Summative Evaluation Guidelines
for Jobs Fund Partners

May 2017

Contents

Introduction

The Jobs Fund ascribes to Results Based Management (RBM) principles in the implementation, monitoring and management of its portfolio of projects. The pursuit of a results-based approach to the implementation and management of development interventions requires the mobilisation of evidence in support of results claims by such programmes. In the context of ever-competing socio-economic interests and needs, managing for results has become an imperative for development agencies, donors and governments alike. Development interventions such as the Jobs Fund need to clearly and systematically demonstrate their development results in order to justify their continued support from the public fiscus.

In order to demonstrate their evidence-backed results, programmes have to be geared up in such a way as to be able to show that it is in fact their interventions that have led to observable results. Results Chains are useful tools that help projects articulate their theories of change in such a way as to demonstrate this envisaged change and enable projects to estimate attribution. Reliable and valid baseline data is therefore crucial in establishing the state of affairs prior to the implementation of a project, as change experienced during the implementation of the project is measured against this formative information.

Evaluation activities are fundamental in demonstrating the progress or lack thereof toward the achievement of stated project goals. This transparent assessment and reporting of programme performance results, promotes programme accountability to government and to the public at large, and engenders public confidence and programme credibility.

Jobs Fund projects are required to conduct a number of evaluations on their projects; Formative (baseline), Mid-term and Summative. These studies are based on key results indicators to be tracked over the duration of a project's implementation (i.e. the programme and project-specific indicators) and would be used at the Mid-term and Summative evaluation to compare and estimate the project's contribution to observed change.

This document should be used by the Jobs Fund Partner (JFP), in consultation with their Jobs Fund Project Team, as a guide to carry out their Summative Evaluation.

Purpose of the Summative Evaluation

A Summative Evaluation (sometimes referred to as an outcome evaluation, final evaluation or programme evaluation) is a time-bound periodic assessment performed characteristically at the end of a project cycle to determine the value of a project. It sets out to ascertain the effect that the project had on the target audience in relation to the goals and objectives that were set at project inception, i.e. the evaluation must determine the extent to which anticipated outcomes were realised and the extent to which the impact may materialise.

Evaluation Criteria

A Summative Evaluation is focused on the results (outcomes) of the intervention and typically measures them in terms of Development Assistance Committee (DAC)[1] criteria for evaluation:

- *Relevance:* The extent to which the objectives of the Jobs Fund project are consistent with target beneficiaries' needs, as well as the local and country priorities.
- *Effectiveness:* The extent to which the project's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved.
- *Efficiency:* Efficiency measures the outputs, qualitative and quantitative, in relation to the inputs. It seeks to ascertain whether the project has used the most cost-effective resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. The focus is not only on monetary-value, but also takes into account quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs and activities as they relate to the achievements of results. Measures of efficiency generally require comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted.
- *Impact:* The Impact criterion seeks to assess the positive and negative changes produced by the Jobs Fund supported project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This should involve impacts and effects resulting from the project on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators.
- *Sustainability:* Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after the Jobs Fund support has come to an end. This may also refer to scaling and replication.
- *Job creation model proficiency:* The Jobs Fund main mandate is on facilitating job creation and uncovering the development and operation of innovative job creation models. The evaluation must investigate the project's methodology for job creation and assess the aptness of the model. This must be done within the context of other job creation models in comparable sectors and within the broader context of South Africa.
- *Learning:* To synthesise lessons that can help to improve selection, design and implementation of future projects and inform policy development.

The Summative Evaluation will determine what works, what does not and the reasons why. These findings are typically used to decide whether a project should be replicated, continued, or modified for improvement.

---

[1] The five evaluation criteria from the Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/DAC) have been a strong foundation for international development evaluation since 1991. http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

Responsibilities of the Jobs Fund Partners

Jobs Fund Partners are required to undertake a Summative Evaluation at the end of the JF funding period, and this forms part of the official Project Close-out process which is described in the Jobs Fund Operating Guidelines.

The Summative Evaluation should be conducted by an independent service provider who was not involved in project design and implementation. This is to avoid a potential conflict of interest and to ensure objectivity, as the credibility of the evaluation depends in part on how independently and objectively performance has been verified. Independence implies freedom from organisational pressure and political influence. It is characterised by uninhibited access to information and by full autonomy in carrying out the assessment and reporting findings, thereby ensuring impartiality and transparency.

Jobs Fund Partners, however, are afforded the opportunity to perform their own internal evaluation of the project, from their project team's perspective, when they complete the Self Evaluation Report (SER) during the Close-out phase of their project. This evaluation is not independent and is meant to be a subjective take on the implementation and subsequent results of the project. Refer to the Operating Guidelines for further information.

Although a Summative Evaluation is results/outcome-focused, the project design, institutional arrangements, environmental and economic conditions, implementation processes and use of prior evaluations findings should also be comprehensively investigated, as they provide the backdrop to the resultant outcomes. All outcomes should be investigated; whether intended or unintended.

The Summative Report should be submitted to the Jobs Fund three months after the official project end date. The JFP is therefore advised to begin preparing for the Summative Evaluation during the Project Close-out Phase which begins four quarters (one year) before the end date. This planning would involve developing the Terms of Reference (ToR), preparing a budget plan, selecting the external evaluator and ensuring that support for the evaluator is in place. The JFP can consult with the Jobs Fund M&E team during this process.

Planning for the Evaluation

Considerable planning should go into preparing for the Summative Evaluation, bearing in mind that the success of the evaluation is hinged on the suitable selection of an external evaluator. Consider the following when preparing for the evaluation:

1. The timeline of the evaluation: When is the final report required and how much time is needed for all the processes leading up to the final report?
2. Evaluation budget: What budget is available and is it sufficient to drive all the processes, if not what are the priorities?
3. Evaluation objectives: What is the purpose of the evaluation? This should take into account that Summative Evaluations evaluate for accountability, progress against plans and also for learning.

4. Scope of the evaluation: this includes the purpose of the evaluation and evaluation questions to be answered (to include process and outcome questions).
5. Potential risks and proposed strategies to mitigate the risks.
6. Roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders that were involved in the project: This is towards a participatory evaluation approach to improve the quality of the evaluation findings and initiate the learning process.
7. Development of the ToR with clear objectives and tasks of the evaluation: The ToR document defines all aspects of how an evaluator will conduct an evaluation. It defines the objectives and the scope of the evaluation, outlines the responsibilities of the evaluator, and provides a clear description of the resources available to conduct the study. The ToR document serves as the basis for a contractual arrangement with the evaluator and sets the parameters against which the success of the assignment can be measured.
8. Development of selection criteria for evaluator: Key requirements to be considered include knowledge on key evaluation concepts and the subject area, experience in the field of evaluation (examples of prior work done can be reviewed), analytical skills, facilitation skills and good communication skills.
9. Determining the tendering process for the external evaluator: Various options exist which include advertising, drawing up a preferred list of potential consultants or inviting notes of interest. This process must be decided very early on to ensure that the best service provider is engaged.
10. Considering the contractual arrangement with the evaluator: The contract typically includes the scope of work, timelines, expected outputs, payment and how ethics will be observed.

The Summative Evaluation Report Template

In order to assist JF partners in undertaking the Summative Evaluation, a reporting template has been provided herein (Annex A). The Summative Evaluation Report template provides a framework for completing the report in which key information must be included (common components and headings). The template includes aspects such as the effectiveness of the project's theory of change and business model (i.e. the results and efficiencies) and its prospects for future sustainability and possible replication. The JFP may decide to include additional categories in order to provide a more comprehensive analysis of performance and outcomes; however the following key areas must be included:

- Executive Summary

- Introduction

- Purpose and Scope

- Methodology

- Assessment of Project Performance

- Post-Implementation Activities

- Lessons Learned

- Conclusion

- Recommendations

- Annexures

Further Information

For any further information or assistance, please contact your JF Project Team. Several readings have also been included below for your reference.

Readings

Bond Networking for International Development (2015) Impact Evaluation: A Guide for Commissioners and Managers. https://www.bond.org.uk/data/files/Impact_Evaluation_Guide_0515.pdf

Bond Networking for International Development (2003) Logical Framework Analysis: Guidance Notes No.4. https://www.gdrc.org/ngo/logical-fa.pdf

Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation (2011). The National Evaluation Framework. The Presidency, South Africa. http://www.gov.za/sites/www.gov.za/files/Evaluation_Policy_Framework%20approved%2011%2011%202023a.pdf

European Social Fund - European Commission. (1997) Guide to Self Evaluation for Employment Projects. http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/equal_consolidated/data/document/gsee-en.doc

Kusek, Jody Zall and Rist, R. (2004) Ten Steps to a Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System: A Handbook for Development Practitioners. Washington DC: World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/14926/296720PAPER0100steps.pdf

The African Evaluation Association (2007). African Evaluation Guidelines - Standards and Norms. http://www.ader-evaluare.ro/docs/African%20Evaluation%20Association.pdf

Annexure - Summative Evaluation Template

<insert your logo here>

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION REPORT

Project Name		
Project Number		
Project Start Date		
Project End Date		
	Contracted	**Actual**
Total Approved Grant Amount	R	R
Total Approved Match Funding Amount	R	R
New Permanent Jobs targets (non-seasonal)		
New Permanent Jobs targets (seasonal)[2]		
Permanent Placements in Vacant Positions beyond project partners		
Permanent Placements in Vacant Positions with project partners		
New Short-term Jobs		
Completed Internships		
Trained Beneficiaries		
Contact Person		
Designation		
Report Submission Date		

---

[2] Seasonal job targets would have been approved at contracting and should be reflected in the ABC PIMP. They apply to sectors such as agriculture.

PROJECT SPECIFIC INDICATORS[3]	
Indicator	**Target**
Number of beneficiaries registered on the on-line system for job matching (*Work-seeker project specific indicator example*)	
Number of hectares under production (*Agriculture project specific indicator example*)	
Number of small-holder farmers supported with mentorship (*Agriculture project specific indicator example*)	
Number of enterprises supported with funding (*Enterprise Development project specific indicator example*)	
Number of SMMEs provided with business development services (*Enterprise Development project specific indicator example*)	
Rand amount disbursed to SMMEs (*Enterprise Development project specific indicator example*)	

Version Control			
	Date	**Version**	**Comments**
i.			
ii.			
iii.			

---

[3] Please note that project specific indicators would have been described on the Outcomes page in the (ABC) PIMP. The indicators provided are examples, and the list is not extensive. Pease include indicators that are relevant to your project.

Table of Contents

Index, list of abbreviations, map

Executive Summary (Maximum 3 pages)

The Executive Summary will set out the key points and findings as contained in the main report. These should be arranged in a logical sequence (which may not necessarily correspond to the order in which they appear in the report), so that the Summary can be read as a self-contained narrative.

It summarises the report in such a way as to present the main arguments and conclusion of the report. It usually contains a brief statement of the purpose, the objectives, the scope, the methodology and the most pertinent recommendations, results and lessons learnt.

Introduction

Project Background and Context

This should be a description of the context and intervention logic of the project, including a summary of the project objectives. The Background and Context element spells out what is to be evaluated and identifies the critical social, economic, political, geographic and demographic factors in which the project operates that have a direct bearing on the evaluation.

Give an overview of the project implementation strategy that has actually been used and the project management structure that has been responsible for implementation.

Other information should include the project sector and funding window, profile of target beneficiaries, budget, timeframe and geographical scope. The problem statement should be well articulated, detailing the proposed solution, delivery modalities and expected results. Information on partnerships and contributions from other stakeholders other than the Jobs Fund should be added.

Project Theory of Change

Elaborate on the logic that explains how the project objectives were to be achieved, including cause and effect and underlying assumptions. This section should demonstrate the logical sequence for the project, detailing the anticipated flow to achieving the desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes and impacts.

Using a logical framework can assist to visually represent and describe the project's theory of change. 'It looks like a table (or framework) and aims to present information about the key components of a project in a clear, concise, logical and systematic way[4].

---

[4] Bond (2013) Logical Framework Analysis: Guidance Notes No.4. https://www.gdrc.org/ngo/logical-fa.pdf.

A useful resource to using logic models is available from [Usable Knowledge](#) (clickable link).

Previous Evaluation Recommendations

An overview of the baseline and mid-term evaluations should be discussed under this section and findings from other evaluations/studies could also be included.

- *Highlight the recommendations from each of the evaluations.*

- *Were they implemented in the project?*

- *Explain why they were/weren't implemented?*

Purpose and Scope

The evaluation scope and purpose defines the parameters and focus of the evaluation. The section addresses the aspects of the intervention that are to be covered by the evaluation. Explain why the evaluation is being done and how the evaluation will be used by the Jobs Fund, the JF Project Partner and other stakeholders. Describe the context of the evaluation to provide an understanding of the setting in which it takes place.

In order to define the purpose, the evaluation manager should ask the following questions: Who wants the evaluation? Why do they want it? How do they intend to use it?

In the context of the Jobs Fund, the summative evaluation has the following main objectives:

- ***Model Efficacy:*** *To find out whether the particular job creation intervention implemented by the JF Partner is effective (i.e. are new sustainable jobs being created as a result of the JF grant);*
- ***Accountability****: To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project results;*
- ***Learning:*** *To synthesise lessons that can help to improve selection, design and implementation of future projects and inform policy development.*
- ***Value for money (VfM)****: Assessing the most advantageous combination of cost, quality and sustainability, taking into account the four VfM 'E's': economy, efficiency, effectiveness and equity.*

Methodology

This section should explain both and approach and the methodology used.

Methodology: The type of evaluation conducted, the quantitative and qualitative methods applied, the evaluation assumptions, the data collection and processing techniques used (e.g. interviews, observations, focus groups, literature reviews, surveys, ratings, knowledge test, site visits), describe who took part in the evaluation (numbers and characteristics), provide a description of the attempts to follow up people who

did not respond to the data collection method, and explain the type of data analysis performed. Also include strengths and weaknesses of the chosen methods. Sampling should be specified for each method (an overview and explanation on beneficiary and site selection criteria). Demonstrate how the main evaluation questions are addressed by the multiple methods and data. Ethical guidelines that will be considered should also be discussed here.

Approach: Explain how the evaluation was carried out (i.e. the steps in the process).

Results

The evaluation should clearly spell out the evaluation criteria against which the project has been assessed. Evaluation questions have been included under each evaluation criterion below and Annexure B lists all the evaluation questions and proposed methodology but you are not limited to the suggestions.

Relevance

Relevance will determine the extent to which the strategy and project activities are suited to the priorities and needs of the labour market; of the employers; and of the beneficiaries (unemployed).

- *To what extent are the objectives of the project consistent with the needs and priorities of the target beneficiaries, and relevant to the local and country needs?*
- *To what extent have stakeholders been involved in the planning and implementation of the project?*
- *Is the project's strategy, objectives and assumptions appropriate for achieving the planned results?*
- *Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended outcomes and impacts of the project?*

Effectiveness

This refers to the extent to which the project's objectives were achieved. Indicate performance over the life of the project in terms of targets and actuals as well as disaggregated beneficiary information. In some instances projects may not be able to complete their implementation within their contracted time period. Use this section to elaborate on other issues that would have affected implementation.

Figure 1 - Programme indicator performance

Indicator (as applicable)	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Final Total		Beneficiary Actuals (disaggregated)			
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	%≤35	%F	%PWD	%PDI
Number of new												

Indicator (as applicable)	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Final Total		Beneficiary Actuals (disaggregated)			
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	%≤35	%F	%PWD	%PDI
permanent jobs created as a result of the funded initiatives												
Number of beneficiaries employed in permanent positions beyond project partners												
Number of beneficiaries employed in permanent positions with project partners												
Number of new short term jobs during of the grant funding												
Number of beneficiaries having completed time bound internships												
Number of trained beneficiaries												

Figure 2 - Project-specific indicator performance

Indicator	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Final Total		Beneficiary Actuals (disaggregated)			
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	%≤35	%F	%PWD	%PDI

- *How well has the project performed? Have they achieved contracted results?*
- *What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?*
- *How effective has each of the project interventions been (e.g. training, enterprise development, access to finance, and infrastructure development)?*
- *What adjustments were made to the project implementation process, the target indicators and why?*

- *Has the project effectively and efficiently succeeded in mainstreaming gender equality and youth development (Jobs Fund disaggregated indicators) in its areas of work (outputs) and its processes?*
- *Has the management and governance arrangements of the project been appropriate?*
- *Has the management and governance arrangements of Jobs Fund been supportive of the implementation process of the project?*
- *How have outputs been transformed into outcomes?*
- *Do not only include quantitative measures, also include qualitative measures which can also speak to systemic change.*

Efficiency

Efficiency measures the outputs, qualitative and quantitative, in relation to the inputs. It seeks to ascertain whether the project has used cost-effective resources possible in order to achieve optimised results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. Measures of Vfm are of particular importance.

Figure 3 - Financial performance

Projected Income	Budget Contracted	Actual Disbursed
A Jobs Fund Grant		
B Matched Funding		
• Own Funding Contributions		
• Contributions from other Sources		
• Loan Financing		
• Value of in kind contributions		
D Other Project Income		
E (A+B+D) Total Income		
PLANNED EXPENDITURE	**Budget Contracted**	**Actual**
F.a Management Costs		
F.b Transfers and Subsidies		
G Project-related Costs		
• Compensation		
• Goods and Services		
• Goods and Services - Other		
• Capital		
K (F+G) Total Expenditure		

	Contracted	Actual
COST PER JOB	Contracted	Actual
Project cost per job		
Grant cost per job		

- *To what extent can the costs of the project be justified by its actual results, taking relevant alternatives into account?*
- *To what extent has the project been able to build on other initiatives and create synergies with other projects, partners and programmes?*
- *Were the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?*

Impact

The Impact criterion seeks to assess both positive and negative changes produced by the Jobs Fund supported project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This should include the effects and impacts attributable to the project on the local social, economic and development environment.

- *In addition to the contracted results as set out in the grant agreement, what other impacts can be identified, positive and negative, intended and unintended?*
- *Are there any innovative elements of the project with scope to be replicated and/or scaled-up, and if so, which ones and how?*
- *What catalytic effects has the project had in job creation within or outside of the sector, in the local area or outside the local area?*

Sustainability

Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of the project are likely to continue after the Jobs Fund support has come to an end.

- *What is the sustainability of the permanent jobs created as a result of the funded initiative?*
- *How does the project's growth (in terms of operations, profits, demand and supply, labour relations, etc.) translate into the sustainability of jobs created?*
- *To what extent are skills developed, enterprises created, or infrastructure developed (durability and usage) through the project is sustainable?*
- *Where should the Jobs Fund focus its future interventions in order to achieve sustainable impacts in job creation within the line of business that your project is in?*
- *Is the project supported by other local or national institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue to work with the project or replicate it?*

Job Creation Model Proficiency

The Jobs Fund mandate is two-fold: 1) permanent job creation and 2) extracting good practice through experimentation with innovative concepts, approaches or models. This measure seeks to examine the project's methodology for job creation and to assess the aptness of the model within the context of other job creation models in comparable sectors and within the broader context of South Africa.

- *Has the job creation model been successful in creating quality jobs? Comment on the jobs created in relation to the specific sector and location.*
- *To what extent is the project's job creation methodology successful in creating sustainable jobs?*
- *How can the job creation model be improved to achieve quality sustainable jobs?*
- *How can the project's job creation model achieve scale?*

Post-Implementation Activities

Identify all post-implementation activities after the end of Jobs Fund support to the project. Make sure to include any carry-over activities in this section. These may include monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities, additional reporting, outstanding disbursement, etc. All projects carry either a one or two year post-project monitoring period, as per the Grant Agreement, and projects must include actions points on these activities.

Figure 4 - Post-implementation action plan

Action	Due Date

Lessons Learned

This section must clearly describe the lessons learnt in the project and identify a list of good practices:

- *What good practices can be learned from the project that can be applied to similar projects in the future?*
- *Considering the outcomes of this project, what are the key lessons learned that both the JF Partner and the Jobs Fund Programme can take away on job creation, project design and implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and impact assessment?*

- *What lessons were learned and applied during the project's design and implementation?*

The table below is an example of how each good practice/lesson learnt can be documented.

Figure 5 - Lessons learned tool

Key Area	Description
Key Project Aspect or Challenge in the following: -Project design, -Implementation processes, -Partnerships -Sector lessons, etc.	*[Enter the category for this lesson learned; which of the usual or most common aspects or challenges faced when managing or working on the project does this lesson learned belong to?]*
Situational Context [brief description of the situation surrounding the lesson learned]	*[Enter a short statement illustrating the context of the situation that resulted in the lesson being learned; a brief explanation of the situation, issue, problem, challenge, risk, threat or opportunity that was being faced or experienced]*
Action Taken [description of the actual actions taken or decisions made]	*[Enter a description of the actual action taken or decision made to manage, deal, mitigate, resolve or take advantage of the situation described above]*
Result(s) Achieved [brief statement of the outcome of above-described actions]	*[Enter a short statement describing the positive or negative outcome or results achieved as a direct consequence of taking the above described action or decision]*
Summary Statement [brief statement of the actual lesson learned]	*[Reiterate the lesson learned from the above-described situation in one sentence; this is the suggested, valuable lesson learned that could be re-used on future projects; try to structure the sentence as a combination of the following components: [action verb] + [description of action to take] + [description of the context/situation] + [description of the desired result]*

Conclusion

Conclusions are substantiated by findings consistent with evaluation methodology, data collected and analysis. They represent insights into identification and/or solutions of important problems or issues. Conclusions should add value to the findings and focus on issues of significance to the project being evaluated, as informed by the evaluation objectives and the key evaluation questions.

Key components of a conclusion should:

- *Emphasise the importance of the evaluation findings;*
- *Give the report a sense of completeness;*
- *State what the next step of the project will be.*

Recommendations

The recommendations should be based on evidence and analysis. They should be relevant to the subject of the evaluation, be realistic, with priorities for action made clear. The recommendations must be formulated in a clear and concise manner and must be prioritised to the best extent possible and responsibilities and the time frame for their implementation clearly stated.

Annexures

Provide any additional documents and information in support of findings in the evaluation report.

Include the following:

- *The Evaluation Terms of Reference*
- *Evaluation Timeline*
- *Detailed Evaluation Framework (an example table is provided below)*

Evaluation Framework

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
Relevance	To what extent are the objectives of the project consistent with the needs and priorities of the target beneficiaries, and relevant to the local and country needs?	Key informant interviews with relevant local authorities Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries Document review of local and country documents on needs assessments that have been conducted	Interview/focus group scripts and survey data. Needs assessment reports.
	To what extent have stakeholders been involved in the planning and implementation of the project?	Interviews and focus groups with stakeholders. Document review of project information	Interview and focus group scripts. Meeting minutes. Monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports.
	Is the project's strategy, objectives and assumptions appropriate for achieving the planned results?	Document review of project information Document review of output and outcome information Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Results chain. Project Implementation Monitoring Plan (PIMP). Progress reports. Interview and focus group scripts.
	Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended outcomes and impacts of the project?	Document review of project information Document review of output and outcome information Surveys or interviews or focus groups	Results chain. Project Implementation Monitoring Plan (PIMP).

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
		with supported beneficiaries	Progress reports. Interview and focus group scripts.
Effectiveness	How well has the project achieved contracted results?	Document review of project information Document review of output and outcome information Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries Key informant interviews with project stakeholders and project implementers	Results chain. Project Implementation Monitoring Plan (PIMP). Progress reports. Interview and focus group scripts.
	What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?	Document review of project information Document review of output and outcome information Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries Key informant interviews with project stakeholders and project implementers	Results chain. Project Implementation Monitoring Plan (PIMP). Progress reports. Interview/focus group scripts and survey data.
	How effective has each of the project interventions been (e.g. training, enterprise development, access to finance, and infrastructure development)?	Document review of project planning data Document review of output and outcome information Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Results chain or theory of change, project PIMP. Progress reports: monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports. Interview and focus group scripts.
	What adjustments were made to the project	Document review on project planning and	PIMPs.

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
	implementation process, the target indicators and why?	implementation information. Interviews with project implementers and project stakeholders.	Progress reports: monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports. Interview scripts.
	Has the project effectively and efficiently succeeded in mainstreaming gender equality and youth development (Jobs Fund disaggregated indicators) in its areas of work (outputs) and its processes?	Document review of output and outcome data Interviews with project implementers and key stakeholders	Progress reports: monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports. Interview scripts.
	Has the management and governance arrangements of the project been appropriate?	Key informant interviews with key stakeholders Document review of project information	Progress reports: monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports. Interview scripts.
	Has the management and governance arrangements of Jobs Fund been supportive of the implementation process of the project?	Interviews with project implementers and key stakeholders Document review of project information	Progress reports: monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports. Interview scripts.
	How have outputs been transformed into outcomes?	Document review of project planning data Document review of output and outcome information Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and key stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Results chain or theory of change, project PIMP. Progress reports: monthly/ quarterly/ annual project reports. Interview scripts and focus group scripts. Survey results.
Efficiency	To what extent can the costs of the project be justified by	Document review of project information	Progress reports,

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
	its actual results, taking relevant alternatives into account?	Document review of comparable projects	monthly/quarterly/annual project reports
			Similar project reports
		Document review of financial reports	Financial statements, audit reports
	To what extent has the project been able to build on other initiatives and create synergies with other projects, partners and programmes?	Key informant interviews with project stakeholders or partners and project implementers	Interview scripts
		Document review of project information	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports
	Were the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?	Document review of project information	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports
		Document review of financial reports	Financial statements, audit reports
Impact	In addition to the contracted results as set out in the grant agreement, what other impacts can be identified, positive and negative, intended and unintended?	Document review of project information	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports
		Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and stakeholders	Interview and focus group scripts
		Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Survey results
	Are there any innovative elements of the project with scope to be replicated and/or scaled-up, and if so, which	Document review of project information	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
	ones and how?	Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	reports Interview and focus group scripts Survey results
	What catalytic effects has the project had in job creation within or outside of the sector, in the local area or outside the local area?	Key informant interviews with industry body specialists Document review of job creation information in the specific industry Document review of project information	Interview scripts Sector or industry specific job creation information Progress reports
Sustainability	What is the sustainability of the permanent jobs created as a result of the funded initiative?	Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries Key informant interviews with employers	Interview/focus group scripts
	How does the project's growth (in terms of operations, profits, demand and supply, labour relations, etc.) translate into the sustainability of jobs created?	Document review of project financial information Document review of project output and outcome information Key informant interviews with employers	Financial records (financial statements, audit reports) Interview/focus group scripts
	To what extent are skills developed, enterprises created, or infrastructure developed (durability and usage) through the project is sustainable?	Document review of project information Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries Key informant interviews with the employers	Progress reports, financial records Interview/focus group scripts or survey results
	Where should the Jobs Fund focus its future interventions	Document review of project information	Progress reports,

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
	in order to achieve sustainable impacts in job creation within the line of business that your project is in?	Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	monthly/quarterly/annual project reports Interview and focus group scripts Survey results
	Is the project supported by other local or national institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue to work with the project or replicate it?	Interviews with project implementers and key stakeholders Document review of project information	Interview scripts Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports
Job creation model proficiency	Has the job creation model been successful in creating quality jobs? Comment on the jobs created in relation to the specific sector and location.	Document review of project information Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and key stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports Interview and focus group scripts Survey results
	To what extent is the project's job creation methodology successful in creating sustainable jobs?	Document review of project information Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and key stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports Interview and focus group scripts Survey results

Evaluation component	Evaluation question	Evaluation methods	Source documents
	How can the job creation model be improved to achieve quality sustainable jobs?	Document review of project information Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and key stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports Interview and focus group scripts Survey results
	How can the project's job creation model achieve scale?	Document review of project information Key informant interviews or focus groups with project implementers and key stakeholders Surveys or interviews or focus groups with supported beneficiaries	Progress reports, monthly/quarterly/annual project reports Interview and focus group scripts Survey results