experience available 2= Proposal makes mention of international experience but not convincing in how this will benefit the project 3= Organisation has undertaken international work and shows in the proposal how it will draw in international experience and insight 4= Recognised international expertise included in the team (either sector or research)	1			*2*
3.2 Research practice	**Demonstrated experience of systematically gathering, analysing, and synthesising relevant evidence**, data and information from a range of sources, identifying relevant material, assessing its quality, spotting gaps, and writing effective research reports. 1= Organisation has undertaken successfully <2 research projects which demonstrate knowledge of (qualitative or quantitative research)*[7] and are over R500 000 2= Organisation has undertaken successfully 3-4 research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000 3= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R500 000 4= Organisation has undertaken successfully 5 research projects which demonstrate (qualitative or quantitative research)* and are over R1 000 000 (convincing as an organisation undertaking this type of research)	3			6

---

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

Domain/ descriptor	Functional Evaluation Criteria	Weight (out of 4)	Score	Weight x score	Minimum
4 Implement-ation of research					
4.1 Research planning	**Approach, design, methodology for the research** 1= Not likely to address the needs of the research 2= Some parts of the research addressed satisfactorily but overall not convincing 3= Addresses these satisfactorily. Confident the research can be implemented. 4= Addresses these satisfactorily. In addition some very interesting approaches suggested for undertaking the research which are likely to increase the use	4			*12*
	Quality of activity-based plan (including effort for different consultants per activity and time frame linked to activities) 1= No plan 2= Activity-based plan produced but not convincing that the methodology can be delivered using resources proposed 3= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology 4= Activity-based plan clear and realistic to address the methodology, and innovative so that more can be delivered	3			9
4.3 Report writing and communication	**Write clear, concise and focused reports** that are credible, useful and actionable, address the key research questions, and show the evidence, analysis, synthesis, recommendations and evaluative interpretation and how these build from each other 1= No examples of writing provided or examples show poor writing skills 2= Examples provided show adequate but not good writing skills, but use of evidence is not good 3= Examples provided show good reports which demonstrate use of evidence, good logic, and are well-written 4= Well-written and punchy reports with good use of infographics, good summaries, good use of evidence	3			*6*
Total		43			

Minimum requirement: Service providers that submitted acceptable bids and that scored at least the minimum for each element as well as the overall minimum score (75), based on the average of scores awarded by the research panel members.

Proposals should clearly address the project description and the functional research criteria mentioned above.

12.4.3 Price research: The PPPFA
Only bids/quotes that meet the minimum required indicated under functional research above will be evaluated in terms of the Preferential Procurement Framework Act and related regulations. The 90/10 research method will be used for bids from R1 million and the 80/20 method will be used for bids/quotes below R1 million. Points will be awarded to a bidder for attaining the B-BBEE status level of contribution in accordance with the table contained in SBD 6.1 (see attached bid documents)

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

In this bid, the 80/20 preference point system will apply.

13.   General and special conditions of contract

Awarding of the final contract will be subject to the conclusion of a service level agreement between the Department and the successful service provider.

14.   Intellectual property

SAMEA and DPME will own copyright of the products of this assignment, except prior material brought in to the assignment or that owned by a third party. The service provider will not use the material (whether in part or whole) without the written permission of SAMEA and DPME.

15.   Enquiries

Regarding the research process and commissioning, please contact Mr Jabu Mathe, Director: Evaluation, DPME: Tel. 012 3120158/Cell: 0823409283, E-mail: jabu@po-dpme.gov.za

———————————————