



Transport Education Training Authority

Driven by Vision

Checklist for the appointment of a suitable service provider to conduct research on behalf of the TETA Research and Knowledge Unit

Schedule 20

	Research item	Description	Evaluation criteria		
			Does not meet requirements (0-3)	Meets minimum requirements (4-6)	Meets most/all of the requirements (7-10)
1	Introduction	The service provider has introduced the topic and placed the study within the context provided by the Terms of Reference (ToR). The service provider has outlined the purpose of the study and provided the general theme, rationale, and background to the study.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
2	Research background	The service provider has provided a detailed guideline of the process that the study has undertaken in order to meet the stated objectives and answer the intended research questions as outlined by the ToR.			

		The suitability of the research approach used by the service provider has been clearly defined in the context provided by the ToR.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
3	Statement of the research problem	The research problem as indicated in the ToR is clearly described by the service provider. There is a clearly established link between the theme of the study, the problem statement, and the key problem areas identified by the study. The rationale and purpose of the study as outlined by the ToR have been referenced and interpreted by the service provider.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
4	Research objectives	The service provider has outlined the key research objectives identified for the study as outlined by the ToR.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
5	Key research questions	The service provider has provided the key research questions for the study as stated in the ToR or as interpreted by the researcher/research team.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				

6	Significance/objectives of the study	The significance of the study should be highlighted and the link between the outcomes of the study and the importance to the TETA R&K Unit must be described.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
7	Literature review	The literature review should clearly outline the theoretical concepts under study. Latest research developments related to the theoretical concepts have been outlined by the study.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
8	Methodology				
8.1	Methodological process	There is a clearly defined methodological process that either follows a quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods approach			
8.2	Data source and data collection method	The data source has been described, namely primary or secondary data. The process of data collection in terms of the instrument used, in the case of primary data, or the source of the data, in the case of secondary data has been fully outlined and described. If primary data has been collected, a description of the collection process, including how interviews/focus groups were conducted, surveys administered, and how pilot testing of the instrument took place.			
8.3	Sampling frame, sampling procedure and sample size	The sampling frame has been adequately described.			

		The sampling procedure and its relevance to the research study has been described. The chosen sample size has been justified in the context of the research study and the stated objectives and research questions.			
8.4	Data analysis and interpretation	The data analysis process is well defined and reference has been made to the statistical/computer package used in the analysis process. The data has been interpreted within the context of the research study against the research objectives and research questions indicated in the ToR.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
9	Report	A project report outline has been included in the proposal by the service provider.			
9.1	Progress reports	The project report outline should include when and how progress reports will be submitted to the TETA R&K Unit. The progress report should include but is not limited to: • Status quo or situational analysis • Questionnaire administration • Field survey process • Results and interpretations • Final report and summary for TEAT Board members • Publication of the Research			

		Any other aspect of the research deemed necessary to report on by the service provider or the TETA R&K Unit			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				
10	Proposed project execution plan	The proposed project execution plan (PEP) corresponds with the time frames indicated in the appendices.			
10.1	Main stages of the PEP	Main agreed stages with TETA in the PEP with respect to: - Inception - Status quo - Surveys/interviews or desktop research - Recommendations - Report of results - Publication of the results - Dissemination of the results - Any other aspect of the research deemed necessary to report on by the service provider of the TETA R&K Unit.			
10.2	Approach to the content of the study in the report of the PEP	The PEP reports on: - How the service provider will undertake to meet the study objectives as outlined by the ToR. - The key study areas as perceived by the service provider.			
10.3	Details of the PEP	Outline of the details and time frames of all deliverables in the PEP with cost schedules			
10.4	Suitability of service provider and required deliverables	Why the consultants think they are the most qualified to undertake the study: - Introduction - Definition of deliverables			

		• Resource persons in the team (responsibility of team members) • Qualifications and skills of research team • Roles and responsibilities of each member of the research team			
10.5	Project and programme management	A detailed description of the project management process from inception, through to completion and close-out has been provided.			
10.6	Cost schedules	The cost for each deliverable and the associated disbursements have been addressed (in appendices)			
10.7	Risk register	The identified risks have been described and categorised (in terms of high, medium, low, and no risk). A risk mitigation strategy for each identified risk has been outlined.			
10.8	Gantt chart	The project Gantt chart corresponds to the project time frames provided in the proposal.			
	<i>Comments by evaluator:</i>				