planning, monitoring
& evaluation

Department:
Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

NDP 2030

DPME Evaluation Guideline 2.2.22

Guideline on rapid evaluative processes: Evaluative Workshops

Created: 14 September 2020
Revised: October 2021

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 evaluative work using an evaluative workshop methodology
Policy reference	National Evaluation Policy Framework and all Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) Evaluation Guidelines
Contact person	Evaluation Unit E-mail: Evaluations@dpme.gov.za Tel: 012 312 0110

1.   INTRODUCTION

Evaluations in government may not be conducted due to capacity and resource constraints. In some instances, there is a burning issue or emergency that requires a quick response but full scale evaluations that generate robust findings may be 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. Department of Planning Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME) is considering a number of rapid ways to undertake evaluative work, and this Guideline is the second in a series of rapid evaluation guidelines, in this case structuring an evaluative process through a workshop modality.

This Guideline is designed to assist government departments to effectively plan and undertake evaluative workshops. Note the word programme is used here but the workshop could equally focus on a policy, or plan – we use intervention to cover any of these.[1]

[1.] This guideline was developed by DPME with the support of Professor Ian Goldman

2. WHAT ARE EVALUATIVE WORKSHOPS?

An evaluative workshop is an internally driven evaluative exercise that is quick to run but requires good preparation and facilitation. It can take place in varying circumstances; when a programme is under review, any time after the peak of a crisis or emergency. 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. It is a small scale, internal exercise that can be led by programme managers working closely with the M&E practitioners within an organisation.

Evaluative workshops can contribute to continuous learning and quick evaluative analysis using criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of a programme, and to explain why performance is as it is, and how it can be strengthened.

3. WHEN ARE EVALUATIVE WORKSHOPS APPROPRIATE?

Evaluative workshops can be undertaken at any stage of the programme cycle but are most relevant where the evaluation is to be used in a formative way. They can also provide indicative summative results, especially where the programme in question produces a progress report which can be interrogated at the workshop. It can be initiated due to an emerging need for rapid evaluative feedback, or where a method is required that is cheap and light, for example for a regular formative review of how a programme is performing, and what corrective action is needed.

So evaluative workshops could be a once off, or become standard practice as an annual process to reflect on progress. For example, an implementation evaluation may be planned for three years after programme inception, with a decision to hold annual evaluative workshops prior to that.

There are many ways evaluative workshops could be conducted. We highlight two examples to help departments to plan for one.

4. METHODOLOGY AND STRUCTURE OF EVALUATIVE WORKSHOPS

4.1 Deciding on the approach and methodology workshop programme

When considering how to plan the workshop two important options to consider are:

1. Where the programme team develops a detailed progress report prior to the workshop, and the workshop can concentrate on validating that.

2. Where all the content has to be developed at the event.

4.2 Where the workshop builds on a detailed progress report

The core of the work is done in groups which could be organised by workstream, or outcome depending how the programme is structured. In this case the groups work through pre-prepared reports systematically and in an evaluative way, validating, refining, adding to the report. This provides an opportunity to give recommendations as to how the programme or policy should be strengthened. The example is drawn from real workshops run by DPME in 2017/18.

Annexure 4 provides an example of a report that could be prepared prior to the workshop, in this case using the headings:

- Overall performance against indicators (outcomes, outputs);

- Activities undertaken since inception;

- Challenges/successes;

- Lessons;

- Recommendations for strengthening implementation/ impact.

The core flow of the programme then would be:

- Introducing the workshop and the methodology being adopted;

- Going through the report(s) and validating them e.g. using the headings above – performance to recommendations. This could be broken into groups looking at components, e.g. outcomes, or it could be plenary. In general, it is better to have group work to maximise participation;

- Coming together to validate across the whole policy/programme;

- Identifying cross-cutting issues and how they should be dealt with;

- Agreeing key recommendations for changes.

Annexure 1 shows a programme for such a workshop, Annexure 2 the critical group task, Annexure 3 shows the facilitator version of the programme, showing how each session is facilitated, Annexure 4 shows an example of a report prepared in advance which is critiqued in the workshop. This is based on a real example undertaken in 2017/2018 on the National Youth Policy.

In this case the key product could actually be the validated report, rather than a workshop report per se, or it could be a workshop report which captures the key recommendations.

4.3   Where a progress report is not prepared previously

Where a report is not prepared previously then the data must actually be collected at the event and the workshop may need to be longer. Again the evaluative work can be done through the group process – for example groups assessing whether particular outcomes have been achieved.

It is also possible to add some other data collection at the workshop, for example participants filling out a questionnaire, or undertaking a few interviews. However, the essence of the evaluative workshop is that it should essentially give you the evaluative outcome. Therefore, the process must be well enough designed to yield the product. Where the results are solely derived from the product of the workshop, then it is even more important that the stakeholders present have the right knowledge to be able to assess performance, the reasons for challenges or success, and can suggest how to strengthen the programme.

Typically, as in 4.2 where a report is prepared previously, the evaluative workshop will aim to cover:

- Whether outcomes are being achieved, and possibly unexpected outcomes;

- How the theory of change/implementation is working in practice;

- Where it is not working as planned, why not;

- What changes need to be made.

So a possible flow in this case could be based on:

- A Theory of change session to draw out the theory of change as it was planned (could take 4-5 hours);

- 2 hour sessions doing outcome mapping to identify the outcomes being achieved, and comparing with the TOC and plans (probably in groups and then plenary);

- Interrogating why the outcomes are not being achieved and unpacking these (possible with groups working with one or two outcomes and unpacking the theory of change leading to these) (3 hours);

- Coming together to bring together and validating the big picture;

- Identifying recommendations for changes.

Annexure 4 contains a possible programme for this type of workshop.

5. PLANNING FOR AN EVALUATIVE WORKSHOP

A critical step in ensuring the successful implementation of any evaluative exercise is to plan for it effectively.

5.1   Establishment of a Technical Working Group (TWG) as a facilitation team to prepare for and facilitate the workshop

The first step involves establishing a Technical Working Group (TWG) to plan for and play some facilitation roles for the workshop. The group should be made up of the programme owners and M&E practitioners, and ideally would include an experienced facilitator to facilitate the event. One of the major responsibilities of the group is the development of the workshop plan which will detail the evaluative topic, purpose, key evaluation questions to be answered in the workshop and outline the process for the workshop and the preparation required.

The development of the workshop plan is a critical stage where the information needs for the evaluative exercise are clarified, a process developed to answer those information needs, and where the key stakeholders in the intervention can agree what they want to get out of the workshop.

It is essential that the TWG is made up of a strong team of individuals that know the programme well, understand evaluation and have a good understanding of how to run effective workshop processes.

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, 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 evaluative exercise;

- Programme owner/manager: an individual(s) with deep programme knowledge and understanding, and who is responsible for the programme;

- Sector specialist – 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;

- Facilitator – someone who is an experienced workshop facilitator and able to help design and facilitate effective and deep workshop processes.

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 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%202.2.2%20Peer%20Review%20of%20Evaluations%2017%2002%2016.pdf).

Many issues can trigger the need to conduct a rapid evaluative process as indicated in the Guideline on Rapid Evaluations. The initiator though is normally going to be the programme owners. The responsibility for managing the workshop may be given to the M&E unit to ensure objectivity and credibility of the evaluation exercise.

The facilitators can be internal or external to the organisation and should be individuals with sound experience in facilitating rich events.

5.2   Inviting the right mix of stakeholders

The success of the evaluative workshop is dependent on quality inputs from participants – and this depends on the right stakeholders being invited and attending. Typically, you want a mix of stakeholders who understand the policy background as well as implementation realities. This means a mix between higher level policy people, managers who are implementing the programme or policy on the ground, partners who are either involved or have a view on how it is working and beneficiaries involved, if they are able to spend the time. If they do join, make sure they can participate effectively and they are not a token presence (for example might you need a group operating in a local language). Alternatively have a special session with them prior to get their views.

5.3   Other preparatory work

Key elements of preparatory work are:

· Ensuring a budget is available for the workshop and possibly a facilitator;

· Establishing a TWG to formalise how the workshop will be organised and used (discussed earlier);

· Organising a skilled facilitator to facilitate the workshop (may need procurement);

· Planning for the workshop (see section 6);

· Inviting stakeholders, taking great care on the mix and skillsets;

· Sending out any background materials.

Depending on which option is chosen (with/without a progress report), some different preparatory work is required:

Option 1 – based on a progress report

With option 1 the quality of the evaluative work is dependent on having a substantive report from the programme. A possible short report version is in Annex 4 – this could either be the report itself, or a template used to capture information from a longer narrative report, but which should include the key tables. The programme in question will need to be advised in time for the need of the report, so that it can be prepared in time.

Option 2 – No progress report

Where there is no progress report, or where there is no theory of change (TOC) for the programme a preparatory step would be a theory of change workshop, against which the evaluative workshop would assess progress. This could either be the day before the main evaluative workshop so that some of the same stakeholders can be present, or a week or more before, where people develop the theory of change for the programme or policy as it was intended to operate. The Western Cape has a guideline on Theory of Change accessible at (insert link) and there are also additional guides that can help in developing a TOC.

For both cases

In both cases it would be advisable to send participants some background to the programme/policy, in case some are not familiar with it.

6. POSSIBLE STEPS

The set of steps involved in organising the evaluative workshop are likely to include:

1. Deciding on which evaluative processes would be best dealt with through this modality.

2. Finding a skilled facilitator and if necessary contracting them.

3. Initial meeting of TWG to review this guideline and agree on an approach, objectives, the model likely to be adopted (with progress report or without), discuss overall flow for the workshop, which are the stakeholders that need to be invited and to develop an action plan, venue.

4. Agreement on outline of the workshop (facilitator and TWG).

5. Contracting venue.

6. Invitation of stakeholders using the outline programme, e.g. with a letter from the Director General.

7. Development of the facilitator programme for the event (facilitator, possibly with TWG).

8. If appropriate, organising a TOC workshop prior to the main workshop.

9. Running through the facilitator programme for the event the day before so all those contributing are well prepared (Facilitator and TWG).

10. Running the event successfully.

11. Writing up the product of the workshop to provide a report which summarises progress, challenges, lessons and recommendations for the future.

Action point:

During the workshop plan for the facilitation team to meet at lunchtime and each evening. At lunchtime this should be a quick check that all is running well and any issues for the afternoon. After the session this should be a deeper reflection on the day and any changes needed for the following day.

7. LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATIVE WORKSHOP METHODOLOGY

As 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 evaluative information.

- While this methodology generates useful evidence on the performance of interventions which can be very valuable for formative evaluations, this does not have the rigour of a full scale evaluation and so where that rigour is essential, either a rapid evaluation or a full evaluation may be needed. This is discussed in more detail on pages 4-5 of the DPME Guideline on Rapid Evaluation.

- The TWG must have at least one experienced facilitator who can guide the process to ensure it is rich and a valuable learning experience.

Signed

Mr Robert Nkuna
Director-General
Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
Date: 03/11/2020

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).

3. DPME (2020), Guideline on Rapid Evaluation, Pretoria: Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.

4. Western Cape Government (2019), Guideline on Developing a Theory of Change, Cape Town: Western Cape Department of the Premier.

ANNEXURE 1: EXAMPLE OF WORKSHOP AGENDA IN OPTION 1, BASING ON A PROGRESS REPORT

National Youth Policy Evaluative Workshop 6-7 December 2017

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: Name All
9.00	Welcome and rationale for the process	Participants understand the purpose of the workshop and where it comes from	Director General, Department
9.15	Introduction to process of the day/ introductions	Participants understand how the two days will evolve	Facilitator
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	Policy specialist
10.00	Discussion		Facilitator
10.30	Methodology	Participants understand the methodology we are applying and what they are expected to do in the workstreams	Evaluation specialist, DPME or custodian department
10.50	Coffee		
11.15	Workstreams	Each work stream has validated and refined the report including progress, activities, lessons, recommendations	Facilitators of workstreams
13.00	Lunch		
14.00	Continue		
16.15	Status report	Understand where each group is at	Facilitator
16.30	Closing		Nominated official
Day 2			
8.00	Arrival and coffee		
8.30	Reflections		Evaluation specialist, DPME or custodian department
8.45	Introduction to day		Director: Evaluation
9.00	Feedback by workstream	Participants have had an opportunity to interrogate and improve what each work stream has done	Facilitator
11.00	Coffee		
11.20	Continue		
11.50	Cross-cutting issues	Considered lessons and recommendations re cross-cutting issues: • Collaboration with private sector • Performance of government departments • Institutionalisation of Policy • Other	
13.00	Lunch		
14.00	Theory of change	Participants have reflected on achievement or not of the Theory of Change	Facilitator role
15.00	Recommendations overall	Participants have agreed key cross-cutting recommendations	Facilitator role
16:00	Way forward and closing	The way forward after the workshop is clear	Nominated official (preferably at DDG level)
16.15	Depart		

ANNEXURE 2: GROUP TASKS FOR OPTION 1

Group task by workstream – where there is a report

Background

The work streams 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 work stream and the task.

3. Outcome Facilitators/Outcome Managers 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 work stream – where there is no report

Background

The work streams are intended to validate or develop the report on each work stream, and assess performance

Objective

Each work stream 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 3: EXAMPLE OF FACILITATORS' PROGRAMME FOR OPTION 1 WORKSHOP

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 National Youth Development Agency (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	Resource
8.00	Arrival and registration			All	
9.00	Welcome and rationale for the process	Participants understand the purpose of the workshop and where it comes from	Welcome	Facilitator	
9.15	Introduction to process of the day/ introductions	Participants understand how the two days will evolve	1. Do generic introductions – ask people to put up their hands if work for national depts. Etc. 2. Introduce flow of the day	Facilitator	PowerPoint with objectives and flow
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: 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)	Policy Specialist	Policy Document M&E Framework Targets from the Implementation Strategy Copy of Theory of change (TOC)
10.00	Discussion			Facilitator	
10.30	Methodology	Participants understand the methodology we are applying and what they are expected to do in the workstreams	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)	Evaluation official	
10.50	Coffee				

Time	Session	Objective	Process	Responsible	Resource
11.15	Workstreams	Each workstream has validated and refined the report including progress, activities, lessons, recommendations	Where there is a report: 1. Facilitators 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) Where there is no report: 1. Facilitators 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)		
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	1. Present a summary of the report by workstream (10 mins) 2. Discussion (10 mins)	Rapporteur for workstream	
15.50	Way forward and closing	The way forward after the workshop is clear	Detail process of finalising report and presenting the findings	Senior Manager	
16.00	Depart				

ANNEXURE 4: EXAMPLE OF TEMPLATE FOR CAPTURING RESPONSES PER WORKSTREAM/THEMATIC AREA

Report on progress with National Youth Policy

Economy Workstream

Overall assessment of performance

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

Workstream Title	Economic participation and transformation		
Number as per M&E framework	1	Score	Use scale in table

Outcomes

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
Increase in youth with relevant skills and learning outcome to meet the present and future needs of the country for improved economic growth	Unemployment rate % of young people between the ages of 15-35	No of people in public employment, youth service	Quarterly Labour Force Survey, StatsSA Quality of Life Survey, GCRO	Between Q1 and Q 2 of 2017 dropped slightly from 49,5% to 49,2% (QLF), between July 2016 and July 17 was an increase in unemployment from 48,6 to 49,2%.
	Rate of NEET of people 15-35		Quarterly Labour Force Survey, StatsSA Dept. of Labour (DoL) and NYDA on jobseekers	For people aged 15-24 who are NEETs, African males Q3 of 2017, rate is 28,4%, African females 34,7%, compared to 28,6% for Q3 2016, and African females 34,8%. Hence slightly worse now for African males. No 25-34 year data in QLFS. DoL/NYDA data would indicate trends but may not be statistically representative.
	Level to which economic or wealth expectations of young people are met		Social Attitudes Survey of HSRC.	No evidence – unlikely to be good

Outcomes	Outcome indicators	Suggested targets in Implementation Strategy	Means of verification	Progress to date
1. Increase participation in PEP (EPWP, CWP and Public service)	% of young people employed in public service	Target is 40% youth	Persal data, DPSA NT for Municipalities? SOEs? – DPE, NT? Employment Equity report to DOL for SOEs, and departments	DPSA study showed that young people see government as last point of employment. Is this still true?
	% of EPWP participants who are youth		DPW data	36,8% of national EPWP are youth according to DPW (Q1 of 2017), Q2 41,8%. Year on year decreaseQ2 of 2016 was 43,9%
2. Increase support and enabling environment for existing youth owned businesses and coops	No of youth participating in DBSD small enterprise programmes	Target is 30%	DBSD mainstreaming quarterly reports	DSBD to send data showing trend.
	No of young entrepreneurs supported by NYDA and DSBD and EDD			
	No of youth participating in DTI supported programmes		DTI admin data	Check what data can be obtained and what action might be needed by DTI
	Value of DFIs contribution to youth-owned enterprise		IDC data, Land Bank Jobs Fund, SEFA, NEF	EDD to check
	% of expenditure for youth set aside targets in specific sectors	Target is 10% for youth	NT data (note provincial Treasury sends out in Gauteng)	Tshepo 1 to send example of Gauteng
	Level of inclusion of labour and the private sector or businesses in target setting for the youth employment accord		Report of Accord Commission	The youth employment accord does have some targets for government but not private sector. Much more effort is needed to get the private sector to commit to targets for youth.
3. Increased exposure of youth to internship programmes	No of interns successfully placed in government departments and SOEs	(DPSA target is 2%). There was also a SONA target for 1m young people in learnerships and internships	DPSA data	Check DPSA data – also need to check value/quality of internships.
	No of interns 18-25 placed in government departments who receive employment within 2 years after completion of internship		Survey to HR departments (but who will pay)	Could be a survey of HR departments of which interns retained, or of interns to see what has happened to them.
4. Increased youth interventions to support youth participation in ag and mining	No of youth participating in mining projects implemented by DMR			Check whether mining communities initiative is tracking this
	% of young agricultural producers supported		DAFF data Land Bank	Check if this data is tracked

Activities undertaken to date

1. None of the participants at the 6 December workshop had been part of the workstream and were not aware of what has happened to date.

Key challenges/successes

Challenges	Successes
How do we get all this information? Too many reporting lines and templates not in sync.	Harambee Youth Enterprise Programme
The age definitions are not the same in all departments, e.g. in Defence they use 18-25	Gauteng has good partnerships with private sector organisations e.g. Microsoft as part of Tshepo 1 million, which is a programme targeting young people with 4 pillars – skills, experiential learning, enterprise development and work placements. About 450 000 young people have been through. 10 000 bursaries mobilise in Gauteng through a partner.
Weak coordination e.g. challenge of multiple departments and schemes supporting entrepreneurship.	IDC/SEFA has dedicated R1 billion youth fund, in partnership with NYDA.
How measure partnerships with private sector, e.g. on youth SMME funding. There are many MOUs with different organisations.	
Private sector does not seem to be investing in this area, unless funded by government.	
Young people not aware of what government is doing.	

Risks

Key risks to the workstream	Likelihood	Impact	Control measure	Proposed changes to control measures
If economy declines further because of downgrades etc.				
Private sector not becoming involved in a meaningful way				
Lack of political buy-in or will across government to taking forward this policy seriously				

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

Lessons

1. Too fragmented at present, with weak reporting lines and accountability, and lack of understanding and overall picture of the theory of change.

2. Must have targets and baselines to measure progress against.

ANNEXURE 5: POSSIBLE PROGRAMME FOR WORKSHOP WHERE THERE IS NO PRIOR REPORT

Evaluative Workshop on Programme/Policy X Date

Background

Outcome

By the end of the workshop we have assessed the performance of X programme to date since its inception 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

- Overall is the theory of change working, and what is needed to strengthen it

Preparation prior

Reading a background document on the programme.

A Theory of change session is undertaken prior to draw out the theory of change as the programme was planned. This could also be the day before with some of the same participants.

Programme

Time	Session	Objective	Responsible
Day 1			
8.00	Arrival and registration		Facilitator: Name
9.00	Welcome and rationale for the process	Participants understand the purpose of the workshop and where it comes from	Senior manager, DPME or custodian department
9.15	Introduction to process of the day/ introductions	Participants understand how the two days will evolve	Evaluation specialist, DPME or custodian department
9.30	Introduction to programme X	Participants are reminded on the background and structure of the programme and its Theory of Change (if such exists) and its M&E framework	Programme manager
10.00	Discussion		Facilitator
10.30	Methodology	Participants understand the methodology we are applying and what they are expected to do in the workstreams	Evaluation specialist from DPME or custodian department
10.45	Introduction to group work	Participants understand the task and are ready to start after coffee	Facilitator
10.50	Coffee		
11.15	Critiquing the theory of change (in groups)	Each workstream has validated and refined the theory of change	Groups
12.15	Feedback		Facilitator
13.00	Lunch	Facilitators refine the theory of change	
14.00	Presentation on TOC to be assessed against	The group has agreed a version of the TOC to evaluate against	Facilitator
14.15	Group work on components of the theory of change	Groups have considered the outcomes achieved against this component/wider – intended/unintended (using sources of evidence)	Groups
15.15	Tea		
15.30	Feedback on outcomes – agreement on overall achievement	The overall outcomes achieved against this component/wider – intended/unintended are agreed and how this can be verified	Facilitator
16.20	Checkout	Participants have expressed how they are feeling	Facilitator
16.30	Closing		Senior manager
Day 2			
8.00	Arrival and coffee		Facilitator
8.30	Recap and introduction to the day		
9.00	Groups work on outputs	Groups have considered • The outputs related to the outcome (using sources of evidence) and how far these have been achieved • Whether the assumptions held or not • The main facilitators/barriers • Suggestions for improvements	Facilitator
11.00	Coffee		Facilitator
11.20	Feedback on outputs	The broad picture of achievement at output level is developed, the main facilitators/barriers and how these need to be addressed, as well as any proposed changes to the TOC	
12.20	Identification of problem areas where work is needed (or opportunities which need to be expanded)	Problem areas where further work is needed are identified (in buzz groups and then processing)	Facilitator

Time	Session	Objective	Responsible
12.55	Introduction to group task	Participants understand the task after lunch	
13.00	Lunch		Facilitator
14.00	Group work on problem areas/ opportunities	Participants have proposed ways that problem areas are addressed going forward, and whether this requires changes to the TOC	Facilitator
15.00	Recommendations on addressing problems or opportunities	Participants have agreed key cross-cutting recommendations	Programme manager
16.00	Way forward	The way forward after the workshop is clear	Senior Manager
16.10	Closing		
16.15	Depart		