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Extended Summary

The project
Like many sub-Saharan countries, Kenya’s education system has been unable to connect skills provision with market needs. Vocational education is perceived as inferior and it has been unable to address the specific challenges of marginalized youth. In response, Kenya’s Vision-2030 includes an emphasis on reforming its technical and vocational education sector as reflected in the 2013 TVET Act. Attention is becoming focused on competency-based education to enhance youth employment.

The CAP-Youth Empowerment Institute (CAP-YEI) introduced the Basic Employability Skills Training (BEST) model to Kenya in 2011 as part of a 5-year project funded by the MasterCard Foundation (MCF). The program targets rural and urban and peri-urban youth and provides short-term employability skills training courses that are labour market oriented and job placement linked. It emphasizes a life skills component for building self-confidence, work readiness and a desire for life achievement. The program integrates financial literacy into skills training and connects youth to institutional service providers for savings and finance. The BEST model fits squarely inside the competency-based education emphasis of the TVET Act as recommended in the Competency Based Education and Training (CBET) framework that has been introduced by the Ministry of Education.

Evaluation purposes
While this is the final evaluation of the 5-year project that ends in 2016, the findings also constitute inputs towards a subsequent project. This dual focus means that the evaluation is both summative in that it captures the achievements and lessons of the first project, and formative in that the findings will help shape the next project. This evaluation focuses on three broad “uses”: to document the program accomplishments and to understand its internal ‘magic’; to describe how the model fits the context and how the ‘ecosystem’ accommodates it as a holistic approach; and to utilize the findings and evaluation approach to improve the future program. Based on the “uses”, six evaluation questions were formulated to guide the data collection, along with five components or elements to guide the utilization of the process and findings.

Evaluation approach & methodology
The overall evaluation approach is based on a utilization-focused evaluation (UFE) decision-making framework: one that emphasizes ownership of the evaluation design by primary evaluation users. The primary evaluation user team was made up of staff from CAP-YEI in Nairobi, from the CAP Workforce Development Institute, and from the MCF in Toronto. The team was mentored to develop the evaluation ‘uses’ and the Key Evaluation Questions that drive this evaluation. They were involved in determining what data to collect, from whom, and in the selection of the data collection instruments. In accordance with UFE, they were also involved in an early review of findings. The “users” team reviewed the evaluators’ interpretation of findings, and as the last section of the report emphasizes, they were able to discern how the findings can be incorporated into the design of the next project.

The data collection process combined: site visits, documentation review (that included findings from the first four years of a University of Minnesota longitudinal study), focus group discussions
with key stakeholders, semi-structured interviews, SWOT analysis, and theory of change diagrams.

While this evaluation is driven by a UFE approach, it also aligned with the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria that were included in the original Request for Proposals (see Annex A for an excerpt about the alignment, copied from the Inception Report).

**Project accomplishments**
The project accomplishments are reported with emphasis on short-term outcomes. The evaluation focuses on decreased spheres of influence taken from the Outcome Mapping tool that acknowledges that a project can be held accountable for outputs and ‘expect-to-see’ outcomes. These elements can be measured in the short term (in this case during year 4 of a 5-year project). A number of ‘like-to-see’ outcomes that have already emerged are also described, but there was no attempt to track changes beyond that point due to the short duration of the evaluation as well as the realization that impact depends on many factors beyond the control of a project.

As of July 2015, 14 CAP-YEI centers were operational across Kenya, six were Demonstration Centers [premises operated by CAP-YEI] and eight were Replication Centers [where CAP-YEI provides the program inside a public or private institution]. The project includes approximately 60 staff (facilitators, coordinators and support). CAP-YEI has also offered a third delivery stream called Capacity Building, which provides training to trainers from the public education system who then adopt and apply the components of the BEST model in their training delivery to their students in the TVET institutions besides training other instructors without the involvement of CAP-YEI. During the four years of operation, 83 batches of students completed the program. A total of 3,223 graduated from demonstration centers, and 2,386 from replication centers. The dropout rate was 2.5%. Women constitute 40% of enrolment on average. The number of graduates from capacity building sites was 3,857, which brought the total to 9,466.

The overall rate of ‘job placement’ (employment) was 73.4% in the Demonstration and Replication Centers, with variations between them and across the four years of operation. The placement rate is higher for males (in six trades – Auto, Building, Carpentry, Hospitality, Electrical, and ITES), and higher for females in three trades (IGM, Clearing & Forwarding and Hair & Beauty). This distribution reflects the relative preferences that males and females have for these respective courses. The degree of youth confidence in the potential for the courses to lead to a job varied across sectors from 51.7% in building and construction, to 80% in security and 100% in floriculture. Nevertheless, most youth found employment with the support of the course facilitators and other contacts. So far, a smaller percent of youth have become entrepreneurs (between 4 and 6%). During the fourth year of the program, a total of 629 new businesses were started by program-trained youth. In some sectors (floriculture, security) over 90% were planning to open their own business in the future. The norm for many marginalized youth is that their incomes are often drawn from multiple sources by combining part-time self-employment with other income earning opportunities demonstrating “mixed livelihood” options made by them.

The graduates interviewed felt good about being associated with CAP-YEI. They said it had been very beneficial, not only for them as individuals, but also for other fellow youth. They felt that the program had been able to shape their character due to the good advice and training in life skills - hence they felt able to relate well with people and view life positively. Graduates in general expressed their gratitude because of how they have benefitted from the training in saving and
entrepreneurial skills that they were taught at CAP-YEI. They added that it had helped them become more proactive in business activities, thus improving their living standards and opened their minds to many opportunities.

At the individual level, the positive outcomes of the program include: youth viewed as role models, youth who have relocated from the family home to their own house, reflecting increased independence. Youth also indicated that they have been able to save and enroll in further education, they are able to look after their personal needs, some are becoming financially independent and have disposable incomes, and their social status has been elevated. At the family level, the positive outcomes include: include: youth able to afford to help their family acquire new assets, and they have gained respect in their community and have been able to support their families and increase their food security.

Most registered CAP-YEI students received financial literacy training that included encouragement to open bank accounts. As the result of the participation in the program, the average percentage of youth who opened a bank account during the four years of operation was 74.6%. Another strategy that is promoted by the program is the formation of savings groups. On average – during the four years of operation – 85 savings groups were formed each year.

Out of a sample of 228 youth surveyed (of whom half were male and half were female), 52.9% of males were employed and 47.1% of females were employed. More men held full time employment than women. Almost half of the youth who graduated from the program were earning a monthly income of between 5,000 and 10,000 KES, an amount which is equal to the Kenyan per capita monthly average wage, and close to 40% of youth were earning above the Kenyan per capita monthly average, and approximately 10% were earning below the Kenyan per capita monthly average. (At the time of writing 102 KES = 1 US$.)

For the first year, their average monthly income was estimated to be 10,767 KES and for the second year their average income was estimated to be 9,700 KES. The average length of employment was estimated to be seven months. Data is not yet available to assess longer-term employment results.

Based on the data collected, during the first two years, the youth who participated in the program generated approximately 67 Million KES in earnings from their employment, and approximately 4 Million KES from the businesses they operated.

The magic
The model engages stakeholders, especially employers, in a direct & purposeful manner throughout the entire process. During the Market Scan (Step 1), potential employers are asked to contribute data on employment possibilities and relevant skills sets. As the curriculum is being developed or revised (Step 2), they are consulted again. During the Road Shows (Step 3), there is engagement by local leaders, local administrators and civil society organizations (which can recommend student candidates). Some employers and local institutional representatives (e.g., from financial institutions) become mentors during the training (Step 5). The instructors keep in touch with employers with special attention paid to confirming internship opportunities (also referred to as ‘attachments’, lasting about a month, either paid or not) for Step 6 and placement during Step 8. This direct and purposeful engagement of stakeholders leads to building up a form of social capital for CAP-YEI: by engaging with the community, by listening to their needs and
responding directly, the program becomes known in each community. As such, the stakeholder interaction is part of the ‘magic’ and constitutes a “non-negotiable” element if the program is replicated. A ‘non-negotiable’ is an aspect of the model that this evaluation suggests is fundamental to its success and should not be cut when another institution implements it.

Beyond stakeholder engagement, the following elements of the program are contributors to the outcomes: offering a safe place to learn, combined with providing a set of life-skills -at the start- to enhance self-esteem, confidence, and a sense of worth. Ensuring the curriculum, and the skills provided, are grounded in the local needs of employers is central. Offering a course duration that meets the needs of a large number of disadvantaged youth has worked, although there have been calls for longer options in some sectors. Allowing students to obtain guidance from mentors from different sectors, and thus creating linkages with employers has been beneficial. The same applies to the benefits of meeting financial organizations, and other local leaders which students would not have been able to achieve on their own.

The model manages students’ expectations through exposure to work sites and to the working world through internships. It also provides advice as young entrepreneurs take the leap towards starting their own businesses. It encourages peer networking and group formation during the course and subsequent to graduation, and it engages graduates in recruitment and in mentoring, to serve as role models. All of the above elements are provided in the Demonstration Centers and Replication Centers; the evaluation did not collect evidence from any Capacity Building sites to enable a comparison. However, it is safe to say that in these sites, the above list would constitute a set of ‘non-negotiables’, which if absent, would lead to poorer outcomes. Attached to this report is a Step-by-Step summary detailing with how the BEST model is designed and delivered.

A contextually relevant, holistic model
The BEST model is relevant to global, regional and national level discussions on the role of technical and vocational education training. The model fits inside the Rio+20 Sustainable Development Goals and it responds to UNESCO’s best practices for TVETs. The BEST model responds to Kenya’s Vision-2030 and the commitment to a TVET transformation. The BEST model matches very closely the key elements and principles of the Competency Based Education and Training Framework (CBET) that the Government has recently introduced.

The model appears to be responding to Kenya’s needs. The 2009 Census Report for Kenya indicates that out of about 11 million youth (15-35 years who comprise about 36 per cent of the population) only 39 per cent are absorbed in the job market, leaving 61 per cent jobless and below the poverty line of one US dollar per day. About 92% of these youth lack the vocational or professional skills demanded by the economy.

CAP-YEI is providing youth with relevant and in-demand skills in specific industry sectors, and it is equipping youth with cross cutting skills, including intrapersonal and interpersonal work attitudes and work etiquette, as well as self-confidence. It is linking youth with internships and gainful job opportunities, and facilitating the financial inclusion of youth though the opening of bank accounts and saving money. This approach has decreased the vulnerability of youth participants after they have secured jobs and earned money and has increased the respect they receive from friends, family, leaders, and communities. This progress in turn has meant a decrease in the burden of parents and elder siblings to provide for poor youth in their families.
The Step-by-Step summary of the BEST model demonstrates its holistic nature. It is embedded in the local context and builds social capital through successive interactions with employers, local leadership, and community based organizations. The social capital built is reflected in how employers and financial organization representatives become mentors and contribute to in-class training and internships. The effort to provide a curriculum that responds to the local employment needs provides a service to both employers and graduates. The program has followed three streams: Demonstration centres (operated by CAP-YEI), Replication Centers (CAP-YEI's model offered inside another institution) and Capacity Building (training of trainers). The commitment to recruiting from among the most marginalized youth and to offering training that they can access (by location and low cost) demonstrates its CAP-YEI’s integration into the local reality. The model is much more than a curriculum, it is an approach that connects, responds, and delivers. A holistic model such as BEST is nurtured by an organizational culture that learns and invites instructor commitment, and that is part and parcel of the package.

The challenges in Kenya continue to be huge. While the 73.4% employment achievement of CAP-YEI graduates is impressive, these numbers need to be appreciated in the context the overall employment environment. According to the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, in 2014 the informal sector contributed 82.7% of total employment, and the total of 799,700 new jobs would fall short of the government’s 1.3 million jobs target. In interviews with the TVETA representatives, the need to train and employ approximately 600,000 new youth per year, roughly half of the total target set by the KNBS was stressed. While the BEST model is in the process of being accredited by the Curriculum Development, Assessment and Certification Council (CDACC) of TVETA, its achievement to date will be seen as more significant in the eyes of the government if the program is expanded from its original target of 10,000 graduates to roughly 30,000. This growth will position CAP-YEI as a significant non-government training provider and, by expanding and improving the capacity building stream; it will demonstrate its critical value as a partner in the delivery and reform of TVET.

Conclusions
The nine-step BEST model serves as the template for delivering a demand-led, market-based and youth-responsive employment program. The holistic nature of the model is characterized by a combination of features that this evaluation refers to as ‘non-negotiables’. The BEST model responds to UNESCO’s recommended practices for the region and responds directly to the GoK’s Vision 2030 and the TVET Act of 2013. The outcomes achieved during year 4 of the project have come close to the 5-year target of 10,000 youth trained, with 74% employed. These achievements provide a proof of concept for the BEST model.

The BEST model will likely evolve further as the specific activities and reporting of each step are consolidated. However, what may be as important as the Step-by-Step formalization will be the ability to continue adapting the steps as new challenges emerge. A monitoring, evaluation and learning system (MEL) will need to track change and flag omissions in the implementation in Capacity Building sites. The MEL will need to cover activities, outputs, and a gradient of outcomes; and it will need to embrace indicators for mixed livelihoods in addition to formal employment.

The total level of placement (74%) will be difficult to maintain. In urban and peri-urban settings, the supply of formal employment is variable; outside these areas it could be more limited. Focusing on placement (employment) may be what the authorities seek, but other measures will need to be added to demonstrate progress (such as job retention, etc.). CAP-YEI graduates exhibit
levels of self-confidence that will stay with them forever, and will allow them to make better livelihood choices. Graduates become community connectors and role models; these outcomes are contributors to improved livelihoods. The theory of change will evolve, but it should guide the Management Information System (MIS) data collection priorities. As was done with this evaluation, the MIS will need to be driven by a set of Uses or Purposes, and relevant Research or Learning Questions that differentiate between activities, outputs, and a gradient of outcomes.

Winning the 2015 African Union prize for TVET models has provided recognition of CAP-YEI and the BEST model. As such, it is poised to become a reference point for a capabilities-focused approach for sub-Saharan Africa TVETs. Like a tree in a nursery, however, it has been growing under controlled conditions. CAP YEI, having successfully proven the BEST model in Kenya, aims to expand this program by integrating the model into the public TVET system. This action will be primarily done through an expanded partnership with Government at different levels and by supporting third-party implementation mainly by collaborating with Vocation Training Centers.

As well, CAP YEI aims to partner with different government levels and departments; these include TVETA, CDACC, selected Counties, Directorate of TVET and specific VTC’s. For TVETA, the key entry point for partnership is the implementation of the CBET framework. CAP -YEI hopes to benefit from the fact that the CBET and BEST principles are very similar and BEST is therefore seen as potentially a demonstration of ‘CBET in practice’.

Changing the organizational and teaching culture of multiple public institutions will take time. At the start, the different stakeholders will have their own assumptions about the expected outcomes. Creating a generation of youth who are entrepreneurial, who are connected to opportunities that allow them to craft their own mixed livelihoods, is not the same as tracking employment targets. The process of youth empowerment needs to include employment while acknowledging that it is also about influencing the minds and souls of thousands of young people. The piloting of the different transfer strategies will be most productive if there is an agreement from the start with TVETA on the theory of change and on the activities, outputs and gradient of outcomes to measure. The literature on collaborative management of natural resources may be a relevant resource to tap. In these approaches, different stakeholders agree from the start on the issues or indicators that matter to them, and agreements are reached on how to measure change. The expansion of the BEST model into a complex, huge, entrenched public TVET sector will very much be an experiment.

**Recommendations**

The focus of the recommendations is on the issues and dimensions that merit attention in the expansion of the model. Most of the recommendations stem from the review of the non-negotiable summary from the Step-by-Step summaries with attention to the challenges of expanding the model.

The challenge of transferring the model from CAP-YEI as an NGO, to the Government-accredited system is akin to transplanting a young tree from the nursery to a farm. Success requires that the conditions of the farm mirror some of the ones at the nursery: some soil with compost is needed to provide fertility along with regular watering. Likewise, the holistic aspect of the BEST model needs to be transferred: this means an organizational culture that creates the conditions for instructors to remain motivated, and for administrators to commit to engaging regularly with local stakeholders. This conclusion suggests the need to pilot a number of different transfer strategies,
to track the performance of each, and to jointly (with TVETA) settle on the most promising mechanisms. It may be naïve to expect the public system to adopt the organizational culture that nourished the BEST model during the last four years under CAP-YEI; however, at the same time it is unrealistic to expect the public system to adopt the model without changing the work environment in the adopting institutions... the young tree will simply not thrive.

The Replication Centers will be useful to show what is possible inside public institutions, but the Capacity Building stream will require more than a training-of-trainer approach. A holistic approach is rooted in an organization that provides the enabling environment for instructors to stay committed. This dimension will need to be recognized from the start, with pilot experiments supported by TVETA to create comparable conditions in the new public institutions that adopt the BEST model.

The list of ‘non-negotiables’ in the Step summaries points to the need to transplant the approach together with the enabling organizational culture.

- **Market Scans** constitute an investment because of the social capital gains and should be presented as such.
- With the growing importance of training for entrepreneurship, **Market Scans** should include looking at business opportunities.
- To increase the social capital of the program, the **Market Scan** reports should be shared with the local government and representatives of the key stakeholders / industries.
- There is scope to broaden the **Market Scans** to include youth’s perspectives, using participatory appraisal tools.
- There is potential to conduct **regional market scans**, (e.g., county-wide) with data and recommendations shared by a number of training institutions to design and implement focused skills programs and support.
- **Engaging employers in the Curriculum Review** is a useful investment because of the resulting social capital gains (i.e. some participants become mentors and their added commitment to employing graduates).
- Beyond the current training (referred to as ‘Level 1’) there should be additional opportunities – such as ‘Level 2’ courses for those who want to come back. Such ‘Level 2’ training could be delivered by CAP-YEI with some flexible training arrangements to accommodate those participants who are already working.
- Any differentiation in **Selection Criteria** between CAP-YEI’s and those of other institutions must be undertaken systematically, explicitly, and purposefully, as the changes will impact on outcomes.
- The process of **Internship** selection needs to be done systematically, explicitly, and purposefully, as changes in selection criteria will impact on outcomes (such as providing financial incentives to work places).
- **Placement** is a key indicator for TVET, and an increase in the number of students per instructor is expected to affect the capacity of the instructor to match employment opportunities with appropriate graduates, because the quality of the student-instructor relationship will likely be reduced.
- **Expanding performance indicators** – While the employment rate of participants should remain the preferred performance indicator for the BEST model, it is important to recognize that other performance indicators should be included when assessing the outcomes of the
program. Potential additional performance indicators could include the following: i) Number / percentage of youth who plan to pursue further education; ii) role played by youth at the community level; iii) life skills gained by youth and their ability to empower other youth; and iv) recovery rate, for instance how quickly youth find a new job or start from a failed business etc.

To create the foundation for a successful expansion / adaptation of the model / program, the following elements are proposed:

- **Phasing in**: Start the expansion of the BEST model by selecting a number of new locations (outside of the Demonstration and Replication centers) where the model could be fully implemented. By incrementally increasing the “catchment area” for the implementation / adaptation of the BEST model, all the parties involved will have a chance to assess what changes would be necessary for a successful expansion of the model.

- **Conduct a readiness assessment** of the new locations to provide a better chance for a successful initial expansion. This step will require the definition of desirable / necessary attributes for the successful implementation of the model / program. These attributes will need adjustment during the expansion process, as not all of them will be evident at the start.¹

- **Learning and adapting continuously** – Both CAP-YEI and other stakeholders need to continuously monitor, evaluate, and learn from the initial expansion phases, as well as be ready to adapt accordingly, using a collaborative management approach.

- **Importance of organizational culture** – While not all the organizational attributes of CAP-YEI can be “transferred” to each new BEST center, it is important that some key organizational attributes – such as the incentives that lead to a committed involvement of the facilitators and their continuous support provided to youth – be present at each new BEST center.

- **The holistic approach** (complete continuum) – The advantage / strength of the BEST model resides in its holistic approach which includes participants’ involvement, provision of Life skills, technical and financial skills, and continuous support from facilitators and the program. While the emphasis on these components can vary – depending on context / location / other factors, the “togetherness” and holistic development continuum of the BEST-related components should be maintained.

---

¹ For instance, the attributes may include organizational strategies, structures, shared values, management styles, internal systems, staff, and skill sets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEST Model</td>
<td>Basic Employability Skill Training model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Community and Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-YEI</td>
<td>CAP - Youth Empowerment Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP WDI</td>
<td>CAP Workforce Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBET</td>
<td>Competency-Based Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDACC</td>
<td>Curriculum Development, Assessment and Certification Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEAC</td>
<td>Civic Education and Advocacy Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Customer Relations and Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Demonstration Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGM</td>
<td>Industrial Garment Manufacture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITES</td>
<td>Information Technology Enabled Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYLDP</td>
<td>Individual Youth Learning Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEQs</td>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KES</td>
<td>Kenyan Shilling (KES 102 = 1 US$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>Key Informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIVA</td>
<td>Microfinance <a href="http://www.kiva.org">www.kiva.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNBS</td>
<td>Kenya National Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNYD</td>
<td>Kenya National Youth Development and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYEP</td>
<td>Kenya Youth Empowerment Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCF</td>
<td>MasterCard Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEL</td>
<td>Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSME</td>
<td>Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Replication Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCO</td>
<td>Savings and Credit Co-operative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strength, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORs</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTI</td>
<td>Teacher Training Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVETA</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFE</td>
<td>Utilization Focused Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMN</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTC</td>
<td>Vocational Training Centers (previously known as Youth Polytechnics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEDF</td>
<td>Youth Enterprise Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YP</td>
<td>Youth Polytechnics (previously known as Village Polytechnics, now renamed as VTCs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction and background

The challenges faced by technical and vocational education and training (TVET) programs in Sub Saharan Africa include: a) failure to link skills provision with market realities b) a negative social perception of vocational and technical skills where parents and youth view it as inferior education c) failure to address the specific challenges that marginalized vulnerable youth, especially girls face in accessing such skills and d) retention of blue print models and approaches that remain unchanged even after their value has been discounted.

The BEST model was introduced to Kenya by CAP-YEI in 2011 as part of a five-year project funded by the MasterCard Foundation. As of July 2015, this project reached 9,466 youth and its transition to employment rate was 74% for the youth trained in demonstration and replication centres, (plus 7% with those who pursued entrepreneurship).

The program provides entrepreneurship training targeted at rural and urban and peri-urban youth. It emphasizes a life skills component for building self-confidence, work readiness and a desire for life achievement. The program also integrates financial literacy into the skills training and connects youth to financial service providers. Vocational, financial and youth service providers come together to enhance learning, earning and saving opportunities for youth.

The short-term outcomes include: increased self-confidence, access to market-demanded skills and job placement. The longer-term outcomes include: rising aspirations for continued education, the ability and willingness to earn and save, contributing to family livelihoods and becoming champions in their community.

The BEST model is a nine-step model that was introduced to Kenya after many years of development and testing in India and adaptation to a few other African countries. In Kenya, the model has been implemented through three streams: at ‘demonstration centers’ that are run and operated by CAP-YEI, at ‘replication centers’ where the program is delivered by CAP-YEI staff inside public TVET institutions, and through ‘capacity building’ where public TVET staff are trained in the model for

---

2 As opposed to graduate and post-graduate education.
3 CAP stands for ‘Community and Progress’.
4 As of October 2015, a total of 6,730 youth had been enrolled into the program, 5,612 had completed training, 868 are in internship, 345 of them had started their own enterprises. 3,517 or 74% who had completed the training had been employed and were earning money. A total of 967 students were under training.
delivery inside their institutions without CAP-YEI staff participation. This evaluation coincides with the start of the fifth year of the project and is intended to document accomplishments, analyze why and how it works, appreciate its integration into the context and extract lessons to contribute to the design of a subsequent, expansion phase.

2 Evaluation Framework, Purposes and Learning Questions

The overall evaluation framework adopted a utilization-focused evaluation (UFE) approach that is essentially a decision-making platform. In accordance with UFE, a select number of primary evaluation users took ownership of the definition of six evaluation uses or purposes, plus five themes or components to ensure the findings were harnessed during the development of the next project proposal. The key evaluation questions were derived from the six evaluation purposes.⁵

2.1 Evaluation decision-making framework

The original Terms of Reference placed emphasis on DAC’s principles of evaluating the program’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, outcomes (anticipated and emergent) and sustainability. For each of the principles, the TORs listed key learning questions and possible sub-questions. As the overall evaluation decision-making framework, UFE emphasizes the identification of individuals who will work closely with the evaluation team as primary users at both MCF and CAP-YEI. In UFE, the evaluation team works mainly as facilitators of a learning process, rather than judges. The primary evaluation users are helped by the evaluators to develop and revise Key Evaluation Questions that flowed from the DAC principles.

The principles that guided this evaluation included:

- Ownership by the USERS of the evaluation process and outcomes;
- Demonstrated usefulness of the evaluation findings;
- Ethical protocols ensuring confidentiality of the information;
- Provision of a culturally sensitive environment during the course of the assignment;
- Attention to gender disaggregation of data;
- Rigorously connecting evaluation questions with the relevant data collection methods and instruments;
- Triangulating findings by using complementary methods and different voices.

2.2 Evaluation purposes

“The evaluation should provide both the Foundation and CAP with details and analyses that will allow for them to assess the performance of the program against its intended goals and objectives, as well as offer evidence that will shape the program moving forward. It is expected that the contents of the evaluation will allow for a review of program design, achievements, and challenges in order to generate key lessons for future strategic and programming decisions. This final evaluation is being commissioned by The MasterCard Foundation, and CAP will collaborate throughout the evaluation process.” (RFP, our emphasis)

⁵ The emphasis on “key evaluation questions” comes from the evaluators’ own work, and is compatible with the original emphasis in the RFP to “learning questions”, as the overall purpose of the evaluation was about learning from practice on the ground.
The evaluation USERS for the evaluation of CAP Youth Empowerment Institute are:

- **Ndungu Kahihu** – Executive Director, CAP-YEI Kenya
- **Nalini Gangadharan** – Founder, Strategic Lead CAP, Workforce Development Institute
- **Ashok Ankathi** – CAP Workforce Development Institute, seconded to CAP-YEI Kenya
- **Tricia Williams** – Manager, Research, Evaluation & Learning, The MasterCard Foundation
- **Karen Moore** – Program Manager, Youth Livelihoods, The MasterCard Foundation

The Evaluation USES agreed upon by the primary evaluation USERS were the following (as organized into three Sections in the Inception Report):

### 2.2.1 The program and its outcomes

1. To document and understand the project’s **accomplishments**.
2. To capture ‘**the magic**’ that makes it work

### 2.2.2 The program in context; the ecosystem

3. To understand the dynamic relationship between the CAP-YEI model and the Kenyan context to feed into improvement and development of MCF’s programs, both with CAP-YEI and other partners.
4. To understand what has made the ecosystem respond to the program
5. To understand the added value/benefit of a holistic programming approach, influencing and informing MCF’s broader strategies in this program area.
6. To document the critical conditions for replication in other areas / counties

### 2.2.3 Once the findings and recommendations from A and B have been assembled, they will be harnessed as per the following components or themes:

- **i. To improve the program for the future**
- **ii. To provide actionable learning for a potential future MCF-CAP partnership.**
- **iii. To prepare for future expansion**
- **iv. To identify what CAP-YEI needs to become as an organization in order to succeed in meeting increasing future expectations?**
- **v. To inform broader work with youth**

The original purposes of the evaluation were organized into six USES or PURPOSES, and were complemented by five themes or components to ensure the findings and recommendations were harnessed to inform the design of the next project.

---

6 CAP Foundation is the non-profit arm responsible for implementing an employability programs in India, and by law it is not allowed to operate outside India. CAP Work Force Development Institute is registered as a for-profit entity with a mandate to operate both in India and overseas. CAP Youth Empowerment Institute (CAP-YEI) is a Kenyan NGO that has a mandate to carry out youth empowerment initiatives in the country. CAP WDI is the official partner of CAP-YEI in the implementation of the MasterCard Foundation funded program. However, CAP-YEI also accesses the technical resource and experience of CAP Foundation from time to time.
3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

3.1 Implementation steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key activities/deliverables</th>
<th>RPF Dates – 2015</th>
<th>Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation launch</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Initial meetings at MCF &amp; CAP-YEI offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Definition of Primary Evaluation Users, USES and draft Key Evaluation Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation work plan /inception report</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Inception visit to Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits</td>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>Primary data collection in Kenya; interview with MCF staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary findings</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Meeting in Toronto with MCF and the ED of CAP-YEI to review emerging findings and working draft of the Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Engage MCF Evaluation Users in reviewing findings in full Draft Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Revisions and finalization of Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Methodology

The data collection requirements for KEQs in Sections A and B used the following combination of methods:

- documentation review
- focus group discussions with key informants
- semi-structured interviews
- strength, weakness, opportunities and threats analysis (SWOT)
- theory of change visualization

The Key Informant (KI) categories include:

- students (in a variety of CAP classes)
- students in internships (or ‘attachments’)
- employed graduates (hospitality, carpentry, electric, horticulture, customer relations, security, etc.)
- graduates from the entrepreneurship stream
- youth that started the program and dropped out before completion (if and where possible)*
- parents, guardians and siblings of the students
- CAP instructors
- CAP managers
- CAP Board members
- CAP mentors
- employers of CAP graduates
- stakeholders (from multiple sectors) engaged in student mobilization
- stakeholders (from multiple sectors) engaged in local labour market assessments
• policy makers (TVETA & CEAC)
• instructors and directors of existing vocational training institutes

All partners interviewed were advised that their inputs would remain anonymous, unless otherwise approved (for instance to provide a statement or quote), and confidential (if requested specifically).

3.3 Limitations

• Existing documentation prepared for other purposes that cannot be expected to fully align with KEQs [Remedial action: triangulation.]
• Data for Section B (contextualization) is broad and requires inferences [Remedial action: verification from primary evaluation users and partners.]
• Sample size from the UMN data inconsistent from year to year – Due to the longitudinal nature of the evaluation, the sample size has decreased during the course of the evaluation. As such with a smaller sample size the generalization of findings to the broader population becomes increasingly difficult; [Remedial action: none.]
• The primary data collection in Kenya was based on purposeful samples and opportunistic gathering of informants [Remedial action: attempted to cover multiple partners’ views from more than one location.]

While this evaluation is driven by a UFE approach, it also aligned with the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria that were included in the original Request for Proposals (see Annex A for an excerpt about the alignment, copied from the Inception Report).

4 Findings

This section is organized into six sub-sections that respond to the six evaluation USES of Sections A and B. Each sub-section constitutes an Abstract of an associated Annex, and each Annex is a summary of a “data collection synthesis” that the users can access in Dropbox.

4.1 Project accomplishments

In the revised Theory of Change, the three higher-level youth OUTCOMEs of CAP-YEI were highlighted: youth who are empowered as individuals, as connectors of opportunities for family and community, and as accomplished multi-taskers able to juggle multiple livelihood opportunities. This report provides evidence of lower level outcomes (‘expect to see’ and some ‘like to see’) that are foundational for these higher-level (‘love to see’) outcomes.

The summary of accomplishments covers both outputs and a gradient of outcomes.

Outputs are the direct result of activities for which CAP-YEI is directly responsible and in control.

Outcomes come in a gradient: ‘expect to see’ outcomes where CAP-YEI has a significant degree of influence; whereas ‘like to see’ outcomes take more time, and depend on multiple factors beyond CAP-YEI’s control where others’ interests come into play.

---

7 Two draft theory of change summaries were shared with the evaluations users (in PowerPoint format).
The diagram illustrates these spheres of influence (a central notion in Outcome Mapping). This evaluation focuses on outputs and ‘expect to see’ outcomes, which are measureable in the short-term.

While the differentiation between outputs and outcomes is consistent with the CAP-YEI logic model, the findings in this section shed light on the conditions that enable people (students, trainers, managers, organizational partners) to achieve the outputs and especially to transform them into outcomes [more on this in section 5.2].

The box below summarizes the outputs and outcomes reported as accomplishments in this report.

**Box 1 – Outputs and Outcomes of the program**

**OUTPUTS and OUTCOMES REPORTED AS ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

**OUTPUTS include:**
- A tested BEST model that demonstrates a capabilities-based TVET curriculum
- Number of Demonstration & Replication sites that are operational
- Numbers of trainers/staff that are operational
- Number of training batches completed
- Number of Capacity development trainings completed
- Cumulative numbers of youth who completed the training (gender, trade)
- Dropout rates, non-employed percentages

**‘Expect to see’ OUTCOMES include:**
- A TVETA-certified curriculum
- Extent to which youth exhibit new behaviors (confidence, self-esteem, social status)
- Employment (‘placement’) of CAP-YEI youth
- Numbers of youth in entrepreneurship
- Numbers of participants that have opened accounts, are saving, have created groups
- Increased earnings (by gender, trade)

**‘Like to see’ OUTCOMES include:**
- Continuation of employment beyond 3 months
- Combination of formal and informal employment (mixed livelihoods)
- Setting up a new business
- Savings and sharing behavior (including family and community asset building)
- Becoming a community champion or role model
- Exhibiting life-long learning abilities (taking more courses, saving for more education), dedication to the program (mentoring other batches)
- Improvement in livelihood assets (financial, social, physical, natural); improved psycho-social status; improved demonstration of resilience

---


OUTPUTS include:
- A tested BEST model that demonstrates a capabilities-based TVET curriculum [further elaboration in section 5.2]
- Number of Demonstration and Replication sites that are operational

As of July 2015, a total of 14 CAP-YEI centers were operational across Kenya. As can be seen from Map 1, these centers are mainly located in the southern part of the country, which contains approximately 80% of the total population. Of the 14 centers, six are Demonstration centers and eight are Replication centers.  

Map 1 – Location of CAP-YEI centers

---

10 Demonstration centers are the ones where CAP-YEI directly rents the premises where the program is being implemented and has control over the delivery of the program.
11 Replication centers are the ones where CAP-YEI uses the premises of another organization / institution and maintains control over the delivery of the program.
The first center started in year one was then followed by a total of five new centers (two Demonstration and three Replication centers) in the second year of operations, six new centers in the third year, and two new centers in the fourth year. Graph 1 provides a breakdown of these centers by type and operation year of the program.\(^\text{12}\)

**Graph 1 – Number of Demonstration and Replication centers**

![Graph 1](image)

**Numbers of staff**

During the four years of operation the program has employed permanent staff as well as various consultants. The number of coordinators and facilitators employed by the program for each of the operating years is provided in Table 1.

**Table 1 – Number of coordinators, facilitators and support staff\(^\text{13}\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Facilitators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coordinators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the period November 2011 until October 2015, the program employed a total of 1,570 person months for staff and 167 person months for consultants. The breakdown of the person months by year of operation is provided in Graph 1 (Annex F). The amount of person months by staff dedicated to facilitators grew from 43.2% of the total person months per year in 2013 to almost 60% of the total person months per year in 2015. The complete data regarding the allocation of person months per year is provided in Graph 2 (Annex F).

\(^{12}\) Year 1 = 2012, Year 2 = 2013, Y3 = 2014, Year 4 = 2015.

\(^{13}\) The assessment period for 2011 includes the period November – December 2011, while the assessment period for 2015 includes the period January – October 2015.
During the period 2013 to 2015, the top three program components that received almost half of the total person months per year included customer relations and sales (CRS), entrepreneurship and hospitality. Graph 3 (Annex F) provides the breakdown of data.

**Number of training batches completed**

During the four years of operation, the program completed a total of 83 batches of training and internships (or ‘attachments’). More than half of these batches (45 or 54.2%) were completed at the Demonstration centers, while the rest (38 batches) were completed at the Replication centers. The number of completed batches has increased steadily during the years – from three batches in the first year of operation, to 13 batches in the second year, 28 in the third, and 39 in the fourth year. Graph 2 shows the breakdown of completed batches by each operating year, while Graph 5 (Annex F) shows the number of batches completed by type of center. As of November 2015, the number of batches offered for each of the trades was as follows.\(^\text{15}\)

**Table 2 – Number of batches offered by trade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Trades</th>
<th>Number of batches offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer relations and sales</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; electronics</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Information technology enabled services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Floriculture</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Industrial garment manufacturing</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Building and construction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Security and guarding</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clearing and forwarding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Hair dressing and beauty therapy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Leather works technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of youth enrolled in the program**

The number of youth enrolled in the program has increased substantially during the four years of operation. The number of youth increased almost three-fold between the second and the first year, almost two-fold between the third and the second year, and close to 50% between the fourth and the third year of operation. During the same period of time, the number of youth trained at Demonstration centers grew from 320 during the first year of operation to 590 in the second year, 1,114 in the third and 1,281 in the fourth. The number of youth trained at Replication centers grew from 361 in the second year, to 760 in the third and 1,400 in the fourth year. Graph 6 (Annex F) provides a breakdown of the number of youth trained by year of operation and types of centers.

The target\(^\text{16}\) set up by the program in relation to the youth reached\(^\text{17}\) included the following:

---

\(^{14}\) A ‘batch’ is a cohort of 25-30 students that completes a 3-month training & a 3-month internship.

\(^{15}\) Source: 18 Dec. 2015 email from James Chepyegon of CAP-YEI.


\(^{17}\) Targets were also set for Year 5 as well as for youth to be reached through Capacity Building.
Graph 4 (Annex F) shows a summary of the set-targets as well as the actual number of youth enrolled and trained for each of the first four years of operation. Another target set up by the program is related to gender breakdown of participants. The target set by the program was that 40% of the youth trained be females. As of July 2015, the number of female participants that enrolled, were trained and found a placement through the program was at least 50%. Graph 3 shows a breakdown of data. (Note: CAP-YEI has no control on the enrollment of youth reach under Capacity building.)

### Table 3 – Targets related to the number of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Type of center</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Replication</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 2 – Number of training batches completed by operational year

Graph 3 – Gender-related target and enrollment, training and placement data
Number of Capacity Building trainings\textsuperscript{18} completed
CAP-YEI started the Capacity Building stream during year 3, through a training-of-trainers approach which has continued since. This approach involved the adaptation of BEST model principles and process to existing 1 to 2 year programs ongoing at selected VTC’s. The number of youth trained at Capacity Building centers remained almost the same between these two years (1,860 in the third year and 1,997 in the fourth). Graph 7 (Annex F) provides the breakdown of the data.

The majority of the youth trained via the Capacity Building stream are being trained in Motor vehicle mechanics (with 27.2%), followed by Electrical and electronics (with 24.4%), and Fashion and design (with 14%).\textsuperscript{19} The complete breakdown of youth trained by trade is provided in Table 9 (Annex F).

Cumulative numbers of youth that completed the training
Graph 4 shows the total number of youth trained per operation year for each type of center. The number of youth trained at the Demonstration and Replication centers has grown year after year – from 316 in Year 1, to 930 in Year 2, 3,822 in Year 3, and 4,398 in Year four. The majority of youth were trained in the Capacity Building stream (3,857), followed by those trained at the Demonstration centers (3,223), and Replication centers (2,386).

The other noteworthy element is that the number of youth trained at the Replication centers – on a yearly basis – surpassed the number of youth trained in the demonstration centers during the fourth year of operations (1,300 youth trained at the Replication centers compared to 1,238 youth trained at Demonstration centers).

Graph 4 – Number of trained youth by year of operation and types of centers

The following are some excerpts from a focus group with CAP graduates who are employed:

\textsuperscript{18} In Capacity Building centres, CAP-YEI conducts train-of-trainers (TOT) for a number of representatives from several education institutions, who in turn train other members of these educational institutions. CAP-YEI does not have control over the method and delivery of the BEST Program in these settings.

\textsuperscript{19} Most of these youth have not completed the 1-2 year courses yet.
• They felt good to be associated with CAP because it has been very beneficial not only for them as individuals, but also for other fellow youth; it has been able to shape the character of many youth due to the good advice and training in life skills - hence they are able to relate well with people and view life positively.

• Graduates expressed their gratitude because of how they have benefitted a lot from the training in saving and entrepreneurial skills that they were taught at CAP; they added that it had helped them become more proactive in business activities, thus improving their living standards and opened their minds to many opportunities.

• One graduate said she “feels awesome” because she learnt a lot in clearing and as a result of the entrepreneurship skills, she set up a coffee business which earned her money. She appreciates CAP very much.

• It was a good experience, he learnt a lot at CAP and benefited greatly. He is happy about it. The entrepreneurship skills enabled him start a small business and the life skills help him relate well with others which impressed his boss and got him promoted.

• Fantastic, fabulous etc. She is proud of her achievements and the life skill lessons really helped her a great deal.

• He feels empowered and happy because the program helped uplift his living standards.

### Dropout rates, non-employed percentages

The dropout rate during the four years of the program has been negligible. The total number of youth that dropped-out of the program during the four years of operation is 154 which represents only 2.6% of the total number of youth enrolled in the program. The number and percentage of dropout youth for each year of operation is provided in Table 4.

#### Table 4 – Dropout youth by year of operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Drop-outs</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half of the dropouts have occurred in the Demonstration centers (82 youth or 53.2% of the total youth that did drop out of the program). The reasons for not completing the program include:

i. Loss of interest in the course: Youth who feel that the program does not meet their expectations.

ii. Education: Youth who had scored high grades in class eight or form four or class eight obtain employment, or scholarships for other courses during the CAP YEI training.

iii. Employment: Youth who secure employment while still in the CAP-YEI program.

iv. Financial constraints: Especially for youths who live a far from the CAP-YEI training centers. The program does not cater for participants’ transport and other subsistence needs. This number will also include youth whose families relocate (in the course of the project) to locations beyond affordable reach to the centers.

---

20 ‘Clearing & Forwarding’ course.

21 Information collected through Focus Group Discussions with CAP-YEI staff.
v. Cultural background: High dropout rates have been observed among certain communities. For instance, youth from the Somali are more likely to drop out than those from other communities.22

vi. Gender: The drop rate among females is higher than that among their male counterparts. Factors include (pressure from their husbands) to prioritize their matrimonial obligations over the course, pregnant and young mothers.

vii. Discipline: CAP-YEI team may expel youth due to misconduct/crime. There have only been two such cases since the program began (theft by the culprit students at Buruburu Centre).

The main reasons why not all the youth trained by the program have been employed are as follows: i) a number of youth had decided to continue further studies once they completed the CAP-YEI program, ii) preferring to start new businesses (entrepreneurs); iii) finishing internship, but not yet placed in a job position, and iv) relocation, getting married, and having children, getting casual job, deciding not to be in work force, etc. Graph 5 provides a complete breakdown of data. Additional data is provided in Graph 8 (Annex F).

As can be seen from Graph 5, a total of 4.6% of the trained youth (86 youth) rejected potential employment opportunities because of low payment or long commuting distances.

Graph 5 – Main reasons for not being employed after the completion of the program

Among the CAP-YEI dropouts interviewed, several mentioned that they had enjoyed engaging with CAP. One indicated that it was a good experience and she tried to go back. Another felt proud to have engaged with CAP and was happy with the knowledge acquired in entrepreneurship skills because it has acted as a jumpstart to start small businesses.

‘Expect to see’ OUTCOMES include:
- A TVETA-certified curriculum

The TVET act of 2013 has created TVETA as the body responsible for regulating the TVET sector. This mandate included accrediting skills providers, regulating examinations and certification etc.

---

22 The possible reasons for remaining unemployed may include the mobility of Somali families (who practice nomadic lifestyles), and the reluctance to send girls to school, but this evaluation did not collect data on this topic.
Regulation falls in two parts: a) curriculum and standards *certification which* is done by CDACC and b) accreditation of skills provider institutions (done by TVETA). CAP-YEI has therefore applied for both kinds of accreditation and is hopeful that this process will be completed in early 2016.

- **Extent to which youth exhibit new behaviors (confidence, self-esteem, social status)**
  The following summary of the ‘expect to see’ outcomes of the program at the youth (individual) level as well as the outcomes at the family and community level was generated based on the information collected from a number of sources. Some of the outcomes are summaries of various statements made by program participants, some of the outcomes are based on the findings from different evaluation / assessment conducted during the course of the program implementation (same sources footnoted). While there is certain variation between the degrees of each identified outcome - the general trend is identified for the whole program population.

**The changes at the individual youth level** – as the result of involvement in the program – include:

- **Youth are viewed as role models** – The youth who participated in the program reported that once they were involved in the program, they were viewed as role models by their siblings as well as their friends, who approached them for advice;
- **Youth have relocated from the family house to their own house** – Due to the income derived from the employment or their own businesses, youth that participated in the program were in a position to relocate from the family home and rent their own living space;
- **Youth have been able to save and enroll in further education** – One of the most common objectives that the youth participating in the program had, was to be able to continue further education. Due to the income derived from the employment or their own businesses, they were saving a certain amount of money for this purpose. Program participants stated that due to their employment situation, they were able to save for their own education, as well as to help their siblings;
- **Ability to look after personal needs** – Program participants indicated that due to the availability of disposable income, they were in a position to buy new clothes and even improve their dress code;
- **Achievement of financial independence** – The involvement with the program provided youth with the possibility to become financially independent, and allowed them the opportunity to be able to obtain transport, food, rent, school fees etc. on his/her own;
- **Increase in disposable income** – As the youth that were involved in the program became financially independent, they were in a position to allocate a certain amount of money derived from the employment or their own businesses towards the purchase of disposable assets; and
- **Involved in critical decision making** – Having an increased social status – both in the family and the community – as well as having achieved financial independence – from their parents or guardians – provided the program participants with the opportunity to be involved in various decision making activities – at the family and community level.

Apart from changes at the individual youth level, the participation in the program had positive outcomes at the family level. These positive outcomes, could be summarized as follows:

---

• **Affordability of some of the luxuries** – Due to the income derived from their employment or their own businesses, and the increase in the amount of disposable income, youth were able to contribute to the purchase of some luxury goods for both their families and themselves;

• **Increase in respect in community** – While prior to being involved in the program youth were looked at as drop-outs, once they started the program and then became employed (or opened their own business), the changes in their individual status played a role in increasing the respect that the family had in the community, as the family could show that one additional member was working and earning an income;

• **Increased food security** – The increase in income – apart from allowing the youth and their families to purchase other household items – had a positive impact on the increased food security in the family, as well as improving consistency in food consumption in the household;

• **Supporting the family** – Even in the cases when youth decided to relocate to their own living spaces, they continued to help their families financially by paying school fees for other siblings, or paying medical expenses, helping with rent payment, helping with the re-payment of loans, debts, etc.;

• **Purchase of household goods /assets** – Youth who participated in the program were in a position to help their families to purchase household items such as beds, stoves, as well as animals such as goats, cows, etc.

Graph 6 provides a summary of the financial contribution made by youth involved in the program.

**Graph 6 – Financial contribution provided by youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth financial contribution</th>
<th>CAP YEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other household foods</td>
<td>percent of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to home / family</td>
<td>percent of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic household needs</td>
<td>percent of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>percent of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonial expenses</td>
<td>percent of youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School fees</td>
<td>percent of youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Employment (‘placement’) of CAP-YEI youth**

Graph 9 (Annex F) shows the rate of youth employment for each operating year by type of center. For the other two years – Year 3 and Year 4, the employment rate at the Demonstration centers has remained consistent over the ones achieved by the Replication centers.

---

24 Note that in Year 1 the model was tested only in Demonstration Centers.

25 During the period between Year 2 and Year 4, the rate of employment has seen a reduction for both types of centers – from a high of 80.1% for the Demonstration centers during Year 2 of the operation to 73.4% for both year 3 and year 4, and from a high of 80.2% for Replication centers in year 2, to 73% in Year 3 and 71.8% in year 4.
Graph 7 shows the distribution of youth placements based on the trade they completed as well as by gender. As can be seen from the graph, the placement rate is higher for males (in six trades – Auto, Building, Carpentry, Hospitality, Electrical, and ITES), and higher for females in three trades (IGM, Clearing & Forwarding and Hair & Beauty).

The youth that completed the Floriculture training had the highest level of confidence in being able to find a job on their own (with 100%), followed by those completing the CRS course (with 80.7%, and Security (with 80%). The complete breakdown of data is provided in Table 10 (Annex F).

**Graph 7 – Placement of youth by trade and gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floriculture</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearing &amp; Forward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair &amp; Beauty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that youth used a variety of methods when looking for a job placement. These included help from the course facilitator, recommendations from friends, advertisements, etc. The majority of both males and females got their jobs as the results of referrals (close to 70% of males and 80% of females). The complete breakdown of data is provided in Table 5.

29 A large number of youth get employment thanks to the exposure that internships gives them and to the confidence it creates in them.
Table 5 – Methods used when looking for a job placement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Help by the facilitator</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recommended by a friend</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Searched on my own</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In several cases, the employers also have become program mentors. The following were statements collected from mentors during a group interview:

- I am honored to be part of CAP-YEI through the mentorship of the youth because it is the high time that our colleges, institutions and our country as whole understand that there’s no a tomorrow without the youths; and a youth with a changed mind-set and perception is better than 1000 learned.
- I appreciate helping the students who are also youths as I am and I know the stage that they are in they need guidance; when they get people of their own level to talk to them it is good because they can easily relate. I appreciate that I am able to be there for them and give them advice on different things e.g., attachment.

Among the employers, the following statements were made:

- One mentioned that he is involving himself because CAP is touching the lives of the poor and is doing a good job.
- Another added that it is a good experience noting that other employers claim to be too busy to interact with CAP.
- Yet another feels good becoming a mentor to young people and also happy about the CAP program whereby it is helping the needy in society, especially those who can’t afford to raise school fees. She added that CAP provides cheap/free courses that are competitive in the job market. And that is a great gesture.
- On a more critical side, anther added that while the personal relationship with CAP is not bad, with the students he has helped it has been a let-down: “They should be well prepared for the job market and the various outside challenges.”

Numbers of youth in entrepreneurship

The initial intention of the CAP-YEI program – as related to entrepreneurship and the start of businesses by youth participating in the program – was to have 10-20% of participants start businesses.\(^3\) During the four year of operation, the average number of entrepreneurs has been 6.1% – with the second year of operations having the lowest percentage (4.2%).\(^4\)

Graph 10 (Annex F) shows an increase in entrepreneurship in Year 3, with a small decline in Year 4. It is worth noting that in many cases, youth entrepreneurs combine multiple livelihood opportunities (part-time employment and self-employment). Graph 11 (Annex F) shows the number of present entrepreneurs, as well as the number of youth who had expressed an interest in becoming

---


\(^4\) CAP-YEI initially contracted out the entrepreneurship component of its program and subsequently built its own internal capacity. The new strategy has led to growth of this component including the staff and specialist engaged.
entrepreneurs. When asked about their plans for opening a business, the percentage of both – males and female students – was almost the same.  

The youth who completed the Floriculture training had the highest percentage of those planning to open a business in the future (with 95.7%), followed by those who completed the security training (with 92%), and those who completed the CRS training (with 90.8%). The complete breakdown of data is provided in Table 11 (Annex F).

**Percentage of participants who have opened accounts, are saving, have created groups**

One of the expected outcomes of the program, was to have the participants open savings accounts at various financial institutions and start saving. This aspect of the program was facilitated by providing youth with financial literacy training, as well as connecting them with various financial institutions that were operating in the area. As the result of the participation in the program, the average percentage of youth who opened a bank account during the four years of operation was 74.6% – with the second year of operation having the highest percentage of youth opening a bank account (95.1%). Graph 12 (Annex F) shows the percentage of youth who opened bank accounts after the completion of the financial literacy training offered by the program.

In terms of gender breakdown, slightly more males (91.2%) than females (88.7%) indicated that they had opened a bank account. Almost three-quarter of males (71.2%) and two-third of females (65.6%) reported saving money regularly.

The percentage of youth having a savings account varies considerably between the different CAP-YEI centers. The centers that had the highest percentage of youth with a savings account were Othaya and Dagoretti (with 98% of youth), while the one with the lowest percentage was Mikindani (with 67.3%).

Youth from the Othaya center had the highest percentage of saving regularly (with 86%), while the center with the lowest percentage of youth that saved regularly was Kakamega (with 50%).

The majority of youth (close to 80%) saved on a monthly basis.

The main reasons for savings included: i) to accumulate enough capital to start a business, ii) to continue further education, iii) for emergency funds, iv) to raise enough money to help family members, and v) acquire property in the future.

Another strategy that is promoted by the program is the formation of youth savings groups. The main purpose of these youth groups is to encourage group savings, as well as instigating income generating activities. Graph 13 (Annex F) shows the breakdown of formed youth groups by year of

---

33 Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2014. pp. 52
34 Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2014. pp. 15
39 Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2013. pp. 30
operation. Both males and females participated almost equally in the composition of the youth groups (93.4% of males and 92% of females reported to be youth group members). The percentage of youth who were part of the youth groups ranged from 100% of youth in Mombasa, to 84.6% in Dagoretti.

In order for the youth groups to be in a position to apply for financial support from various financial institutions and government-supported programs and initiatives, the youth groups had to be registered. Out of the 341 youth groups that were formed during the four-year period, 160 (or 46.9%) were registered. Groups’ failure to register is due to timing; the batch’s duration comes to an end while some of the students are still organizing themselves into a group that has yet to be registered. Graph 8 shows the number of formed and registered youth groups by year of operation.

**Graph 8 – Number of groups formed by youth**

[Diagram showing the number of groups formed and registered by year of operation.]

**Cumulative number of financial inclusion outcomes**

Out of a total of 4,778 youth enrolled in the program, 4,741 (or 99.2%) were trained in financial literacy, and after the completion of the program a total of 4,183 (or 87.5% of the enrolled youth or 88.2% of the youth trained in financial literacy) had opened a bank account. The number of registered groups with a bank account was 48 (or 30% of the registered youth groups). Table 12 (Annex F) provides a summary of data related to financial literacy training, opened bank accounts and group formation.

Table 13 (Annex F) provides a summary of data related to the number of youth who have set up new businesses, the number of start-up businesses plans facilitated, and the number of business plans referred to various financial institutions. As can be seen from Table 13, during the four years of the program, a total of 629 new businesses were started by program-trained youth, with the third year of the program having the most new businesses (263 new businesses or 41.8%). During the same

---

40 Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2014. pp. 15
41 Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2014. pp. 43
42 CAP YEI is now addressing these delayed registrations by relating the groups with organizations that have products that can be used by the groups to generate income and start the registration process sooner than before and help them stay together even after the training.
period, the number of business plans that were facilitated grew from 32 during the first year of operations to 271 facilitated business plans during the fourth year.

**Increased earnings**
Almost half of the youth who graduated from the program were earning a monthly income of between 5,000 and 10,000 KES, an amount which is equal to the Kenyan per capita monthly average, and close to 40% of youth were earning above the Kenyan per capita monthly average, and almost 10% were earning below the Kenyan per capita monthly average.\(^{43}\)

For the first year the average monthly income was estimated to be 10,767 KES and for the second year the average income was estimated to be 9,700 KES. The average length of employment was estimated to be seven months.

The majority of the businesses started by the participants in the program generated a monthly income between 5,000 and 10,000 KES, with one-in-five of the businesses (20.5%) earning more than 10,000 KES per month. Graph 9 provides the complete breakdown of employment earning by year of operation.

Based on the data collected, during the first two years, the youth who participated in the program generated approximately 67 Million KES in earnings from their employment, and approximately 4 Million KES from the businesses operated by youth.

‘Like to see’ **OUTCOMES** include:\(^{44}\)

**Continuation of employment beyond three months**
The data collected\(^{45}\) show that the duration (in months) of employment for the program participants ranged from one to five months (78% of youth), to six to ten months (19.8%), 11 to 15 months (1.1%) and 16 to 20 months (1.1%). The breakdown of the length of employment by gender is provided in Table 6.

**Table 6 – Duration of employment by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Duration in employment (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{43}\) Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2013. pp. 71

\(^{44}\) This category of outcomes will need to differentiate Demo and Replication from Capacity Development sites soon, as the spheres of control are significantly different.

\(^{45}\) Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2013. pp. 69
The rate of employment differed between the various centers. Table 7 provides a summary of data related to the present level of employment or working for pay of youth who had completed the program at least six months prior to the data collection (year 2014).

Table 7 – Employment situation after at least six month of graduation from the program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Are you currently employed / working for pay (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Naivasha</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eldoret</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Othaya</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nakuru</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Athi River</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mombasa</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Thika</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Buruburu</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kisumu</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of a sample of 228 youth surveyed, 52.9% of males were employed and 47.1% of females were employed. More men held full time employment than women.

Close to 30% of males and 27% of females had been employed for less than six months, close to 61% of males and almost 63% of females were employed for a period between six months to a year, and close to 9% of males and 10% of females were employed for longer than a year. At the end of the second year, the average length of employment for youth entering the program was seven months.

---

Based on the data collected, by the end of the second year the youth graduated from the program had contributed some 6,317 person months of employment to the national economy.

Another aspect related to the employment is that close to 30% of youth who had graduated from the program and were employed, had been promoted in the work place.⁴⁹

**Combination of formal and informal employment (mixed livelihoods)**
CAP-YEI does not disaggregate its data into ‘formal’ and ‘informal’ employment. According to the Market scan consultant, all potential employers are approached equally without separation into informal, short-term and long-term employers. The informal sector actors are the best entry point for the scan because they are able to describe the trend in the area and give references to other players in the same area. Even during analysis, the data is not separated into informal Vs formal; short, medium Vs long term. The first contact list is composed of people receptive to the research team, and they enable snowballing to other players.

CAP YEI provides all students skills in Financial Inclusion and Entrepreneurship, but those interested or who demonstrate better performance in business are identified and supported. At least six months after the completion of the program, close to 27% of males and almost 40% of females had started their own businesses. Of the youth who had started a new business, close to 43% of males have had their business operation for less than six months, almost 54% of them had been in operation for a period between six to 12 months, and close to 4% had been in operation for more than one year. From the female business owners, close to half had been in operation for less than six months, almost one-third of them had been in operation for a period between six to 12 months, and close to 16% had been in operation for more than one year.⁵⁰

Of the youth who had started their own business, three-quarter of them had employed one additional person, 15% had employed two people, 5% had employed three people and 5% had employed more than five people at their businesses.⁵¹

**Savings and sharing behavior (including family and community asset building)**
Data collected through follow-up surveys indicated that regular savings continues well beyond the completion of the program. Almost 14% of the male savers continued to save on daily basis, close to one-fifth of males continued to save on weekly basis, and almost two-thirds continued to save on a monthly basis. Close to one-third of female savers saved on a daily basis, close to one-third save on weekly basis, and almost 40% of females saved on monthly basis.⁵³

**Becoming a community champion or role model**
Close to half of both male and female alumni of the CAP-YEI program had chosen to become mentors of the program participants.⁵⁴

---

⁵² Data collected by CAP-YEI show that more females started businesses, and that most of their earning are used to start businesses or to expand their businesses.
⁵³ Ibid, Chepyegon, J. 2014. pp. 15
Exhibiting life-long learning abilities (taking more courses, saving for more education), dedication to the program (mentoring other batches)
Out of a sample of 108 students from 12 centres, 35 (32%) were saving to start a new business, 17 (16%) for further education, and 14 (13%) to expand a business.55

Improvement in livelihood assets (financial, social, physical, natural); improved psycho-social status
A quarter of male savers had accumulated saving of less than 5,000 KES, close to 44% of male savers had accumulated between 5,000 and 10,000 KES, one quarter had accumulated between 10,000 and 20,000 KES, and close to 6% had accumulated above 30,000 KES. Amongst the female savers almost 10% had accumulated less than 5,000 KES, close to 40% had accumulated between 5,000 and 10,000 KES, close to one quarter had accumulated between 10,000 and 20,000 KES, close to 10% had accumulated between 20,000 and 30,000 KES, and close to 14% had accumulated more than 30,000 KES.56

### 4.2 Understanding the model’s performance (the ‘magic’)

The previous section provided evidence of the BEST model’s outcomes. This one seeks to explain why it works by dissecting each of the ten steps in the model, and reporting on how different stakeholders become engaged with each one. Each Step summary lists the objectives, activities, outputs and outcomes (separate Annex). In addition, in the Step Summary, the elements are listed that appear to be central to the model’s performance or ‘magic’. These elements are referred to as ‘non-negotiables’ to underscore their importance, without them, the model will either perform poorly, or not at all. This distinction is important as CAP-YEI already follows three delivery streams that include the ‘Capacity Building’ steam — where there is no control by CAP-YEI over the implementation of these steps and associated activities.

The model engages stakeholders, especially employers, in a direct & purposeful manner during various steps. (Annex E includes a summary of each step). During the Market Scan (Step 1) potential employers are asked to contribute data on employment possibilities and relevant skills sets. As the curriculum is being developed or revised (Step 2), they are consulted again. During the Road Shows (Step 3), there is engagement by local leaders, local administrators and civil society organizations who can recommend student candidates. Community mobilizers are also involved. They are individuals that CAP YEI works with to broadcast and promote the program in particular sites. The mobilizers publicize the opportunities being presented, the qualification criteria, and they identify potential candidates for up-coming courses, and related program of activities. The mobilizers include local administrators (chiefs, etc.), religious leaders, former graduate parents and employers. Some employers and local institutional representatives (e.g., from financial institutions) become mentors during the training (Step 5). The instructors keep in touch with employers with special attention to confirming internship opportunities for Step 6 and placement during Step 8. The data in Section 5.1 confirms that the stakeholders perceive and notice these benefits.

This direct and purposeful engagement leads to a form of social capital for CAP-YEI: by engaging with the community, by listening to needs and responding directly, the program becomes known in each community. The feedback from stakeholders about this consultation process, which incorporates several steps, indicates that it is a contributor to both short-term (expect-to-see) outcomes, and to

---

middle-term (like-to-see) outcomes. **As such, the stakeholder interaction is part of the ‘magic’ and constitutes a non-negotiable.**

Beyond stakeholder engagement, the following elements of the program are contributors to the outcomes:

- Providing a safe place to learn
- Providing a set of life-skills – at the start- to enhance self-esteem, confidence, and a sense of worth
- Ensuring the curriculum, and the skills provided, are grounded in the local needs of employers
- Offering a course duration that meets the needs of a large number of disadvantaged youth
- Allowing students to get guidance from mentors from different sectors, and thus creating linkages with employers, financial organizations, and other local leaders which they would have not been able to achieve on their own
- Managing students’ expectations through exposure to work sites and to the working world through internships (or ‘attachments’)
- Providing advice as young entrepreneurs take the leap towards starting their own businesses
- Encouraging peer networking and group formation during the course and subsequent to graduation
- Engaging graduates in recruitment and in mentoring, to serve as role models.

All of the above elements are provided in the Demonstration Centres and Replication Centres; the evaluation did not collect evidence from any Capacity Building sites to enable a comparison. However, it is safe to say that in these sites, the above list would constitute a set of non-negotiables, which if absent, it is reasonable to expect poorer outcomes.

The following is a summary of the changes that the BEST model has undergone since its introduction to Kenya\(^\text{57}\) four years ago [more on this in 5.3]:

- It was adjusted to address the concerns and uncertainty the candidates felt about themselves and their suitability for employment or entrepreneurship. For example the graduating youth may feel that their short course duration and qualification does not bring them up to par with other workers (from other colleges). The CAP-YEI training addresses such fears, ensuring them that the skills provided are what the employers are looking for and if they (the students) work as trained they will be duly rewarded.
- Two units were added: namely **Introduction to Savings & Financial Literacy** and **Entrepreneurship.** In India, the program was aimed at helping youths acquire white and blue-collar jobs. Such jobs are less available in many areas of Kenya, thus the two added units impart knowledge necessary for youths interested in venturing into entrepreneurship, in addition to fitting into the limited job opportunities.\(^\text{58}\)
- Other changes were technical and related to training content: The technology used for automotive training in India was more advanced than in the Kenyan automobile industry.

---

\(^{57}\) The Life Skills curriculum was contextualized to the Kenyan societal and cultural practices. A good number of students come from poor and marginalized backgrounds such as city slums. They come with feelings of inadequacy to fit into the normal streams of life. The life skill sessions address such confidence issues, helping the youth feel as part of the rest of the training and working society.

\(^{58}\) Both CAP Foundation and CAP WDI in India are also learning from the experience on entrepreneurship.
• The CAP-YEI team is implementing the program at a time when the government has introduced a Youth Enterprise Development Fund\(^5\) for youth to easily access loans and set up MSMEs. Thus, the additional two programs were aimed at enabling vulnerable Kenya youth to create employment for themselves and others through entrepreneurship.

• In addition, each of the program courses now has an ICT module. This is in-line with the Kenya Vision 2030 that gives great emphasis to development of related skills to youth. In addition, the CAP-YEI is introducing e-Learning with the training is now going digital for more effective transfer of knowledge of knowledge and skills. All training content can be shared in digital format to several centers.

The diagram below (Figure 1) summarizes the attitudes and developmental changes reported by youth since the program’s inception. These changes directly influence the family and community level outcomes reported in the previous section.

**Figure 1 – Attitude and development changes**

![Figure 1](attachment:image.png)

Figure 2 summarizes what motivates partners to get involved and what they get out of the relationship with CAP-YEI.

---

\(^5\) The Youth Enterprise Development Fund was established by the Kenya government in 2006, with the sole purpose of reducing unemployment among the youth. It was an initiative aimed at addressing the unemployment rate among the youth, through twin strategic pillars of enterprise development and externally focused employment creation. More details at: [http://www.youthfund.go.ke/about/](http://www.youthfund.go.ke/about/)
The main suggestions by partners refer to changes in the duration of the courses, especially as there were skill gaps in some sectors. For instance, a mentor suggested a longer period of six months with adjusted class hours from full day to half day. For courses that require much practical training, the suggestion was for students to do more exposure visits. Or, if the course has to be limited to three months, it was suggested that the time allocated to practical skills be increased and that training materials are delivered on time. (Table 14 – Annex F provides a summary of the SWOT exercise on this subject).

4.3 A model that is contextually relevant (embedded in the ecology)

The BEST model is contextually relevant to global, regional and national level discussions on the role of technical and vocational education training (TVET). The model fits inside the UN Sustainable Development Goals and it responds to UNESCO’s best practices for TVET. Moreover, the BEST model responds to GoK Vision 2030 and the commitment to a TVET transformation.

“TVET, as part of lifelong learning, can take place at secondary, post-secondary and tertiary levels and includes work-based learning and continuing training and professional development which may lead to qualifications. TVET also includes a wide range of skills development opportunities attuned to national and local contexts. Learning to learn, the development of literacy and numeracy skills, transversal skills and citizenship skills are integral components of TVET.” (Unesco 2015: 10 – our emphasis)

The BEST model responds to a number of skill gaps that, as early as 2010 were observed with the status of most Vocational Training Centres (VTCs):

• Most of the training is delivered using basic tools and outdated equipment
• Most lecturers lack experience in modern technology and best practice industrial production.

---

60 SCDBGs No. 1-5 and 8 are directly relevant: https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/focussdgs.html
• **Linkages between industry and training providers are minimal** thus making trainee attachment and placement difficult.
• **YP graduates are rarely employed in the formal sectors of the economy.**
• **Over 80 per cent of all graduates of VTCs either work in the MSME sector or are self-employed.**
• **Employers spend six to 12 months retraining** those who join the formal sector and the trainees may only be productive once the skill gap has been adequately addressed.
• **Young people prefer fast turn-round courses** which provide them with means of livelihoods
• **The courses are not market-driven** and may not address the developmental needs of the regions where they are offered.
• Most of the **youth groups are not in touch with the YPs and VTCs in their neighborhood** and
• A large number of the out of school **youths have a low level of literacy and numeracy.**

The following\(^{61}\) methodologies were proposed in 2010, many of which are embodied in the CAP YEI’s BEST model:
• **Experiential learning** focusing on creativity including modeling and simulation
• **Mentorship programs**
• **Developing curriculum that caters to a variety of needs**, i.e., to facilitate exploitation of untapped/under-utilized resources in arid, semi-arid, slum, rural and high potential areas.
• **Bench marking and exchange program** for best practice and good performance
• **Internship/placement/apprenticeship**
• **Training should be short, practical and address the needs of youth**
• **Training should be tied to production**

The above list needs to be understood in the context of Kenya’s youth unemployment problem. A number of initiatives to apply these methodologies have since been proposed, the most far reaching being the development of the CBET framework and the introduction of a new curriculum standards and certification system by CDACC.

The 2009 Census Report for Kenya indicates that out of about 11 million youth (15-35 years who comprise about 36 per cent of the population) only 39 per cent are absorbed in the job market, leaving 61 per cent jobless and below the poverty line of one US dollar per day. About 92% of these youth lack vocational or professional skills demanded by the economy to which agriculture contributes 30% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP). By the year 2012, the number of youth was expected to have risen to 16 million. The high level of unemployment undermines the country’s potential for development, leaving youthful energy and resourcefulness untapped while raising dependency levels.\(^{62}\)

Marope et al. (2015), authors of **UNESCO’s report Unleashing the potential: Transforming technical and vocational education and training**, dedicate Ch. 2 to “Improving TVET’s Contextual Responsiveness”. Table 15 (in Annex F) summarizes how the BEST model responds to three policy measures (to support economic growth, to promote social equity, and to enhance sustainability).

---


CAP YEI’s main impact on Kenyan youth is its focus on:

I. Targeting youth from deprived background and high states of vulnerability;
II. Training youth with relevant and demanded skills in specific sector industries;
III. Equipping youth with cross cutting skills, including intrapersonal and interpersonal work attitudes and work etiquette, self-confidence and hope for the future, and the capacity to target or goal set, and exercise self-discipline;
IV. Linking youth into internships and gainful job opportunities;
V. Facilitating the financial inclusion of youth though the opening of bank accounts and saving money;
VI. Providing post placement counseling and support through follow-up;
VII. Achieving an overall job placement of 76.97 % for all the youth it trained;
VIII. More youth (both employed and un-employed) engaged in business enterprises (this is less of an impact and more of an outcome);
IX. Increased earning by trained youth through employment and entrepreneurship;
X. More savings and increased regularity of saving by youth;
XI. Decrease in vulnerability among youth after securing jobs and earning money;
XII. Increased respect and positive attitudes towards youth from friends, family, leaders, and communities; and
XIII. Decrease in the burden of parents and elder siblings to provide for poor youth in their families.  

4.4 A context that accommodates the model (ecological affinity)

The box below provides a summary of the challenges faced by this sector, a context that is typical across much of sub-Saharan Africa.

Box 2 – Kenyan context

- “Youth (15 – 34 year olds), who form 35% of the Kenyan population, have the highest unemployment rate of 67%.
- Over one million young people enter into the labour market annually without any skills, some having either dropped out of school or completed school and not enrolled in any college.
- A further 155,000 join the labour market annually after completing training in TVET or at the university.
- A total of over 1.3 million new employment places have to be created annually to meet this demand.
- It is also noted that, the skills acquired by the college and university graduates often do not meet the expectation of employers.
- There is therefore an urgent need for the Government to strengthen and scale up successful measures targeting quality skill development and employment creation for the youth."
- Youth face: “...few available employment opportunities against a fast growing pool of employment seekers; lack of requisite skills sought by industry due to mismatch of TVET acquired skills and industry expectation; and poor access to information on available opportunities.” (p3).

The Kenya National Bureau of Statistics reported that the informal sector contributed 82.7% of total employment in 2014. According to KNBS data, a total of 799,700 new jobs were created in 2014, out of which 693,400 were in the informal sector. (KNBS, 2015: 16) According to the above data, the 799,700 new jobs would fall short of the 1.3 million jobs target (in the text box) by half a million jobs.

The timing of the CAP-YEI pilot coincides with a GoK commitment to transforming TVET (TVET Act 2013) with an emphasis on competencies. Transforming vocational education is a Government of Kenya (GoK) priority. Both the Social and the Economic Pillars of the strategy assign a high priority to training and employment in seven key sectors. Among the flagship projects, Technical, Vocational Education and Training infrastructure and Equipment (TVET) includes as an objective the establishment of institutes and vocational schools in conjunction with re-branding and raising awareness programs to ensure increased enrolment.

Kenya’s Visions 2030 includes a commitment to TVET, and the CAP-YEI program fits squarely with its emphasis on a competency-based education and training system. During this evaluation, the BEST model was submitted for accreditation to the CDACC which will allow its official recognition (certificates will have official recognition and the course will be integrated into the national TVET structure.  

**Box 3 – TVET Objectives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key ongoing projects in the TVET programme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of 60 Technical Training Institutions (TTIs) at a cost of KSH 2.4 B;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction of TTIs in 9 Counties where there is none is ongoing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6 New TTIs have been completed and equipment is being installed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modern Equipment has been provided to TVET institutions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of the Curriculum Development Assessment and Certification Council (CDACC);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of a Competency-Based Education and Training (CBET) system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“...the Government is committed to reforming the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) system in order for the sector to better address national priorities for economic development, employability, national competitiveness and productivity enhancement. The goal of the reforms is to produce high-end TVET graduates capable of effectively participating in vision 2030 Flagship projects. The majority of these graduates will be delivered by TVET Institutions. The management of Institutions is vested in the Board of Governors or councils whose appointment is done in accordance with the provisions of the TVET Act 2013.” (remarks by Professor Collette A. Suda, Principal Secretary, 2015: 5-6)

TVETA values CAP-YEI’s model because it is a competency-based education and training (CBET) program that is in line with the government’s direction. It approves of the fact that the program...
targets vulnerable youth and seeks to make them useful to the community (to society). The youth obtain skills that make them employable. It noted that the market scans ensure that training is developed for what the market wants (something no other program does). It is attributed to the very high success in placement; it is demand based and targeted: by identifying a gap, training can be designed to fill that gap.67

CAP-YEI was established in Kenya in 2011, prior to the 2013 TVETA Act. The BEST model is an example of a capability-based training curriculum and as such it fits with the Kenyan commitment to restructuring this sector. The BEST model is not the only one following this approach (for instance, in this report we contrast it with the Kenya Youth Employment Program (KYEP), but has so far demonstrated to be compatible with global best practices in TVET. Its early achievements will gain more weight as it responds to the devolution push to the county level. This thrust will mean expanding its reach to rural areas where agriculture is the mainstay and formal employment opportunities are limited compared to urban centres. More emphasis will be needed on self-employment and mixed livelihoods as opposed to formal employment. Some of the steps, especially Market Scans, when done in concert with county authorities, may provide inputs to local economic development planning.

With regards to the challenge of graduates seeking more training and better opportunities, the TVETA leaders feel that following the current training (referred to as ‘Level 1’) there should be additional opportunities – such as ‘Level 2’ courses for those who want to come back. They suggested that the ‘Level 2’ training be done by CAP-YEI with some flexible training arrangements to accommodate those participants who are already working. They also suggested collaboration with other training institutions (such as VTCs) to provide the ‘Level 2’ training to support upward mobility. This approach would require that CDACC accept the development of formal institutions’ curricula for higher training levels that could accommodate credit transfers from the lower level courses. [Source: TVETA interview by JN, 18 Sep 2015]

4.5 The value of a holistic model (encouraging youth livelihoods)

The findings summarized in this report demonstrate that the BEST model has improved youth outcomes and enabled 74% of the students to find internships and work placements, mainly in formal employment settings. In an Africa wide competition ‘TVET for the 21st Century in Africa’ organized by USAID and the African Union, CAP-YEI was selected as the best NGO model out of the ten most promising TVET models in Africa, which is further evidence of its recognition. The model responds to international TVET recommended practices and fits with the Kenyan Government Vision 2030 priorities for the sector. It is also a timely example of a capabilities based approach. The holistic character of the approach is evident in the purposeful engagement with key stakeholders, the commitment to respond to local conditions in terms of employment and skills, the combination of training in life skills and employment skills, and the careful attention to matching employers with the graduates.

The above achievements need to be reviewed in the context of GoK statistics that indicate that approximately 83% of all employment is generated by the informal sector with opportunities rapidly emerging in both urban and rural settings. CAP-YEI has worked mainly in urban and peri-urban areas, and will soon branch into many counties where agriculture is the mainstay and formal employment

67 Source: and Meetings with Professor Wilson Ogola, Chairman, TVETA and Dr. Manasseh Ondieki, Chairman, CDACC, during the July visit to Kenya; and TVETA interview by JN, 18 Sep 2015.
opportunities are few. The program’s experience in entrepreneurship and self-employment will be key. Rural youth will have many fewer formal employment opportunities relative to urban ones, and will need to find ways of combining employment and entrepreneurship to more effectively serve their needs.

The gaps identified by stakeholders regarding the present model pertain primarily to requests for longer period courses for some topics (already addressed above) and the need for official recognition (certification is forthcoming). A more challenging gap has to do with the extent to which the Capacity Building stream will remain faithful to the holistic approach, and to the activities that constitute the list of ‘non-negotiables’. Transferring the model to TVET institutions may be insufficient unless some of the CAP-YEI organizational culture is introduced into the public system as well. In addition, the like-to-see outcomes, especially placement, will need to be adjusted to a gradient of outcomes associated with self-employment (entrepreneurship) and mixed livelihoods.

4.6 Conditions for expansion

The unit costs of the BEST model have been stabilizing over the four years of the project. Graph 10 shows the dollars per youth trained and placed and Graph 11 the human resources investment per youth trained and placed.

Graph 10 – Cost per trained and placed youth

To put these numbers in context, we compare CAP-YEI’s performance with another comparable project: the Kenyan Youth Empowerment Project (KYEP), which is funded by the GoK and the World Bank.

68 The work by A. von Kotze on mixed livelihoods speaks to this challenge.
69 The total amount (in SUS) spent by CAP-YEI for each year was divided by the number of youth trained during that particular year, and by number of youth placed during that particular year. This includes resources spent in Capacity Building, but not youth trained through that stream.
70 Source: http://www.kepsa.or.ke/projects/kypep/
Annex E includes a detailed comparison between the two. Both shared comparable numbers of graduates and comparable placement percentages (72.4 Vs 77), but with significant differences in the level of investment.

Graph 11 – Number of person days per trained and placed youth

The key differences between the two programs are as follows:

* **Market scan** – While the CAP-YEI program conducts Market scans on regular basis in order to measure and assess the demand for specific jobs, KYEP derives it employment needs based on Vision 2030 and pre-determined growth sectors;

* **Relationship between youth – facilitators – private sector** – Under the CAP-YEI program there is a close relationship between the youth (participants), the facilitators of the courses and the local employers, with the facilitator being the “nucleus” of the relationship;

* **Provision of incentives** – While the CAP-YEI program does not provide any monetary incentive to either participants – to attend the training course, or the local employers – to hire the program participants, KYEP program provides both participants and local employers with monetary incentives;

* **The cost per youth (efficiency)** – the CAP-YEI costs are 2/3 of those achieved by the KYEP program (US$600 Vs. $935), and this may be related to the latter’s payment of incentives.

While there are differences, both project seek to provide employment opportunities for youth.

While TVETA has voiced support for the BEST model, both TVETA officials and CAP-YEI board members feel there is merit in demonstrating a larger target number of youth trained. This goal calls for:

a) An increase in the number of youth trained via the model (approximately 30,000 over five more years),

b) An increase in the number of Demonstration and Replication Centers (at least 30 centres spread over more counties), and
c) An increase in the transferal of the model to public institutions through a modified Capacity Building stream.

The TVETA officials suggested an increase in the number of youth trained and placed as a way for the BEST model to receive wider acceptability. The devolution plans require that the expansion in Demonstration and Replication centres should ideally cover approximately 30 counties (out of a total of 47). This expansion means that the program identifies sectors that will be relevant to other counties, including agriculture (over most of the rural ones), as well as pastoralist (for the arid and semi-arid lands), lake and marine industries.

For CAP-YEI it will mean the need for variations to the Market Scan approach to incorporate new stakeholders (example: agricultural value chains) and to develop new courses (example: improvements in productivity, transformation and marketing). Very likely, it will also mean more attention on mixed livelihoods - as formal employment opportunities will be few compared to urban centres. Rural economies & communities also involve other sectors: travel and tourism including game reserves; health; finance and banking; education; local government; forestry and fisheries; telecommunications; to name a few. Another possible change could be in the Market scan process in order to consider County or Region-wide scans with the data shared across many localities and centers. This task would be more efficient and enable CAP-YEI to better focus the BEST model on the challenges of regional economic growth.

To achieve higher numbers of trained and placed youth, CAP-YEI will also need to rely on the Capacity Building stream. This stream deserves special attention, as the transfer of the Program cannot simply be about the curriculum, but must be about the holistic 10 steps BEST approach. It is for this reason that it is referred to as the ‘modified’ Capacity Building Stream.

5 Conclusions

5.1 Proof of concept

The nine-step BEST model serves as the template for delivering a demand-led, market-based and youth-responsive employment program. The holistic nature of the model is characterized by the following features, which this evaluation refers to as ‘non-negotiable’:

- Providing a safe place to learn
- Providing a set of life-skills at the start to enhance self-esteem, confidence, and a sense of worth
- Ensuring the curriculum, and the skills provided, are grounded in the local needs of employers
- Offering a course duration that meets the needs of a large number of disadvantaged youth
- Allowing students to get guidance from mentors from different sectors, thereby creating linkages with employers, financial organizations, and other local leaders which they would have not been able to achieve on their own
- Managing students’ expectations through exposure to work sites and to the working world through internships
- Providing advice as young entrepreneurs plan to start their own businesses
- Encouraging peer networking and group formation during the course and subsequent to graduation
- Engaging graduates in recruitment and in mentoring, to serve as role models.
A number of elements of the model vary depending on the local ecosystem and its opportunities. However, the delivery structure remains focused on developing a wide range of: partnerships, mentor networks, sectoral committees and teams, and youth alumni networks. It maintains marginalized youth as the main priority. Last, but not least, the emphasis on job placement vs entrepreneurship is a balance that needs to be adjusted to each context.

The BEST model responds to UNESCO’s recommended practices for the region and responds directly to the GoK’s Vision 2030 and the TVET Act of 2013. The outcomes achieved during year 4 of the project have come close to the CAP-YEI’s 5-year target of 10,000 youth trained, with 74% employed. These achievements provide a proof of concept for the BEST model.

The success of the model is attributable to many factors and no single one can be isolated as responsible. This holistic aspect is one of the justifications for the recommendation to consider several ‘non negotiables’ as essential when replicating this program. The Step-by-Step summaries shed light on the integrated nature of the model. They signal that an important part of the ‘magic’ has to do with its localization and embedded nature. The model is more than a curriculum, it is an approach that seeks to connect and remain relevant. The CAP-YEI organizational culture sustains the trainers’ commitment and detailed follow-up efforts. The linkages made through Market Scans, Curriculum Development, Internships (or ‘attachments’), Training, Placement and Follow-up create social capital that contribute to the outcomes.

The BEST model will likely evolve further as the specific activities and reporting of each step are consolidated. However, what may be as important as the Step-by-Step formalization, will be the ability to continue adapting the steps as new challenges emerge. The anticipated challenges include:

- The pressure to increase targets (numbers of youth trained and employed; numbers of Centers established);
- The expansion to rural areas where employment opportunities are fewer, and where the physical environments offer few productive opportunities;
- Catering to the most marginal youth (displaced; handicapped), and youth in the arid and less populated north and east of the country;
- The expansion through Capacity Development to public TVET institutions that goes beyond training of trainers (as is the current practice);
- The integration of the model with county level policy-making and programs;
- Maintaining the current model at Demonstration and Replication Centers as a reference point, and providing quality control as the Program is expanded to public institutions;
- Framing the challenge as having a mixed livelihoods goal, that may include: both traditional employment and self-employment, as well as adapting the model to support the multiple pathways and livelihood practices of youth.

A monitoring, evaluation and learning system (MEL) will need to track change and flag omissions in the implementation at the Capacity Building sites. The MEL will need to cover activities, outputs, and a gradient of outcomes; and it will need to embrace indicators for mixed livelihoods in addition to formal employment.\(^7\) CAP-YEI’s role and responsibility as a quality control advisor will need to be clarified with TVETA. CAP-YEI will need to experiment with different Capacity Building strategies to ensure that it is transferring the holistic model, not just a curriculum if success is to be obtained.

5.2 Outcomes beyond employment

The CAP-YEI level of internship and placement (74%) will be difficult to maintain. In urban and peri-urban settings, the supply of formal employment is variable (a drop in tourism could reduce hotel and restaurant employment); while other sectors like floriculture are subject to international trade and price variations. Outside these areas, the supply of jobs will be more limited. Focusing on tracking placement (employment) may be what the authorities seek, but other measures will need to be added to demonstrate progress. Other possible indicators could take into account that CAP-YEI graduates exhibit levels of self-confidence that will stay with them forever, and will allow them to make better livelihood choices. Graduates also become community connectors and role models; these outcomes are contributors to improved livelihoods and should be reported.

The different stakeholders will have different expectations, and it will be important to produce and share a theory of change that clearly explains the gradient of outcomes that are expected. A shared assumption needs to take into account that the high level of placements recorded so far will be difficult to maintain in rural areas with fewer employers. Helping youth create more self-employment opportunities can be expected to be more complex and time consuming relative to the current approach.

The theory of change will evolve, but it should guide the Management Information System (MIS) data collection priorities. As was done with this evaluation, the MIS will need to driven by a set of (evaluation) Uses or Purposes, and relevant Research or Learning Questions that differentiate between activities, outputs, and a gradient of outcomes.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the project can be expected to follow one trajectory in the Demonstration and Replication Centers, and a different one in the Capacity Building stream. The former two streams will need to adhere as closely as possible to the Step by Step ‘non-negotiables’ process to set a reference point for the other stream. This differentiation means that comparable data will be needed from institutions adopting the model through the Capacity Building stream. There are numerous risks in allowing the model to be transferred simply by relying on a training of trainers format, when its holistic nature requires system wide adoption of all the steps identified.

5.3 Organizational challenges for expansion

CAP-YEI has thus far been driven by a single purpose: to adapt an approach to the Kenyan context and achieve proof of concept. In the next project, CAP-YEI will have multiple purposes that will include:

- Expanding the program into ~ 30 counties
- Increasing the target from 10,000 to ~30,000 trained youth
- Supporting new sectors in rural areas (agriculture being central, but others were listed above) and developing new course offerings
- Modifying its Capacity Building stream to ensure that the ‘non-negotiables’ are understood, budgeted for, and integrated into settings where CAP-YEI has no control
- Monitoring activities, outputs and a gradient of outcomes in Demonstration & Replication Centers, as the reference point to review the same data in Capacity Building sites
- Engaging with TVETA to clarify CAP-YEI’s role in certifying other institutions that adopt the BEST model

---

Aflatoun’s work with cocoa value chain and youth in Ghana is worth exploring, contact: iwanna@aflatoun.org
Monitoring, evaluation and learning: agreeing on indicators of mixed livelihoods, rather than just formal employment, will require advocacy, reliable data, and case examples.

‘Expansion’ is the term used to underline the importance of demonstrating that the BEST model can deliver a larger number of graduates. Finding ways to share the BEST model from CAP-YEI with the TVETA-accredited institutions needs to take into account its holistic nature. The holistic aspect of the BEST model needs to be transferred as an essential element and this process will require the development of an organizational culture that creates the conditions for instructors to remain motivated, and for administrators to commit to engaging regularly with local stakeholders. This process is akin to transplanting a young tree from the nursery to a farm. Success requires that the conditions of the farm mirror some those at the nursery.

CAP-YEI aims to partner with different government levels and departments; these include TVETA, CDACC, selected Counties, the Directorate of TVET and specific VTC’s. For TVETA, the key entry point for partnership is the implementation of the CBET framework. CAP-YEI hopes to benefit from the fact that the CBET and BEST principles are very similar and the BEST model is therefore seen as potentially a demonstration of ‘CBET in practice’.

CAP-YEI has limited expertise in transferring its model beyond adapting it to the Capacity Building stream that focuses on training trainers. As is made clear in the reference to Outcome Mapping (see the Spheres of Influence diagram in Section 4.1), trainees’ achievements depend on multiple factors beyond the control of the trainer. During the early phases, CAP-YEI may need to mentor the trainees and the public system instructors on-the-job, rather than leaving them to adapt the model with a limited understanding of its components.

This requirement suggests the need to pilot a number of different transfer strategies, to track the performance of each, and to jointly (with TVETA) settle on the most promising mechanisms. It may be naive to expect the public system to adopt the identical organizational culture that nourished the BEST model during the last four years under CAP-YEI. However, at the same time, it may be unrealistic to expect the public system to adopt the model without changing the work environment in the adopting institutions. This understanding also points to the necessity of CAP-YEI to position itself as a policy influencer within the TVET reform program of the government, a situation that will not be reached unless the CAP-YEI organization grows appreciably as a skills provider and as a ‘go to’ technical provider of youth employment expertise.

5.4 Informing broader work with youth

The 2015 African Union prize\(^\text{73}\) has provided recognition to CAP-YEI and the BEST model. As such, CAP-YEI is positioned to become a reference point for a capabilities-focused approach for sub-Saharan Africa TVETs. The alignment of CAP-YEI’s BEST model and the TVETA’s priorities is an opportunity to explore the expansion of the model into the public system. Beyond this alignment, CAP-YEI will need TVET partners to expand reach. The contemplated expansion may need to be presented as a further pilot project with different objectives to be tested.

Changing the organizational and teaching culture of multiple public institutions will take time. At the start, the various stakeholders will have their own assumptions about the expected outcomes.

---

\(^{73}\) The African Union Commission, in collaboration with USAID and FHI360, hosted a competition to uncover the 20 most promising models in Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) for the 21st century.
Creating a generation of youth who are entrepreneurial, who are connected to opportunities that allow them to craft their own mixed livelihoods is not the same as achieving job placement targets in urban areas. The facilitation of youth empowerment needs to include employment development while acknowledging that the model is about raising the expectations of, and creating opportunities for thousands of young people. The testing of several different replication strategies will be most productive if there is an agreement from the start with TVETA on a common theory of change and on the activities, outputs and gradient of outcomes to measure.

Agreeing on these parameters of a new initiative from its inception is paramount, very much as was done during this evaluation by establishing common purposes and key evaluation questions. The expansion of the BEST model into a hierarchical public TVET sector is very much an experiment in adapting a system.

6 Recommendations

While this exercise has been a Final Evaluation of the 5-year pilot project, the conclusions and recommendations from it will feed directly into actionable directions in the next project. For this reason, the focus is on the issues and dimensions that merit attention in the expansion of the model – especially the non-negotiables.

The list of ‘non-negotiables’ in the Step summaries stresses the need to transplant the approach together with the enabling organizational culture. The following recommendations build on the importance of the ‘non-negotiables’, while the latter ones address expansion challenges:

6.1 Market Scans

• Market Scans constitute an investment because of the social capital gains and should be presented as such.
• With the growing importance of training for entrepreneurship, Market Scans should include looking at business opportunities.
• To increase the social capital of the program, the Market Scan reports should be shared with the local government and representatives of the key stakeholders / industries.
• There is scope to broaden the Market Scans to include youth’s perspectives, using participatory appraisal tools.
• There is potential to conduct regional market scans, e.g., county-wide with data and recommendations shared by a number of training institutions to design and implement focused skills programs and support.

6.2 Curriculum review

• Engaging employers in the Curriculum Review is a useful investment because of the resulting social capital gains (i.e. some participants become mentors and have added commitment to employing graduates).
• Beyond the current training (referred to as ‘Level 1’) there should be additional opportunities – such as ‘Level 2’ courses for those who want to come back. Such ‘Level 2’ training could be delivered by CAP-YEI with some flexible training arrangements to accommodate those participants who are already working.
6.3 **Road shows**

- Any differentiation in **Selection Criteria** between CAP-YEI’s and those of another institution must be undertaken systematically, explicitly, and purposefully, as the changes will impact on outcomes. Guaranteeing an independent selection of participants will be paramount; the same applies to the independent and unpaid role of mobilizers.

6.4 **Internships**

- The process of **Internship** (or ‘attachment’) selection needs to be done systematically, explicitly, and purposefully, as changes in selection criteria will impact on outcomes (such as providing financial incentives to work places).

6.5 **Placements**

- **Placement** is a key indicator for TVET, and an increase in the number of students per instructor is expected to affect the capacity of the instructor to match employment opportunities with appropriate graduates because the quality of the student-instructor relationship will be reduced.

6.6 **Measurement of performance**

- **Expanding performance indicators** – While the employment rate of participants should remain the preferred performance indicator for the BEST model, it is important to recognize that other performance indicators should be included when assessing the outcomes of the program. Potential additional performance indicators could include the following: i) Number / percentage of youth who plan to pursue further education; ii) role played by youth at the community level; and iii) life skills gained by youth and their ability to empower other youth.

  _These indicators are illustrative examples, but negotiating outcome indicators may be best done in consultation with local partners._

6.7 **Expansion of the model**

A three-pronged strategy for future expansion can be boiled down to two streams, in that the key variable will be the degree of control that CAP-YEI will have over the delivery of the model. The Replication Centers will demonstrate what is possible within public institutions, while the Capacity Building stream will require more than a training of trainer approach. A holistic approach is essential in an organization that provides the enabling environment for instructors to stay committed. This dimension will need to be recognized and taken into account from the start, within pilot projects supported by TVETA in order to create comparable conditions in new public institutions that deliver the BEST model.

---

74 In its agricultural work with young cocoa farmer in Ghana, Aflatoun tracks: critical thinking, problem solving, future orientation, participation, savings, entrepreneurship; and their local partners has added nutrition/sanitation, gender balance, child labour, cocoa resource management, micro credit, environment and coaching. (Source: personal communication from Iwanna Rosalie Swart and Simon Bailey, Aflatoun, 12 Nov. 2105).
The recommendations that address expansion included possible additional, short-term [expect-to-see] outcomes to track, which will help minimize the risk that lower than expected numbers of placements may be result in a challenge to the model.

To create the foundation for a successful expansion / adaptation of the model / program, the following elements are proposed:

- **Phasing in**: Start the expansion of the BEST model by selecting a number of new locations (outside of the Demonstration and Replication centers) where the model could be fully implemented. By incrementally increasing the “catchment area” for the implementation / adaptation of the BEST model, all the parties involved will have a chance to assess what changes would be necessary for a successful expansion of the model.

- **Conduct a readiness assessment of the new locations to provide a better chance for a successful initial expansion. This step will require the definition of desirable / necessary attributes for the successful implementation of the model / program. These attributes will need adjustment during the expansion process, as not all of them will be evident at the start.**

- **Learning and adapting continuously** – Both CAP-YEI and other stakeholders need to continuously monitor, evaluate, and learn from the initial expansion phases, as well as be ready to adapt accordingly, using a collaborative management approach.

- **Importance of organizational culture** – While not all the organizational attributes of CAP-YEI can be “transferred” to each new BEST center, it is important that some key organizational attributes – such as the incentives that lead to a committed involvement of the facilitators and their continuous support provided to youth – be present at each new BEST center.

- **The holistic approach (complete continuum)** – The advantage / strength of the BEST model resides in its holistic approach which includes participants’ involvement, provision of Life skills,

---

75 For instance, the attributes may include organizational strategies, structures, shared values, management styles, internal systems, staff, and skill sets.
technical and financial skills, and continuous support from facilitators and the program. While the emphasis on these components can vary – depending on context / location / other factors, the “togetherness” and holistic development continuum of the BEST-related components should be maintained.

This Evaluation Report is complemented by the following documents:

- Inception Report (August 2015)
- Annexes A to F
- Annex E: Step-by-Step Summaries (separate document)
- Theory of change (two Powerpoint presentations)