



Youth Employment Initiative evaluation

Growth Programme Board Presentation
13.12.2016



Overview of the presentation

- Evaluation aims and methodology
- Key findings:
 - strategic fit
 - design/development
 - implementation
- Considerations arising
- Questions and discussion

Evaluation aims and methodology

Aims

1. Gathering and analysing evidence to evaluate the **strategic fit, design and implementation** of the YEI
2. Preparing for a planned second YEI evaluation focusing on effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the YEI

Methodology

Key elements of the methodology:

- Desk review of YEI documentation
- 5 telephone interviews with ESFD and EC representatives
- 11 telephone interviews with LEP area ESIF sub-committee representatives
- 40 telephone interviews with YEI provider representatives (strategic leads and delivery partners)
- Fieldwork period August – November 2016
- Analysis based on evaluation framework

Key findings – strategic fit

Strategic fit

- Clear read across between YEI objectives at the EU level and the translation of these at the national and local levels
 - Projects and activities developed reflect EU and national guidance
 - Activities generally complementary to existing provision
- high degree of relevance and coherence in respect of the policy and operational intent but...
- Some views that relevance lessened since YEI's inception
 - Though most interviewees felt that initiative remained highly relevant, and this is also reflected in statistical evidence

Key findings – design and development

Design - initial launch

- Generally positive experiences with development of YEI at programme level, including involvement of EC, ESF MA and LEP area sub-committees
- Varying involvement of LEP area representatives in project level design - expressed wish for a more ongoing role beyond procurement phase
- Broad consultations and collaboration of partnerships in the design phase locally; key role of good prior relationships

Design – key considerations

- Localism strongly influenced YEI design
- The flexibility of programme was appreciated and activities were designed to add value and address gaps in services
 - Though some potential overlap in areas with multiple projects
- Learning from previous experiences informed the YEI design
- Value for money considerations played a role, but acknowledgement that this was not the key driver
 - Engagement with the target group inevitably expensive
- ESF cross-cutting themes said to have been considered
 - Practical influence less evidence

Design – challenges

- Initial design and development impacted by delays in agreeing the ESF OP and related factors (compressed timescale); duration of procurement process
- Geographical mismatch between NUTS2/NUTS3 areas and LEP areas– ‘divided provision’
- Some perceived restrictiveness of YEI guidance and eligibility rules, e.g. around pre-NEET and apprenticeship provision
- Requirements to source match-funding
 - Potentially negative impact on innovation
- Some LEP areas felt unable to engage – issues securing match funding and fit with existing provision

Key findings - implementation

Implementation – overall delivery

- Delivery seen as going broadly to plan though some ongoing effects resulting from delays in some areas...
 - E.g. delivery being staggered in terms of involvement of partners
- Activities broadly follow the ‘participant journey’
- Governance/partnerships working well but some challenges
 - Delivery partnerships often built on pre-existing relationships
 - Limited involvement of LEP area representatives in governance
 - Issues around recruitment delays, staff turnover, lack of meetings
- Some evidence of good practice sharing but ltd. overall
- Limited reflection of cross-cutting themes in delivery

Implementation – contractual relations

- Despite delays and procurement / contracting issues relationships with DWP seen as working well and understanding of context
 - Though some calls for more f-2-f contact, clearer collated guidance in a single place and faster resolution of queries
- Some concern over potential underspend, both at the LEP area level and in the case of particular projects/providers
 - Though equally in some areas LEP area and project representatives confident that they will spend their allocations
- Some issues raised over perceived high levels of paperwork and MI requirements related to the initiative
 - Further guidance needed

Considerations arising

Issues to consider...

- In general a lot of positivity over the initiative and its potential benefits in addressing issues of NEET young people
- Some issues to consider however...
 - In light of possible future calls for proposals important to review position in some areas to ensure there is need for additional funding
 - Explore any ways to reduce period between procurement decision and contracting
 - Reconsider eligibility evidence requirements if possible
 - Possible benefits in reviewing guidance for providers
 - Consider how LEP area representatives might be more involved in monitoring/oversight

Questions and discussion