

2022/23 Discretionary Grant Proposals Evaluation Form

Municipality/Entity Name: _____

Section A: Desktop Evaluation of DG Open Window for Levy and Non-Levy Paying Applications

Criteria	Description	Yes/No/Partial/ or N/A	Confirmation of Information
General			
1. Municipalities/Entities/Organisation/ Application	Category A, B or C municipality – District/Local or Metropolitan; Constituent/levy paying local government organisation Organisation in the local government sector Higher Education Institution NGOs, CBOs, NPOs, Coops, SMME and Organised labour	Confirm	State
2. Entity Size	Number of employees	Confirm	Indicate
3. B-BBEE Status (If relevant)	Company level 1-8 Status; Not relevant for public entities	Confirm	Indicate
4. Will a training provider be appointed by the municipality/organisation	Yes/No	Confirm	Confirm
5. Received funding from LGSETA previously	Confirm number of times received funding over three-year period	Confirm	Confirm
Project Focus Alignment			
6. Beneficiaries	Confirm number of employed and/or unemployed beneficiaries	Confirm	Core - State projected number
7. Contribution to Equity	Confirm number of black (85%), women (54%), persons with disabilities (4%) contributing to occupation/skills priority areas	Confirm	Core - State projected number

Criteria	Description	Yes/No/Partial/ or N/A	Confirmation of Information
8. Contribution to disadvantaged learners/ rural learners	Number of Learners from disadvantaged backgrounds or rural areas according to List of Rural Municipalities (Local/District) contributing to occupation/skills priority areas	Confirm	Core - State projected number
9. Youth focus	Number of youth aged from 18 -35 years of age contributing to occupation/skills priority areas	Confirm	Core - State projected number
10. Location of the project	Confirmation of Province/ Metropolitan/District/Local Municipal area	Confirm	Core - State location
Type of intervention – Linking of Learning Interventions with LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas/ERRP/Occupational Shortages (Scarce) and Skills Gaps (Top-Up Skills) List/DDM/DG Priority Areas		Yes/No/Partial/ or N/A	Select Relevant Intervention
11. Learnership	Name and Level and linkage to LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and occupational priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
12. Apprenticeship	Name and Level and linkage to LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and occupational priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
13. Internship/Work Experience	Name and Level of Qualification and linkage to LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and occupational priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
14. WIL for University/TVET	Name and Level of Qualification and linkage to LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and occupational priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
15. RPL/ARPL	Name and Level of Qualification and linkage to LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and occupational priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
16. Skills Programme (PIVOTAL)	Name and level of Qualification and LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and linkage to occupational	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant

Criteria	Description	Yes/No/Partial/ or N/A	Confirmation of Information
	priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas		
17. Short Course (Non-PIVOTAL)	Name of programme and relevance to the LG sector and skills gaps	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
18. Bursaries	Name and level of Qualification and LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and linkage to occupational priorities and skills gaps or national/provincial/district priority skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
19. AET	Basic Education Programmes level 1 – 4 and NSC Programme	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
20. Candidacy	Name of the professional body candidacy linked to priority occupational/skills areas	Confirm	Core - State intervention if relevant
Quality Assurance (If LGSETA Intervention)			
21. Confirm Learnership/qualification registration status of intervention, if relevant	Verify learnership/qualification registration status (correct SAQA ID if qualification valid and current)	Confirm	Core - State registered intervention(s)
22. Confirm Workplace approvals , if relevant	Applicable interventions refer to Learnership, Apprenticeship, Work Integrated Learning (WIL), or Candidacy. List of mentors provided for workplaces is indicated. Workplace approvals for hosting of learners to be confirmed during due diligence	Confirm	State registered intervention
23. Accreditation of service provider	Confirmation of accreditation status and programme approvals are valid and current at the time of application. Confirmation of appointment of letter of SDP/SLA and MOU signed with the Employer List of assessors and moderators registered and valid	Confirm	Confirm - State accreditation, SLA/Appointment letter of SDP and MOU if relevant

Criteria	Description	Yes/No/Partial/ or N/A	Confirmation of Information
Allocation of Discretionary Grants			
24. Recommendation of Desk top Analysis		Confirm	Confirm and/or Outline Reasons if there are issues:

Section B1: Evaluation Criteria Definition

Scale	Rating	Definitions (Choose and/or Modify as Appropriate)
3 points	Good. Acceptable. Comprehensive.	<p>Applicant addresses all aspects of the criteria and demonstrates an ability to successfully meet LGSETA requirements to ensure effective performance. All criteria were met; no deficiencies exist in the areas assessed.</p> <p>Evidence provided demonstrate the likelihood of successfully meeting the LGSETA requirements to ensure effective performance</p>
2 points	Average Less than Acceptable	<p>The applicant has not met some of the criteria. Some deficiencies exist in the areas assessed and are of major concern.</p> <p>The evidence presented partially demonstrate the likelihood of successfully meeting the LGSETA requirements to ensure effective performance.</p>
1 point	Weak. Poor. Inadequate information	<p>Applicant does not adequately address the criteria. The evidence presented does not demonstrate the likelihood of successfully meeting the LGSETA requirements to ensure effective performance. Not all the criteria were met; deficiencies exist in the areas assessed and are of major concern.</p>

Section B2: Evaluation Scoring Criteria for DG Applications

DESCRIPTION	WEIGHTING/POINTS	SCORES	COMMENTS
1. Purpose of the Proposal - What will the proposal aiming to achieve?	3 = Aim of the proposal is clearly articulated and comprehensive 2 = Aim of the proposal is articulated and is average or less than acceptable 1 = Aim of the Proposal is weak and has gaps or inadequate information		
2. Strategic Intent of the Proposal – How does the Proposal link to the following: 2.1 LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas 2.2 LGSETA Response to Economic Reconstructive and Recovery Plan 2.3 LGSETA Scarce and Critical Skills List 2.4 LGSETA Discretionary Grant Strategic Priority Areas 2.5 District Development Model and Municipal Key Service Areas	3 = Proposal links with LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and Discretionary Grant Priority Areas as per 2 in Column A and is detailed and comprehensive 2 = Proposal shows some links with LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and Discretionary Grant Priority Areas as per 2 in Column A and is considered average or less than acceptable 1 = Proposal is not well articulated and is weak in terms of linkage with LGSETA Strategic Focus Areas and Discretionary Grant Priority Areas as per 2 in Column A		
3. Target Group or Beneficiaries 3.1 Include Learner status (employed or unemployed) 3.2 Include Equity details of the learners or beneficiaries 3.3 Include Geographical location of learners (Rural or Urban)	3 = Proposal clearly indicates the Target or beneficiaries and is well detailed/comprehensive as per items in 3 in column A 2 = Proposal indicates the Target or beneficiaries and is not detailed as per items in 3 in column A		

<p>3.4 Indicate % of learner with disability status and nature of disability</p> <p>3.5 Indicate how the learners will be recruited</p>	<p>1 = Proposal shows gaps in the Target or beneficiaries and is considered weak or inadequate</p>		
<p>4. Details of the programme – Learning Interventions applied</p> <p>4.1 Indicate full programme name and ID.</p> <p>4.2 Is the programme credit-bearing or non- credit-bearing?</p> <p>4.3 Indicate duration of the Project</p> <p>4.4 Indicate the training provider</p> <p>4.5 Indicate accreditation details of training provider (attach proof)</p> <p>4.6 Indicate if successful completion will recognition in a specific occupation and lead to registration with a professional body</p> <p>4.7 Indicate location (where project is going to take place: Province/Metro/District/Local)</p> <p>4.8 Indicate the amount of time that learners will be in workplaces and the classroom</p> <p>4.9 Indicate Mentors availability in workplace</p> <p>4.10 Indicate whether workplace approval was done by the LGSETA or by other SETA</p> <p>4.11 Indicate the appointment letter of SDP/SLA and MoU</p>	<p>3 = Clear and comprehensive details of the programme/Learning interventions applied for as per requirements indicated by items in 4 in column A provided fully</p> <p>2 = Details of the programme/Learning interventions applied for are considered adequate or less than acceptable as per items in indicated under 4 in column A</p> <p>1 = Details of the programme/Learning interventions applied for are weak or gaps areas/inadequate as per items under 4 in column A</p>		

<p>signed between SDP and Employer</p>			
<p>5. Project Implementation 5.1 Levy-Paying institutions - Indicate if WSP/ATR provides list of relevant programmes 5.2 Detail Project Plan to be attached in the proposal 5.3 Method of delivery of training (blended/face to face/e-learning) 5.4 Indicate Covid19 protocol</p>	<p>3 = Applicant has provided a comprehensive and detailed information on roll-out/implementation plan as per the items under 5 in Column A. 2 = Applicant has provided average or less than acceptable information on a roll-out/implementation plan as per the items under 5 in Column A. 1 = Applicant has provided weak or partial information on roll-out/implementation plan as per the items under 5 in Column A.</p>		
<p>6. Opportunities Upon Completion – Exit Strategy 6.1 Indicate how the project will impact on the learner’s life 6.2 Indicate if there will be any employment opportunities upon completion/ absorption /placements/self-employment (Will the organisation employ them, negotiate employment with other employers, etc)</p>	<p>3 = Applicant indicated opportunities upon completion or exit strategy and is clearly articulated and detailed 2 = Applicant indicated opportunities upon completion or exit strategy but is considered average or less than acceptable 1 = Applicant indicated gaps in the opportunities upon completion or exit strategy but is considered weak or inadequate</p>		
<p>7. Capacity to manage the project 7.1 Indicate the organisation’s experience in project management 7.2 Stipend disbursement management (if applicable)</p>	<p>3 = Applicant submitted outline of capacity of management of the project and is well articulated and comprehensive 2 = Applicant submitted outline of capacity of management of the project but is considered average or less than acceptable</p>		

	<p>1 = Applicant submitted outline of capacity of management of the project but is considered weak or inadequate I</p>		
<p>8. Previous Experience in Managing Similar Project 8.1 Indication of any SETA funding (or other sponsor) received previously and performance by organisation in this regard (attach proof)</p>	<p>3 = Applicant submitted detailed/comprehensive information on previous experience managing similar projects</p> <p>2 = Applicant submitted information but is considered average or less than acceptable in the information</p> <p>1 = Applicant submitted limited or weak information and is considered inadequate in terms of managing similar projects</p>		
<p>9. Financial Implication 9.1 Budget based on actual costs and cost per beneficiary analysis 9.2 Budget and actual costs to be in line with LGSETA Grants Policy</p>	<p>3 = Applicant submitted comprehensive and detailed budget</p> <p>2 = Applicant submitted budget but is less than acceptable or considered average in the information</p> <p>1 = Applicant submitted budget but is considered weak or inadequate</p>		
<p>10. Risk and mitigating factors 10.1 Indicate the risks and provide mitigating factors for managing these risks</p>	<p>3 = Applicant submitted comprehensive/detailed information on risk</p> <p>2 = Applicant submitted information on risk but information provided is average or less than acceptable</p> <p>1 = Applicant submitted information relating to risk is weak or inadequate</p>		

Final Recommendation and Score		Score	Comments
11.Total Score			
11.1 Recommendation for Due Diligence	<p>Submission meets the necessary requirements including appropriate intervention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project implementation plan • Beneficiaries (Rural/Youth/Disability/Race/Women) • Duration of learning interventions in line with qualification prescripts • Budget/project costs aligned to the project plan • Exit strategy (absorption or placements or self-employment of unemployed learners in a workplace) in place 		

Section C: Declaration

Description	Yes/No	Confirmation of Information
<p>Section C1: Declaration</p> <p>1. Validate the following in the application:</p> <p>1.1 Full name of person responsible for the application</p> <p>1.2 Position in the organization</p> <p>1.3 Confirm if application has been signed</p>		
<p>2. First Evaluator</p> <p>2.1 Full name of person responsible for the Evaluation: _____</p> <p>2.2 Position in the organization: _____</p> <p>2.3 Signature: _____</p> <p>2.4 Date: _____</p>		
<p>3. Second Evaluator</p> <p>3.1 Full name of person responsible for the Evaluation: _____</p> <p>3.2 Position in the organization: _____</p> <p>3.3 Signature: _____</p>		

3.4 Date: _____	
------------------------	--

SECTION D: SCORE THRESHOLD

The minimum threshold of 21 points (70%) will proceed to due diligence phase.

Evaluation Scale	Scoring	Evaluation Outcome
0 - 69%	0 - 20	Not Proceeding to Due Diligence Phase
70% -100%	21 - 30	Proceeding to Due Diligence Phase