



planning, monitoring & evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

DPME Evaluation Guideline 2.2.20

Guideline on Rapid Evaluations: Evaluative Workshops

Created: August 2019

Addressed to	Government departments who are undertaking evaluations (programme managers and M&E staff) as well as evaluators of government programmes and policies.
Purpose	The purpose of this Guideline is to provide technical guidance on undertaking rapid evaluations specifically the evaluative workshops methodology
Policy reference	National Evaluation Policy Framework and all DPME Evaluation Guidelines
Contact person for this guideline	Jabu Mathe, Evaluation and Research Unit (ERU) E-mail: Jabu@dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0158

1. Introduction

Often, evaluations in government are not conducted due to a host of reasons such as capacity and resource constraints. In other instances, there is a burning issue or emergency that requires a quick response however full scale evaluations that generate robust findings, are often too costly to implement and can take a long time to complete. Despite the limited resources and time frames, evaluations are expected to be accurate, comprehensive, and insightful so that important evidence-based decisions are taken to improve the government's programme of action. Internationally, rapid evaluations have proved to be a solution to afore-mentioned challenges. They use intensive, multi-method data collection, collaborative and heavy stakeholder participation techniques. The Rapid evaluation methodology is fast, cost-effective, and can be used in circumstances where time or resources are limited, or where solutions to the burning issues are sought. It is important to note that "rapid evaluation" does not mean "rushed evaluation". Even though rapid evaluations take much less time to conduct than traditional evaluations, the amount of preparation work done beforehand is intensive.

This Guideline is the second in a series of rapid evaluation guidelines, designed to assist government departments to effectively plan and undertake evaluative workshops. The Guideline provides a step-by-step guidance and critical tools for government staff aiming to conduct internal rapid evaluations. The use of rapid evaluation methods such as evaluative workshops offers a middle strategy that can provide a "balance between speed and trustworthiness" (McNall & Foster-Fishman, 2007) in the collection, analysis and use of data to support program improvement and performance efforts. Note the word programme is used here but the evaluation could equally apply to a policy, or plan – we use intervention to cover any of these.

2. What are evaluative workshops?

One of the rapid evaluation methods, is the evaluative workshop which is an internally driven exploratory exercise that is less formal than full-length evaluations. It can take place in varying circumstances; when a programme is under review, any time after the peak of a crisis or emergency.

It combines methods such as: desktop, document and literature review, key informant interviews, stakeholder workshop and so on. Evaluative workshops are varied in scope and scale as they are based on the users' needs and can range from a 2 hour- meeting to a 3-day workshop. This is a small scale, internal exercise that can be led by the programme managers working closely with the M&E practitioners within an organisation.

The purpose of evaluative workshops is contribute to continuous learning and quick analysis of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of a programme with input from document review and stakeholder participation. It can thus be undertaken at any stage of the programme cycle.

3. Planning and logistics for evaluative workshop

A critical step in ensuring the successful implementation of an evaluation is to plan for them effectively. As with all evaluations that follow the prescripts of the NES, there are several planning processes to ensure the smooth implementation of the evaluation. The evaluative workshop model uses the same principles but not as detailed as the turnaround times are much shorter.

3.1 Setting up Structures: Establishment of the Technical Working Group (TWG)

The first step involves establishing a Technical Working Group (TWG). The group should be made up of the programme owners and M&E practitioners. One of the major responsibilities of the group is the development of the Terms of Reference (TORs) which will detail the evaluation topic, purpose, key evaluation questions and outline the methodology. The development of TORs is a critical stage where the information needs for the evaluation are clarified, an outline methodology developed to answer those information needs, and where the key stakeholders in the intervention can agree what they want to get out of the evaluation.

It is essential that the TWG is made up of a strong team of individuals that know the programme well and technically strong in research and evaluation methods. Teamwork is crucial for this flexible processes of data collection and analysis, where team members work in groups and present and discuss findings and their meanings on a daily or weekly basis until the evaluation is complete. During these discussion sessions, team members also develop checklists of new and continuing topics to explore the following day/week, along with the methods they will use to gather the information. This intensive cycle of data gathering and analysis goes on throughout the evaluation, so that at the end of the evaluation exercise, most of the data analysis is already completed.

The TWG is composed of the following key roles:

- *Evaluation team leader* from the M&E unit– responsible for overall project management, secretariat support and quality control as well as liaison with stakeholders;
- *Programme owner/manager*: an individual(s) with deep programme knowledge and understanding;
- *Evaluation specialist from the M&E unit* – able to bring specialist knowledge of evaluation methodology (and not just research). This member could be tasked with consolidating all inputs and final write up of the evaluation;
- *Sector specialist/Facilitators* – can be internal or external member with in-depth knowledge of the sector and able to bring this insight to ensure that the richness of the sector is explored and meaningful recommendations derived.

It is possible for one member to play more than one of the roles listed above. The listed roles serve as only outline the key roles. It is important to highlight that the TWG should be a team of +/- 5 to 10 people (depending on the scope of the exercise).

If time allows, national and international peer reviewers can be contracted to support the assignment. Refer to the DPME Guideline on Peer Reviewers on DPME website for more detail

(<http://evaluations.dpme.gov.za/images/gallery/Guideline%202.2.20Peer%20Review%20of%20Evaluations%2017%2002%2016.pdf>).

Many issues can trigger the need to conduct a quick evaluation as indicated in previous sections of this guideline. The initiator though is normally going to be the programme owners but the responsibility of managing the evaluation is given to the M&E unit. This is done to ensure objectivity and credibility of the evaluation exercise.

Evaluative workshops do not often require the establishment of Steering Committees that normally play the role of overseeing and taking decisions on the overall evaluation process. A strong representative TWG (consisting of key technical; officials) is the only structure required to implement the evaluation. After the development of TORs, the TWG has to decide on key thematic areas for the evaluation and allocate facilitators and secretariat per thematic area. The facilitators can be internal or external to the organisation and should be individuals with sound experience in the particular area. The roles and responsibilities of all members will be outlined in section 4 below.

3.2 Workshop Programme:

The programme is developed by the TWG. It is advisable to develop two versions of the programmes, a succinct version for the workshop participants and a detailed version for the facilitators. Refer to **Annexure 1 and 2** for an example of both versions.

3.3 Invitations:

The success of the evaluative workshop is dependent on stakeholder attendance and participation. The stakeholders need to be formally invited and the invitations should go out timeously. Refer to the attached, example of an invitation letter that was used to invite stakeholders to a National Youth Policy (NYP) Evaluative Workshop on 6 December 2017 (**Annexure 3**). The workshop was a pilot to test out the rapid evaluation model. The invitation letter was signed by the Director-General of DPME.

4. Methodology and Structure and of Evaluative Workshops

The typical data collection methods are qualitative; interviews, stakeholder workshops, direct observations, focus group discussions, and so on. Though quantitative techniques like surveys can also be used. It is advisable that data be collected and analysed by monitoring and evaluation teams that are led by an experienced professional who has considerable knowledge of qualitative methods. Finally, a rapid evaluation approach can take from 4 days to 6 weeks to accomplish, though the average time frame ranges between 4 and 6 weeks.

Although there are numerous methods that are suitable for the evaluative workshops model, four basic methods are the “pillars” of this methodology. They are desktop reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussions conducted at the evaluative workshop and verification exercise. The selected methods should be clearly outlined in the TORs of the evaluation.

4.1 Desktop reviews: This involves reviewing existing research and programme documents to assist in better understanding the programme. This step also assists in the development of interview instruments.

4.2 Key informant interviews: are conducted with key programme stakeholders to gather a wide range of perspectives, it is important that a wide range of key informants are selected. Key informants often not only express their own opinions, but also present a range of differing viewpoints from within

the sector under review. Good key informants are thoughtful and articulate and show interest in the evaluation. It is important to stress that key informants should be made up of stakeholders that understand the intervention well. Typically, key informant interviews are conducted in pairs, with one team member taking the role of interviewer, guided by the interview instrument and the other team member serving as scribe.

4.3 Focus group discussions conducted at the evaluative workshop: The discussions can be conducted at the evaluative workshops. They usually have 6 to 12 participants and a facilitator, and are used to gather data on a particular topic or thematic area. The discussions work best with a group of people who do not know each other, but who are comfortable enough in each other's presence to openly share their thoughts. It is useful to have more than one scribe taking notes during a focus group discussion, in order to keep track of all the speakers. Further, it is useful to also develop tools such as templates to gather data in the work streams and guide or programme for the facilitators.

Box 1: Methodologies

Methodologies may include quantitative/qualitative/mixed methods eg:

- Document review/analysis of programme/project records;
- Interviews;
- Research synthesis;
- Participatory methodologies with citizens/key stakeholders/partners;
- Case studies.

- Template to capture responses from stakeholders (See Annex 4). This can be populated by the facilitators before the evaluative workshop.
- Facilitators Guide/programme (See Annex 2) it is useful for ensuring that all facilitators are briefed adequately before they begin the exercise.

Box 1: Useful data collection tools

4.4 Data Triangulation is often triangulated with focus group discussion and key informant interview data to verify the data collected. This can involve visiting few intervention sites, administering a survey and/or doing a detailed document review.

- a) **Feedback per group:** The group discussions will be guided by the facilitator and a thematic area reporting template. A template (**Annexure 4**) was developed for the NYP workshop. The reporting template can be completed by the facilitators/TWG members before the workshop using the findings from the interviews/ group discussion flowing from the workshop and document review or completed prior to the workshop if there is sufficient time. A key group task in thematic areas/ groups is to develop actionable recommendations.
- b) **Post evaluation:** Unlike other NES evaluations, evaluative workshops do not follow the normal post evaluation requirements (e.g. management response, improvement plans). This step is omitted because of time factors.
- c) **Data analysis:** As indicated in the previous sections, data analysis does not wait until the end of the assignment but is done throughout the evaluative process. It is important to highlight the importance of triangulating: a key element that use data from various sources to capture different perspectives of the same phenomenon. This means using data from documents and focus groups from evaluative workshop. This ensures that it is not just an opinion based exercise but a credible one.
- d) **Report writing:** This step is also done throughout the assignment. The TWG has a person assigned with the responsibility of bringing all the sections and themes together and produce one evaluation report.

- e) **Presentation of the evaluation report to top management:** The TWG team leader will present the report to top management

In a nutshell, the process for undertaking evaluative workshop, follows the following processes:

1. Establish TWG
2. Produce TOR/ Evaluation Proposal
3. Logistical arrangements (developing the program, date and venue
4. Invite workshop participants
5. Decide on thematic areas and allocate facilitators and secretariat, meeting to brief the facilitators and secretariat
6. Develop data collection tools
7. Conduct background research and collect basic documents per thematic area
8. Populate the instruments
9. Host the workshop: Key informant interviews/ facilitation in thematic areas
10. Consolidate findings and key recommendations from group discussions
11. Post workshop: conduct data analysis
- 12 Report Writing

Box 2: Process for undertaking evaluative workshop

6. Limitations of the evaluative workshop methodology

Just with any evaluative approach, there are limitations and disadvantages that are important to consider for risk management. These include:

- Unavailability of key stakeholders due to the urgency and timing of the evaluation which can affect the usability of the evaluation.
- While this methodology generates useful evidence on the performance of interventions, the levels of validity and reliability may be questionable compared to full scale evaluations.
- It cannot be conducted by a single evaluator, as one of the basic methodological principles is that it uses teams of evaluators—preferably the team usually consists of three to five members depending on the size of the intervention being evaluated. Furthermore, government still has inadequate pool of skilled evaluators
- The TWG must have at least one experienced, trained evaluator with expertise in qualitative methods who can guide the data collection and analysis processes.

Signed

Ms Nompumelelo Mpofo
Director-General
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
Date:

References

1. I-Tech Technical Implementation Guide #6, Rapid Evaluation. 2008. Accessed: <http://www.go2itech.org/resources/technical-implementationguides/TIG6.RapidEval.pdf/view>
2. McNall, M. and Foster-Fishman, P. 2007. Methods of Rapid Evaluation, Assessment, and Appraisal, American Journal of Evaluation, 28(2)

Annexure 1: Example of workshop agenda

National Youth Policy Evaluative Workshop 6-7 December 2017

Venue: Burgers Park Hotel, Pretoria

Background

The National Youth Policy was adopted in May 2015. The M&E Framework has only been prepared recently, but bearing in mind that over two years have elapsed it is time to reflect on how implementation of the Policy is progressing. This workshop seeks to bring together stakeholders from the different streams to reflect on progress and identify how implementation can be strengthened.

Outcome

By the end of the workshop we have assessed the performance of the NYP to date since its inception in May 2015 and what needs to be done to strengthen it.

Outputs

- For each of the workstreams, an analysis of how it has performed against targets (at outcome and output level), what has been done, what the lessons are, and what recommendations there are for strengthening it going forward
- How has collaboration with private sector been
- How has performance of government departments been in taking on the youth mandate, including NYDA
- How the institutionalisation of the Policy has worked - driving, reporting, resourcing (workstreams, committee of DMs, Presidential working group on youth, reporting system)
- Overall is the theory of change working, and what is needed to strengthen it

Preparation prior

Workstream report based on template prepared.

Programme

Time	Session	Objective	Responsible
Day 1	Wednesday 6 December		
8.00	Arrival and registration		Facilitator: Ian Goldman
9.00	Welcome and rationale for the process	Participants understand the purpose of the workshop and where it comes from	DG Mpofu, DPME
9.15	Introduction to process of the day/introductions	Participants understand how the two days will evolve	Ian Goldman, DPME
9.30	The National Youth Policy, and the M&E Framework, and the Implementation Strategy	Participants are reminded on the content of the Policy and the M&E Framework/Theory of Change across all the streams	Bernice Hlagala, DPME
10.00	Discussion		Ian Goldman
10.30	Methodology	Participants understand the methodology we are applying and what they are expected to do in the workstreams	Jabu Mathe
10.50	Coffee		
11.15	Workstreams	Each workstream has validated and refined the report including progress, activities, lessons, recommendations	Facilitators
13.00	Lunch		
14.00	Continue		

Time	Session	Objective	Responsible
16.15	Status report	Understand where each group is at	Ian Goldman
16.30	Closing		Josephilda Nhlapo-Hlope
Day 2	Thursday 7 December		
8.00	Arrival and coffee		
8.30	Reflections		Matodzi Amisi, DPME
8.45	Introduction to day		Matodzi Amisi
9.00	Feedback by workstream	Participants have had an opportunity to interrogate and improve what each workstream has done	Ian Goldman
11.00	Coffee		
11.20	Continue		
11.50	Cross-cutting issues	<p>Considered lessons and recommendations re cross-cutting issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with private sector • Performance of government departments • Institutionalisation of Policy • Other 	Jabu Mathe
13.00	Lunch		
14.00	Theory of change	Participants have reflected on achievement or not of the Theory of Change	Ian Goldman facilitates Matodzi Amisi presents
15.00	Recommendations overall	Participants have agreed key cross-cutting recommendations	Ian Goldman facilitates Jabu Mathe presents
16.00	Way forward and closing	The way forward after the workshop is clear	Ntsiki Tshayingca-Mashiya, DPME
16.15	Depart		

Group task by workstream – where there is a report

Background

The workstreams are intended to validate or develop the report on each workstream, and assess performance

Objective

Each workstream has validated and refined the report including progress, activities, lessons, recommendations.

Process

1. Facilitators and scribes are allocated for each workstream.
2. Remind the focus of the workstream and the task.
3. OFs/OMs present the draft report.
4. Discuss any high level questions
5. Work through each section systematically, validating, refining, adding.
 - Overall performance against indicators (40 mins)
 - Activities undertaken since inception (40 mins)
 - Challenges/successes (30 mins)
 - Lessons (30 mins)
 - Recommendations for strengthening implementation/ impact (20 mins)

Documents:

Report with name of outcomes/outputs and indicators

1 copy of NYP, M&E Framework and Implementation Strategy per table.

Group task by workstream – where there is no report

Background

The workstreams are intended to validate or develop the report on each workstream, and assess performance

Objective

Each workstream has validated and refined the report including progress, activities, lessons, recommendations

Process

1. Facilitators and scribes are allocated for each workstream.
2. Remind the focus of the workstream and the task.
3. Facilitator presents the skeleton report with indicators, and runs through the structure.
4. Work through each section discussing:
 - Overall performance against indicators (40 mins)
 - Activities undertaken since inception (40 mins)
 - Challenges/successes (30 mins)
 - Lessons (30 mins)
 - Recommendations for strengthening implementation/ impact (20 mins)

Documents:

Report with name of outcomes/outputs and indicators

1 copy of NYP, M&E Framework and Implementation Strategy per table.

Annexure: 2 Example of Facilitators' Programme

National Youth Policy Evaluative Workshop 13-14 November 2017

Outcome

By the end of the workshop we have started the assessment of the performance of the NYP to date since its inception in May 2015 and a discussion of what needs to be done to strengthen it.

Outputs

- For each of the workstreams, we are developing an analysis of how it has performed against targets (at outcome and output level), what has been done, what the lessons are, and what recommendations there are for strengthening it going forward
- Discussed how has collaboration with private sector been
- Discussed how has performance of government departments been in taking on the youth mandate, including NYDA
- Discussed how institutionalisation of the Policy has worked - driving, reporting, resourcing (workstreams, committee of DMs, Presidential working group on youth, reporting system)

Preparation prior

Workstream report based on template prepared. It is important this is prepared to be able to handle the workshop in one day.

Programme

Time	Session	Objective	Process	Responsible Facilitator:	Resources
8:00	Arrival and registration			Ian Goldman	
9:00	Welcome and rationale for the process	Participants understand the purpose of the workshop and where it comes from	Welcome	Ian Goldman	
9:15	Introduction to process of the day/introductions	Participants understand how the two days will evolve	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do generic introductions – ask people to put up their hands if work for national depts. Etc 2. Introduce flow of the day 	Ian	Powerpoint objectives and flow with

Time	Session	Objective	Process	Responsible	Resources
9:30	The National Youth Policy, and the M&E Framework, and the Implementation Strategy	Participants are reminded on the content of the Policy and the M&E Framework/Theory of Change across all the streams	One presentation including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background to the Policy, approach etc (5mins) 2. The main pillars and the indicators for these (and possibly draft targets from the Strategy) (15mins) 3. Theory of Change (10 mins) 	Bernice Hlagala	Policy Document M&E Framework Targets from the Implementation Strategy Copy of TOC
10:00	Discussion			Ian	
10:30	Methodology	Participants understand the methodology we are applying and what they are expected to do in the workstreams	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The evaluative approach 2. The type of report we want to generate 3. How this will be used 4. Introduction to the task for the workstream groups (5 mins) 	Sihle	
10:50	Coffee				
11:15	Workstreams	Each workstream has validated and refined the report including progress, activities, lessons, recommendations	<p>Where there is a report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Facilitators are allocated for each workstream. 7. Remind the focus of the workstream and the task. 8. OFs/OMs present the draft report. 9. Discuss any high level questions 10. Work through each section systematically, validating, refining, adding. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall performance against indicators (40 mins) • Activities undertaken since inception (40 mins) • Challenges/successes (30 mins) • Lessons (30 mins) • Recommendations for strengthening implementation/ impact (20 mins) 	Facilitators	

Time	Session	Objective	Process	Responsible	Resources
			<p>Where there is no report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Facilitators are allocated for each workstream. 6. Remind the focus of the workstream and the task. 7. Facilitator presents the skeleton report with indicators, and runs through the structure. 8. Work through each section discussing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall performance against indicators (40 mins) • Activities undertaken since inception (40 mins) • Challenges/successes (30 mins) • Lessons (30 mins) • Recommendations for strengthening implementation/ impact (20 mins) 		
13.00	Lunch				
14.00	Continue		Continue		
14.30	Feedback by workstream	Participants have had an opportunity to interrogate and improve what each workstream has done	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Present a summary of the report by workstream (10 mins) 2. Discussion (10 mins) 	Matodzi	
15.50	Way forward and closing	The way forward after the workshop is clear	Detail process of finalising report and presenting the findings	Ntsiki Tshayingca-Mashiya	
16.00	Depart				

Participants

Economic participation and transformation	Education, skills and second chances	Health and combating substance abuse	Social cohesion and nation-building	Optimisation of youth development machinery	DPME
Rudi Dicks	Thabo Mabogoane	Thulani Masilela	Josephilda Nhlapo-Hlope	Bernice Hlagala	Ntsiki
Nokuthula Zuma	Lulu Madhlophe	Mohlapametsi Moditsi	Theresho Mokgatla	NVDA	DG
EDD youth focal point + M&E	DHET	Joy Rathebe	DAC	SA Youth Council	Dineo
Dti	DBE	DoH	Sport and Recreation	DPSA	
DSBD	DPE	DSD	DSD	Offices of Premiers	
Labour	Labour	SAPS	DRDLR- NARYSEC	Tessa Doom, NPC	
DPW		Sport and Recreation	DBE	SALGA	
DPE		UNFPA		COGTA	
DAFF				Metros x 9	Bayanda Mzoneli
Communications					Clayton Peters
DTPS					Ian
NPOs working in the sector x 5 (inc young people from COSATU, BBC, BUSA)	NPOs working in the sector x 5	NPOs working in the sector x 5	NPOs working in the sector x 5	NPOs working in the sector x 5	Jabu
ILO			Clayton Peters		Matodzi
Jabu	Sihle	Matodzi	Lungiswa	Ian	Siphehle
27	16	18	19	34	Lungiswa Zibi
					3 (some counted left)

**Bernice to finalise list
Develop invitation****Facilitation team**

Ilan, Jabu, Matodzi, Bernice, Josephilda, Clayton, Siphehle, Lungiswa

Meet at lunch and end of day to check how its going, and what we need to change

Action plan

Action	Who	When
Ensure OFs/OMs participate	Josephilda/Bernice	11 October
Draft letter from DM and submission to DM for invitation letter, to be submitted by Ian	Bernice/Josephilda	10 October
Draft programme for circulating	Ian	9 October
Finalise list of people to be invited	Bernice	11 October
Send out invites with programme/meetings requests to DMs (Policy, M&E Framework, draft meeting invite put in meeting invite)	Bernice	
Work on structure of report template for submission to OFs to be completed prior to workshop	Ian	11 October
Finalise detailed facilitator programme and instructions for group work	Ian	13 October
Get venue for 100/120 plus 4 breakaway rooms, 5 data projectors, 5 flip charts Layout – herringbone in main plenary	Nkamang/Sihle	13 October
Stationery	Sihle	6 November
Packs – programme, draft reports, M&E framework, TOC, badge – electronic Policy, M&E Framework, Strategy	Sihle	10 November

Annexure 3: Example of Invitation Letter

To all Director-Generals and Offices of the Premier

Dear Colleague

REQUEST FOR REPRESENTATIVE/S TO ATTEND THE EVALUATIVE WORKSHOP FOR THE MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL YOUTH POLICY

As you may be aware, the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) is responsible for overseeing implementation of the National Youth Policy (NYP) 2015-2020, that was adopted in May 2015. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework that guides implementation of the NYP has only been developed recently.

Taking into account that over two years have already passed since approval of the Youth Policy, the DPME is conducting a mid-term review to evaluate progress made in implementing the Policy. The first midterm review workshop already took place on the 06/12/2017, where initial reports were reviewed or drafted.

The second workshop will validate the reports on each of the workstreams being taken forward under the Youth Policy. You are requested to nominate two officials (the youth focal point and the M&E specialist) to attend the workshop for the National Youth Policy. It will be held as follows:

Date: 20 March 2017

Time: 08h00-16h00

Venue: Burgerspark Hotel

We would appreciate confirmation for attendance of the workshop. Kindly send your responses to **XXXXX** or Tel: (012) 312-XXXX.

Your support and favourable response is appreciated in advance

Yours sincerely

Ms Nompumelelo Zandile Mpofu

Director-General for DPME

Date:

Annexure 4: Example of template for capturing responses per workstream/thematic area

Report on progress with National Youth Policy

Education and Skills Workstream

Overall assessment of performance

Workstream Title	Number as per M&E framework	Score	Use scale in table
	1		

Description	Scale
Substantially exceeded expectation	A++
Moderately exceeded expectation	A+
Met expectation	A
Moderately did not meet expectation	B
Substantially did not meet expectation	C

Outcomes

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
Increase access to high-level occupationally directed programmes in needed areas	Improve articulation across education system	Articulation policy based on Ministerial Task Team and SAQA report approved by the Minister for publication	Eg Stats SA data DHET	The Articulation Policy was published in the Government Gazette on 13 January 2017.
	Establish TVET college campuses and expand as per demand estimates and agreements.	Number of TVET college campuses to be built and expanded	POA Report	1 (Thabazimbi Campus) TVET College completed and 2 (Bambanani and Nkandla A) are near completion
		Number of learners registered for skills	ALL Dept	Work with TVET in Action Work Group 7 (structure chaired by the Premier). OTP trying to ensure colleges focus on short skills rather

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
Increase success in programmes leading to intermediate and high level	Establish appropriate training opportunities for TVET college staff	Number of Universities offering programmes for lecturers in TVET colleges	POA Report	<p>than training people with skills which do not help them find employment in the market.</p> <p>National Skills Fund gives money for CBW and EPWP projects, OTP needs to consolidate these numbers, in as much as line departments are doing reporting. Challenge is not having officials specifically working on youth issues in order to get this information.</p> <p>Project Sukuma: Integrated project with SANDF, Provincial Health, Provincial Education, and OTP. Training of young people as paramedics. OTP gives out bursaries and coordinates. Learners have to pass the SANDF recruitment process. Trainees are paid by SANDF during training. (Community Service).</p> <p>Entrepreneurship Opportunities: One event has been held in June 2017 where the Minister hosted a dialogue.</p> <p>1 (UWC) University offering programmes</p>
	Develop protocols on the secondment of sector specialist to work in TVET colleges and lectures exposed to the work place	A percentage of TVET lectures undergoing specified hours of work in their industry for specified periods every two years.	POA Report	Guideline was developed for the implementation
	Implement Youth Development support programmes to bursary recipients.	Value of funds available for bursaries		
	Establish a Youth Skills Fund for youth that are Not in Education, Employment and Training (NEET).	Number of NEET youth engaged in skills development initiatives.		

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
	All students in higher education institutions participate in community service of the NYSP to generate credits towards possible employment with the public, civil society and the private sector.	Number of higher education students undertake community service		
	Offenders participate in skills development programmes	Percentage of offenders who participate in skills development programmes measured against the list of offenders registered for participation as per enrolment register		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17 216 learners in internships Department of Human Settlements: Real estate Internship for those with appropriate qualifications.
Increasing exposure for youth to work opportunities, on-the-job training, and internship and volunteer opportunities.		Percentage/number of internships reported	SETA Reports DHS Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 148 517 Workbased learning opportunities Department of Human Settlements: Real estate Learnership ('1 learner, 1 real estate') done with Estates Agencies Board (EAB) recruits directly and also absorbs some people from programmes A and B above. Scholarship Programme targeting youth with Grade 12 (some through above listed programme, other come directly into this scholarship programme) to attend university and universities of technology. Career guidance is offered in conjunction to ensure participants go into careers. Recruitment into programme is done once a project is approved through liaising with province and municipality
		Percentage / number of youth participating in workplace learning	SETA Reports	

Outcomes	Outcome Indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
				<p>counterparts where the construction is taking place. The participants remain trainees for 12-18 months.</p> <p>KZN Office of the Premier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with SETAs on different projects Internship programme recruits 45 people per annum paying a stipend. The programme runs for 1 year and people work within the OTP. To provide numbers of internship recruitment for departments in entire province. Learnerships (mostly NQF 2 and NQF 3) placed through SETAs to place students who have not yet qualified. OTP coordinates and facilitates placement of learners into private companies etc. OTP collaborates with private companies for them to get funding from SETAs to train students, however OTP has found that the admin systems of these companies do not operate well with SETA system especially when it comes to timeous payment of stipends. Bursaries previously budget was R25 mill per year to cover about 120 students. For 2017/18 206 learners have been given bursaries. Target for OTP is 120 per year. Accurate numbers will be provided. Collaboration with SETAs (ETDP/FOODBEV). All SETAs are engaged in the Provincial Youth Skills Development Forum to ensure alignment especially around bursaries and internships. Challenge with MOUs and legal processes presented by SETAs to OTP make it difficult to work with SETAs. The MOUs seem to be standardised and very challenging to make changes that accommodate needs of the OTP. Department of Energy: Learnerships, Internships, Bursaries targeted at Youth Schools Energy Day: Grade 10 -12, career guidance targeting rural and township schools working with provincial education depts. 4 provinces per year (reaching about 4000 pupils). Several high schools offering Maths & Science are invited for the day. Partners include SOEs such as PetroSA, Eskom, and energy sector companies (big 5 petroleum Sasol, BP, Shell,

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
	Increase the number of qualified artisans	Number of newly qualified artisans	SETA Reports	<p>Total: Oryx for gas; and some independent power producers); and SETAs. In January 2017 80 bursaries were awarded through this programme for the first time.</p>
Improved success opportunities through provision of appropriate career guidance to learners	Strengthening SETA partnership with Public, Private Sector	Evaluation Report with recommendations in improving career guidance and skills training provided	NYDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21 199 qualified artisans in 2016/17 Department of Human Settlements: National Programme for Unskilled/semi-skilled youth (NQF 3) – offered to those with grade 10 to grade 12 running for 12 or 18 months. Skills training through NHBRC (budget sits with them). Training consists of brick layering, plastering, plumbing, roofing, carpentry. Every young person does brick laying (compulsory) and can CHOOSE a second trade, All participants undergo NYDA life orientation training. DHS provides all participants with stipend. Targeting 2000 youth per annum. Youth are selected where there is construction using traditional NYS model. Training which happens at a live site gives opportunity for exit strategy or directing youth participants to jobs and higher education within the area. Participants graduate and can go into Artisan Development offered at TVET colleges. Numbers of going into TVETs has been increasing however attrition once at TVET is quite high. Since 2015, DHS tightened recruitment criteria participants seem to be faring better at TVET. This is fully funded by NHBRC up to trade test also paid for by NHBRC. <p>419 partnerships established by SETAs with TVET Colleges and Universities / UoT</p>

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
and additional learning opportunities.				
Improved quality of teaching and learning through provision of quality infrastructure, effective teaching methods and fostering or essential values	Develop a Matric Second Chance Support Programme for learners who cannot meet pass requirements.	Number of learners exposed to a support programme consisting of various learning opportunities such as face-to-face tuition by schools, broadcasting, free Wi-Fi hotspots, access to internet resources at teacher centres, libraries, etc.	NYDA	<p>Department of Energy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learners Focus Week: Started in 2011, taking place over June/July holidays every year. Grade 10 – 12 (trying to focus more on matrics). Provinces are categorised as inland and coastal targeting parents who are likely not to study further after matric due to poor background. Each province selects 50 learners per year from rural and township schools doing Maths and Science. Target is 250 – 300 learners per year. Learners travel with 5 teachers per province. Inland learners are taken to coastal, and vice versa, using travel/excursion as kind of social learning, cultural exchange, and life skills. Provincial depts. Pay for transport, and DOE covers other costs. Partners including CHETA commit bursaries for learners to cover university tuition and so far 170 awarded (2012, 2013, 2016, 2017; 200 there were no bursaries yet and 2015 the LFW was not held). Learners get to visit power facilities, refineries etc in the province. Partners also give away laptops, and tablets etc to learners. DOE follows up on bursary recipients.
Provide learners with access to required textbooks		Percentage of learners provided with required textbooks in all grades and in all subjects per annum	DBE POA report	95%
Providing schools with adequate infrastructure in line with agreed norms and standards		Percentage of public ordinary schools provided with water supply; electricity supply; supplied with sanitation facilities in line with agreed	NEIMS	<p>Water: 99%</p> <p>Sanitation: 99%</p> <p>Electricity: 95%</p>

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
Improved quality of teaching and learning through provision of quality infrastructure, effective teaching methods and fostering or essential values	Enhancing teacher content knowledge in areas where there are gaps through in-service training	Percentage of teachers who meet requisite content knowledge.	DBE POA report	73.4% demonstrate required knowledge after training.
	Empowering teachers on different teaching method and approaches so that diverse learner needs and learning styles are catered for	Percentage of teachers who received training in teaching methods and approaches.	DBE POA report	60 hours according to last quarter statistics.
	Strengthening inclusive education	Percentage of learners in schools with at least one educator with specialist training on inclusion.	DBE POA report	65%

Outputs

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
Increase in youth with relevant skills and learning	Percentage distribution of the highest levels of	Level to which young people are satisfied with their holistic educational or learning	Eg Stats SA data	Don't list activities here – report on changes against the indicator and target

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
outcomes to meet the present and future needs of the country for improved economic growth	education attained by youth	opportunities, including both academic support and building self-esteem	CAPS	All schools teach Life Orientation as it is compulsory.
Fostering of essential values	Percentage of schools that have introduced Life Orientation subject	50%	CAPS	All schools teach Life Orientation as it is compulsory.

Activities undertaken to date

1.

Key challenges/successes

Challenges	Successes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unwillingness / Reporting fatigue from Departments • What is progress with Youth Wage Subsidy? PPP is important for placing youth in places of employment. How to deal with perceptions and disagreements between unions and organised business to move forward. How to find balance between work opportunities and decent work, gainful employment. • Organisational structures must dedicated posts for youth so youth policy implementation can be prioritised. • Youth programmes are not prioritised in budgets. E.g. SANDF (NARYSEC) youth character building programmes which departments need to pay for to send their trainees. However, the costs seem to be quite steep. Can NSF not assist with funding here? • Admin fatigue with SETA funding processes. • Post-training retention, employment opportunities are lacking. Especially, with DHS as training for youth is cyclical, depending on project cycle. • Job preparedness programme via NYDA essential. How widespread is this programme? Graduates lack soft skills to market themselves. This is also core function of Dept. of Labour, Public Employment Services. Depts. Need to coordinate services. • Mis-alignment between youth support opportunities (i.e. willing host employer) and youth programme (e.g. Jobs Fund) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination of youth interventions across public and private sectors • Catching young people early – programmes targeting youth from grade 10 onwards for career guidance • Articulation process happening (programmes staggered in a way that allows a participant to graduate from one training to another higher level training) • A youth vision exists although marred with a lot of challenges. Progressive policy exists. • Several provinces have existing chief directorates. Effort to institutionalise youth development must be recognised.

Risks

Key risks to the workstream	Likelihood	Impact	Control measure	Proposed changes to control measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retention post-training and employment opportunities not guaranteed Poor relations/lack of buy-in between government, business and labour. Private sector/labour market demand vs supply of youth that government is training. Not enough work opportunities, (e.g TVET graduates with scarce skills are not getting jobs) Curriculum in colleges not meeting demand of private employers). 	Often	Increase in the unemployment rate		Government planning which should involve strong participation of the
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most training designed to produce employees, as opposed to producing entrepreneurs. 	Often	More young people stay unemployed		More involvement from the DTI and DSBD to make entrepreneurship more attractive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inability to get all relevant data. 	Difficulty in measuring progress.	Policy implementation is adversely affected.	Alignment of Youth MTSF and DBE APP.	By the end of January 2018 Youth MTSF and DBE APP should have been aligned.

Lessons

1.

Actionable recommendations going forward

1.

Annex 1: key to risk table

Impact	Meaning	Financial Impact	Score
Catastrophic	Total shutdown of the programme in question	Can lead to termination of Business Operation	5
Critical	Requires complete redesign or high level intervention in the service/programme	Cost increase > 10%	4
Major	Requires major redesign or intervention in the service/programme	Cost increase > 5%	3
Significant	Requires redesign or intervention in the service/programme	Cost increase < 1%	2
Negligible	Requires ongoing monitoring and minor changes	Minimal or no impact on cost	1

Likelihood	Occurrence	Description	Score
Almost Certain	The risk is almost certain to occur in the current circumstances	The risk is almost certain to occur in the current circumstances	5
High	More than an even chance of occurring, 1 out of 10 times	More than an even chance of occurring	4
Medium	Could occur sometimes, 1 out of 100 times	Could occur often	3
Low	Will seldom occur, 1 out of 1000 times	Low likelihood, but could happen	2
Minimum	Will almost never occur, 1 out of 10 000 times	Not expected to happen - event would be a surprise	1

