



# Centres of Specialisation Programme Midterm Evaluation *Synthesis Report*

**Project leader:** James Keevy

**Researchers:** Zulaikah Brey, Kelly Brownell & Nargis Motala

**Reviewers:** Florus Prinsloo, Andrew Paterson & Raymond Matlala

**Organisation:** JET Education Services in partnership with Trialogue



higher education  
& training

Department:  
Higher Education and Training  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



## Table of contents

<b>Acronyms .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Key findings: Relevance and Appropriateness.....</i>	<i>5</i>
Relevance .....	5
Appropriateness.....	6
Institutional framework .....	6
<i>Key findings: Efficiency.....</i>	<i>7</i>
Outcome 1: Appropriate regulatory, governance and funding structures .....	7
Outcome 2: Appropriate learning materials developed .....	9
Outcome 3: Increased capacity of TVET colleges to produce artisans .....	10
Outcome 4: Employers able to adequately train and develop apprentices .....	12
Outcome 5: SETAs effectively participate in the CoS Programme .....	15
<i>General implementation findings.....</i>	<i>17</i>
M&E and reporting .....	17
Reporting requirements.....	17
<i>Findings: Early effectiveness.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Recommendations for improvement, sustainability and scalability .....</i>	<i>19</i>
Overarching recommendation.....	19
Specific recommendations.....	19
<i>Conclusion .....</i>	<i>22</i>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>23</b>

## Acronyms

CoS	Centre of Specialisation
CoS Programme	Centres of Specialisation Programme
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DSPP	Dual System Pilot Project
EIAS	External Integrated Summative Assessment
GTAC	Government Technical Advisory Centre
INDLELA	National Artisan Development Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NOCC	National Occupational Curriculum Content
NOS	National Oversight Structure
NSF	National Skills Fund
OTC	Occupational Team Convener
PMU	Project Management Unit
POP	Priority Occupation Package
QCTO	Quality Council for Trade and Occupations
SDL	Skills Development Levy
SETA	Sector Education and Training Authority
SIP	Strategic Integrated Projects
SLM	Sector Liaison Manager
SPU	Special Projects Unit
SSACI	Swiss-South African Cooperation Initiative
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
WPBL	Workplace-based Learning

## Introduction

South Africa has a significant mismatch between the skills needed in the economy and the skills available in the labour market, and this has necessitated the design and implementation of strategies to coordinate economic planning and skills development. The Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) colleges sector seen as best placed to make skills development fit-for-purpose and more responsive to current and future needs. However, the TVET system has not been functioning optimally to produce the skills needed, while a poor image and reputation as an inferior education provider means that it is not seen as the first choice for young people looking to further their studies.

The government, through the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), has designed and implemented the Centres of Specialisation Programme in the TVET college sector (the CoS Programme). The CoS Programme entails the establishment of a dedicated department – known as a Centre of Specialisation (CoS) - within a host TVET college which serves as an anchor, working closely with employers, to deliver a dual-system based apprenticeship programme.

In 2019, the DHET rolled out the CoS Programme in 19 public TVET colleges. Thirteen priority artisan trades were selected, with each trade offered at two sites. In November 2020, the DHET contracted a mid-term evaluation of the CoS Programme. The specific objective is to evaluate progress made and lessons to date. The overall objective of this mid-term evaluation is to inform adjustments in programme design and implementation for the current cohort, and to effectively prepare for future cohorts.

The methodology used for this mid-term evaluation combines elements from two types of evaluations: a design evaluation and an implementation evaluation. The approach utilised for this evaluation was based on an evaluative case study design and utilised mixed methods to enrich understanding and triangulate findings, employing the most appropriate methods for specific aspects of the evaluation. Limitations to the evaluation included limited documentation and institutional memory relating to the early processes and stages of the design of the CoS Programme, limited consolidated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) information, and limited participation from Sector Liaison Managers (SLMs) and employers.

Overall, this mid-term evaluation highlights the considerable progress made in designing and implementing this new approach to apprenticeship training in South Africa, both to increase the number of artisans produced in line with demand, and to improve the quality of artisans produced by public TVET colleges. There are however a number of inefficiencies which, if left uncorrected, could threaten the achievement of the longer-term outcomes of the CoS Programme. The context wherein this evaluation took place is outlined below, followed by a summarised version of the key findings from the main evaluation report.

## Context

This evaluation report presents the outcome of an exacting monitoring and evaluation process conducted by JET Education Services (JET) in partnership with Trialogue. The evaluation unpacked and scrutinised the CoS Programme, taking into account many different perspectives and then distils and presents the findings. This report is robust and forthright in its assessment of the program, in its attempt to provide valuable insights into the Programme implementation, while also offering well-founded suggestions for future action. This approach is considered critically important to optimise a continual improvement process given the strategic importance and value of the Programme to moving South Africa's skills

development sector, and the broader Post School Education and Training (PSET) system, towards a pragmatic and effective industry demand-based approach.

There is no doubt that the CoS Programme represents a moment of transformative innovation in the South African PSET system. This type of innovation is crucial for maintaining the sustainability and success of societies and social institutions such as education systems. Innovation in education and training usually involves implementation of novel ideas or concepts that culminate in the practical introduction of new or improved ways of providing education and training opportunities that result in benefits to individuals, societies and economies. Innovation is often a product of the need to bring about change through doing something differently. Engaging in innovation in any field almost inevitably comes with resistance to change, contestation and critique. In these moments, the necessity to take action and the consequence of failing to do something may be momentarily forgotten.

The mid-term evaluation reported here, was designed to focus on the institutional dynamics of the CoS Programme innovation and was not mandated to give an account of the lived experiences of TVET and employer participants and role players in the Programme. Various models show how as institutions and individual actors adapt to innovation and change, participants experience a range of emotions from resistance and fear to commitment and belief. It is therefore worth acknowledging these lived experiences of participants underlying the implementation of the CoS Programme, even if not included in the scope of the evaluation. It is also important to acknowledge the importance that the DHET conceived of the CoS Programme and made it a reality through committing significant resources to implementation, and mobilising joint public and private energies and aspirations towards this purpose, more so during a period troubled by economic and pandemic events internally and externally. The CoS has now emerged as a fully-fledged programme of a concept that has experienced a long gestation period, as far back as 2012, when the dual systems pilots were initiated as strategic approach from the Minister of Higher Education and Training.

The CoS Programme has far reaching potential to demonstrate the value of moving towards a more industry demand led approach to skilling the youth of this country in such a way as to meet the skills needs of industry and unlock sectoral and economy wide growth while at the same time opening opportunities for youth to flourish in their career paths as graduates of the Programme. The importance of Programme should not be underestimated in its potential to demonstrate how to shift the really huge bulk of the PSET system towards an industry demand-led system. The direction that the CoS Programme is taking and leading is towards breaking away from the taken for granted orthodoxy of a supply side approach to the labour market according to which the education institutions decided what was needed for the labour market and not the market itself.

## Key findings

### Key findings: Relevance and Appropriateness

#### Relevance

The evaluation suggests that the CoS Programme has been developed to address three needs and challenges. These are interlinked, with the first need partly the result of the latter two challenges.

The first need relates to a *shortage in the supply of suitably skilled and qualified artisans*. Research to assess skills supply and demand in South Africa suggests that occupations with “severe demand” included “Metal, Machinery and Related Trades”, “Electric and Electronic Trades Workers” and “Building and

Trade-Related Workers” (Reddy, Mncwango and Chabane, 2017: 23-24, 40). The shortages in the supply of suitably skilled and qualified artisans in the market could be explained by two challenges - systemic weaknesses and poor quality.

The research reveals *systemic weaknesses* that negatively affect artisan production, including fragmented trade qualifications; poor monitoring and quality assurance of apprenticeship programmes; complicated registration systems; inefficient grant application and disbursement processes; excessive delays in trade testing; and the length of time it takes to produce an artisan (GTAC, n.d.). The *poor quality of apprenticeship training* and the resulting lower level competency of the artisan produced is also a challenge. The research suggests that even when artisans are completing the training, they may still not be effectively absorbed into the labour market or perform adequately (weak employability). Causes of poor-quality training include a lack of confidence in public providers; poor governance of public TVET colleges; poor quality workshops; and a curriculum not aligned to the needs of the sector.

## Appropriateness

To respond, the DHET developed the CoS Programme. Although the CoS Programme is referred to as a programme, its design and implementation to date suggests that it is viewed as a pilot or special project.

## Design process

The evaluation suggests that the design of the CoS Programme is based on research, consultation and previous pilot projects. There appears to have been some consultation with industry associations, but on further reflection such appears to have been more to promote the CoS Programme rather than to feed into the programme design. The dual-apprenticeship training system has also been piloted twice since 2012 - the Dual-System Apprenticeship Pilot (DSAP) Project and Dual System Pilot Project (DSPP), both of which yielded learnings for the CoS Programme (Mzabalazo Advisory Services, 2017: v-vi; SSACI, 2019 & DHET, 2017b).

## The Centres of Specialisation (CoS) Programme

The consensus between stakeholders is that the CoS Programme has been correctly conceptualised and designed (in theory). The CoS programme answers directly to the commitment of the DHET to create a “skilled and capable workforce to support inclusive economic growth” (The Presidency, 2014: 22) by increasing the general availability of critical technical artisanal skills, expanding delivery of qualified artisans in 13 priority trades, and enhancing the capacity of public TVET colleges.

## Objectives of the CoS Programme

The CoS Programme aims to achieve two objectives: a quantity objective and a quality objective. These objectives are clear and commonly understood, relevant and realistic and have a clear theory of change (ToC). The *quantity objective* is focused on addressing the demand for skilled labour to meet not only the demands of the government’s Strategic Integrated Projects (SIPs), but also general labour market demand. The *quality objective* is focused on building the capacity of the public TVET college system to deliver specialised, good quality industry-appropriate trade qualifications.

## Institutional framework

The majority of participants agreed that while the institutional framework (governance, management and implementation structures) established for the CoS Programme is adequate and appropriate, it does appear to rely heavily on temporary structures. Evaluation participants raised the concern that while the “what and why” of the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders are clear within these documents, little is detailed on the “how and when”. Participants also questioned if the roles and responsibilities have

been adequately and appropriately communicated to stakeholders by the Project Management Unit (PMU), and if stakeholders have engaged with and correctly understood their roles and responsibilities.

## Key findings: Efficiency

### Outcome 1: Appropriate regulatory, governance and funding structures

The evaluation suggests that while roles and responsibilities are clear (as above), there does appear to be some disconnection between all the parties to the evaluation.

#### Programme governance structures established and operational

- The intended purpose of the National Oversight Structure (NOS) was to act as a multi-stakeholder representative structure that would provide oversight, guidance and governance to the programme. The effectiveness of the NOS has been limited by the large size of the committee, irregularity of meetings, a lack of commitment from some stakeholders, and misalignment between the TVET and Skills Branch.

#### Programme management structures established and operational

- The external project managers were appointed late. As the Occupational Team Conveners (OTCs) had been appointed nine months prior, they had, by default, assumed the role of the PMU. As a result, the Swiss-South African Cooperation Initiative (SSACI) struggled to enter this space and were often seen as an unnecessary player creating a level of bureaucracy.
- Confusion around the roles and responsibilities resulted in tensions between the parties above, a breakdown in communication and a significant duplication of effort. It also resulted in downstream confusion, with TVET colleges unclear on their reporting lines.
- With the conclusion of the SSACI contract in 2020, the roles and responsibilities reverted back to the CoS team within the Special Projects Unit (SPU). However, the evaluation suggests that the DHET PMU team is not adequately capacitated to take over all responsibilities of central project management.
- The workstream concept did not have sufficiently robust organisational support and therefore made slow progress. Workstream 2 was found to be poorly planned and heavily impacted by delays in government procurement processes, while the M&E workstream (7) appears to have been sporadic.
- The OTCs have been found to be extremely important. Over and above their assigned responsibilities, OTCs played a role in the selection of TVET colleges; developing the equipment specifications and budgets; advocating for the CoS Programme to bring employers on-board; and filling the gap in the development of learning materials where and when required.

#### Occupational qualification funding framework finalised and implemented

The determination of costs associated with the delivery of apprentices under each trade was the responsibility of the National Skills Fund (NSF), together with the OTCs under Workstream 3. Funding frameworks were developed for all 13 priority artisan trades, with these costs used to determine allocations (for voted funds) to the TVET colleges (multiplied by the number of learners in the TVET budgets).

In order to bring the selected TVET colleges into the CoS Programme, a Priority Occupation Package (POP) grant - a levy-funded grant - was created to build the capacity needed to deliver graduates in the areas of specialisation. The POP grant covered individual learner support; employer incentives; system support;

institutional capacity; and management capacity for the implementation of the POP grant project plan. For the pilot phase of the CoS Programme, funding was sourced as follows:

- **Appropriations - TVET Branch fiscus:** the TVET Branch budget surplus was allocated to the CoS TVET colleges to fund the operational costs for the 13 priority trades for three years (cohort 1). Allocations were done based on Occupational Qualification costing and modelling for the thirteen trades.
- **Skills development levy - National Skills Fund (NSF):** the NSF provided the catalytic funding for the project and covered the costs for the PMU, the external consulting partners, facilitator salaries, capital expenditure required for the infrastructure and equipment costs, the OTCs, and the development of the National Occupational Curriculum Content (NOCC) and learning materials.
- **Skills development levy – Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs):** the artisan development grant of R165 000 per apprentice (R207 225 per apprentice for 2021) was funded from the Skills Development Levy (SDL) via the SETA grants and was intended to cover the apprentices' transport and subsistence (no accommodation allocations have been made).

Provision for the future funding of the CoS Programme is intended to take place within DHET funding of Programme 4 - and funded through appropriations, the SDL and tax rebates to employers. One of the biggest challenges is that the two main funding requirements (institutional (DHET) and workplace (SETAs)) are not connected. The evaluation also reveals aspects relating to funding that need to be taken into account if the funding model is to work as planned.

### Change management at colleges

The costing model for the trades includes funding for the maintenance of infrastructure and equipment - assuming that colleges will build up a reserve. If this fails to hold true, or if the allocation to maintenance is reduced, this could threaten the sustainability of the CoS.

### Sector Education and Training Authorities

As SETAs receive the biggest slice of SDL funds collected, they can be viewed as the gatekeepers to funding for apprenticeship training. The evaluation has revealed a number of issues here:

- SETAs do annual planning and some SETAs commit funding to the CoS Programme one year at a time, resulting in misalignment between programme length (three years) and the funding commitment.
- The CoS programme is demand-led, and apprentices must have an employment contract in place prior to being able to enrol at the colleges at the start of the academic year. The SETA financial year only begins in April, at which time grants are made available to employers.
- While a standardised grant amount has been put in place, SETAs, due to their autonomous nature, set their own funding policies and procedures.
- It is anticipated that the SETA mandatory grants will be increased from 20% to 50% (reversal of a previous decision), resulting in a decrease in discretionary grants. If the workplace-based learning (WPBL) component is funded from the discretionary grant of the SDL, there will be a large shortfall in the funding.
- SETAs traditionally only fund employers who are registered with them (in terms of the Standard Industrial Classification code) and are levy paying. Under the CoS, this has led to significant confusion in the CoS Programme.

- Lead SETAs have misunderstood their role. Some have interpreted the role to mean that they are required to only fund employers in those trades, and as a result have overlooked all other trades (even if the employer applying is a registered levy-paying member of the lead SETA).

## Employers

The evaluation suggests that not enough consideration was given to the funding by employers (over and above the SETA grant allocation). Unseen costs contributed by some employers include personal protective equipment (PPE), higher apprentice wages (the difference between the grant and bargaining council wage rates), and the cost of mentorship (work time dedicated to mentorship and the training of the mentor). This means that the costs of producing an artisan may be understated, and that there is a level of risk in assuming that all employers will absorb all of these costs all of the time.

## Outcome 2: Appropriate learning materials developed

### Occupational qualifications developed

New Occupational Qualifications are in place for all 13 priority artisan trades. Feedback from the evaluation suggests that new Occupational Qualifications for the 13 trades have been developed in consultation with employers and industry. The rigger trade was the only trade to have a completely new occupational qualification developed, while the remaining 12 were reregistered with the Quality Council for Trade and Occupations (QCTO) in 2018.

### National Occupational Curriculum Content developed and implemented

The NOCC for all 13 priority artisan trades has been developed under the management of Workstream 2. In general, these are aligned to the Occupational Qualifications and should help guide the implementation of the programme. Findings from the evaluation suggest that NOCC has now been developed for all 13 priority artisan trades.

### Learning materials developed and implemented

Interviewees asserted that there was a significant number of trades for which, at the time of this evaluation, appropriate and adequate learning materials had still not been developed. There were conflicting views as to the reason behind this, but the overarching sentiment was that this workstream (Workstream 2) was managed in a piecemeal fashion with a lack of proactive coordination and planning, resulting in challenges that have not yet been resolved.

- The delivery of learning materials was derailed by delays and bottlenecks in the government procurement processes. Tenders were published late, and an insufficient number of qualifying bids for specific trades further complicated matters.
- Where learning materials had been developed, stakeholders raised concerns about the quality of the product delivered which was described as misaligned to the NOCC, containing significant factual errors and/or out-of-date information, and created piecemeal by copying existing materials from other platforms with applying any thought or understanding (plagiarism and not fit for purpose).

What followed was the development of learning materials drawn from legacy qualifications, OTC materials, and SETA materials. Operating with incomplete learning material has created confusion, a lack of consistency within trades (across the two sites) and places a significant burden on facilitators who needed to spend time preparing for theory and practical lessons.

## **Outcome 3: Increased capacity of TVET colleges to produce artisans**

### **TVET Colleges inducted into the CoS**

Nineteen TVET colleges with 26 sites have been inducted into the CoS programme. These colleges have entered into a contractual arrangement with the DHET using the Centre of Specialisation Terms of Reference (ToR). The evaluation findings suggest that actual commitment to the CoS is more than just this contract. It finds, that for a TVET college to truly succeed, the implementation of the CoS must be driven by college executive buy-in, which has been consistently cited as key to the success of the CoS.

One of the biggest challenges to the selection of the sites was the number of employers within the prescribed radius willing and able to participate in the programme. For some CoS such as the Kimberly Carpenter and Joiner CoS, concerns were raised that they may not be able to fulfil the quota of 30 apprentices given employer numbers and interest, and that this is a risk to the sustainability of the CoS. Participants in the evaluation also suggested that given the “1-site-1-trade” rule in place (for specialisation), the first or second choice colleges or sites for certain trades were unavailable for selection (having been assigned a different trade). This meant that for some trades, less favourable sites were selected, and many believed that this situation is partly to blame for some of the implementation challenges which arose later.

### **TVET Colleges accredited by the QCTO**

The evaluation found that all 19 participating TVET colleges (across 26 sites) had been accredited by the QCTO as a Skills Development Provider for the relevant trade. No challenges were raised in this process.

### **TVET College governance and management systems meet CoS requirements**

All TVET colleges have established the structures required to assist with the governance, management and implementation of the CoS Programme. The success of these however, differs by CoS.

### **CoS Reference Groups**

All 19 colleges have established reference groups. Evaluation findings suggest:

- The success of a reference group is highly dependent on the strength and commitment of the OTC, TVET CoS project manager and college management.
- The level of participation by key stakeholders differs by CoS, but all stakeholders agree that employer participation in the reference group is the most important.
- Host employers do not participate – they are represented instead by lead employers. No relationship is built between the TVET college and host employer, and the host employer is unable to feed into learnings.
- Stakeholder participation in the reference groups was found to be problematic for the following: trade unions, SETAs and OTC (for the welding trade – where the South African Institute of Welding (SAIW) has not been replaced following their exit from the programme).
- Employers agreed that reference group meetings are held as planned, are scheduled with sufficient notice, are productive with robust discussion, and minutes are distributed to all.

### **Implementation Committee**

Unlike the reference groups, implementation committees have not been established by all TVET colleges. Some have elected to combine the work of the implementation committee with that of the reference groups. Key evaluation findings include:

- The committee is key to ensuring that rotation plans are developed collaboratively and adhered to.
- It is the fastest way to address day-to-day issues regarding the implementation of the CoS.
- Employers agree that meetings are held as planned and are productive with robust discussion and with minutes distributed to all. There was however some contention around the level of attendance, with mentors and WPBL representatives from all employers not always in attendance.
- While the intention was for these committees to be dissolved as relationships with employers and processes matured, concern has been raised that the introduction of new employers into the CoS Programme for future cohorts will bring new challenges which will again require these committees.

### **TVET College administrative systems meet CoS requirements**

While many TVET colleges have appointed CoS project managers, many have failed to fill the administrative support position. At the time of conducting this evaluation, 18 /19 TVET colleges had filled the CoS project manager position. However, previous research and reports suggest that some colleges have struggled to retain project managers, while in others, the project manager role has been assigned to existing staff – most commonly, to the deputy principal and may not be given due attention.

The role of the TVET CoS project manager and administrators becomes even more important in light of the expectation that when the OTC contracts end, all OTC responsibilities will cede to these project managers. As the OTCs are the main force behind the college-employer relations, attention must be given to ensuring that project managers and administrators have the necessary capability and capacity.

### **Workshops infrastructure, equipment and tools meet trade requirements**

Workshops appear to have been completed at 21 of the CoS sites. The evaluation suggests significant challenges with the CoS workshops and this poses a risk given the importance of these workshops in the successful completion of the practical component of the integrated programme:

- Specifications: For some trades, the specifications were reported to be poor and that this lack of clarity was cited by some as the reason why infrastructure, equipment and/ or tools fail to meet the required standards.
- Procurement standards: OTCs attributed an abundance of caution on the part of the TVET colleges' Chief Financial Officers to avoid what might be perceived as wasteful expenditure in their approach to procurement. Cheaper and/or inferior quality infrastructure, equipment and tools were procured, which had to be returned and re-ordered, resulting in delays, or centres operating with infrastructure and equipment inadequate for industrial use.
- Commissioning: Even when infrastructure had been upgraded and equipment and tools sourced, the workshops had not all been commissioned.

### **Facilitators contracted and met standards**

The evaluation findings reveal difficulties in finding, recruiting, appointing and training appropriately qualified and experienced facilitators: where facilitators had good theoretical knowledge, they had limited experience, and if they had significant industry experience, they often lacked the andragogical and teaching skills required. A tension also appears to have existed between the TVET colleges and the OTCs around the recruitment and appointment of facilitators as colleges favoured candidates with theoretical and academic backgrounds, while the OTCs leaned more towards candidates with industry experience.

Finding, retaining and replacing suitably qualified facilitators for rural colleges also proved to be a challenge, resulting in delays in the appointment of facilitators.

The evaluation also reveals a shortcoming with regard to the training of facilitators. OTCs were expected to determine the skills gap of facilitators (knowledge, andragogy and methodology) in the early stages of the programme. The TVET colleges were then required to invest in the continuous professional development of facilitators. The extent to which facilitators' training has been undertaken is unclear, but feedback suggests that it has been fragmented and uncoordinated. While facilitators are keen to attend such training, it appears that the OTCs and TVET colleges have overlooked this component of the CoS (in terms of both funding and delivery), with no apparent facilitator training having been formally conducted (except that done by international partners in selected trades).

#### **Outcome 4: Employers able to adequately train and develop apprentices**

As the CoS Programme is designed to be demand led, employers are a central pillar to the delivery of the programme. The evaluation finds that the burden of responsibility and time placed on this stakeholder grouping is a cause for concern: while such should have been reduced through the support mechanisms, implementation challenges have exacerbated rather than eased, the burden on employers.

#### **Employers inducted into the CoS**

A number of challenges around the mobilisation of employers into the CoS exist, many of which can be ascribed to the SETAs. While some SETAs (Manufacturing, Engineering and Related Services Sector Education and Training Authority (merSETA) Mining Qualifications Authority (MQA) and Chemical Industries Education and Training Authority (CHIETA)) played a strong role in the identification and engagement of employers, the OTCs and TVET colleges have been the driving force behind employer participation for the majority of the CoS. SETAs suggest that their inability to fulfil this role stems from a lack of capacity, time and resources.

The evaluation suggests that for the large part, employer interest is high. Where employer interest and/or commitment was low, challenges included limited capacity and appetite from employers to do apprenticeship training, TVET colleges not viewed favourably as a skills development provider (SDPs) by industry, the geographic requirement that employers be no further than 25km from an urban CoS and 50km from a rural CoS, the need to comply with high bargaining council wage rates and delays, and challenges in the grant disbursement of SETAs, which were a deterrent for smaller employers.

A decision was taken to allow for the lead-employer/host employer to be introduced, and industry associations (beyond the OTCs) stepped up to take on the role of lead employers. There are now three 'types' of employers participating in the CoS:

1. Direct employers – they recruit and contract apprentices directly. They are responsible for all administrative processes relating to the apprentice as well as all WPBL aspects (WPBL, mentorship, logbooks etc.).
2. Lead employers – they recruit and contract apprentices, and while responsible for the administrative processes relating to the apprentice, they do not provide the WPBL aspects. Instead, they identify host employers at which to place apprentices for the WPBL.
3. Host employers – they have no contractual relationship with the apprentices, and only provide the WPBL aspects of the programme.

While this lead employer/host employer model enables the participation of smaller employers by relieving them of the administrative burden, the model is not without its challenges:

- A heavy reliance on lead employers could create a dependency, such that if the lead employers were to exit, the sustainability of the relevant CoS could be called into question.
- Host employers are contractually bound to the lead employer, not to the CoS (unlike the direct and lead employers who are signatories to the apprentice contract registered with the SETAs).
- Host employers appear have no voice and are represented in all TVET structures by their lead employer. The absence of host employers from TVET structures has created distance between the TVET college, apprentice and the employer, which is contradictory to the objective of the CoS.
- SETA workplace approvals are only done with the employer receiving the monies. As the lead SETAs receive the funding, they are assessed and approved for WPBL – host employers are not.
- Given the size of host employers and their proclivity to specialise or limit work to some aspects of a trade, they may not be able to provide apprentices with the full exposure needed to complete WPBL.
- The responsibility for disciplinary issues is unclear. If it is the responsibility of the host employer, they have no powers as they are not the contract holder (i.e. the employee is not actually contracted to them). If it is the lead employer, this negates one of the core WPBL objectives of the CoS – for the apprentice to experience employment with all its policies and procedures.

### **Workplace approval**

While all direct and lead employers have received workplace approval, many have raised concerns about the criteria and guidelines, the processes and the length of time this takes. These concerns may pose a risk to the programme if interested employers choose to withdraw from the programme.

- Evaluation participants consistently spoke of frustrations regarding a general lack of commitment from SETAs to the workplace approval process, which they believe is manifested in the SETAs strict application of the regulations (following the word rather than the spirit of the regulations).
- Unclear and non-standardised workplace approval criteria and guidelines, inefficient processes and systems, insufficient SETA capacity (for site visits), and lengthy timelines were all flagged as barriers to workplace approvals.

### **Mentors appointed and trained**

The evaluation reveals inconsistency between the CoS around the mentorship of apprentices. While some employers have appointed mentors, others use the more supervisory structure. Irrespective of the model used, little training appears to have been done to capacitate mentors in their role:

- Many employers have failed to appoint a dedicated mentor, instead appointing supervisors to oversee specific tasks.
- Given the arms-length relationship between the CoS and host employers, it is also unclear if employers have made this mentorship capacity available. Even when the host employers do have capacity, if apprentices are required to move between small host employers to get the full WPBL experience, mentorship continuity is lost.
- Employers and mentors are cost conscious and focused on productivity and outputs. Some employers fail to recognise the purpose of mentorship and thus see it as a sunk cost to the company.

### **Implementation of the NOCC by employers**

The vast majority of employers participating in the evaluation reported that they were familiar with the NOCC, that is had been adequately explained to them, and that their roles and responsibilities in its

implementation were clear. Only employers from the pipe fitter and diesel mechanic trades felt that the NOCC was not fully explained and/or commonly understood by the CoS and employers.

### **Recruitment of apprentices**

Employers reported that while they advertised for recruits, most were recruited from the lists provided by the TVET colleges. This underscores the importance of the relationship and collaboration between employers and TVET colleges throughout the CoS Programme.

### **Apprentice contracts signed and registered**

Employers are required to sign a Workplace Based Learning Programme Agreement with every apprentice. All employers and apprentices in the evaluation acknowledged that these agreements have been signed and submitted to the relevant SETAs as a prerequisite for funding. Employers did however feel that the registration of contracts with the SETAs was delayed due to incomplete agreements, requirements for additional information, inefficient SETA registration processes, and tensions between some employers and their SETAs due to previous partnerships and dealings.

### **Logbooks**

Employers hold that little training on how the logbooks were to be completed was provided. As a result, many find the logbooks difficult to understand and complete. Employers also believe that the completion of the logbook is solely the responsibility of the apprentice as it can create an additional administrative burden to employers.

### **Apprentice wages**

The wages (stipends) paid by employers are regulated and guided by the Apprenticeship Sectoral Determination, which falls under the Basic Minimum Wage Legislation and is currently set at R3 500 per month. This amount should be covered by the SETA grant funding. In some sectors however, employers are required by labour laws to be members of bargaining councils. These councils often have different minimum stipend or allowance levels for apprentices – of around R5 000 – R7 000 per month (for year 1). In these instances, employers are expected to (having joined the CoS with this knowledge) top up on the stipends or find complementary funding sources for the additional amount A21 Guidelines. While the legislation does make allowances for exemption from this higher wage, such a decision would need to be made by the Department of Labour.

Employers were asked how they paid apprentices' wages if they had not received the grant payments from the SETAs, with mixed results.

- Some employers reported that the payment of stipends is linked to the receipt of grants. If the SETA pays the employer, the employer will pay the apprentice; and if the SETA fails to pay the employer, the employer will not pay the apprentice. Smaller employers who follow this approach indicated that they do not have the cash-flow or reserves to carry this cost. Larger employers who follow this approach indicated that while they may have the available funds, SETAs must [on principle] be held accountable for their responsibilities and fix challenges around grant funding. This non-payment of stipends does pose a risk to the programme, as apprentices who are unable to fund their living and transport expenses may choose to leave and find paying work.
- Some employers choose to pay the stipend anyway – doing so from their own cash flows and reserves and replacing such when the payments are received. Employers explain that they have elected to follow this approach to avoid the risk of potential dropouts.

## **Outcome 5: SETAs effectively participate in the CoS Programme**

The evaluation reveals a fragmented landscape, with varied levels of commitment from SETAs and inconsistent processes and criteria for workplace approvals, grant funding applications and grant disbursements. It would appear that not enough consideration has been given to the autonomous nature of SETAs.

### **SETAs commitment to the CoS (SETA planning)**

The evaluation findings suggest that several assumptions made during the design of the CoS Programme with reference to SETA participation were flawed and that these have had implications for the CoS programme. This is evidenced by the inconsistent buy-in from the SETAs and inconsistent understanding of their roles and responsibilities. The following are some of the reasons provided for this.

- Inadequate collaboration between units within the DHET (TVET Branch and Skills branch: SETA Coordination) has resulted in limited participation by SETA Coordination and the SLMs.
- DHET explained that as the funding of learnerships is already the mandate of SETAs, the CoS Programme is not something new (i.e. it does not require SETAs to do anything different). Instead, it is simply an extension of the SETA mandate to these specific trades at these specific TVET colleges. DHET assumed and expected that the SETAs would understand the CoS Programme and their roles and responsibilities in the same way. Instead, some SETAs appear to view the CoS programme as a special project or pilot that is over and above their normal duties.
- Where SETAs do treat the CoS as business as usual, a further assumption was that SETAs are filling their mandates efficiently and effectively. This appears to also not hold true, based on findings relating to the late registering of apprentice contracts, slow workplace approval, inefficiencies in grant processes and delays in grant payments.
- Whilst SETAs perceive themselves to have good working relationships with one other, other stakeholders consistently view the SETA operating environment as fragmented and siloed, with little sharing of information and learnings.

Three additional complications arise relating to SETA involvement in the CoS:

1. The first is that a single SETA could be funding multiple trades, and as such may not have sufficient capacity to undertake all these duties for all trades and across all sites.
2. Conversely, a single trade or a single CoS (two per trade) could end up having to engage with a large number of SETAs. Not only does this require a significant amount of effort and coordination, but it also creates some confusion around funding criteria, workplace approvals and employer engagement (as all SETAs are autonomous and have their own processes and guidelines).
3. Some SETAs are funding employers that are not registered with them (or registered at all) and are not levy-paying. Questions must be asked about the level of effort these SETAs put towards the CoS Programme when they derive no benefit in return. Furthermore, this approach could turn apprentice funding into a 'lottery', where any employer can approach any SETA for funding (rather than just the SETA they are registered with). If this approach is to be continued into the future, it needs to be centrally managed and very carefully controlled.

### **Apprentice wages standardised**

Apprentice wages have not been standardised. The evaluation suggests that while this was a noble intention at the start of the programme, but the presence of the bargaining councils, which employers are by law required to engage with, create an insurmountable challenge in this regard. Participants explain that bargaining councils and labour relations are the responsibility of the Department of Labour (DoL).

Any contemplation to standardise apprentice wages will require a broader inter-departmental discussion and policy shift which is outside the ambit of the CoS Programme.

### **SETA grant funding criteria approved, and grants allocated as planned**

Although a common guideline for SETA funding management exists, SETAs are autonomous and determine how they execute this funding independently. As a result, funding criteria can differ between the SETAs. This was recognised as a challenge long before the CoS Programme and was acknowledged as a problem in the SETA interviews. The frustration and confusion created in this regard with employers and the cascading effect to apprentices has been discussed. Engagements with employers unpacked their interaction with the SETA grant policies. While employers were positive about the ease of accessing these policies, and that they are easy to read and understand, they were less positive about the system used for grant applications as well as the level of flexibility allowed by the policy.

In some cases, there are SETAs that have extensive criteria that need to be met with reference to the employer grant allocation and which serve as prerequisites for grant disbursements. Some employers report that there has been little flexibility to accommodate the CoS mode of training on the part of the SETAs, particularly with respect to the tranche payments.

- Traditionally, many SETAs pay the SDL discretionary grant in four tranches, with the tranche payment linked to the proof of completion of a certain number of credits by an apprentice. The inability of SETAs to accommodate the CoS, which is an integrated delivery approach and therefore does not fit into this model of credit-based performance measurement, creates a bottleneck in funding flows.
- In some cases, the funding criteria can be a burden for employers, particularly when multiple tranches are paid each year (up to 12, i.e. monthly as in the case of the Construction Education & Training Authority (CETA)). In order to access the funding, employers are required to submit reports (based on the individual SETA requirements) for every tranche.
- Other challenges identified with the grant funding relate to the lags between applications and approvals, poor communication from the SETAs and the general lack of understanding of the CoS.

### **Effective and efficient trade centres for COS trades**

The final immediate outcome of the CoS Programme related to the establishment of efficient and effective trade test centres. The evaluation findings suggest that this is the biggest area of concern for the CoS programme as little work had been completed to date.

#### **Trade test regulation in place**

The National Artisan Development Unit (INDLELA) hold that the trade test regulations are already in place and that no special regulations need to be developed. Existing regulation make allowance for the development of the trade tests as per the QCTO's external assessment specifications. The QCTO however seems to suggest that different regulations are needed for the CoS qualifications.

#### **Trade tests developed**

The evaluation suggests that phase assessments have not been developed for all trades. Two reasons have been provided for this:

- Facilitators do not have the necessary knowledge and skills, and have not been given any training and support, to design and develop these assessments, particularly as they must comprise both

theory and practical application questions (i.e. they should focus on the application of theory by solving problems using a project-based approach).

- With the restrictions under COVID-19 lockdown, TVET colleges and the CoS were closed, and even when restrictions were reduced, limited numbers of people were allowed on site. As a result, phase assessments have still not been developed for all trades.

The design of the CoS Programme also includes an internal formative assessment at the end of the three-year period. This test will serve as an indicator of the apprentices' readiness, thus forming an entrance point into the External Integrated Summative Assessment (EISA), which is the final competence check. The evaluation suggests that only four EISA trade tests have been developed for the CoS trades – electrician, plumber, fitter and turner and mechanical fitter, with the first three driven by the participation of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ) and Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), and by the fact that the electrician and plumber trades are also the focus of the DSPP. A further two tests, rigger and welder, are currently being piloted.

### **Trade test facilities (centres) established ad meet required standards**

As mentioned, the EISA trade tests must be conducted in a simulated environment at an accredited centre. In the initial ToR for the TVET colleges, one of the criteria for participation in the CoS Programme was for the TVET college to become an accredited trade test centre as well. This clause appears to have been removed from the final ToR, with the criterion rephrased to focus rather on the proximity, availability and capacity of external trade test centres near each CoS.

The evaluation suggest that this design suggestion has failed, and that existing trade test centres are not capacitated (in terms of infrastructure, equipment and tools) to conduct the EISA for the CoS qualifications. The suggestion from stakeholders now is to revert to the original plan of accrediting every CoS as a trade test centre. Some stakeholders believe that this could be a conflict of interest, but the overwhelming view is that this would be the most efficient way of creating the required trade test capacity. Stakeholders explained that these CoS already have the capacity (infrastructure, equipment and tools) to conduct the trade tests in line with the occupational qualification assessment specifications. They also believe that the facilitators, given their knowledge and experience in the Occupational Qualifications, can fill the role of assessors. No consensus has been agreed on the best way forward.

## **General implementation findings**

### **M&E and reporting**

The evaluation finds that there is limited evidence that M&E data has been collected, consolidated and analysed for assessing programme status or guiding programme improvement. The existence of an M&E framework is a positive finding, but reporting seems to be done more for compliance purposes as opposed to seeking to constructively grow and strengthen the CoS Programme.

### **Reporting requirements**

The CoS Programme has not clearly set out and documented the reporting requirement from and between stakeholders. Furthermore, it does not appears that standard templates have been developed to assist with reporting, and no training has been given to stakeholders to ensure that the data they collect and report on is i) aligned to the M&E framework and indicators; ii) complete; and iii) accurate. No reporting appears to be done by the SETAs (registered apprentices, disbursement of funding, stipends paid) to the CoS, OTCs, or PMU. Gathering data on the CoS Programme is a difficult exercise as no consolidated databases exist.

## Findings: Early effectiveness

At the time this evaluation was commissioned, many COS should have been concluding year 2 of their studies. Some had fallen behind schedule as COVID-19 had affected all aspect of learning, with the closure of TVET colleges and then later the move to virtual learning and the closure of non-essential workplaces and a reduced amount of time or WPBL. As such, it is not possible to measure the full effectiveness of the programme. Instead, the evaluation focused on measuring the emerging outcomes which could result from the programme as the cohorts complete and the programme matures.

### ***Intermediate outcome 1: Has/will the CoS programme improved/improve the capacity of the colleges to train and deliver on the overall objectives?***

Feedback from stakeholders suggests that significant progress has already been made in achieving this outcome. Colleges, particularly those with strong management buy-in and support, have successfully implemented the CoS, with all inputs (project manager, reference groups, implementation committees, facilitators, employers and apprentices) working together to implement the programme. Measures are also being put in place to institutionalise the programme at college level.

### ***Intermediate outcome 2: Has/will the CoS programme improved/improve collaboration/coordination between stakeholders for the delivery of the apprenticeship training?***

The evaluation reveals mixed views on whether the programme has achieved this objective.

- Weak buy-in from stakeholders means that they have not adequately and effectively participated in CoS structures, and as a result, the intended relationships have not been built.
- Several relationships appear to be working well, but a closer examination reveals the existence of a middle-man, most often the OTC. These are temporary structures, and measures will need to be put in place to reduce the dependency on OTCs to manage relationships.
- Consideration may need to be given to formalising, through agreements, some of the relationships that are integral to the CoS, particularly when the partner is autonomous.

### ***Intermediate outcome 3: Has/will the CoS programme improved/improve implementation and delivery of apprenticeship training across all three components?***

The evaluation suggests that given the strong and appropriate design of the programme, and its commitment to overcome the challenges with the apprenticeship training, the programme is likely to improve the implementation and delivery of such.

### ***Intermediate outcome 4: Has/will the CoS programme improved/improve the knowledge, skills and competencies of the apprentice (employability)?***

While early indication is that that this should happen, few actual knowledge, skills or competency tests have been conducted to date (as explained under Section 0). Stakeholders suggest that the true test for this will come when apprentices undergo the internal and external assessments.

### ***Intermediate outcome 5: Has/will the CoS programme reduced/reduce the timeframe to produce an artisan (faster throughput)?***

Stakeholders agree that while the CoS Programme throughput will definitely be higher than that from traditional apprenticeship training, they do not agree with the faster throughput. They explain that while the CoS Programme Occupational Qualifications have all been designed to be completed over a three-year period, not all trades are the same, and therefore should not be treated as such. For example, the

millwright trade is actually a combination of two trades, and employers believe it could comfortably be a five-year qualification as opposed to a three-year qualification. On the other hand, employers in the welding trade, believe that three years is too long for this trade.

## Recommendations for improvement, sustainability and scalability

The evaluation finds that the CoS Programme is well-designed and widely accepted as a solution to the shortage of artisans, and specifically also addresses some of the challenges in traditional apprenticeship training. There are however a number of systemic challenges which could affect both the sustainability of existing CoS, as well as the potential scalability to establish CoS in new trades and/or locations. Implementing the recommendations from this evaluation should assist to move the project from a pilot to a mainstream programme.

### Overarching recommendation

For all future trades or CoS introduced into the CoS Programme (expansion into new trades or new sites), all aspects of the programme should be in place prior to the roll-out of the programme.

### Specific recommendations

#### Immediate outcome 1: Improve capacity for delivery of apprentice training

##### 1. Institutional framework

- Improve engagement and collaboration between stakeholders involved in programme governance, management and oversight to ensure that the CoS Programme is driven using the top-down approach initially to gain momentum, but with the medium to long term goal of becoming a more bottom up driven approach as the relationships between local employers and college campuses grow. Specifically, this includes improving the CoS Programme-related relationship between and with:
  - a. The Skills Branch of the DHET (including SETA Coordination and INDLELA);
  - b. The SETAs and their employer member base; and
  - c. The QCTO.
- To ensure cooperation, options for formalising these relationships, maybe even through a regulated process, should be investigated to ensure accountability.
- At an implementation level, work to institutionalise, strengthen and capacitate the DHET PMU and the TVET project managers while reducing dependency on the OTCs. The high reliance on the OTCs, while a driving force in the implementation of the programme, has been somewhat counter-productive for the development of relationships between key stakeholders to the programme where consultants were used as intermediaries between TVET colleges and employers – such a process does not build direct TVET college-employer relationships.
- Ensure that all stakeholders understand what their roles and responsibilities in relation to the CoS Programme are while also expanding on how, who, where and when these roles are to be performed. This includes when the programme is part of the stakeholders 'business as usual' activities (such as in the case of SETAs – where assumptions were made that the SETAs would recognise this), and where changes may be needed to accommodate the CoS Programme (in the case of employers). These expanded roles and responsibilities need to develop the existing digital based roles and responsibilities guidelines and align these to the QTO's quality assurance system.

## **2. Funding**

1. Funding should not be fragmented. Efforts should be made to follow the TVET norms and standards funding model. Voted and SDL funds (NSF and SETAs) should also be coordinated to ensure that funding is secured in a holistic way for the CoS Programme (funding needs to link to a learner from registration to certification for the full three-year period of any apprentice in one single agreement).
2. The true cost to employers must be factored into the budgeting and planning (to understand the true cost of producing an artisan), with this also being clearly communicated to employers from the onset of the programme. This includes wages above the SETA rate, allowances and the cost of time and lost productivity involved with mentorship.

**Immediate outcome 2: While the design of the CoS programme was found to be sound and robust, with clear pathways to change, the evaluation suggests the following:**

## **3. National Occupational Curriculum Content**

Given the importance of the NOCC as it satisfies the integrated delivery requirement for accreditation from QCTO in a standardised manner across all TVET Colleges, the NOCC documents should be finalised and in place before the roll-out of new trades introduced into the programme. This could be achieved by the NOCC being a mandated integral component of qualification, curriculum and assessment specification development by the QCTO before registration of any occupational qualification on the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Care should also be taken to overcome some of the weaknesses identified in the NOCC, such as the sequencing of modules and the sometimes siloed way of covering different topics (as opposed to project-based learning).

## **4. Learning materials**

A common set of learning materials for all trades must be finalised and in place before expansion for future cohorts. This suggests that even for cohort 2 and 3 of the 13 current priority artisan trades, efforts should be made to standardise the materials used. This should also follow for expansion into new trades with learning materials in place well before roll-out. Consideration should also be given to delays and challenges in the government procurement system when planning for future trades.

**Immediate outcomes 3: The evaluation suggests that the success of the CoS Programme is closely linked to the TVET College structures at which the CoS is based**

## **5. Project management**

The TVET CoS project manager and administrator roles must be strengthened. If the intention is for these project managers to take over the roles and responsibilities of the OTCs, the transition needs to be planned and implemented with sufficient time to ensure Programme continuity.

## **6. Workshops**

The procurement challenges experienced with regard to the infrastructure, equipment and tools of the CoS must be addressed by the NSF. Guidance should be given to the CFOs of the TVET colleges clarifying the importance of following the specifications set out for each occupational qualification.

## **7. Facilitator training**

Facilitator training should be prioritised (including the identification of who will deliver and carry the cost of such). Facilitator training must be based on occupational qualifications and not academic university qualifications so that facilitators have credibility in the system – occupationally qualified trainers delivering Occupational Qualifications, not lecturers delivering Occupational Qualifications.

**Immediate outcome 4: The importance of the employer cannot be overlooked as they are a central pillar to the CoS Programme. The following recommendations are made regarding this outcome:**

#### **8. Employer recruitment**

The CoS Programme must clarify who is responsible for the sourcing and mobilisation of employers, particularly when more than one SETA is participating in a CoS.

#### **9. COVID-19**

The economic impact of COVID-19 should be factored into future planning for the CoS Programme as many employers have reduced workforce numbers. Some employers may elect to exit or reduce their participation. Additional support should be sought where possible to mitigate this risk.

#### **10. Lead employer-Host employer**

Given the challenges experienced in the recruitment of employers (due to bargaining council wage rates and high administrative burdens), the lead employer-host employer is probably the most suitable solution. However, the following must be considered:

1. The CoS and TVET project manager should have a say in the selection of host employers (i.e. it should not be done in isolation by the lead employers).
2. Host employers should also be required to have workplace approval to ensure that they are able to deliver on the WPBL component of the CoS training.
3. A relationship should also be built between the CoS and the host employers, with host employers participating in CoS structures and contributing to the CoS Programme. CoS should also have a record of all host employers participating in the programme.

#### **11. Mentorship**

Employer understanding of mentorship must be improved (mentorship versus supervision). In addition, mentorship training should be prioritised in the implementation of the programme (including the identification of who will deliver and carry the cost of such).

**Immediate outcome 5: As one of the main funders of the CoS Programme, the participation of SETAs must be revisited:**

#### **12. Funding allocation**

The role of the coordinating SETA must be clarified to avoid the challenges which have arisen (with lead SETAs only funding the trades allocated to them). In this regard, lessons learnt through the Coordinating SETA-TVET Offices (CSTO) project could prove invaluable.

#### **13. Process efficiencies**

The lack of streamlined processes (for registration, grant approval and disbursement between SETAs) has created significant confusion and may contribute to a higher administrative burden on employers. This is compounded when a single CoS or employer is engaging with multiple SETAs. The role of the SLMs (and SETA Coordination) in the streamlining of these processes should be investigated.

#### **14. Wages**

The DHET and DoL should investigate the use of the exemption clause by employers wishing to participate in CoS which include bargaining councils.

## Immediate outcome 6: Effective and efficient trade centres for COS trades

### **15. Workstream 8 was established to address challenges with the trade tests.**

The success with which these challenges are appropriately addressed is dependent on an improvement in the alignment and the working relationship between the QCTO and INDLELA. Attention should be given to this working relationship to ensure that the existing challenges around the trade tests are resolved timeously and in a coordinated manner.

## Conclusion

This mid-term evaluation has found a number of inefficiencies in the CoS Programme which, if left uncorrected, could threaten the achievement of the longer-term outcomes of the CoS Programme. This does however not take away from the fact that considerable progress has been made in designing and implementing this new approach to apprenticeship training in South Africa, both to increase the number of artisans produced in line with demand, and to improve the quality of artisans produced by public TVET colleges.

The CoS Programme captures the value that inheres in a work-based learning approach which leverages the joint contribution of skills and theoretical learning in preparing graduates for sustainable employment. Even though the Programme in its current form is small in comparison with the vast structure of the PSET system, it is providing a proof of concept for a systemic shift in the future of education and training in South Africa towards greater responsiveness.

The DHET is to be commended for this progress to date and is encouraged to make this report public to ensure that course correction can be made without delay.

## References

Department of Higher Education and Training. (2017b) *Factsheet 10: DSPP process monitoring & evaluation framework. First lessons learnt in the Dual System Pilot Project, August 2016-October 2017*. Accessed at: <https://www.skills-green-economy.org/en/article/72.factsheet-10-dspp-process-monitoring-evaluation-framework.html>

Government Technical Advisory Centre (GTAC). (n.d.) *National artisan development programme. Executive summary*. Accessed at: <https://www.gtac.gov.za/perdetail/20.1%20Summary.pdf>

Mzabalazo Advisory Services. (2017) *Dual system apprenticeships pilot project summative evaluation report*. April 2017. Accessed at: [https://www.ssaci.org.za/images/0\\_DSAP\\_EVALUATION\\_REPORT\\_final\\_July.compressed.pdf](https://www.ssaci.org.za/images/0_DSAP_EVALUATION_REPORT_final_July.compressed.pdf)

Reddy, V., Rogan, M., Mncwango, B., & Chabane, S. (2017) *Occupations in high demand in South Africa: A technical report*. Labour Market Intelligence Partnership (LMIP), Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), funded by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). Accessed at: <http://repository.hsrc.ac.za/bitstream/handle/20.500.11910/13752/10843.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

SSACI. (2019) *Research: Apprentices experiences of the Dual System Pilot Programme*. August 2019 Powerpoint. (Hard copy).

The Presidency South Africa. (2014) *Medium-term strategic framework (MTSF). 2014-2019*. Pretoria: The Presidency.

South Africa has a significant mismatch between the skills needed in the economy and the skills available in the labour market, and this has necessitated the design and implementation of strategies to coordinate economic planning and skills development. The Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) colleges sector seen as best placed to make skills development fit-for-purpose and more responsive to current and future needs. However, the TVET system has not been functioning optimally to produce the skills needed, while a poor image and reputation as an inferior education provider means that it is not seen as the first choice for young people looking to further their studies.

The government, through the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET), has designed and implemented the Centres of Specialisation Programme in the TVET college sector (the CoS Programme). The CoS Programme entails the establishment of a dedicated department – known as a Centre of Specialisation (CoS) - within a host TVET college which serves as an anchor, working closely with employers, to deliver a dual-system based apprenticeship programme. In 2019, the DHET rolled out the CoS Programme in 19 public TVET colleges. Thirteen priority artisan trades were selected, with each trade offered at two sites. In November 2020, the DHET contracted a mid-term evaluation of the CoS Programme. The specific objective is to evaluate progress made and lessons to date. The overall objective of this mid-term evaluation is to inform adjustments in programme design and implementation for the current cohort, and to effectively prepare for future cohorts.

Overall, this mid-term evaluation highlights the considerable progress made in designing and implementing this new approach to apprenticeship training in South Africa, both to increase the number of artisans produced in line with demand, and to improve the quality of artisans produced by public TVET colleges. There are however a number of inefficiencies which, if left uncorrected, could threaten the achievement of the longer-term outcomes of the CoS Programme. The context wherein this evaluation took place is outlined below, followed by a summarised version of the key findings from the main evaluation report.

*This publication was produced with the financial assistance of the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the DHET or the NSF, or indicate that the DHET or the NSF endorse the views of the authors. In quoting from this publication, readers are advised to attribute the source of the information to the author/s concerned.*



**higher education  
& training**

Department:  
Higher Education and Training  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

