



merSETA

MANUFACTURING, ENGINEERING AND RELATED SERVICES SETA

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION TRAINING (ABET) PROJECT

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES.....	4
3. ACTIVITIES (METHODOLOGY).....	6
4. DELIVERABLES.....	6
5. DURATION (TIMEFRAMES).....	7
6. COMPETENCY AND EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS	7
7. PROJECT MANAGEMENT	7
8. NOTES TO TENDERERS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	
10. GENERAL INFORMATION	
11. DISCLAIMER	

1. INTRODUCTION

In November 2008, the merSETA invited service providers through an open tender process to provide ABET Training in the following modalities:

a) **ABET Project 1: Accelerated ABET**

Utilizing advanced approaches to ABET provisioning, curricula, methodologies and the scheduling of learning, (including blended learning and modular approaches), the aim of this project is to demonstrate how adult basic education and training can be “accelerated” in high potential learners to 1250 unemployed (18.2) and 1250 employed (18.1) learners at ABET Levels 2 and 3.

b) **ABET Project 2: Business ABET**

This project seeks to provide a bridging qualification in the form of a GETC Business Practice learning programme at NQF 1 as an alternative to traditional ABET training. The qualification will facilitate entry to work opportunities and articulate with the FET Level and further learnership opportunities. In a very real sense it is the provision of a generic Business ABET model that will provide a bridge between the first and second economies in South Africa to 500 employed (18.1) and 500 unemployed (18,2) learners.

c) **ABET Project 3: Occupational ABET**

Research indicates that adults learn more effectively if they perceive some meaningful benefit from the process, and an adult who wants to do his job better is driven to acquire those skills and knowledge first. In addition, the provision of life skills can strengthen the learners’ capacity to gain access to and to benefit from vocational and technical training. Building on learning in context theory, this project aims to develop and provide 5 (five) ABET curricula and learning materials at ABET L2, L3 and L4 customized to each of the merSETA Chambers in order to build a closer fit between ABET and the occupational needs of those sub-sectors. Besides the courseware development component of the project, it is expected that 750 employed (18.1) and 750 unemployed (18.2) Learners will be reached through this project.

The project commenced on the 01st January 2009 and ends on the 30th June 2010

2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The purpose would be to seek an impartial, substantive, critical and objective evaluation of the overall project.

The specific objectives of the evaluation would be to:

- a) Assess the effectiveness and efficiency and economy of scale of the project in achieving its goals and objectives;
- b) Review the project's processes, principles, criteria and including the following aspects:
 - (i) The Funding Model
 - Was the funding model suitable for the project?
 - Were the formulas market related?
 - What is the relationship between the amount paid and the quality of training?
 - What was the Return on Investment (ROI) for merSETA?
 - Did the performance based agreement achieve its goals?
 - Was the payment structure effective?
 - Any other funding model related issues impacting on the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.
 - (ii) Quality Assurance
 - Was the Quality Assurance aspect covered and applied according to policy?
 - What was the merSETA's quality assurance role?
 - Were the roles of the various accreditation bodies according to policy?
 - (iii) Corporate Governance
 - Was the project managed and monitored reviewed in accordance with policy for the project.
 - Was an effective risk strategy adopted and implemented.
 - Evaluate whether sufficient controls exist to mitigate these (internal and external) risks, both manually and automatically.
 - Was the penalty and exclusion of defaulting training providers applied to contract.

(iv) Benchmarking against other SETA's

- How do ABET projects implemented by other SETA's differ?
- Is their implementation approach different?
- What impact does their model and funding structures have on the merSETA project?
- Does this have any impact on the same training providers on the merSETA project?
- Benchmarking at list two non seta related models Abet Institutions.

(v) Project Design

- Evaluate whether the project structure, design and implementation methods were aligned to the desired outcomes.
- Evaluate the impact of Provider driven vs. Beneficiary driven or company driven against the 3 Abet modules.
- Evaluate the project management against other modules but not limited against decentralisation and institutions.
- Assess the projects potential as a more widely applied methodology for the future.
- How effective were the three (3) modalities of ABET training as compared to the traditional form of ABET training?
- Was there a difference in uptake and success rates between the modalities and across the employed and unemployed?
- What were the strengths and weakness of each modality?

(vi) Merseta Project Resources

- Is the project sufficiently resourced with respect to administration, advocacy, monitoring, moderation etc

(vii) Marketing

- Was the marketing sufficient?
- Which strategies should be adopted?
- Was the project aligned with merSETA brand health, specifically with regard to delivering to the training mandate of its sector, and sound Stakeholder relationships;
- Branding...

(viii) Training Providers

- Was the tender process followed correctly?
- Was the criteria used to evaluate training providers ability to deliver on the project affective?
- Was the tender specification appropriate?
- Was the best strategy dopted for indirect training expenses e.g. travel, accommodation, meals etc?
- How do we effectively monitor Institutional Capacity to ensure quality of learning?
- Etc.

c) Using the outcomes of the evaluation, provide recommendations and guidance to the merSETA on the implementation of future ABET projects.

3. ACTIVITIES (METHODOLOGY)

The appointed provider will be required to:

- To design an evaluation framework for the project;
- Undertake a systematic evaluation of the project, involving all relevant stakeholders, against the overall project purpose and stated outcomes.
- Review learner records, datanet, training materials, project reports and minutes, as well as other relevant documents.
- Conduct detailed interviews with all internal and external stakeholders, including the training providers on the project, and a sample of learners across the three (3) ABET modalities in all regions and providers.

4. DELIVERABLES

The appointed providers will:

- Submit an evaluation report in electronic format and hardcopy to the merSETA Office by the 30 June 2010

- Present the findings of the evaluation to the relevant merSETA committees (MANCO, Executive Committee, Governing Board, and Inter-Chamber Committee).

5. DURATION (TIMEFRAMES)

The evaluation will be conducted over a period of three (3) months, commencing on the 01st April 2010 and end on the 30th June 2010.

6. COMPETENCY AND EXPERTISE REQUIREMENTS

Core competencies and expertise which are required include, but are not limited to:

- The service provider must be able to demonstrate experience in projects of similar scope, size and time constraints;
- Demonstrate competence and ability to implement the activities envisioned for the project.
- Have a knowledge and experience of ABET programmes and evaluation thereof.

7. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The project will be managed by a Project Manager from the merSETA Projects Division, The General Manager: Projects will oversee the project.

8 . NOTES TO TENDERERS

This section outlines basic requirements that must be met. Failure to accept these conditions or part thereof will result in your proposal being excluded from the evaluation process.

- Short-listed firms might be invited to present and discuss details of their proposals.

- Tenderers will be required to fill in an MERSETA “Supplier Questionnaire” before their tenders are considered.
- Tender documents should be presented to the MERSETA marked “Tender for Insurance Broker Services – RFP no:
- The MERSETA will not be liable to reimburse any costs incurred by the tenderer during this tender process.
- The MERSETA is committed to maximize the value obtained from the available insurance broker resource. However the MERSETA does not bind itself to accept the lowest tender.
- Evaluation of tenders will be carried out by a Tender Evaluation Committee. The Evaluators will, if necessary, contact Tenderers to seek clarification of any aspect of the tender.
- Tenderers should identify any work they are currently carrying out or competing for which could cause a conflict of interest, and indicate how such a conflict would be avoided.

9. Additional information

Kindly email **Mr Bertram Baird** on bbaird@merseta.org.za if you require clarification of these terms of reference or further background related information. Any telephone requests will be disregarded.

Any requests for additional information will be collated by the MERSETA, Supply Chain Management Office and a composite response posted on our website www.merseta.org.za under the tender link..

All bids must remain valid for a period of ninety (90) days after the closing date. Late telegraphic, telefax and/or e-mailed bids will not be accepted.

10. GENERAL INFORMATION

- Potential Service Providers are required to submit their proposals on or before 12:00 on Any tender document received after closing date and time will not be considered.
- Tender documents should be deposited into the tender box of the MERSETA Head Office at:

Metropolitan Office Park
8 Hillside Road
3rd Floor
Parktown

Proposal received in any other way will not be considered.

- Two (2) bound hard copies AND one(1) unbound hard copy of the proposal must be submitted
- All correspondence to bidders will be in writing.

11. Disclaimer

MERSETA reserves the right not to appoint a provider for this tender, Merseta further reserve a right to split this tender with more than one provider or award the portion of this tender to other providers.