



Evaluation Report Feedback/Second Final Draft Report of the Design Evaluation: **Draft Policy on Community Colleges 2014**

Report Version: Second Final	Report Date: March 2015	
General Feedback	Summary: (one line of the general feedback provided below)	
	1. The report correctly identifies the problems associated with the PCC 2. The report (especially the international review) provides very good insights into the notions of CCs, worldwide 3. However, there are many weaknesses with the technical dimensions of the report: a. Ideally the report should be structured to address the key evaluation questions by triangulating different methods and sources. As it stands, it is difficult to see how insights from different sources were brought together to respond to the key evaluation questions. This does not mean that the report should be re-written. For now, it can only serve as an observation. b. The executive summary needs to be reworked – there is no flow and logic. It needs to mention that the evaluation was commissioned by the DPME etc. It needs to explain the context and the notion of function shift more clearly. A reader will not quite understand what the report is about by reading the exec summary. c. The report is not properly referenced (sources are not reflected in many instances) d. The methodological approach should have been explained a bit more (reference was made to Patton later in the section, but was not explained properly) e. The report is weighed too heavily towards the literature review (about 30 pages) as compared to interviews (about 5 pages) and the actual interrogation of the policy document (about 9 pages). One cannot understand this, especially since the task team on CC had already undertaken an extensive literature review of the same issue not too long ago. 4. There is one content issue that I feel has been missed altogether from the report, namely reference to the Constitutional amendment to shift the function of PALCs from PEDs to DHET. The constitutional amendment was the 1st step towards reforming the adult education system in the country – was this the correct decision?	
Detailed Feedback	Feedback marked in tracked changes	Assessment (whether question answered ✖ or ✔)/ Comment (please see detailed comments)
Purpose of the Evaluation	The implementation evaluation is focused on implementation relative to programme objectives, assessment of the current design of the PCC and validation of the underlying Theory of Change, with a view to improving design and implementation in the new Financial Year.	✔ General purpose of the evaluation met
Evaluation Questions	1. Is the PCC internally coherent, and is it aligned with other relevant pieces of legislation?	✔ In general answered, but some gaps were noted as marked (✖)



	1.1. Does the policy read well? 1.1.1. Is it clear? 1.1.2. Is it accessible (written in plain English)? 1.1.3. Is it logical?	✗ Succinct answer required, with clear assessment indicated ✗ Succinct answer required, with clear assessment indicated ✗ Succinct answer required, with clear assessment indicated ✓
	1.2. On what is its conceptualisation (logic) founded? 1.2.1. what needs identification process was followed re: the stated challenge of youth and adults? 1.2.2. How was/were the policy gap(s) identified? 1.2.3. What sub-policies are envisaged to complement the PCC?	✓ Answered ✓ Answered ✓ ✗ Not answered adequately
	1.3. Is there well-researched evidence that points towards the necessity for a policy?	✓ Answered
	1.4. To what extent were there effective and inclusive policy consultations with sector stakeholders? 1.5. To what extent is there alignment of the PCC with the Constitution (1996), the White Paper on Education and Training (1995), and other legislation, and existing policy in the education/skills development sectors? 1.6. Is there overlap, or the danger of duplication? 1.7. Is the PCC presently reflected in the strategy of the DHET? 1.8. Has a sectoral institutional review been undertaken in relation to programmes targeting youth and adults? 1.9. In terms of a direct policy comparison, how does the PCC differ from the ABET (2000) and FET Colleges (2006)/FET Colleges Amendment (2012) Acts?	✓ Answered, although a little more could be offered ✓ Answered ☐ Unsure whether answered ✓ Answered ✗ Not adequately answered ✓ Answered, although a clear summary statement to this sub-question is required
	1.10. Is there cross-sectoral alignment of the PCC with UN commitments and other international agreements?	✗ Not answered
	2. Is the PCC's theory of change (logic) appropriate, and is it sufficiently robust to address the problems that have been identified in the policy?	✓ Answered, although a very clear and succinct assessment summary is required
	2.1. What is the PCC's underlying theory of change? (If it doesn't exist, the service provider will prepare one). 2.2. Test the theory of change for conceptual clarity. What are the critical assumptions underlying the PCC?	✓ ✗ Answered, but incorrect from a technical perspective – there is an underlying theory of change, and it is the task of the team to unearth it. Even if flawed! The prepared one (subject to our comments provided) offered must, therefore, offer the corrected theory of change. (Comments offered on draft logframe, and whether it can be used as the basis for programme planning. The underlying theory of change has, therefore, not been tested and critiqued. This needs to be done, and the draft one prepared, must be posed as an alternative, based on the critique of the underlying theory of change. The underlying assumptions of the PCC must be clearly articulated
	2.3. To what extent does the policy as articulated address its stated needs? 2.4. Is there a policy logframe? (If this does not exist, the service provider must draft one). 2.5. To what extent does the logframe comply with the design requirements in terms of soundness, technical correctness and readiness as the basis for programme planning? 2.6. Are the results (outcomes and impact as defined) of the PCC appropriate? 2.7. Describe and detail any disjuncture between existing policy, and the new shift implied in the introduction of the PCC.	✓ Answered ✓ Answered, although the logframe must be redrafted based on the comments provided ✓ Please see comments provided in tracked changes ✓ The sub-question 2.6 deals with the intended results of the draft PCC. The argument presented is that the PCC in its current form cannot deliver on any significant development-oriented results (outcomes and impact) except the legal transfer of the function from provinces to national sphere. This needs to come across more



		forcibly in the policy summary, the executive summary, the executive report and the comprehensive report.
	2.8. Are there any cross-cutting issues not adequately reflected in the PCC? (for example, gender, human rights, and inclusivity.)	✗ Cross-cutting issues not dealt with adequately
	3. To what extent is the PCC measurable, and therefore capable of being evaluated in the future?	✓ ✗ A clearer answer must be formulated on how to take the draft PCC in its current form, to a point how to ensure that the PCC in future will be measureable. Not too much detail, but quite specific. A starting point is for the team to define measurability, and to indicate what is required to be in place for a policy to be “measurable”
	3.1. To what extent is policy delivery of the PCC in the future measurable, as presently defined?	✓
	3.2. Which complimentary actors (stakeholders) would contribute to the results of the policy besides the DHET?	✗ Not dealt with. Please attend to
	3.3. What would their contributions be, and to what extent does that have implications for policy coordination and programmes delivery? Specify these.	✗ Here is an opportunity to create space for NGOs to engage around the policy, and also remain involved in implementation of the PCC going forward
	4. To what extent is the PCC ready to be implemented? That is, is there sufficient evidence that the resources and capabilities required to implement the policy, are in place and are adequate to address the scale of the policy challenge? How can the PCC be improved?	✓
	4.1. To what extent is the PCC able to be operationalised – with specific reference to institutional support, funding, human resourcing, etc.? Provide evidence that the resources and capabilities required to implement the policy, are in place and are adequate to address the scale of the policy challenge.	✗ We need a clearer indication that current resourcing of the draft PCC will be inadequate. At least some kind of ball-park figure for an ideal (yet practical) budget for the policy, versus current rough estimates of how much is currently available for the policy implementation. There is clearly “function shift” that has taken place, so there must be some idea of current funding. ✗ The policy identification fiche is inadequate – requires significant work.
	4.2. Is the PCC legally ready to be implemented?	✓ Function shift is addressed legally, but it is clear that the draft PCC in its current form does not speak to the policy content dimension of Community Colleges going forward
	4.3. In what form will the DHET migrate the existing policy into the emerging community education sector?	
	4.4. To what extent does the PCC balance standardization versus flexibility?	
	4.5. What is the implementation strategy for the PCC? (Identify key options, highlight the proposed option, and outline and account for its recommendation.)	✗ The team can do more here, with some “blue sky” thinking. Surely there are some basic and some good ideas regarding an implementation strategy for the PCC, even if currently the DHET may be silent on this question at the moment. At the least some options could be outlined, and one identified as the most practical.
	4.6. Is there strong ownership of the PCC by the DHET and PEDs (provinces)? Is there sufficient institutional and management capacity to implement the PCC?	✓ ✗ Only partially answered. A clearer statement on institutional and management capacity is required.
	4.7. What is the envisaged method of implementation? (The PCC will be funded as part of the DHET budget appropriation).	✗ Not answered. And not to be confused with implementation strategy. Implementation strategy refers to the broad options available to the DHET going forward. Method of implementation refers to how (under conditions of the centralization of function shift to national) how a more comprehensive PCC may be implemented by the service delivery-oriented DHET, possibly even in partnership with non-state actors such as NGOs.