

Minutes of the Initial Briefing Session with the Service Provider on the Policy on Community Colleges (PCC) Evaluation

Date : Thursday June 12, 2014
Time : 09:00 – 12:00
Venue : Southern Sun Hotel, Pretoria

Attendees:

- Dr H Narsee (DHET) Chair; Mr A Hercules (DPME); Ms R Pillay (DHET); Prof B Makobe (DHET); Ms M Bialobrzeska (SAIDE); Ms Glennie (SAIDE); Prof J Aitchison (SAIDE); Mr E Mhlanga (SAIDE).
Mr B Maluka (DPME).

Apologies:

- Mr D Diale (DHET).

Objective: To ensure that by the end of the meeting the Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME), Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), and the service provider (South African Institute for Distant Education (SAIDE)) have a consensus agreement on all evaluation issues going forward.

Item	Action Needed	By who	When
1. Opening and welcome			
- In opening the Chair kindly welcomed everyone present at the meeting. She then asked everyone to kindly introduce themselves. - The Chair indicated that Mr Diale (the Director responsible for Adult Education and Training (AET at the DHET) will not be able to attend the meeting due to other commitments. - She then stated that the purpose of the meeting was to outline several that need to be addressed prior to the service provider starting work on the inception report and the revised proposal. - The Chair requested the service provider to state what they will be doing going forward in undertaking the evaluation. The service provider thus stated the following: - It was noted that after the inception report has been accepted by the departments, the service provider will start on the literature review (following a two pronged approach) which will encompass both local and international literature on training colleges. - It was stated that the service provider will follow the order of the evaluation steps as noted in the TOR. - It was indicated that the service provider will further request an inception guideline (which it will follow) from the DPME. - It was indicated that interviews will also be held with relevant stakeholders from the various provinces. The service provider noted that it would be better if all stakeholders could convene in Pretoria. - The service provider mentioned that how it proceeds will be determined largely by the state at which the Policy on Community Colleges (PCC) is in. - Further, the state of the Theory of Change (TOC) and Logframe. - The service provider also indicated that how they proceed will to a large extent be determined by what they are told at the meeting regarding the TOC and the Logframe, and the engagements needed with the TOC and Logframe.			

Item	Action Needed	By who	When
2. Inception report			
The following issues regarding the inception report were indicated: • It was noted that inception report from the service provider will not be influenced by whether the Minister of HET has signed the PCC or not. • The Chair indicated that the inception report will/has to be based on the current version of the PCC as it is (thus the service provider should not for the version to be signed by the Minister, but should carry on with the inception report). • The Chair mentioned that they (DHET) will communicate with Mr Diale to see whether there are any substantial comments and changes made to the policy which may affect the evaluation. • Mr Hercules indicated that the Service Level Agreement (SLA) will only be signed after the submission and approval of both the inception report and the revised proposal. • The service provider asked what the difference is between the inception report and the revised proposal. ○ In response Mr Hercules indicated that the inception report fundamentally outlined what the changes are that have been made to the initial proposal. • It was noted that the DPME will forward a guideline/template on inception phase and inception report to the service provider before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2014. • Mr Hercules indicated that the inception report will be expected to address/incorporate comments generated at the meeting.			

3. Theory of Change (TOC) and Logframe workshop			
The following issues were addressed on matters pertaining to the TOC and Logframe workshop: • The Chair indicated that there is a draft Logframe and that it will be forwarded to the service provider. • It was noted that there is no TOC; hence the service provider will need to produce a draft of the TOC. • The Chair mentioned that the TOC and Logframe will need to be workshoped with all stakeholders present. She noted that the TOC will be implicit in the policy. • Mr Hercules mentioned that the service provider will be expected to take facilitator's notes for the TOC workshop. • The Chair suggested that the service provider should also use the Steering Committee meeting of Thursday July 17, 2014 to liaise with the stakeholders and to ask questions as a lead-up to the TOC workshop.			
4. Service Level Agreement (SLA)			
The following was indicated on matters of the SLA: • Mr Hercules indicated that the service provider should start preparing an invoice, should not wait for the SLA to be signed. • He stated that the invoice would then be submitted right after the SLA has been signed by all parties. • The Chair indicated that the SLA should be signed by Thursday July 31, 2014. • The service provider asked whether it was feasible for the SLA to be signed by Thursday July 31, 2014.			

5. Evaluation budget			
In terms of the evaluation budget, the meeting noted the following: • Mr Hercules indicated that the total budget set for the PCC evaluation is R400 000. • He mentioned that the the evaluation is expected to run through the course of 6 weeks. • He noted that in the event that the service provider is encountering problems with regard to the budget, then additional funds will need to be sourced. • He stated that all evaluation and stakeholder related workshops (i.e.: TOC workshop) will be paid for by the DPME. • The service provider asked whether the budget of R400 000 set aside by the DPME for the PCC evaluation is vat inclusive or not. ○ In response Mr Hercules stated that the figure is inclusive of vat. • Mr Hercules indicated that the evaluation budget was initially at R125 000. • The Chair mentioned that at the initial conceptualization of the study the thought was that the evaluation would be carried out by a team of 2 people, and would be done within a period of 10 days. • Mr Hercules asked what the rate for the evaluation expert is in the service providers' proposal. ○ It was noted that on average the rate was between R6000 and R6500. • The Chair requested Mr Hercules to check with the DPME on the matters of vat and flexibility regarding the budget as contained in the proposal. ○ It was noted that Mr Hercules will check with the DPME (on the issues of the vat and budget as quoted in proposal) and respond in writing to the service provider.			

6. Peer reviewer			
The following issues were stated on the matter of the evaluation Peer reviewer(s): • Mr Hercules indicated that for every evaluation two Peer Reviewers are appointed. ○ He stated that one Peer Reviewer is appointed to work on the content issues, and ○ Another is appointed to work specifically on the methodology. • Mr Hercules thus requested the DHET to provide names (suggestions) of/for the prospective Peer Reviewers. • The Chair indicated that the DHET will provide the names of the prospective Peer Reviewers.			
7. Data systems and available data			
In terms of available data the following was noted: • The service provider requested access to data on adult education. • The Chair mentioned that date on adult education is available on the DHET website. • She indicated that there is a data form that the service provider will also need to complete when requesting data from the DHET. • It was stated that Ms Pillay will forward the data form to the service provider before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2014. • The Chair suggested that the service provider should also look into the ABET examination data. She stated that the data was only available in a table form and indicated that it was very reliable. • The service provider asked whether the data on the old senior certificates will also be provided. ○ The Chair stated that the DHET will need to check if the data on senior certificates can be obtained. ○ She further noted that the Department of Basic Education (DBE) might not be in possession of such data. • A suggestion was made for the DHET to make a formal request to UMALUSI for the sought data. • Another question was asked on whether the DHET knew what the total number of registered AHET centers is. ○ The Chair stated that they were not in possession of data on the total number of registered AHET centers.			

8. Capacity building			
In terms of the capacity building aspect of the evaluation the following issues were stated: • The Chair indicated that there are two interns at the DHET whom they would like to involve in the PCC evaluation. • She noted that the interns could assist (administratively and in other means) in the evaluation. • The stated that when the service provider goes to gather data it could also involve the interns. • Mr Hercules also mentioned that another intern from the DPME will be available to work with the service provider on the PCC evaluation. • He noted that the service provider should use the interns provided. • The Chair thus mentioned that the interns' Curriculum Vitae will be provided.			
9. Composition of the PCC Evaluation Steering Committee			
On matters pertaining to the composition of the evaluation Steering Committee the following was indicated: • Mr Maluka indicated that the evaluation Steering Committee was composed of representatives from the following institutions: ○ DPME; ○ DHET; ○ Representatives from each of the nine provinces (departments of education), and ○ Researchers and specialists from other institutions and universities. • The Chair noted that there will be a total of 4 Steering Committee meetings on the PCC Evaluation commencing with the one to be held on Thursday July 17, 2014. • A question was asked on the responsiveness of the representatives from the provinces. ○ The Chair mentioned that the representatives from the provinces were/will be very responsive to the service provider. ○ Prof Makobe indicated that the DHET will communicate with the provincial representatives prior to the service provider interacting with them.			

10. Discussion			
The following matters were mentioned in the discussions: • The service provider asked when the SLA will be ready for signing. ○ The Chair indicated that the SLA will be signed by Thursday July 31, 2014. • The service provider asked whether there is a draft policy (PCC) that they could look at. ○ The Chair mentioned that there is a draft policy; she further noted that it will be forwarded to the service provider. ○ She noted that the service provider will be expected to handle the policy with care keeping in mind that it is still a confidential document. • The service provider asked if they will be allowed to access the public comments when the PCC goes public. ○ The Chair indicated that the service provider will be provided access to the comments on the PCC. • The Chair suggested that the service provider should keep in contact with Pillay when they need additional information on the evaluation. • It was noted that the service provider should not wait until the policy is signed by the Minister to start work on the evaluation, but should proceed immediately. • Prof Makobe indicated that he will ensure that the service provider gets hold of the current version of the PCC. • The Chair asked when the revised proposal and the inception report will be submitted. ○ The service provider stated that they will start work as soon as the Logframe and the signed policy are provided. ○ It was noted that the Logframe will be provided by before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2013. It was further stated that the service provider should not wait until the policy is signed by the Minister, but should work with the current version. • The Chair asked how long it will take for the service provider to submit an inception report if the policy is provided by Friday June 13, 2014 • The Chair suggested that the service provider should also interview representatives from the function shift.			

• The Chair asked what the service provider sees as possible deviations from the proposal apart from the TOC. ○ It was noted that there were no other deviations. • The Chair stated that the final Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) will be in place by mid-July 2014, she noted that the service provider ought to keep in mind that there might be changes made to the AHET in the MTEF/MTSF. • A question was asked on whether there are any guidelines within the DPME on policy as opposed to guidelines on a programme. ○ Mr Hercules indicated that there is no guideline on policy at the DPME. He stated that the PCC evaluation is the first of its kind. • Mr Hercules indicated that the service provider's deliverables will be assessed based on the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) as the base document for the evaluation. • The Chair noted that the service provider should also consider interviewing representatives from the National Treasury (NT). • She indicated that the DHET is currently engaged in a White Paper process and indicated that AHET unit in the DHET will be presenting a plan on the White Paper to the Minister. She further noted that the plan is essential for the PCC evaluation; hence the service provider should also look into it. • The service provider made a suggestion for the use of ICTs in a decentralized system (they spoke of an idea of a broadband rollout). • The Chair indicated that there is an individual by the name of Shirley at the DHET who is responsible for the NQF; she suggested that the service provider should consider interviewing her as well. • Mr Hercules indicated that the service provider needs to engage the MTEF. He stated that the MTEF will be important for the evaluation. • He also noted that it is important that the service provider interacts with the NT and with the people dealing with the budget. • The service provider asked who the finance people at the DHET are. ○ The Chair indicated that Mr Diale would know more about the budget issues and the MTEF. • Mr Hercules suggested that the service provider should also speak with/interview some of the officials in the Ministry (DHET). • He indicated that one thing that is also expected from the service provider is the policy identification fiche.			
---	--	--	--

• He indicated that he will ensure that the service provider gets the template to use in obtaining the deliverables noted in paragraph 2 on page 8 of the evaluation TOR.			
11. Way forward			
In terms of the way forward the following was stated:			
• It was noted that inception report from the service provider will not be influenced by whether the Minister of HET has signed the PCC or not. • It was noted that the DPME will forward a guideline/template on inception phase and inception report to the service provider before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2014. • It agreed that the service provider will need to produce a draft of the TOC. • It was noted that all evaluation and stakeholder related workshops (i.e.: TOC workshop) will be paid for by the DPME. • It was noted that Mr Hercules will check with the DPME (on the issues of the VAT and budget as quoted in proposal) and respond in writing to the service provider. • It was stated that Ms Pillay will forward the data form to the service provider before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2014. • The Chair noted that there will be a total of 4 Steering Committee meetings on the PCC Evaluation commencing with the one to be held on Thursday July 17, 2014. • The Chair indicated that the service provider will be provided access to the comments on the PCC. • Prof Makobe indicated that he will ensure that the service provider gets hold of the current version of the PCC. • It was indicated that the draft policy will be forwarded to the service provider before end of business on Friday June 12, 2014. • It was noted that the inception report will be submitted on Wednesday July 09, 2014. • It was also indicated that the SLA will only be signed after July 17, 2014. Thus it was agreed that it will be signed by Thursday July 31, 2014. • It was noted that the service provider will also be provided with the audit report on the DHET from the Auditor General. • It was stated that Ms Pillay will forward to the service provider the data form which the service provider will use to obtain non-exam data.	Forward guideline to the service provider.	DPME.	Thursday June 12, 2014.
	Forward data form to service provider.	DHET.	Thursday June 12, 2014.
	Forward draft policy to service provider.	DHET.	Thursday June 12, 2014.
	Submission of the inception report.	Service provider.	Wednesday July 09, 2014.
	Signing of the SLA.	All parties involved.	Thursday July 31, 2014.

12. Meeting closure			
• In closing the Chair kindly thanked everyone present for their time and effort. • Having dealt with issues on the agenda, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00.			
10. Discussion			
The following matters were mentioned in the discussions: • The service provider asked when the SLA will be ready for signing. ○ The Chair indicated that the SLA will be signed by Thursday July 31, 2014. • The service provider asked whether there is a draft policy (PCC) that they could look at. ○ The Chair mentioned that there is a draft policy; she further noted that it will be forwarded to the service provider. ○ She noted that the service provider will be expected to handle the policy with care keeping in mind that it is still a confidential document. • The service provider asked if they will be allowed to access the public comments when the PCC goes public. ○ The Chair indicated that the service provider will be provided access to the comments on the PCC. • The Chair suggested that the service provider should keep in contact with Pillay when they need additional information on the evaluation. • It was noted that the service provider should not wait until the policy is signed by the Minister to start work on the evaluation, but should proceed immediately. • Prof Makobe indicated that he will ensure that the service provider gets hold of the current version of the PCC. • The Chair asked when the revised proposal and the inception report will be submitted. ○ The service provider stated that they will start work as soon as the Logframe and the signed policy are provided. ○ It was noted that the Logframe will be provided by before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2013. It was further stated that the service provider should not wait until the policy is signed by the Minister, but should work with the current version.			

• The Chair asked how long it will take for the service provider to submit an inception report if the policy is provided by Friday June 13, 2014 • The Chair suggested that the service provider should also interview representatives from the function shift. • The Chair asked what the service provider sees as possible deviations from the proposal apart from the TOC. ○ It was noted that there were no other deviations. • The Chair stated that the final Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) will be in place by mid-July 2014, she noted that the service provider ought to keep in mind that there might be changes made to the AHET in the MTEF/MTSF. • A question was asked on whether there are any guidelines within the DPME on policy as opposed to guidelines on a programme. ○ Mr Hercules indicated that there is no guideline on policy at the DPME. He stated that the PCC evaluation is the first of its kind. • Mr Hercules indicated that the service provider's deliverables will be assessed based on the evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR) as the base document for the evaluation. • The Chair noted that the service provider should also consider interviewing representatives from the National Treasury (NT). • She indicated that the DHET is currently engaged in a White Paper process and indicated that AHET unit in the DHET will be presenting a plan on the White Paper to the Minister. She further noted that the plan is essential for the PCC evaluation; hence the service provider should also look into it. • The service provider made a suggestion for the use of ICTs in a decentralized system (they spoke of an idea of a broadband rollout). • The Chair indicated that there is an individual by the name of Shirley at the DHET who is responsible for the NQF; she suggested that the service provider should consider interviewing her as well. • Mr Hercules indicated that the service provider needs to engage the MTEF. He stated that the MTEF will be important for the evaluation. • He also noted that it is important that the service provider interacts with the NT and with the people dealing with the budget. • The service provider asked who the finance people at the DHET are. ○ The Chair indicated that Mr Diale would know more about the budget issues and the MTEF.			
--	--	--	--

• Mr Hercules suggested that the service provider should also speak with/interview some of the officials in the Ministry (DHET). • He indicated that one thing that is also expected from the service provider is the policy identification fiche. • • He indicated that he will ensure that the service provider gets the template to use in obtaining the deliverables noted in paragraph 2 on page 8 of the evaluation TOR.			
11. Way forward			
In terms of the way forward the following was stated: • It was noted that inception report from the service provider will not be influenced by whether the Minister of HET has signed the PCC or not. • It was noted that the DPME will forward a guideline/template on inception phase and inception report to the service provider before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2014. • It agreed that the service provider will need to produce a draft of the TOC. • It was noted that all evaluation and stakeholder related workshops (i.e.: TOC workshop) will be paid for by the DPME. • It was noted that Mr Hercules will check with the DPME (on the issues of the vat and budget as quoted in proposal) and respond in writing to the service provider. • It was stated that Ms Pillay will forward the data form to the service provider before end of business on Thursday June 12, 2014. • The Chair noted that there will be a total of 4 Steering Committee meetings on the PCC Evaluation commencing with the one to be held on Thursday July 17, 2014. • The Chair indicated that the service provider will be provided access to the comments on the PCC. • Prof Makobe indicated that he will ensure that the service provider gets hold of the current version of the PCC. • It was indicated that the draft policy will be forwarded to the service provider before end of business on Friday June 12, 2014. • It was noted that the inception report will be submitted on Wednesday July 09, 2014.	Forward guideline to the service provider. Forward data form to service provider. Forward draft policy to service provider. Submission of the inception report.	DPME. DHET. DHET. Service provider.	Thursday June 12, 2014. Thursday June 12, 2014. Thursday June 12, 2014. Wednesday July 09, 2014.

- It was also indicated that the SLA will only be signed after July 17, 2014. Thus it was agreed that it will be signed by Thursday July 31, 2014. - It was noted that the service provider will also be provided with the audit report on the DHET from the Auditor General. - It was stated that Ms Pillay will forward to the service provider the data form which the service provider will use to obtain non-exam data.	Signing of the SLA.	All parties involved.	Thursday July 31, 2014.
12. Meeting closure			
- In closing the Chair kindly thanked everyone present for their time and effort. - Having dealt with issues on the agenda, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00.			

Signed as correct record

Chair

Name

Date