

**SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART A**  
**Mid-term evaluation of the Higher Education Support Programme – UNI.AO**  
**FWC SIEA 2018 - LOT 4 – Human Development and safety net**  
**EuropeAid/138778/DH/SER/multi**  
**OPSYS reference number PC-15395**

**CONTRACTING AUTHORITY: THE EUROPEAN UNION DELEGATION TO ANGOLA**

<b>1</b>	<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	RELEVANT COUNTRY AND SECTOR BACKGROUND .....	2
1.2	THE INTERVENTION TO BE EVALUATED .....	4
1.3	STAKEHOLDERS OF THE INTERVENTION .....	9
1.4	PREVIOUS INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MONITORING (INCL. ROM), EVALUATION AND OTHER STUDIES UNDERTAKEN .....	10
<b>2</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1	OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION CRITERIA .....	10
2.2	INDICATIVE EVALUATION QUESTIONS .....	11
2.3	STRUCTURING OF THE EVALUATION AND OUTPUTS .....	12
2.4	SPECIFIC CONTRACT ORGANISATION AND METHODOLOGY (TECHNICAL OFFER) .....	16
2.5	MANAGEMENT AND STEERING OF THE EVALUATION .....	17
2.6	LANGUAGE OF THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT AND OF THE REPORTS .....	17
<b>3</b>	<b>LOGISTICS AND TIMING .....</b>	<b>17</b>
3.1	PLANNING, INCLUDING THE PERIOD FOR NOTIFICATION FOR PLACEMENT OF THE STAFF .....	17
<b>4</b>	<b>REQUIREMENTS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>REPORTS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1	USE OF THE EVAL MODULE BY THE EVALUATORS .....	18
5.2	NUMBER OF REPORT COPIES .....	18
5.3	FORMATTING OF REPORTS .....	18
<b>6</b>	<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1	CONTENT OF REPORTING .....	18
6.2	COMMENTS ON THE OUTPUTS .....	18
6.3	ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALITY OF THE FINAL REPORT AND OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	18
<b>7</b>	<b>PRACTICAL INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTIONS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA .....</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>ANNEX III: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM .....</b>	<b>23</b>
	<b>ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX .....</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS .....</b>	<b>26</b>
	<b>ANNEX VI: PLANNING SCHEDULE .....</b>	<b>29</b>
	<b>ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID .....</b>	<b>30</b>

## 1 BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Relevant country and sector background

#### Country background

In 2002 a protracted armed conflict ended in Angola and, thanks to oil revenues, the country's GDP increased exponentially. However, the increase of that monetary wealth did not result in an increase of the well-being of the greatest part of the population. In fact, Angola has enormous economic and social challenges that have been aggravated due to the combination of both the declining oil revenues and current socio-economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, structural problems persist, such as lack of access to quality and inclusive health services and education. As a result, the country indicators rank low in human development and it is estimated that about 40% of the population live in less than a dollar a day.

Yet, Angola has an untapped potential for human development. To start with, the country has an affluence of natural resources in terms of oil (the second largest reserves in Africa); arable land; water (except in the South of the country); coffee; livestock; forest; fish and minerals (including diamonds). Apart from that, Angola has one of the highest biodiversity in the world and it is second in Africa, only to mega-diverse South Africa, in terms of the number of ecoregions within its borders.

The Angolan economy is characterized by a heavy dependence on oil exports and the diversification of the economy has been pointed out by the government as a priority. At the same time, unemployment, mainly of the youth, is of social concern and a risk for national security and cohesion. The technical and academic capacities of the new generations are inadequate to feed in the country's ambitious reform agenda and respond to the challenges of economic transformation.

In terms of skills of both current and future workforce, Angola ranks at the bottom of the list of 141 countries assessed by the Global Competitiveness Report 2019 (World Economic Forum). The same applies to digital skills among the active population.<sup>1</sup>

#### Sector background

Some authors argue that the foundations of higher education (HE, hereafter) in Angola date back to the XVIII century, with the creation of “Luanda’s Medical School” by the queen D. Maria in 1791. Many years later, in the decade of 1960, the Portuguese colonial administration created several higher education institutions (HEIs hereafter) such as the “University Studies Centres” in Luanda, Huambo and Lubango. The greatest number of the students at the time were white. One year after independence, in 1976, the University of Angola was created. It changed its name to Universidade Agostinho Neto in 1985 becoming the first public university in the country. In 1992, the first private university was created, the Catholic University of Angola.

Since then, as in many other African countries, the higher education system has seen an exponential growth in enrolment and number of institutions. In 2014 there were 62 HEIs and in 2020, 83 whereas the number of higher education students in 1997 were 8.000 and in 2019, 300.000. In Angola, there are more private HEIs than public ones and there are more students enrolled in private HEIs than in public ones. In turn,

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2019.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_TheGlobalCompetitivenessReport2019.pdf)

private HEIs are less spread out and more present in Luanda province while the public HEIs are evenly spread over the country.

According to the diagnostic study (attached to this ToR), carried out in 2017, to inform the design of the Higher Education Support Programme- UNI.AO (hereafter UNI.AO), the fast growth of the higher education system had several implications. Firstly, the study points out that, to quickly cope with the high demand, the HES prioritized access to the system to the detriment of quality and relevance, in part because no regulatory measures and governmental institutional capacity were in place to enforce policies towards quality assurance. Actually, the first legislation that includes the issue of quality assurance is the article 63 of the “Lei nº13/01, Lei de Bases do Sistema de Ensino” from 2001. Meanwhile, quality assurance in the HES still remains a matter of concern today. Also, the study suggests that the focus on teaching and learning resulted in a weaker focus on knowledge production and that the HEIs have a reduced scope and incentive to seek funding other than from government (public HEIs) or from student fees (private HEIs) for a number of reasons such as: being young; having been relatively closed to the outside world during the war period; and being relatively isolated due to the fact that the use of the English language is not mainstreamed within Angolan scholars. Those factors, the study argues, hampered the capacity of Angolan HEIs to access global knowledge networks or international funding and international interuniversity cooperation mechanisms.

In addition, according to the study, while the policy frameworks at various levels expressed a strong desire for a dynamic change and democratic governance, regulation had been predominantly government driven. In addition, the study affirms that the HE sector lacked a space for brokering various perspectives and interests of different actors leading to an undifferentiated treatment of a very heterogeneous institutional landscape. So while the law and decrees form a coherent framework, their very detailed prescriptive and procedural character, coupled with overly rigid interpretations, severely limited the space for real autonomy of institutions.

In 2020, three years after the diagnostic study referred above was produced, the programme UNI.AO shared its first report covering the six initial months of implementation (*Relatório de arranque*, attached to this ToR). This report contains some of the developments that had taken place in the higher education system since the release of the diagnostic study. In particular, the Ministry of Science and Technology was merged with the Ministry of Higher Education and several research institutions were also merged; the concept and classification of academic regions was set aside and several decrees concerning the status of teachers and researchers were published. In addition, the Presidential Decree n 221/20 of 27th August 2020 led to the restructuring of many ministerial departments and in MESCTI the National Direction for Postgraduate Studies was integrated in the National Direction of Higher Education (DNES Portuguese acronym).

Below in the section 1.2 in “evolution of the project background” the ToR refers to other recent developments.

### **Long-term strategic orientations**

Since 2008, the strategy “Angola 2025” has provided eight long-term strategic orientations for the development of Angola: (1) unity and national cohesion; (2) a democratic and participative society; (3) human development and well-being; (4) sustainable, competitive and equitable development; (5)

development of science, technology and innovation; (6) development of entrepreneurship and the private sector; (7) harmonious development of the national territory; (8) a regionally and internationally competitive Angolan economy. To achieve these aims, higher education plays a pivotal role. The national development plan (PND) for 2013- 2017 aimed at diversifying the economy away from oil export dependency towards transformative and innovative economic activity; higher education plays a pivotal role in the achievements of the PND. The plan focused on a territorial spreading strategy and a sector development strategy by mobilising investment in priority sectors such as food and agro industry, energy and water, housing, transport and logistics. The new PDN for 2018-2022 continues to focus on this territorial development and economic diversification but, with the change of government, it now also includes a focus on sustainable economic development to improve its role in the international and regional context and a State reform towards democracy and rule of law to be achieved through good governance and decentralisation.

With the Human Capital National Plan (Plano Nacional de Formação de Quadros (PNFQ) 2012-2020, Angola created a national strategy for human resource development and for differentiation and specialisation in both the higher education system and the economy at large. Although the timeframe of the plan was intended up to 2020, the PNFQ is still running to this date and is coordinated by an inter-ministerial commission constituted by the state secretaries' of the respective ministries (Economy and Planning, Public Administration, Labour and Social Security Territorial Administration, Economy, Education, and MESCTI) while implementation is steered by a special unit (UTG-PNFQ) at the Civil House of the Presidency. Apart from the creation of cadres, professors, researchers, entrepreneurs, by increasing access to higher and professional education, the PNFQ is in charge of the development of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). In addition, UTG- PNFQ has had other mandates: develop a common database on all post-graduate courses in Angola and to link postgraduate qualifications with the job market through employment related digital platforms.

In terms of Research and Development (R&D) Angola's indicators are still weak. For instance, the gross spend in R&D was 0.03% of the GDP in 2016 and in the same year there were 18,8 researchers for million of inhabitants, a very limited number (UNESCO, 2016). As a result, there is a limited number of patent applications (from 117 to 82) but an increasing number of patents granted (from 22 to 33) between 2019 and 2020<sup>2</sup>.

At regional level, there is a growing interest in higher education governance due again to its pivotal role in socioeconomic development. The African Comprehensive Continental Education Strategy (ACES 2016-2025) aims at revitalising and expanding teaching and learning, as well as research and innovation to address continental challenges and promote global competitiveness. African Union members are committed to allocate 1% of GDP to research and innovation.

## 1.2 The intervention to be evaluated<sup>3</sup>

This evaluation covers one intervention financed by the EU in the higher education sector as follows:

<sup>2</sup> "Relatório Nacional Voluntário 2021 sobre a implementação da Agenda 2030 para o Desenvolvimento Sustentável, Governo de Angola, Objectivos de Desenvolvimento Sustentável".

<sup>3</sup> The term 'intervention' is used throughout the report as a synonym of 'project and programme'.

<b>Title of the intervention to be evaluated</b>	• Higher Education Support Programme – UNI.AO	
<b>Budget of the intervention to be evaluated</b>	• 12,750,000 euros	
<b>CRIS number of the intervention to be evaluated</b>	• 411-672	
<b>Dates of the intervention to be evaluated</b>	• Start date:	13/12/2019
	• End date:	12/12/2024

UNI.AO supports the higher education system in producing knowledge and innovation, and teaching relevant skills to foster greater employment, transformation, and diversification in the Angolan economy. The strategic programming framework within which the intervention is framed is the 2014-2020 National Indicative Programme (NIP) for Angola that allocated EUR 45 M (representing the 21,4% of the total NIP budget) to TVET and Higher Education. This contribution aimed at supporting the development and valorisation of human capital resources in Angola, by expanding knowledge and skills as to meet the requirements of the country's labour market.<sup>4</sup>

UNI.AO's overall objective is to increase the economic diversification and the creation of employment in priority sectors.

The project's specific objectives are:

- (1) Enhance the alignment of higher education governance and policy instruments towards postgraduate research specialisation in priority sectors;
- (2) Increase specialisation and recognition of postgraduate institutions;
- (3) Increase the equitable access to post graduation and career development to vulnerable groups.

The activities under specific objective 1, include a panoply of actions that include amongst others: improving higher education data production and management; supporting the development of a post-graduation strategy; post-graduate level training on higher education management delivered to HEIs representatives and administrative staff;

Activities under specific objective 2 include supporting: the creation of post-graduate courses in key economic sectors; the introduction of the b-learning teaching modality at postgraduate level; HEIs to formulate postgraduate courses; the creation of online and access-free scientific repository;

Finally, activities under specific objective 3 include: supporting equity on higher education; creating enabling conditions to increase the participation of disadvantaged women and men in postgraduate studies (under specific objective 1, scholarships will be granted - taking into account socioeconomic criteria – for students to attend the post-graduate courses created within the programme); supporting public-private partnerships to enhance the dissemination of employment opportunities for graduates and postgraduates.

The activities above aim at producing the following results:

Result 1.1: Further alignment between governance decision-making platforms, information systems and quality assurance mechanisms;

Result 1.2: Results-based and incentive-based financing instruments are in place to promote differentiated specialisation at post-graduate level;

Result 1.3: Strengthened inter-ministerial cooperation mechanism for implementation of the post graduate differentiated specialisation;

Result 2.1: Institutions have autonomy and flexibility to build their competitive advantage in areas of specialisation at post-graduate level;

<sup>4</sup> [njp-angola-edf11-amended-2016\\_en.pdf \(europa.eu\)](#) (accessed 18/03/2022)

Result 2.2: Institutions have the capacity to develop their post graduate specialisation and formulate projects to finance its implementation;

Result 3.1: Students and postgraduate teachers from target groups and communities are more equally represented in different disciplines and professions;

Result 3.2: Students and jobseekers have easy access to information on study choice, scholarships and post-graduate career progression;

UNI.AO also aims at boosting the capacity of Angolan academia, scientists, researchers and institutions to participate in Erasmus+ and Horizon Europe. The action is consistent with the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, namely SDG 4 "Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning"; SDG 5 "Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls"; SDG 9 "Build resilient infrastructure, promote sustainable industrialisation and foster innovation. Targets: 9.5 and 9.B), and SDG 8 "Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all".

Further below, in Annex I of this ToR, you can find the logical framework.

UNI.AO is fully in line with the Angola 2025 strategy, the National Development Plan (PND) 2018-2022, the country's Human Capital National Plan (PNFQ), and the priorities set in the 2014-2020 National Indicative Programme and the "EU-Angola Joint Way Forward" agreement, in which higher education has been identified as a priority area. In particular, the pivotal role of higher education at the top of the country's knowledge production system is key in creating human capital at post-graduate level and mobilising it to improve higher education research and teaching capacity, as well as on teaching capacity at other levels of the education system.

In addition, UNI.AO is consistent with the EU's Development Policy as set out in the New European Consensus on Development "Our World, our Dignity, our Future" and in the "Agenda for Change". More recently, the Multiannual Indicative Programme for Angola for the period 2021-2027 - drafted after succeeding consultations with the Angolan government - envisages the continuation of the support to higher education. In particular, 55 million euros have been budgeted for actions in the field of TVET and Higher Education for that period<sup>5</sup>.

Links to UNI.AO's related information:

<https://ciencia.ao/proyectos-mescti/uni-ao>

<https://www.facebook.com/programauniaio>

### **Evolution of the project's background**

The project started in December 2019 and in March 2020, the COVID19 pandemic unfolded resulting in both domestic and international flights restrictions. As a consequence, UNI.AO's implementing team had to resort to online means to interact with HEIs. Besides that, missions of Expertise France colleagues based in Paris to Angola were limited. Nevertheless, the implementation adapted itself to the new context and to the working methodology with remote interactions and therefore, the pandemic did not pose serious problems for the implementation.

<sup>5</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/system/files/mip-2021-c2021-9359-angola-annex\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/international-partnerships/system/files/mip-2021-c2021-9359-angola-annex_en.pdf) (accessed 30/03/2022)

In terms of the action content, two activities were added in September 2020 at the request of MESCTI. In particular, MESCTI made available office space for the Expertise France implementing team. As a result, the budget planned to rent an office was re-allocated to those two activities (mentioned above under objective 2), namely: a) the creation of an open scientific repository and b) the creation of Blended learning (B-learning) modules for post-graduate courses.

In terms of the evolution of the higher education context since the start of the project (December 2019), some occurrences can be noted. To begin with, the pandemic resulted in the paralysis of higher education courses around mid-March 2020 that later resumed in October 2020. Actually, the HEIs were expecting to reopen in July but in that month a new decree to stipulate the measures to contain the spread of the COVID19 was released postponing the reopening of HEI indefinitely. Some private HEIs were in the brink of bankruptcy as, without the possibility of resorting to distance learning, many students stopped paying their fees. Facing this situation, MESCTI stipulated in April that private HEIs would be allowed to increase students' fees. Notwithstanding, the government stipulated that no fees were to be charged until the reopening of the HEIs. In September 2021, the government allowed for up to a 25% increase of the university fees in private and public-private HEIs.<sup>6</sup> That decision has been contested by student associations and some student demonstrations have taken place not only in Luanda but also in Benguela<sup>7</sup>, Uíge, etc.

In March 2021, the Angola Post-graduate Strategy was presented at a joint meeting of the Higher Education National Council and the Science, Technology and Innovation National Council, attributing to postgraduation the role of: being the engine to scientific research and innovation; contribute to economic and social development and enabling the articulation between HEIs and the private and social sector. In addition, MESCTI presented the proposal concerning the revision of the Presidential Decree 125/5 of 19th June concerning the regulation of science, technology and innovation activities.

In August 2021, MESCTI created the National Foundation for Science and Technology Development - FUNDECIT to implement science, technology and innovation policies; to manage the national budget allocated to Research & Development and to evaluate and accredit scientific research institutions in Angola.<sup>8</sup>

In November 2021, higher education teachers called a strike that ended a few days later after a compromise was reached between trade unions and MESCTI<sup>9</sup>. However, the strike resumed in January 2022 and went on for 3 months until the 5th April when the SINPES (*Sindicato Nacional dos Professores do Ensino Superior*) announced that, if the government does not respond to their demands, they will resume the strike on the 9th May<sup>10</sup>.

Finally, it is worth noting that the election of public HEIs representatives was one of MESCTI objectives for

<sup>6</sup> [Governo permite aumento das propinas no ensino privado e público entre 15 e 25 por cento \(novojornal.co.ao\)](https://www.novojornal.co.ao/) (accessed 30/03/2022)

<sup>7</sup> [Estudantes angolanos "inconformados" com aumento das propinas | Angola | DW | 03.10.2021](https://www.dw.com/pt-002/angola-professores-universit%C3%A1rios-suspendem-greve-por-30-dias/a-61364766) (accessed 30/03/2022)

<sup>8</sup> <https://ciencia.ao/noticias/ciencia/item/1139-mescti-concede-posse-aos-orgaos-singulares-de-gestao-da-fundecit> (accessed 30/03/2022)

<sup>9</sup> [Jornal de Angola - Notícias - Aulas no Ensino Superior retomam na segunda-feira](https://www.jornal-de-angola.com/noticias/Aulas-no-E Ensino Superior retomam na segunda-feira) (accessed 30/03/2022)

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.dw.com/pt-002/angola-professores-universit%C3%A1rios-suspendem-greve-por-30-dias/a-61364766> (accessed 19/04/2022)



the current term in office (2017-2022), however, by the time of publication of this ToR, the elections have not taken place.

***How the intervention links with other interventions financed by the EU or other donors and any further relevant elements.***

**Science and Technology Development Project – PDCT (2016-2022)**, supported with a \$ 90 M loan by the **African Development Bank** to the Angolan government and with two main objectives: to support science and technology research activities in key priority areas for the diversification of the economy and to create an enabling context for science, technology and innovation.

<https://ciencia.ao/projectos-mescti/pdct>

**UNDP** is collaborating with MESCTI to create strategies to contribute to the strengthening, promotion and formalization of an entrepreneurship and innovation ecosystem in the HEIs. In February 2022, MESCTI and UNDP presented the strategic plan to implement HEI's incubators.

<https://www.ciencia.ao/noticias/inovacao/item/1162-mescti-e-pnud-apresentam-plano-estrategico-para-implementacao-de-incubadoras-universitarias>

MESCTI, in partnership with the **World Bank**, is preparing a Higher Education White Book to be finalised by May 2022.

**France** is supporting the project FSPI ESR-T “Fundo de solidariedade para projectos inovadores - Ensino superior e investigação na área da tecnologia” to create a master degree on engineering; the second edition of another course; the creation of a FAB-LAB and the organisation of an annual conference on technology.

**Agence Française du Développement – AFD** has provided a loan to the Angolan government to support a higher education infrastructure in Malanje, in particular, the “Instituto Superior de Tecnologia Agro-Alimentar », inaugurated in October 2020 to promote research in the area of food processing and transformation.

**Norway** is supporting a programme to increase high quality science-based and independent research that can enhance the factual basis and understanding underlying public decision-making, media reporting and public discourse on current and future economic and socio-political issues in Angola.

**Other interventions funded by the European Union related with Higher Education/Scientific Research:**  
**RETFOP – Revitalization of Technical Vocational Education and Training** (2017-2023), EUR 21.800.000, aims at strengthening the strategic management capacities of the relevant public institutions at central and local levels and reinforce coordination among them and with the private sector; to improve the quality and relevance of the curricula and qualifications provided by TVET and to facilitate and support the transition of TVET trainees to the labour market.

**Pesquisa operativa contra a desnutrição crônica infantil em Angola (Projeto CRESCER)**, (2020-2024) EUR 6.720.004,50 (2020-2024) in the provinces of Huíla and Cunene coordinated by *Fundació Hospital Universitari Vall D’Hebron – Institut de Recerca* (Spain) and with *Universidade Mandume Ya Ndemufayo* (Angola) among the the Angolan co-beneficiaries.



**RE-FARM - Research on agroecological innovations for increasing resilience to climate change in Cuanza Sul and Benguela**, EUR 1.111.111,00 will start on July 2022 up to July 2026, coordinated by *Università degli Studi di Firenze (UNIF1)* and with *COSPE - COOPERAZIONE PER LO SVILUPPO DEI PAESI EMERGENTI* and the Angolan “*Centro Nacional de Investigação Científica*” as co-beneficiaries.

**Dialogue Facility EU-Angola (2019-2023)** aims at fostering collaboration between Angolan and European institutions in different areas including economic diversification; science and technology. So far, the Dialogue Facility has provided support to maritime science and blue economy and it has launch a post-graduate academic award addressed at students and their thesis supervisors. The award includes the publication of the thesis, an opportunity to present it at an international conference and a trip to Brussels to meet potential partners.

<https://dialogosue-angola.org/>

### 1.3 Stakeholders of the intervention

The following table describes the key stakeholders of the intervention.

Stakeholder groups	Role and involvement in the intervention	How the intervention is expected to impact on the stakeholder group
<b>Implementing partners</b>	Expertise France	
<b>National partners</b>	MESCTI, the Technical Coordination Unit (UTG) of the <i>Plano Nacional de Formação de Quadros (PNFQ)</i>	MESCTI’s capacities are expected to be reinforced in terms of: research funds management; collection of data and data use for planning; digital procedures to approve new higher education courses; higher education quality assurance mechanisms and so on.
<b>Target groups</b>	Public and private Higher Education Institutions and research centres.	With UNI.AO’s support Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) might improve/expand their post-graduate training offer and consequently their research production and specialisation; improvement of the institution’s management; improvement of the performance of their Student Support Cabinets more oriented towards employability and student career monitoring.
<b>End beneficiaries</b>	Research and academia, Private Sector, Civil Society Organisations, vulnerable groups: women in vulnerable situation (especially in rural areas), people with disabilities, people from socio-economic disadvantaged background, etc.	The private sector would benefit from better trained human resources (graduates/post-graduates) whose skills are more adequate to the needs of the labour market.

The main institutional beneficiary of the intervention is the Ministry of Higher Education, Science,

Technology and Innovation (MESCTI). In particular, there are a number of departments within MESCTI that are particularly involved in the project such as the National Direction of Higher Education, the Cabinet for Studies, Statistics and Planning (GEPE), the Cabinet for Technology and Information (GTI), the National Institute for Evaluation, Accreditation and Higher Education Studies Recognition (INAAREES), National Institute for Scholarships Management (INAGBE) amongst others. It is worth mentioning that UNI.AO's focal point at MESCTI is the National Director of Higher Education.

In addition, the UTG-PNFQ (PNFQ Technical Management Unit), established at the Civil House of the Presidency of the Republic is involved in UNI.AO, in particular, in the activities concerning higher education information systems.

The project has two governing bodies: the Technical Coordination Committee and the Steering Committee. The members of those committees are representatives from MESCTI; the National Authorising Officer (NAO), the DUE, Expertise France and the Embassy of France.

#### 1.4 Previous internal and external monitoring (incl. ROM), evaluation and other studies undertaken

No previous ROM or evaluations conducted.

## 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION ASSIGNMENT

Type of evaluation	Mid-term
Coverage	The intervention in its entirety
Geographic scope	Angola
Period to be evaluated	The entire period of the intervention to date

### 2.1 Objectives of the evaluation and evaluation criteria

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority<sup>11</sup> of the European Commission<sup>12</sup>. The focus of evaluations is on the assessment of achievements, the **quality** and the **results**<sup>13</sup> of interventions in the context of an evolving cooperation policy, with an increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs**.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> COM(2013) 686 final "Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation" - [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com\\_2013\\_686\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf); EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/2000; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008

<sup>12</sup> SEC (2007)213 "Responding to Strategic Needs: Reinforcing the use of evaluation", [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval\\_comm\\_sec\\_2007\\_213\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/evaluation/docs/eval_comm_sec_2007_213_en.pdf); SWD (2015)111 "Better Regulation Guidelines", [http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd\\_br\\_guidelines\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/guidelines/docs/swd_br_guidelines_en.pdf); COM(2017) 651 final 'Completing the Better Regulation Agenda: Better solutions for better results', [https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/completing-the-better-regulation-agenda-better-solutions-for-better-results_en.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> Reference is made to the entire results chain, covering outputs, outcomes and impacts. Cfr. Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 "Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action" - [https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial\\_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014\\_cir.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/236-2014_cir.pdf).

<sup>14</sup> The New European Consensus on Development 'Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future', Official Journal 30th of June 2017. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:C:2017:210:TOC>

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether and how the EU intervention(s) has/have contributed to the achievement of these results** and seek to **identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union and the interested stakeholders with:

- an overall independent assessment of the performance of the Higher Education Support Programme UNI.AO, paying particular attention to its different levels of results measured against its expected objectives; and the reasons underpinning such results;
- key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve current and future interventions.

In particular, this evaluation will serve:

- to understand the performance of the intervention, its strengths and its eventual downsides in order to:
  - a) been able to prioritise actions and strategies/approaches that will help to maximise its potential to achieve the expected results during the remaining implementation time;
  - b) inform the planning of the future EU interventions in the same sector;
- to ascertain to what extent the implementation has adapted itself to the institutional and national context and idiosyncrasies in order to bring about good results and positive change to the benefit of all stakeholders and final beneficiaries.

The main users of this evaluation will be the EU Delegation, INTPA, MESCTI, the UTG-PNFQ, the National Authorising Officer, Expertise France, the French Embassy and higher education institutions.

The evaluation will assess the intervention(s) using the **six standard DAC evaluation criteria**, namely: **relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability** and perspectives of **impact**. In addition, the evaluation will assess the intervention(s) through an **EU specific evaluation criterion**, which is the **EU added value**.

The **definition** of the 6 DAC + 1 EU **evaluation criteria** is contained for reference in **Annex II**.

Furthermore, the evaluation team should consider whether **gender equality and women's empowerment**<sup>15</sup>, **environment** and **adaptation to climate change** were mainstreamed; the relevant **SDGs and their interlinkages** were identified; the principle of **Leave No One Behind** and the **rights-based approach methodology** was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the intervention, its governance and monitoring.

## 2.2 Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific EQs, as formulated below, are indicative. Following initial consultations and document analysis, and further to the finalisation/reconstruction of the Intervention Logic of the intervention(s) to be evaluated, the evaluation team will discuss these with the Evaluation Manager<sup>16</sup> and Reference Group, and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions. This will

<sup>15</sup> Read more on Evaluation with gender as a cross-cutting dimension by following this link: [new link to C4D to be publish](#)

<sup>16</sup> The Evaluation Manager is the staff member of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational Manager of the Action(s) under evaluation.

include an indication of specific judgement criteria and indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

Evaluation questions:

#### **Relevance and coherence**

- 1- To what extent UNI.AO's design and strategy is responding to the challenges that is supposed to address?

#### **Efficiency**

- 2- Is UNI.AO complementing in a rational and efficient way other ongoing interventions/programmes in the area of higher education or more generally in the area of sustainable development? If the answer is yes, how is UNI.AO complementing them?

#### **Effectiveness**

- 3- To what extent UNI.AO's performance, approach and working methods are fit for purpose?
- 4- To what extent the modalities of implementation of the activities can cope with the constraints linked to the context?
- 5- How has the recent evolution of the Higher Education in Angola been taken into account in the implementation of the planned activities?
- 6- Are there any changes that should be introduced in the design and the intervention logic at this stage to improve the chances of meeting the expected results?

#### **Sustainability**

- 7- Taking into consideration that the next multiannual indicative programme for the period 2022-2027 - drafted by the EU in collaboration with the Angolan executive - includes the continuation of support for higher education, what are the challenges affecting higher education - that have arisen during the implementation of UNI.AO – that should be addressed in future interventions in the sector and why do they need to be addressed?
- 8- What needs to be done to maximize the chances of UNI.AO's having sustainable results?

### **2.3 Structuring of the evaluation and outputs**

The evaluation process will be carried out in four phases:

- Inception phase
- Interim phase
- Synthesis phase
- Dissemination phase

Throughout the evaluation and following the approval of the Inception Report, if any significant deviation from the work plan could compromise the quality of the evaluation or jeopardise the completion of the specific contract within the contractual timeframe, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

### **2.3.1 Inception Phase**

Objectives of the phase: to structure the evaluation and clarify the key issues to be addressed.

Main activities of evaluators during the Inception Phase

- Initial review of background documents (see Annex IV).
- Remote/hybrid or face-to-face kick-off session in Luanda between the EUD and the evaluators. Objectives of the meeting: i) to arrive at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility; ii) to clarify expectations of the evaluation; iii) to illustrate the tentative methodology to be used; iv) any other relevant objectives.
- Initial interviews with key stakeholders, including civil society, professors, researchers and university students.
- Finalisation or reconstruction of the description of the Intervention Logic/Theory of Change and its underlying assumptions. This requires an assessment of the evidence (between the hierarchy of results e.g. outputs, outcomes and impact) and the assumptions necessary for the intervention to work or prevent change from happening.
- Graphic representation of the reconstructed/finalised Intervention Logic/Theory of Change.
- Finalisation of the Evaluation Questions, based on the indicative questions contained in the Terms of Reference and on the reconstructed Intervention Logic.
- Finalisation of the evaluation methodology, including the definition of judgement criteria and indicators per Evaluation Question, the selection of data collection tools and sources. The methodology should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and assess if and how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.
- Representation of the methodological approach in an Evaluation Matrix (see Annex IV).
- Workplan of subsequent phases.
- Identification of the expected risks and limitations of the methodology, and of the envisaged mitigation measures.
- Preparation of the Inception Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Remote or face-to-face presentation of the Inception Report (if face-to-face, in Luanda) to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Revision of the report (as relevant) following receipt of comments.

### **2.3.2 Interim Phase**

This phase is entirely devoted to gathering and analysing the information required to provide preliminary answers to the EQs. Work in this phase will consist of two activities.

1. Desk activities - review interviews with key stakeholders and other initial data collection using different tools such as surveys.
2. Field activities - further data collection and analysis with the aim of testing the hypotheses identified during the 'Desk activities'.

#### **2.3.2.1 Desk and field activities**

Objective of the phase: to analyse the relevant secondary data and conducting primary research.

Main activities of evaluators

- Completion of in-depth analysis of relevant documents and other secondary sources, to be done systematically and to reflect the methodology as described in the Inception Report.

- Face-to-face<sup>17</sup> interviews to support the analysis of secondary data, as relevant.
- Formulation of the preliminary responses to each Evaluation Question, with analysis of their validity and limitations.
- Identification of the issues still to be covered and of the preliminary hypotheses to be tested during primary research.
- Face-to-face presentation in Luanda of the preliminary findings emerging from the desk review (incl. gaps and hypotheses to be tested in the field) to kick-off the in-country portion of this phase, supported by a slide presentation.
- Completion of primary research following the methodology described in the Inception Report.
- Guarantee of adequate contact, consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders, including the relevant government authorities and agencies, throughout the phase.
- Use of the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respecting the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and being sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments, throughout the phase.
- Preparation of the Intermediary Note; its content is described in Annex V.
- Preparation of a slide presentation of intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions (to be tested with the Reference group) free format;
- Face-to-face presentation in Luanda of the intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings and preliminary conclusions to the Reference Group, supported by the slide presentation.

### **2.3.3 Synthesis Phase**

Objectives of the phase: to report on results from the evaluation (final answers to the Evaluation Questions (final findings) and formulate conclusions and recommendations).

#### Main activities of evaluators

- Analysis and synthesis of the evidence and data collected during the previous phases to provide a final answer to the Evaluation Questions.
- Preparation of the Draft Final Report; its content is described in Annex V.
- Face-to-face presentation of the Draft Final Report in Luanda to the Reference Group, supported by a slide presentation.
- Preparation of a response to the draft QAG (Quality Assessment Grid) formulated by the Evaluation Manager via the EVAL module<sup>18</sup>.
- Once the comments on the Draft Final Report are received from the Evaluation Manager, addressing those that are relevant and producing the Final Report, upload to the EVAL module; its content is described in Annex V. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluators must explain the reasons in writing (free format).
- Preparation of the Executive Summary and upload to the EVAL module by using the compulsory format given in the module.
- Inclusion of an executive summary (free text format) in the Final Report (see Annex V).

#### The evaluators will make sure that:

- their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted;
- when drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be taking place already;

---

<sup>17</sup> Same as above

<sup>18</sup> All mentions to the EVAL module throughout the text in accordance with the Art.43.3 of the “Draft Framework Contract Agreement and Special Conditions” of the SIEA Framework Contract. The module EVAL will be integrated into OPSYS.

- the wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, considers the audience as identified in Art. 2.1 above.

### 2.3.4 Dissemination Phase

**Objective of the phase:** to support the communication of the results of the evaluation. In particular, one important objective of the dissemination is to provide a platform for all the interested parties to exchange views and reflect about the Programme UNI.AO and about the higher education and research ecosystem in Angola.

**The targeted audience** will be MESCTI, UTG-PNFQ, university professors and researchers, the private sector, civil society, post-graduate and graduate students; other donors active in higher education, R&D, etc.

#### Main activities of evaluators

- Organise a dissemination seminar in Luanda in semi-remote format so that participants from other Angolan provinces can join. Invite members of the target audience groups mentioned above keeping a balance so that they are evenly represented. The seminar duration would be around three hours and include a 20 minutes/30 minutes coffee break. One whole hour of the seminar should be consecrated to Questions & Answers and comments to the findings/recommendations from the participants.

**References:** the team should take inspiration from the ESS/INTPA work on **Dissemination of Evaluation**

**Results** at [https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation\\_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/evaluation_guidelines/wiki/disseminating-evaluations); this contains an analysis of best practice in 12 international organisations and NGOs plus five 'how-to' guides on production of infographics, briefs, videos, blogs and podcasts.

### 2.3.5 Overview of the outputs and meetings and their timing

The synoptic table below presents an overview of the outputs to be produced by the team, the key meetings with the Reference Group (including the Evaluation Managers) as described previously, as well as their timing.

Evaluation phases	Outputs and meetings	Timing
<b>Inception phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting: kick off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be defined: usually after initial document analysis</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of Inception Phase</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slide presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of Inception Phase</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting: presentation Inception Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of Inception Phase</li> </ul>
<b>Interim: Desk and Field activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting: presentation of preliminary findings (to be tested) emerging from the desk work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shortly before or at the beginning of the field missions</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intermediary note</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slide presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting: debriefing on intermediate/preliminary (Desk and Field) findings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of Interim (Desk and Field) Phase</li> </ul>
<b>Synthesis phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft Final Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>September 2022</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Meeting: presentation of the Draft Final Report</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• September 2022</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments to the draft QAG</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Together with Final Report</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 days after receiving comments on Draft Final Report</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Executive summary of the Final Report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Together with Final Report</li> </ul>
<b>Dissemination Phase</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dissemination seminar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After receiving comments on the Draft Final Report</li> </ul>

## 2.4 Specific contract Organisation and Methodology (Technical offer)

The invited framework contractors will submit their specific contract Organisation and Methodology by using the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i and its Annexes 1 and 2 (B-VII-d-ii).

The evaluation methodology proposed to undertake the assignment will be described in Chapter 3 (Strategy and timetable of work) of the template B-VII-d-i. Contractors will describe how their proposed methodology will address the cross-cutting issues mentioned in these Terms of Reference; it should be gender sensitive, contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how interventions have contributed to progress on gender equality.

The methodology should also include (if applicable) the communication action messages, materials and management structures.

This evaluation may be impacted by difficulties in accessing the field due to security constraints or health-related issues. The to-be-selected contractor will bear the duty of ensuring that the evaluators will respect, at all times, the relevant international, national and local guidance regarding travel limitations and will exert due care in preventing the spread of diseases, avoiding any unreasonable, unnecessary risks. The specific contract Organisation and Methodology should contain a clear and detailed description of the methods that the evaluation will use to address potential difficulties in access to the field. These may include the combination of face-to-face and remote methods of data collection, if relevant<sup>19</sup>.

By derogation of what is specified in the standard SIEA template B-VII-d-i, the maximum length of the specific contract Organisation and Methodology is 10 pages, written in Times New Roman 12 or Arial size 11, single interline, excluding the Framework Contractor's own annexes (maximum length of such annexes: 3 pages), additional to the annexes foreseen as part of the present specific ToRs. The timetable is not included in this limit and may be presented on an A3 page]

Please note that you might need to use specific methods due to the need for the reconstruction of a missing baseline.

### 2.4.1 Evaluation ethics

All evaluations must be credible and free from bias; they must respect dignity and diversity, and protect stakeholders' rights and interests. Evaluators must ensure confidentiality and anonymity of informants and be guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles in the observation of the 'do no harm' principle. The approach of framework contractors to observe these obligations must be explicitly addressed in the specific Organisation and Methodology, and implemented by the evaluation team throughout the evaluation, including during dissemination of results.

<sup>19</sup> The Framework Contractors are invited to consult the wealth of resources available through the two ESS/INTPA initiatives Evaluation in Hard-to-Reach Areas and Evaluation in Crisis: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/devco-ess>.

## 2.5 Management and steering of the evaluation

### 2.5.1 At the EU level

The evaluation is managed by the Evaluation Manager of the EUD; the progress of the evaluation will be followed closely with the assistance of a Reference Group consisting of members of the Cooperation Section of the DUE, MESCTI and Expertise France.

The main functions of the Reference Group are:

- to define and validate the Evaluation Questions;
- to facilitate contacts between the evaluation team and the EU services and external stakeholders;
- to ensure that the evaluation team has access to, and has consulted with, all relevant information sources and documents related to the intervention;
- to discuss and comment on notes and reports delivered by the evaluation team. Comments by individual group members are compiled into a single document by the Evaluation Manager and subsequently transmitted to the evaluation team;
- to assist in feedback on the findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations from the evaluation;
- to support the development of a proper follow-up action plan after completion of the evaluation.

### 2.5.2 At the Contractor level

Further to the requirements set out in Article 6 of the Global Terms of Reference and in the Global Organisation and Methodology, respectively Annexes II and III of the Framework contract SIEA 2018, the contractor is responsible for the quality of the process, the evaluation design, the inputs and the outputs of the evaluation. In particular, it will:

- support the Team Leader in its role, mainly from a team management perspective. In this regard, the contractor should make sure that, for each evaluation phase, specific tasks and outputs for each team member are clearly defined and understood;
- provide backstopping and quality control for the evaluation team's work throughout the assignment;
- ensure that the evaluators are adequately resourced to perform all required tasks within the time framework of the contract.

## 2.6 Language of the specific contract and of the reports

The language of the specific contract is to be English.

All reports will be submitted in Portuguese and in English.

## 3 LOGISTICS AND TIMING

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

### 3.1 Planning, including the period for notification for placement of the staff<sup>20</sup>

As part of the technical offer, the framework contractor must fill in the timetable in the Annex VI (to be finalised in the Inception Report). The 'indicative dates' are not to be formulated as fixed dates but rather as days (or weeks or months) from the beginning of the assignment (to be referenced as '0').

Sufficient forward planning is to be taken into account in order to ensure the active participation and consultation with government representatives, national/local or other stakeholders.

---

<sup>20</sup> As per Article 16.4 a) of the General Conditions of the Framework Contract SIEA

## 4 REQUIREMENTS

Please refer to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

All the costs other than costs for key experts of the evaluation team will be reflected in a dedicated budget provision under the chapter “Other details” of the framework contractor’s financial offer.

## 5 REPORTS

For the list of reports, please refer to Chapter 2.3 of Part A and to Part B of the Terms of Reference.

### 5.1 Use of the EVAL module by the evaluators

The selected contractor will **submit all deliverables by uploading them into the EVAL Module**, an evaluation process management tool and repository of the European Commission. The selected contractor will receive access to online and offline guidance in order to operate with the module during the related specific contract validity.

### 5.2 Number of report copies

Apart from its submission, the approved version of the Final Report will be also provided in 6 paper copies and in electronic version at no extra cost.

### 5.3 Formatting of reports

All reports will be produced using Font Arial or Times New Roman minimum letter size 11 and 12 respectively, single spacing, double sided. They will be sent in Word and PDF formats.

## 6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

### 6.1 Content of reporting

The outputs must match quality standards. The text of the reports should be illustrated, as appropriate, with maps, graphs and tables; a map of the area(s) of intervention is required (to be attached as annex).

### 6.2 Comments on the outputs

For each report, the Evaluation Manager will send the contractor consolidated comments received from the Reference Group or the approval of the report within 10 calendar days. The revised reports addressing the comments will be submitted within 10 calendar days from the date of receipt of the comments. The evaluation team should provide a separate document explaining how and where comments have been integrated or the reason for not integrating certain comments, if this is the case.

### 6.3 Assessment of the quality of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary

The quality of the draft versions of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager using the online Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) in the EVAL Module (text provided in Annex VII). The Contractor is given the chance to comment on the assessments formulated by the Evaluation Manager through the EVAL module. The QAG will then be reviewed, following the submission of the final version of the Final Report and of the Executive Summary.

The compilation of the QAG will support/inform the compilation of the FWC SIEA’s specific contract Performance Evaluation by the Evaluation Manager.

## 7 PRACTICAL INFORMATION

Please address any request for clarification and other communication to the following address(es):

[DELEGATION-ANGOLA-CRIS-FWC-OFFERS@eeas.europa.eu](mailto:DELEGATION-ANGOLA-CRIS-FWC-OFFERS@eeas.europa.eu)

## ANNEXES TO TOR - PART A

### ANNEX I: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX (LOGFRAME) OF THE EVALUATED INTERVENTIONS

#### ANEXO 1: QUADRO LÓGICO

Cadeia de resultados	Indicadores	Bases de referência (incluindo o ano de referência)	Metas (incluindo o ano de referência)	Fontes e meios de verificação	Pressupostos
<b>Objetivo geral:</b> Maior diversificação económica e criação de emprego em setores prioritários em Angola					
<b>IMPACTO</b>	1) Taxa de crescimento de emprego nos setores alvos do programa 2) Índice de Economia do Conhecimento 3) N.º de novas cadeias de valor reforçadas através da linha especial de financiamento da UE	1) Base de referência (2019) 2) 1.08 em 2010 3) Zero (2019)	1) Aumento até 2024, de acordo com o PND 2) 3.00 em 2024 3) 10 cadeias de valor em áreas de especialização até 2024	▪ 1) Indicadores de emprego e desemprego (INE) ▪ 2) Banco Mundial ▪ 3) Estudo final do parceiro de execução e relatórios anuais das finanças públicas	
<b>Objetivos específicos: Realizações</b>					
<b>OE.1:</b> Maior alinhamento entre a governação e os instrumentos de política no domínio do ensino superior no sentido da especialização da investigação pós-graduada em setores prioritários	1.1) N.º de novos projetos de pós-graduação bem sucedidos em setores prioritários 1.2) Estado de políticas baseadas em potenciais vantagens comparativas territoriais pelo MESCTI 1.3) Definição e difusão de dados sobre qualidade do sistema (sistemas integrados de informação de gestão e de garantia da qualidade)	1.1) Zero (2019) 1.2) Não existente/Não disponível (N/D) (2017) 1.3) N/D (2017)	1.1) 30 novos até 2024 1.2) Plano de Ação/ estratégia de especialização relevante adoptada e com fundos alocados 1.3) O MESCTI publica dados agregados sobre o ensino superior em Angola em 2024, incluindo dados sobre avaliação da qualidade do sistema de ensino superior pós-graduado.	▪ 1.1 Dados da DNFP ▪ 1.2 Ata da reunião ministerial das notas de reuniões de governação ▪ 1.3. MESCTI e grupo de sistemas de garantia da qualidade	MESCTI (O governo de Angola adota uma abordagem inclusiva e participativa no que respeita à orientação e regulamentação do ensino superior) - As metas do PND são ativamente prosseguidas e avaliadas

Cadeia de resultados	Indicadores	Bases de referência (incluindo o ano de referência)	Metas (incluindo o ano de referência)	Fontes e meios de verificação	Pressupostos
<b>OE.2:</b> Maior especialização e reconhecimento das instituições de pós-graduações	2.1) N.º de novos/novas investigadores e professores pós-graduados com artigos - revistos por pares - publicados. 2.2) N.º de projetos diferenciados formulados pelas IES privadas 2.3) N.º de artigos de investigação, revistos por pares a nível nacional e internacional publicados por instituição	2.1) Ver base de referência (2019) 2.2) Ver base de referência (2019) 2.3) Zero (2019)	2.1) 60 novos/40 novas até 2024 2.2) pelo menos 25% dos projetos até 2024 2.3) 1 artigo de investigação por investigador doutorado/ano; 20 artigos de investigação, revistos a nível internacional, de IES angolanas / ano até 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1) Dados do GEPE</li> <li>2.2) Relatórios de projetos</li> <li>2.3) Base de dados Scopus</li> </ul>	O governo é capaz de priorizar os investimentos e criar nichos de excelência
<b>OE.3:</b> Maior igualdade no acesso a pós-graduações e progressão na carreira para os grupos vulneráveis	3.1) % de mulheres docentes de nível pós-graduado no país 3.2) Taxa de estudantes de pós-graduação (m/f) com deficiência física	3.1) 25, 5% (Anuario estatístico do ensino superior- 2016) 3.2) Ver base de referência (2019); indicador de desigualdade na educação (PNUD) referido na página 11 do estudo diagnóstico.	3.1) 3 % de crescimento ao ano 3.2) Aumento até 2024 (a ser determinado no arranque do programa)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1) Estatísticas anuais do GEPE</li> <li>3.2) Estatísticas anuais do gabinete central de estatísticas</li> </ul>	O governo adota uma política mais inclusiva, orientada para a igualdade de género e a proteção de grupos vulneráveis
<b>Resultados</b>					
<b>Resultado 1.1</b> Maior alinhamento entre as plataformas de tomada de decisões de governação, os sistemas de informação e os mecanismos de	1.1.1) O Sistema de Informação Integrado permite obter dados globais sobre o desempenho das IES, produção científica, etc. 1.1.2) Novos processos de garantia de qualidade	1.1.1) Zero (2019) 1.1.2) Ver base de referência (2019)	1.1.1) Publicação de dados sobre avaliação do ensino superior pós-graduado 1.1.2) Aumento até 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.1) Relatórios internos de monitoramento e avaliação</li> <li>1.1.2) Relatórios internos da DNFPG/MESCTI</li> </ul>	O MESCTI é capaz de estabelecer uma relação cooperativa e produtiva com as partes interessadas.
<b>Cadeia de resultados</b>	<b>Indicadores</b>	<b>Bases de referência (incluindo o ano de referência)</b>	<b>Metas (incluindo o ano de referência)</b>	<b>Fontes e meios de verificação</b>	<b>Pressupostos</b>
garantia da qualidade					
<b>Resultado 1.2</b> Instrumentos de financiamento baseados em resultados e incentivos estão criados para promover uma especialização diferenciada de nível pós-graduado	1.2.1) Pessoal interno ao MESCTI formado em gestão de fundos de investigação 1.2.2) N.º de profissionais capacitados para em gestão e financiamento do ensino superior 1.2.3) N.º de bolsas de especialização de pós-graduação disponíveis em Angola	1.2.1) Zero (2019) 1.2.2) Zero (2019) 1.2.3) Zero (2019)	1.2.1) 20 mulheres/20 homens 1.2.2) 100 mulheres/100 homens (2022) 1.2.3) 300 bolsas (150 homens/150 mulheres) até 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2.1) relatório final da atividade de formação ao (incluído resultados dos participantes)</li> <li>1.2.2) relatório final da atividade de formação ao (incluído resultados dos participantes)</li> <li>1.2.3) relatórios INAGBE</li> </ul>	Liderança do MESCTI e pessoal-chave com disponibilidade e capacidade para realizar mudanças culturais significativas
<b>Resultado 1.3</b> Mecanismo de cooperação interministerial reforçado para a implementação da especialização diferenciada de nível pós-graduado	1.3.1) N.º de acordos de cooperação interministerial e protocolos assinados 1.3.2) % de programas de pós-graduação inventariados e acessíveis numa plataforma 1.3.3) Uma estratégia de valorização do banco de dados QNQ elaborada e implementada 1.3.4) Um plano de	1.3.1) Ver base de referência (2019) 1.3.2) Ver base de referência (2019) 1.3.3) Zero (2019) 1.3.4) Zero (2019)	1.3.1) 4-7 protocolos assinados até 2024 1.3.2) 100 % até 2021 1.3.3) Estratégia elaborada em 2020 e implementada em 2021 1.3.4) Plano elaborado em 2021 e implementado em 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.3.1) Relatórios da UTG-PNFQ</li> <li>1.3.2) Relatórios internos do programa</li> <li>1.3.2) Relatório da UTG-PNFQ</li> <li>1.3.4) Relatórios UTG-PNFQ</li> </ul>	A UTG-PNFQ tem um papel de destaque para estimular a cooperação interministerial e multissetorial



Cadeia de resultados	Indicadores	Bases de referência (incluindo o ano de referência)	Metas (incluindo o ano de referência)	Fontes e meios de verificação	Pressupostos
	integração do SIGOF e estratégia de implementação existente				
<b>Resultado 2.1</b> As instituições têm autonomia e flexibilidade para desenvolverem as suas vantagens competitivas em áreas de especialização ao nível pós-graduado	2.1.1) Guias de procedimentos existentes 2.1.2) Número de reuniões de divulgação para com o setor privado 2.1.3) pessoas (staff) da DNFPD dedicadas à acompanhar as IES nos seus esforços de especialização	2.1.1) Zero (2019) 2.1.2) Zero (2019) 2.1.3) Ver base de referência (2019)	2.1.1) Efetivo em 2020 2.1.2) 5 por ano a partir de 2020 2.1.3) Aumento (a ser definido)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.1) Relatórios internos do programa</li> <li>2.1.2) relatórios DNFPD</li> <li>2.1.3) relatórios DNFPD</li> </ul>	As plataformas de orientação e governação inclusiva e participativa foram criadas e estão a funcionar
<b>Resultado 2.2<sup>1</sup></b> As instituições têm capacidade para desenvolver a sua especialização de nível pós-graduado e formular projetos para financiar a sua execução	2.2.1) N.º de candidaturas das IES apresentadas no edital 2.2.2) % de candidaturas das IES concluídas com sucesso 2.2.3) Número de projetos elaborados pelas IES em resposta a editais internacionais 2.2.4) Número de redes regionais (SADC) criadas e funcionando	2.2.1) Ver base de referência (2019) 2.2.2) Ver ver base de referência (2019) 2.2.3) Ver no arranque da atividade (2019) 2.2.4) zero (2019)	2.2.1) 50-150 (2024) 2.2.2) pelo menos 30 % até 2024 2.2.3) 50% dos participantes a capacitações respondem a editais internacionais e 100% na participação de Angola no Erasmus +, programa Intra-Africa e Marie Curie (2024) 2.2.4) 5 (2024)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.2.1) Relatórios internos FUECIT</li> <li>2.2.2) Relatórios internos FUECIT</li> <li>2.2.3) Relatórios internos da DNFPD/MESCTI</li> <li>2.2.4) Relatórios internos da DNFPD/MESCTI</li> </ul>	As IES respondem de forma dinâmica às oportunidades de financiamento
<b>Resultado 3.1:</b> Estudantes e	3.1.1) Número de bolsas oferecidas a a pessoas desfavorecidas	3.1.1) Zero (2019) 3.1.2) Zero (2019)	3.1.1) 30% das bolsas 3.1.2) 30% no final do programa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1.2) Relatorios do INAGBE</li> <li>3.1.3) Relatórios</li> </ul>	O governo adota uma política mais inclusiva, orientada para a
Cadeia de resultados	Indicadores	Bases de referência (incluindo o ano de referência)	Metas (incluindo o ano de referência)	Fontes e meios de verificação	Pressupostos
professores pós-graduados de grupos e comunidades-alvo estão representados de forma mais equitativa nas diferentes disciplinas e profissões	3.1.2) % das IES que adoptam medidas de mitigação			internos PAES	igualdade de género e a proteção de grupos vulneráveis
<b>Resultado 3.2:</b> Os estudantes e candidatos a emprego têm fácil acesso à informação sobre escolha dos estudos, bolsas de estudo e progressão na carreira pós-graduada	3.2.1) % de posgraduados que encontram emprego no ano após a conclusão dos seus estudos . 3.2.2) % de posgraduados que encontram emprego como investigadores a tempo completo.	3.2.1) Ver base de referência (2019) 3.2.2) Ver base de referência (2019)	3.2.1) Aumento de pelo menos 30% 3.2.2) Aumento de pelo menos 30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.2.1) relatório anual das IES</li> <li>3.2.2) relatório anual das IES</li> </ul>	As parcerias público-privadas podem ser criadas com sucesso

## ANNEX II: THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

The definition and the number of the DAC evaluation criteria has changed following the release (10 December 2019) of the document “Evaluation Criteria: Adapted Definitions and Principles for Use” (DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL).

The evaluators will ensure that their analysis respects the new definitions of these criteria, their explanatory notes and the guidance document. These can be found at:

<https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

Unless otherwise specified in chapter 2.2.1, the evaluation will assess the intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria and the EU added value, which is a specific EU evaluation criterion. Their short definitions are reported below:

### **DAC CRITERIA**

- **Relevance:** the “extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.”
- **Coherence:** the “compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.”
- **Effectiveness:** the “extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.”
- **Efficiency:** the “extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.”
- **Impact:** the “extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.”
- **Sustainability:** the “extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.”

### **EU-SPECIFIC CRITERION**

- **EU added value:** the extent to which the intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States’ interventions only in the partner country. It directly stems from the principle of subsidiarity defined in the Article 5 of the Treaty on European Union (<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/factsheets/en/sheet/7/the-principle-of-subsidiarity>).



### ANNEX III: INFORMATION THAT WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE EVALUATION TEAM

The following is an indicative list of the documents that the Contracting Authority will make available to the selected evaluators shortly after the contract signature:

- Country Strategy Paper and Indicative Programmes (and equivalent) for the periods covered;
- intervention identification studies;
- intervention feasibility/formulation studies;
- intervention financing agreement and addenda;
- intervention's quarterly and annual progress reports, and technical reports;
- EUD gender equality diagnostic;
- calendar and minutes of all the meeting of the Steering Committee of the intervention(s);
- any other relevant document.

**Note:** The evaluation team has to identify and obtain any other document worth analysing, through independent research and during interviews with relevant informed parties and stakeholders of the intervention.

#### • ACRONYMS

DUE: Delegation of the European Union to the Republic of Angola

GDP: Gross domestic product.

HE: Higher Education

HEI: Higher Education Institution

MESCTI: Ministry of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation.

NAO: (*Ordenador Nacional*, National Authorising Officer)

PND: National Development Plan (Plano Nacional de Desenvolvimento)

PNFQ: Human Capital National Plan (*Plano de Formação de Quadros*) of the Civil House of the Presidency of the Republic (*Casa Civil da Presidência da República*).

ToR: Terms of Reference

TVET: Technical Vocational Education and Training (ETF in Portuguese)

UNDP: United Nations Development Programme

UTG-PNFQ: Technical Management Unit of the Human Capital National Plan

## ANNEX IV: THE EVALUATION MATRIX

The evaluation matrix (hereinafter: the matrix) will accompany the whole evaluation by summarising its **methodological design** (Part A, to be filled and included in the Inception Report) and **documenting the evidence analysed** to answer each EQ (Part B)

The full matrix (parts A and B) is to be included in the following reports.

Use one set of tables (Parts A and B) for each Evaluation Question (EQ) and add or delete as many rows as needed to reflect the selected judgement criteria and indicators. Delete the guidance and the footnotes when including the matrix in the reports.

### PART A – Evaluation design

EQ1: "XXX?"				
Evaluation criteria covered <sup>21</sup>				
Judgement criteria (JC) <sup>22</sup>	Indicators (Ind) <sup>23</sup>	Information sources		Methods / tools
		Primary	Secondary	
JC 1.1 -	I 1.1.1 -			
	I 1.1.2 -			
	I 1.1.3 -			
JC 1.2 -	I 1.2.1 -			
	I 1.2.2 -			
	I 1.2.3 -			
JC 1.3 -	I 1.3.1 -			
	I 1.3.2 -			
	I 1.3.3 -			

### PART B – Evidence log

<sup>21</sup> What evaluation criterion/criteria is/are addressed by this EQ?

<sup>22</sup> Describe each selected JC and number them as illustrated in the template; the first numeric value represents the EQ the JC refers to.

<sup>23</sup> As above. The two first numeric values represent the JC the indicators refer to. The number of JC and indicators per JC as reported in the table is purely illustrative. The table is to be adapted to your specific evaluation and reflect the appropriate JCs and indicators.

Ind <sup>24</sup>	Baseline data <sup>25</sup>	Evidence gathered/analysed	Quality of evidence <sup>26</sup>
I 1.1.1			
I 1.1.2			
I 1.1.3			
I 1.2.1			
I 1.2.2			
I 1.3.1			

---

<sup>24</sup> Use the same numbering as in Part A; no need to describe the indicators.

<sup>25</sup> In case they are available. This column can also be used to record mid-term data (if available).

<sup>26</sup> Score as follows: 0 (no evidence), 1 (some evidence), 2 (sufficient evidence), 3 (conclusive evidence)

## ANNEX V: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORTS

### **1. INCEPTION REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Inception phase)**

The format of the Inception Report is free and should have a maximum length of 20 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| • Introduction  | Short description of the context of the evaluation, its objectives and focus   |
| • Reconstructed Intervention Logic  | This will be based on initial analysis of secondary sources and consultation with key stakeholders   |
| • Stakeholder map   | Free format; this will represent the key stakeholders of the intervention(s) under evaluation and their relations with the intervention(s)   |
| • Finalised Evaluation Questions with Judgement criteria and indicators (Evaluation Matrix, part A) | See the template   |
| • Methodology of the evaluation   | This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overview of entire evaluation process and tools</li> <li>○ Consultation strategy</li> <li>○ Case studies</li> <li>○ Approach to the following phase of the evaluation, including planning of the missions</li> </ul> |
| • Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures                   | In tabular, free format  |
| • Ethics rules  | Including, but not limited to, avoiding harm and conflict of interest, informed consents, confidentiality and awareness of local governance and regulations  |
| • Work plan   | This will include a free text description of the plans and their representation in Gantt format  |

### **2. INTERMEDIARY DESK AND FIELD NOTE (to be delivered at the end of the Desk and Field phase)**

The format of the Intermediary Desk and Field Note is free and should have a maximum length of 15 pages excluding annexes; it must contain at least the following:

- list of activities conducted;
- difficulties encountered and mitigation measures adopted;
- intermediate/preliminary consolidated Desk and Field findings;
- preliminary overall conclusions (to be tested with the Reference Group).

### **3. DRAFT FINAL REPORT AND FINAL REPORT (to be delivered at the end of the Synthesis phase)**

The Draft Final and the Final Report have the same structure, format and content. They should be consistent, concise and clear and free of linguistic errors both in the original version and in their translation, if foreseen. The Final Report should not be longer than 30 pages excluding annexes. The presentation must be properly spaced, and the use of clear graphs, tables and short paragraphs is strongly recommended.

The cover page of the Final Report should carry the following text:

*"This evaluation is supported and guided by the European Commission and presented by [name of consulting firm]. The report does not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of the European Commission".*

The main sections of the evaluation report should be as follows:

Executive Summary	The Executive Summary is expected to highlight the evaluation purpose, the methods used, the main evaluation findings and the conclusions and recommendations. It is to be considered a "stand alone" document.
1. Introduction	A description of the intervention, of the relevant country/region/sector background and of the evaluation, providing the reader with sufficient methodological explanations to gauge the credibility of the conclusions and to acknowledge limitations or weaknesses, where relevant.
2. Findings	A chapter presenting the answers to the Evaluation Question headings, supported by evidence and reasoning. Findings per judgement criteria and detailed evidence per indicator are included in an annex to the Report.
3. Overall assessment ( <i>optional</i> )	A chapter synthesising all answers to Evaluation Questions into an overall assessment of the intervention. The detailed structure of the overall assessment should be refined during the evaluation process. The relevant chapter has to articulate all the findings, conclusions and lessons in a way that reflects their importance and facilitates the reading. The structure should not follow the Evaluation Questions, the logical framework or the evaluation criteria.
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	
4.1 Lessons learnt	Lessons learnt generalise findings and translate past experience into relevant knowledge that should support decision making, improve performance and promote the achievement of better results. Ideally, they should support the work of both the relevant European and partner institutions.
4.2 Conclusions	This chapter contains the conclusions of the evaluation, organised per evaluation criterion.

In order to allow better communication of the evaluation messages that are addressed to the Commission, a table organising the conclusions by order of importance can be presented, or a paragraph or sub-chapter emphasising the three or four major conclusions organised by order of importance, while avoiding being repetitive.

#### 4.3 Recommendations

They are intended to improve or reform the intervention in the framework of the cycle underway, or to prepare the design of a new intervention for the next cycle.

Recommendations must be clustered and prioritised, and carefully targeted to the appropriate audiences at all levels, especially within the Commission structure.

#### 5. Annexes to the report

The report should include the following annexes:

- Terms of Reference of the evaluation;
- names of the evaluators (CVs can be shown, but summarised and limited to one page per person);
- detailed evaluation methodology including: the evaluation matrix; options taken; difficulties encountered and limitations; detail of tools and analyses;
- detailed answer by judgement criteria;
- evaluation matrix with data gathered and analysed by (EQ/JC) indicator;
- Intervention Logic/Logical Framework matrices (planned/real and improved/updated);
- relevant geographic map(s) where the intervention took place;
- list of persons/organisations consulted;
- literature and documentation consulted;
- other technical annexes (e.g. statistical analyses, tables of contents and figures, matrix of evidence, databases) as relevant.

#### **4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (EVAL Module)**

An Executive Summary is to be prepared using the specific format foreseen in the EVAL Module. Its format will be available to evaluators at the time of the submission through EVAL of the Final Report. This is additional to the request to prepare a self-standing executive summary to be included in the Final Report (please refer to the paragraph above, detailing the content of the Final Report).

## ANNEX VI: PLANNING SCHEDULE

This annex must be included by framework contractors in their specific contract Organisation and Methodology and forms an integral part of it.

Framework contractors can add as many rows and columns as needed.

The phases of the evaluation should reflect those indicated in the present Terms of Reference.

		Indicative Duration in working days <sup>27</sup>		
Activity	Location	Team Leader	Evaluator	Indicative Dates
<b>Inception phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
<b>Desk phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
<b>Field phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
<b>Synthesis phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
<b>Dissemination phase: total days</b>				
•				
•				
<b>TOTAL working days (maximum)</b>				

<sup>27</sup> Add one column per each evaluator



## ANNEX VII: EVAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

The quality of the Final Report will be assessed by the Evaluation Manager (following the submission of the draft Report and Executive Summary) using the following quality assessment grid, which is included **in the EVAL Module**; the grid will be shared with the evaluation team, who will be able to include their comments.

### Intervention (Project/Programme) evaluation – Quality Assessment Grid Final Report

Evaluation data			
Evaluation title			
Evaluation managed by		Type of evaluation	
Ref. of the evaluation contract		EVAL ref.	
Evaluation budget			
EUD/Unit in charge		Evaluation Manager	
Evaluation dates	Start:	End:	
Date of draft final report		Date of Response of the Services	
Comments			
Project data			
Main project evaluated			
CRIS/OPSYS # of evaluated project(s)			
DAC Sector			
Contractor's details			
Evaluation Team Leader		Evaluation Contractor	
Evaluation expert(s)			

#### Legend: scores and their meaning

Very satisfactory: criterion entirely fulfilled in a clear and appropriate way

Satisfactory: criterion fulfilled

Unsatisfactory: criterion partly fulfilled

Very unsatisfactory: criterion mostly not fulfilled or absent

## The evaluation report is assessed as follows

### 1. Clarity of the report

This criterion analyses the extent to which both the Executive Summary and the Final Report:

- are easily readable, understandable and accessible to the relevant target readers;
- highlight the key messages;
- have various chapters and annexes well balanced in length;
- contain relevant graphs, tables and charts facilitating understanding;
- contain a list of acronyms (only the Report);
- avoid unnecessary duplications;
- have been language checked for unclear formulations, misspelling and grammar errors.
- The Executive Summary is an appropriate summary of the full report and is a free-standing document.



#### Strengths

#### Weaknesses

#### Score

Contractor's comments

Contractor's comments

### 2. Reliability of data and robustness of evidence

This criterion analyses the extent to which:

- data/evidence was gathered as defined in the methodology;
- the report considers, when relevant, evidence from EU and/or other partners' relevant studies, monitoring reports and/or evaluations;
- the report contains a clear description of the limitations of the evidence, the risks of bias and the mitigating measures.



#### Strengths

#### Weaknesses

#### Score

Contractor's comments

Contractor's comments

### 3. Validity of Findings

This criterion analyses the extent to which:




- findings derive from the evidence gathered;
- findings address all selected evaluation criteria;
- findings result from an appropriate triangulation of different, clearly identified sources;
- when assessing the effect of the EU intervention, the findings describe and explain the most relevant cause/effect links between outputs, outcomes and impacts;
- the analysis of evidence is comprehensive and takes into consideration contextual and external factors.



#### Strengths

#### Weaknesses

#### Score

Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>4. Validity of conclusions</b>		
This criterion analyses the extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>conclusions are logically linked to the findings, and go beyond them to provide a comprehensive analysis;</li> <li>conclusions appropriately address the selected evaluation criteria and all the Evaluation Questions, including the relevant cross-cutting dimensions;</li> <li>conclusions take into consideration the various stakeholder groups of the evaluation;</li> <li>conclusions are coherent and balanced (i.e. they present a credible picture of both strengths and weaknesses), and are free of personal or partisan considerations;</li> <li>(if relevant) the report indicates when there are not sufficient findings to conclude on specific issues</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>5. Usefulness of recommendations</b>		
This criterion analyses the extent to which the recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>are clearly linked to and derive from the conclusions;</li> <li>are concrete, achievable and realistic;</li> <li>are targeted to specific addressees;</li> <li>are clustered (if relevant), prioritised, and possibly time-bound;</li> <li>(if relevant) provide advice for the intervention's exit strategy, post-intervention sustainability or for adjusting the intervention's design or plans.</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Score</b>
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	
<b>6. Appropriateness of lessons learnt analysis (if requested by the ToR or included by the evaluators)</b>		
This criterion is to be assessed only when requested by the ToR or included by evaluators and is not to be scored. It analyses the extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lessons are identified;</li> <li>where relevant, they are generalised in terms of wider relevance for the institution(s).</li> </ul>		
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	
Contractor's comments	Contractor's comments	

Final comments on the overall quality of the report	Overall score



# **TERMS OF REFERENCE – PART B**

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **1. Benefitting Zone**

Angola

### **2. Contracting authority**

The European Union, represented by the European Commission, B-1049 Brussels, Belgium.

### **3. Contract language**

English

## **LOCATION AND DURATION**

### **4. Location**

- Normal place of posting of the specific assignment: Luanda, Angola
- Mission(s) outside the normal place of posting and duration(s): Tentative mission(s) to one or two Angolan provinces to be decided inter alia at the end of the inception phase (two days duration)

### **5. Start date and period of implementation**

The indicative start date is 29/05/2022 and the period of implementation of the contract will be 180 days from this date (indicative end date: 25/11/2022).

## **REQUIREMENTS**

### **6. Expertise**

The minimum requirements covered by the team of experts as a whole are detailed below:

- Qualifications and skills required for the team: - post-graduate degree; - professional evaluation expertise; - higher education expertise; - excellent team-working skills; - knowledge of the Project Cycle Management; - demonstrable ability to effectively communicate and interact within a multicultural setting; - demonstrable knowledge of the Angolan context and institutional landscape;
- General professional experience of the team: The evaluation team must have a cumulative experience of at least 5 years in the area of evaluation (of which at least a minimum of 3 successfully completed intervention-level or strategic evaluations), in the field of development cooperation, with solid experience in rigorous evaluation methods and techniques. This includes the capacity to adapt and use quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. In addition, the evaluation team should have a demonstrable expertise in the area of higher education.

- Specific professional experience of the team: At least one of the experts must have demonstrable expertise in the area of higher education. Working experience in the area of higher education as professor and/or researcher in Sub-Saharan Africa will be considered an asset.
- Language skills of the team: C1 level in Portuguese and B2 in English

Additional expertise requirements for the team composition:

Position	Expert category	Minimum requirements	Minimum number of working days	Additional information
Expert	Cat. I (>12 years of experience)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- post-graduate degree;</li> <li>- professional evaluation expertise;</li> <li>- higher education expertise;</li> <li>- excellent team-working skills;</li> <li>- knowledge of the Project Cycle Management;</li> <li>- demonstrable ability to effectively communicate and interact within a multicultural setting;</li> </ul>	35	
Expert	Cat. II (>6 years of experience)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- professional evaluation expertise;</li> <li>- higher education expertise;</li> <li>- excellent team-working skills;</li> <li>- knowledge of the Project Cycle Management;</li> <li>- demonstrable ability to effectively communicate and interact within a multicultural setting;</li> <li>- demonstrable knowledge of the</li> </ul>	35	



Position	Expert category	Minimum requirements	Minimum number of working days	Additional information
		Angolan context and institutional landscape;		

## **7. Incidental expenditure**

No incidental expenditure provided for in this contract.

## **8. Lump sums**

No lump sums provided for in this contract.

## **9. Expenditure verification**

No expenditure verification report is required.

## **10. Other details**

**1 - Incidental expenditure is reimbursed at actual costs and is limited to the following 3 categories: (1) travel costs; (2) per diems; (3) other reimbursable costs identified in the Specific Contract.**

Minimum quantity (if applicable): 2

# **REPORTS AND DELIVERABLES**

## **11. Reports and deliverables requirements**