

Potential Evaluation Options for the Youth Career Initiative (YCI)



Illustrative draft only from Youth Employment Network (YEN) Evaluation Clinic July 2009

ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY PREPARED BY DR PAUL DUIGNAN FROM DISCUSSION AT AN EVALUATION CLINIC ON THIS PROJECT - NOT ENDORSED BY THE INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS LEADERS FORUM OR THE JORDAN RIVER FOUNDATION. LOGOS ONLY USED FOR ILLUSTRATIVE PURPOSES.
(paul@parkerduignan.com)

This is part of a DoView Visual Evaluation Plan which shows a visual evaluation plan around a visual outcomes model of the program being evaluated visualized in DoView outcomes and evaluation software. More information can be obtained from www.easyoutcomes.org on the overall methodology and a template for developing plans like this. A workbook for producing Visual Evaluation Plans such as this is available at http://www.doview.com/files/info/doviewvisualevaluationplanworkbookv1-0sv_2008-11-20.pdf

● DoView evaluation plan workbook

● www.EasyOutcomes.org

● www.DoView.com

4 August 2009

doview.com model

Information on Potential Evaluation Options for the Youth Career Initiative (YCI)

At the YEN evaluation clinic a number of issues were raised regarding whether or not undertaking an impact/outcome evaluation was appropriate for the YCI project at this point in time. Impact/outcome evaluation is one of three types of evaluation: 1) formative evaluation ensures that a program is well implemented; 2) process evaluation describes the course and context of a program; and 3) impact/outcome evaluation assesses whether or not changes in high-level outcomes can be attributed to a particular program. The major point made was that as just one example of an international program, a strategic evaluation approach would suggest that instead of just attempting to undertake an impact/outcome on a single program such as the Jordan program, there should be careful consideration of undertaking a more comprehensive and well resourced impact/outcome evaluation of a representative 'demonstration' program (which may or may not be the Jordan one). However, despite making this point, the attempt was made to look at potential impact/outcome evaluations for a program like the Jordan YCI program. For options were considered and a fifth revised option was added after discussion at the final session of the YEN evaluation clinic.

The five options are set out in the following pages. Information on selecting impact/outcome evaluation designs is available at:

- Duignan, P. (2009). Selecting impact/outcome evaluation designs: a decision-making table and checklist approach. Outcomes Theory Knowledge Base Article No. 256. (<http://knol.google.com/k/paul-duignan-phd/-/2m7zd68aaz774/115>).

Option 1: Propensity matching from existing national data

Design:

- Use existing data to predict what would be the likely outcomes of young people who seem to be similar to the program participants
- Compare the labour market outcomes of program participants with what would be expected

Issues:

- We do not know what national data there is
- Those actually selected by hotel interview are likely to have characteristics not measured by the national data

Decision:

- Investigate further

Option 2: Construct a comparison group from matching people

Design:

- Ask the Ministry of Labour to locate young people who match participants on observables.
- Track their labour market outcomes
- Compare the labour market outcomes of program participants with those of the matched comparison group.

Issues:

- Those selected into the program by the hotel interviews are likely to have characteristics not controlled by the matching.

Decision:

- Do not investigate further

Option 3: Construct a randomized control group from a two stage recruitment process

Design:

- When young people come into the office (or perhaps through other contact) randomly select some of them to just fill in a questionnaire and give them an incentive (e.g. cell phone credits) so they can be tracked.
- Track their labour market outcomes
- Compare the labour market outcomes of program participants with those of the comparison group.

Issues:

- Those in the intervention group, selected through the hotel interviews, are likely to have different characteristics from the comparison group.
- There may be some issues about turning young people away from the program.

Decision:

- Do not investigate further

Option 4: Construct a randomized control group from those interviewed by hotels

Design:

- Select sufficient eligible applicants and send them to the hotels to be interviewed (e.g. 120)
- Tell the hotels to select 30 who they 'would employ' but then randomly allocate people to the intervention or a control group.
- Compare the labour market outcomes of program participants with those of the control group.

Issues:

- It may be difficult to convince NGOs who provide participants that some will not get the program.
- Those who have been through the build-up of getting on the program and then who go into the control group may get 'depressed' (lose confidence). This will be an ethical and a technical problem (in that their following labour market outcomes may be worse because of this 'depression' (loss of confidence).
- Not at all sure that could track control group in Jordan for 3 years

Decision:

- Investigate further

Option 5: Construct a randomized 'waiting list' control group from those interviewed by hotels (pipeline or waiting-list design)

Design:

- Select sufficient eligible applicants and send them to the hotels to be interviewed (e.g. 120)
- Tell the hotels to select 30 who they 'would employ' but then randomly allocate people to the intervention or a waiting list group.
- Compare the labour market outcomes of program participants with those of the waiting list group.
- After 12 months offer those on the waiting list a place on the program.

Issues:

- It may be difficult to convince NGOs who provide participants that some will just go on the waiting list.
- Those who are on the waiting list may use having been selected for the program as evidence of their skills and this might mean that they are more likely to get work just because they have been through the selection process.
- One year may not be long enough to show any useful effect.

Decision:

- Investigate further

This is an amended design which came out of discussion in the final session at the YEN workshop

Option 5: Construct a randomized 'waiting list' control group from those interviewed by hotels (pipeline or waiting-list design)

Budget

\$US20 per questionnaire x 30 people x follow-up interviews = \$2,400

Consultant to do the work (20 days \$200 US a day).

15 % overhead

Total = \$US7,400