**Skills for Prosperity Programme – Kenya (S4PKe) Final Evaluation Report**

**QUICK FACTS**

**Countries:** Kenya

**Evaluation date:** 31 March 2023

**Evaluation type:** Project

**Evaluation timing:** Final

**Administrative Office:** Country Office Dare Salam

**Technical Office:** DWT Pretoria

**Evaluation manager:** Ndombi, Aggrey

**Evaluation consultant(s):** Dr. Sebastian Njagi Runguma- Lead

Dr. Paul Machocho Wanyek team member

**DC Symbol:** KEN/20/02/LCH

**Donor(s) & budget:** FCDO USD 906,429.79

*Key Words: skills, people with disabilities, Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET)*

## BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

| | |
|---|---|
| **Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure** | Leonard Cheshire (LC) together with seven other organizations formed the Skills for Prosperity-Kenya (S4PKe) consortium in 2020 to implement the S4PKe programme between October 2020 and March 2023 with funding from FCDO under the UK Prosperity Fund. The consortium comprised Leonard Cheshire, UK (LC) as the lead agency, International Labour Organization (ILO), The Open University (OU), Federation of Kenya Employers (FKE), Federation of African Women Educationists **(**FAWE), Capital Strategies, Edukans, and Warwick University[1]. |
| | S4PKe is part of the global Skills for Prosperity Programme (S4P), which draws on the United Kingdom (UK) expertise to improve the equity, quality, and relevance of higher education (HE) and Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) provision. The programme aimed at achieving change for and addressing challenges facing young people in Kenya by bringing together stakeholders and organisations to increase inclusive and mutually beneficial economic development resulting from greater and more equitable employability and productivity. Its interventions were organised under three pillars: equity, quality and relevance of education and skills training in higher education institutions (HEIs), TVET institutions, and Vocational Rehabilitation Centres (VRCs). It pursued three outcomes (one per pillar), three intermediate results (one per pillar) and three immediate results (one per pillar). |
| | Leonard Cheshire managed the overall implementation including the Integration of crosscutting areas of Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI), Economic Inclusion (EI), Disability Inclusion (DI) and safeguarding across HEIs, TVET institutions, VRCs and among the TVET agencies[2] targeted in the programme. The ILO led the TVET/VRC component that entailed capacity building and strengthening of policies and systems in the TVET eco-system (included TVET institutions, VRCs, and TVET agencies). The OU led the HE component that focused on digital education capacity building and mentorship of HEIs staff (leaders/managers, educators/lecturers and support staff). |
| | The initial programme design underwent substantial change at the end of the inception period (initial 6 months). This entailed a revision of the theory of change, scope of work, and focus of the programme. The revision was necessitated by changes in the priorities of FCDO and the Government of Kenya |

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

2

|  | (GOK)[3]. In the revised design, S4PKe focused mainly on technical assistance and systems strengthening targeting mainly higher education institutions (HEIs), TVET institutions, vocational rehabilitation centres (VRCs) and TVET agencies.

The endline evaluation of the programme took place between January and mid-March 2023 and covered the entire implementation period (October 2020 to March 2023), with a concentrated focus on the re-designed programme. The evaluation sought to provide information on the level of achievement of performance targets and the effectiveness of S4PKe interventions. It focused on ten evaluation objectives and thirty key questions contained in the evaluation terms of reference.

The evaluation report is based on data collected through multiple research methods, which included extensive desk review, interviews, and field observations. Primary data were obtained from 752 evaluation participants selected through a combination of random, purposive, and snowballing sampling methods among S4PKe's stakeholder groups. Of the total number of evaluation participants, 433 (58%) were male, 319 (42%) were female, while 164 (22%) were persons with disabilities[4]. A vast majority of the evaluation participants (573 representing 76% of the total sample) were learners from HEIs (5)[5], TVET institutions (7) and VRCs (2). The rest of the sample (179 respondents representing 24%) were mainly key informants from sample institutions (HEIs, TVET institutions and VRCs), TVET agencies, government officials, industry sector players, S4PKe staff, FCDO representatives and other S4Pke stakeholder groups.

A vast amount of the evaluation data were qualitative and these were analysed using the thematic content analysis technique. Stata version 16 and Ms Excel were used to analyse quantitative data obtained in the evaluation. These processes yielded the findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the report. |
|---|---|
| **Present situation of the project** | This was a 2.5 years project funded by FCDO and is scheduled to end on the 31st March, 2023. |

.

| Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation | This end line evaluation was intended to serve learning and accountability purposes. It sought to provide information on the level of achievement of performance targets and the effectiveness of S4PKe interventions among the target groups and institutions and within the target counties and nationally. The specific objectives of the evaluation were to: |
|---|---|
| | 1. Establish the relevance of the programme design and implementation strategy in relation to the United Nations (UN), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), DWCP (Decent Work Country Programme), ILO and national development frameworks. |
| | 2. Provide a comprehensive measurement of the S4PKe's results against the intended intermediate outcomes and outcomes, in particular improving skill levels, employment rates and productivity for women, low-income youth and persons with disabilities in Kenya, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including implementation modalities chosen. |
| | 3. Understand the drivers, enablers and barriers to specific sub-groups (women, low-income youth and persons with disabilities) targeted by the programme. |
| | 4. Understand how and how well the programme adapted the design and implementation of activities and outputs, and the degree to which these activities and outputs achieved their desired effects at outcome level. |
| | 5. Understand how and how well the programme included and supported women, low-income youth and persons with disabilities, (specifically, capture changes in safeguarding, inclusion and gender-sensitive practices within the target institutions - HE and TVETs) and has contributed to increasing equity, quality and relevance and improving skill levels, employment rates and productivity. |
| | 6. Identify unexpected positive and negative results of the programme. |
| | 7. Describe and assess the lasting impact that the programme has had and will have (or can reasonably be expected to have) at the level of communities and systemically. |
| | 8. Draw lessons and good practices from the process, design, implementation, successes, and failures of the programme to inform the key stakeholders (i.e., national stakeholders, partners' beneficiaries and the donor) for future similar interventions and support with the dissemination of evaluation findings and lessons from the programme. |

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL   types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

| | |
|---|---|
| | 9. Provide recommendations to programme stakeholders to promote sustainability and support further development of the programme outcomes. |
| | 10. Assess the extent to which the programme outcomes will be sustainable. |
| **Methodology of evaluation** | The evaluation applied a utilization-focused[6], systematic and participatory approach in its planning, execution, and reporting. Further, the evaluation process was organised and conducted under four inter-linked phases: inception/planning, data collection, data analysis, and reporting and feedback. Each of these phases had specific activities and deliverables and the tasks were organized logically. The evaluation task manager and reference team comprising key staff from the S4PKe consortium remained in touch with the evaluation team throughout the four phases. |
| | The evaluation team comprised the Consultant, Associate Consultant, twelve research assistants, and two disability experts who supported data collection among some of the persons with disabilities in the sample institutions, and one data analyst and manager. The Consortium Evaluation Task Manager and other members of the evaluation reference group[7] oversaw the evaluation process. |
| | The evaluation team triangulated data, data sources and methods of data collection and analysis in answering the evaluation questions. Both the key and specific questions were aligned to the evaluation objectives and the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) evaluation criteria. These two elements guided the development of the data collection tools, data analysis, and the presentation of key findings contained in this report. |
| | A mixed-methods approach was adopted where quantitative and qualitative data were collected by the evaluation team from secondary and primary sources to respond adequately to the evaluation questions and to meet the evaluation objectives. |

---

[6] This evaluation sought to produce evaluation results that meets the needs of intended users.

[7] These comprised core S4PKe staff from each of the consortium member.

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

5

Validity was achieved by subjecting research tools to a thorough process of expert reviews to improve on content, construct, and criterion validity. Draft data collection tools prepared by the consultant were shared with the evaluation reference group for review and approval. The face validity was assured through alignment of the language, tone and formatting of the tools to the data needs.

Reliability of the data was assured through appropriate targeting of evaluation participants with the correct tools, and the piloting of the tools at the Paramount Chief Kinyanjui Technical Training Institute in Nairobi County. This included the pre-testing of electronic data collection tools, notably questionnaires hosted on the Kobo Collect Platform. After piloting, internal consistency was checked and appropriate amendments made. Reliability of data was further enhanced by the appropriate administration of data collection tools by the evaluation team drawing on insights from a two-day methodology training conducted prior to the commencement of fieldwork. The reliability of electronic technology deployed in the evaluation (Kobo Collect Platform) was determined and modified as appropriate.

## 2.2 Sampling

Selection of representative samples of evaluation participants was accomplished mainly through random and purposive sampling methods using sampling frames provided by the consortium members. Random sampling was used to select trainees/learners in sample HEIs, TVET institutions and VRCs while purposive sampling augmented with snowballing was used to select key informants from the target HEIs, TVET institutions and VRCs; S4PKe staff; officials from TVET agencies and the ministries of education and labour at the national and county levels; and other stakeholders of the programme.

### Data Collection and Management

Secondary data were collected from S4PKe documents as well as external sources including GoK reports, media reports, blogs, and institutional websites. Desk review was used as key source of evaluation data and was the starting point in data collection. Annex 8 provides a list of the documents reviewed.

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

6

Diverse primary data sets were obtained from key stakeholders of S4PKe identified in Chapter 1. These included learners (women, low-income youth, and persons with disabilities), administrators (managers/leaders), academic staff, and support staff in the sample HEIs, TVET institutions, and VRCs.

The evaluation team carried out fieldwork between the 4th week of February up to Mid-March 2023. Fieldwork commenced simultaneously among the different evaluation participant categories in the sample institutions, and at the county and national levels. The evaluation team made introduction meetings (courtesy calls) to the heads of the sample institutions.

Methods of data collection used were key informant interviews, questionnaires in both physical and electronic formats[8], and non-participant observations in the sample HEIs, TVET institutions, and VRCs.  Prior to field work, the evaluation team participated in a two-day methodology training aimed at achieving a common understanding of the evaluation objectives, responsibilities, data collection methods and tools, sampling, ethical issues, and other aspects of the evaluation. During the first day of the training, LC facilitated a session on gender equality and social inclusion (GESI), Disability Inclusion (DI), Economic Inclusion (EI), Safeguarding policy, code of conduct, and other relevant policies. This was followed by the pre-test, refinement and approval of the data collection tools.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data were analysed using the thematic content analysis (TCA) technique. Here, data from the various sources was synthesized to identify commonly occurring themes from opinions, feelings and experiences expressed during the key informant interviews, group interviews, non-participant observations, and secondary data. The TCA data analysis process resulted in data display matrices summarising data analysis results for each tool. These matrices serve as evidence and source of qualitative findings and are presented in the main report.

The quantitative data were analysed using Stata version 16 for the descriptive statistics and visualizations were done using Ms Excel. The data analysis results

---

[8] Leaners in HEI, TVET institutions and VRCs with visual, physical or mental impairment could not participate effectively in the evaluation (completing the online questionnaire) disability specialists and care givers of persons with disabilities supported the learners in filling of the learner's questionnaire.

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL   types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

7

were in the form of tables with frequencies, mean, proportions, and cross-tabulations. Annex 9 provides select tables, figures, and excerpts from the data analysis process.

| | |
|---|---|
| **MAIN FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS** | 1. Internal coherence demonstrated by alignment with the aim and objectives of the Global Skills for Prosperity Fund; priorities and interventions by LC (GESI, EI), ILO (decent work and labour issues), and OU (Digital/online education). |

1. Internal coherence demonstrated by alignment with the aim and objectives of the Global Skills for Prosperity Fund; priorities and interventions by LC (GESI, EI), ILO (decent work and labour issues), and OU (Digital/online education).
2. External coherence demonstrated by alignment with the aspirations of Kenya Vision 2030 (employment, gender equality, wealth creation, among others); GoK policies and priorities relating to gender equality, youth and women empowerment, affirmative action, quality digital education provision, OUK, TVET sector, employment); and UN and global commitments, especially SDGs: Goal 1 (no poverty), Goal 4 (quality education), Goal 5 (gender equality), Goal 8 (decent work and economic growth) and Goal 10 (reduced inequalities).
3. The programme aligned and responded well to the socio-cultural, economic, political and policy context it operated.
4. The revised ToC was in line with the stated objectives and expected results and led to improvement in programme implementation and results.
5. Results that are reported in programme records are an accurate record of achievement.
6. There are outstanding achievements in all components of S4PKe.
7. S4PKe performed well, especially the HE component.
8. S4PKe results align or support the revised theory of change.
9. There are positive views and satisfaction with services and benefits produced so far.
10. S4Pke succeeded in raising awareness and promoting GESI, EI and safeguarding among HEIs, TVET institutions, VRCs and other stakeholder groups it engaged.
11. Several external factors, including substantial budget cut and effects of COVID-19 affected programme performance.
12. Mitigation measures adopted by the consortium against COVID-19 pandemic and other hindrances during the implementation phase were adequate.
13. S4PKe did produce unintended positive results, particularly for HEIs. However, there were three negative effects and there is no evidence these have been mitigated adequately.

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

8

14. S4Pke did not directly engage women, low-income youth and persons with disabilities in its interventions despite these being its core beneficiaries. It was however an effective technical assistance programme which strengthened systems, services and offerings that will benefit these target groups.

## RECOMMENDATIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

| Main findings & Conclusions | RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|
| | 1. FCDO, and GoK (MoE and MoL) should consider developing and implementing a second phase of the programme to enable the consolidation and expansion of the gains of the evaluated intervention (High priority). |
| | 2. Government of Kenya (MoE, MoL and TVET agencies) should consider institutionalising and cascading the various principles (notably GESI, EI and safeguarding), policies, standards, products, services and benefits from S4PKe interventions with a view to sustainability (High priority). |
| | 3. FCDO should in future provide adequate funding, appropriate financing mechanism and timely disbursement of funds to implementing partners to facilitate smooth activity implementation (High priority). |
| | 4. Government of Kenya (MoE, MoL and TVET agencies) should through policy intervention on GESI and EI enhance inclusivity in the access of benefits from similar programmes for marginalised groups, especially persons with disabilities (High priority). |
| | 5. Government of Kenya (MoE, MoL and TVET agencies) should formalise the NOUK ambition and explore ways of enhancing digital education in HEIs, TVET institutions and VRCs. This include creating a link between relevant HE and TVET regulators at MoE (notably CUE and TVETAs) and the HEIs, TVET institutions and VRCs, (High priority). |
| | 6. Government of Kenya should support building the capacity in assistive technology for persons with disabilities (both students and staff) (High priority). |
| | 7. Implementing agencies should utilise various measures such as launch meetings to enhance the visibility of similar interventions (Medium priority). |
| | 8. FCDO along with other international donors and implementing partners should consider packaging similar programmes into phases of approximately 3 years of actual implementation rather than as short interventions (Medium priority). |
| | 9. Implementing agencies should ensure similar programmes have specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) change (impact and outcome) statements and indicators and select indicators that have more |

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

9

| | reliably published or available data, or that are within the implementing partners' control to obtain (Medium priority). |
|---|---|
| **Main lessons learned and good practices** | **Lessons** |
| | 1. The significant building of new skills and capabilities through the technical assistance and capacity building interventions has potential to benefit the intended core beneficiaries of the S4PKe programme - women, low-come youth and persons with disabilities - long after the S4pPKe programme. To maximise its direct impact, however, the programme could have prioritised and retained activities that directly engaged its core beneficiary groups – women, low-come youth and youth with disabilities. |
| | 2. Because S4PKe used a systemic approach, working within the existing systems and structures was essential for achieving the required results especially in view of various constraints: budget (reduced budget), limited implementation period (2.5 years), and human resources (lean staff portfolio). |
| | 3. Collaboration and partnerships with the industry can open opportunities for improved financing mechanisms to improve the quality, relevance, and skill experience of TVET and HE skills training programmes leading to a more responsive and productive workforce. |
| | 4. While planning and sharing activities with the beneficiary institutions, it was necessary to enter into binding MOUs other than operate under informal agreements. For example, S4PKe could have entered into MOUs with universities with clear ToRs. |
| | 5. Capacity building of key individuals and entities at national and institutional level involved in decision making, co-creation and implementation of programme intervention was an important mitigation measure against potential operational and implementation challenges that often undermine programme effectiveness. |
| | 6. Building flexibility in programme design and implementation was critical for remaining relevant and effective when operating within a challenging environment and in order to accommodate changes in the priorities of key stakeholders. |
| | 7. Universities have challenges in delivering online education to persons with disabilities hence a need for S4PKe to model and to build capacity on good use of pedagogies, and assistive technology for persons with disabilities for online learning. |
| | 8. Online learning can be particularly challenging but the use of inclusive pedagogies, accessible platforms, and the provision of support, enable participants with disabilities to complete the programme successfully at comparative rates with those who did not declare a disability. |

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL   types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

10

9. Attaining the desired change and impact in gender equality, social inclusion and promotion of skills and employability among women, low-income youth and persons with disabilities in the target counties and national level required longer time, substantial coordination and collaboration with actors at local and national levels in appropriate interventions.

10. Younger staff in universities were not competent in digital education matters contrary to the common perception that they competent in digital application since they are always online. There was a need to pay attention to this reality and include them when designing digital education programmes.

11. There was still resistance to the adoption of online classrooms, especially for subjects that required practical work. People still view online classes as having poor quality and leading to half-baked graduates, which will remain a challenge for those implementing digital education to continue to address, largely through good quality provision.

12. Ensuring impact and outcome indicator statements are clearer and easier to measure and more periodic outcome and impact monitoring would have enabled better measuring of programme progress.

13. A longer implementation period could have enabled more cascading of the training at institutional level as well as more time to realise gains from the capacity building and technical assistance.

14. The importance of having a dynamic local coordinator to support progress and implementation of the largely digital/remote activity on the ground.

15. The need to consider and manage expectations around digital vs printed certificates was important to some participants and their context.

16. The need to work with institutional leadership to secure support for time intensive capacity building initiatives, such as the 15 digital education projects, and ensure institutional incentives and support materialise.

17. Choosing and socialising the use of digital platforms to facilitate online discussion and collaboration, for example: (a) after participant feedback the HE capacity building programme switched from using Teams to Zoom as this was more familiar to participants and some felt it was more bandwidth friendly, however (b) while WhatsApp was the first choice and Facebook group a second choice for the 'community of practice' discussion and collaboration platform, we selected Facebook because WhatsApp was limited to too few participants at the time; Facebook group however has remained a barrier for some participants to fully engage with the Community of Practice.

**Good Practices**

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

11

1. *Building on the achievements, and ongoing government projects:* The programme built on existing government projects by providing technical assistance. This facilitated the government to quickly buy into the interventions and work together towards the realization of the government objectives.

2. *Undertaking organizational capacity assessments and training needs analysis of targeted institutions/agencies:* S4PKe carried out various research (capacity analysis) in all target agencies/institutions participating in the programme. This analysis looked at the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and how best the programme could come in to offer technical assistance. Insights form these analyses informed the design and implementation of planned activities.

3. *Adaptive management:* S4PKe worked within a dynamic environment hence the importance of flexibility in programme implementation in order to respond effectively to the changing external context. This was enabled by the appropriate adaptation of work plans.

4. *Elaborate programme documentation*: The consortium developed useful management documents and tools, such as MERL manual, communications and visibility plan, and VfM framework. These documents were essential for providing a common understanding and guidance on responsibilities, processes, and "how to do" the different components of the programme.

5. *Integration of GESI, economic inclusion, safeguarding and VfM in operational management:* GESI, EI and safeguarding remained an important measure for programmes that designed to benefit and empower vulnerable groups. S4PKe placed these at the centre of the programme design and implementation. Also, centering VfM in operational management was important for ensuring effective use of available resources, especially in light of substantial budget cut.

6. *Blending technology with physical activities:* This not only contributed to efficiency and VfM, but also enabled activities to take place within a challenging context, notably the challenges of COVID-19 and budget cut.

7. *Co-creation of learning products:* S4PKe co-created it services and products with other actors, and also used existing structures, policies and human resources (e.g. at MoE and TVET agencies) in support of its work. For instance, the ILO did not hire a consultant to develop most of the learning products but worked closely with departmental heads and knowledge experts to develop a CBET manual. This promoted ownership of the product within the TVET ecosystem because the products were relevant, contextual,

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

12

and responsive to the needs of the sub-sector. Co-creation of programme A and B was also experienced in the HE component. The mentoring of training participants by experts in relevant fields, enabled them to apply and develop their skills, and implement their significant digital education projects.

8. *Additional good practices emerging from the HE component:*

- Expert webinars enabled universities in Kenya to benefit from world-leading experts in various areas relevant to digital education.
- The use of appropriate digital education pedagogies and an accessible learning management system (LMS) meant that persons with disabilities performed just as well throughout the online HEI training / courses as those who did not declare a disability.
- The co-design of practical digital education projects meant (a) the training was tailored towards something specific that participants and their institutions wanted to achieve and (b) participants were motivated to make the most of the programme as an opportunity to achieve a project that was important to them.
- Well defined selection criteria that cut across key groups (leaders, educators, and technical support staff) has meant that a core group in each institution, representing various areas required to implement digital education, are trained, and can work together to contribute to the implementation of good quality digital education in their institution.
- Online courses often have online discussion groups or forums, however the establishment of a 'Community of Practice and Study' group, independent of the online course, meant that we were able to use this to start to develop a professional digital education Community of Practice (COP). MOE has appointed a technical working committee to support this online COP after the end of S4PKe and will be able to draw on COP expertise in establishing the new OUK.

This "internal evaluation" as per ILO/EVAL   types of evaluation of the ILO followed a formalized evaluation process managed by an officer of the Regional Programming Unit of the Regional Office for Africa of the ILO. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning.

13