

EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND OBJECTIVE 3 EVALUATION STRATEGY AND WORK PROGRAMME (2000 - 2003)

England

Contents

Evaluation Strategy

Introduction	Page 1
Labour market rationale	Page 1
Programme objectives	Page 1
Overall evaluation strategy	Page 3
Organisation and funding of monitoring and evaluation	Page 4
Monitoring	Page 4
Leavers' surveys	Page 4
Adding a qualitative dimension	Page 5
Ad hoc research	Page 6
a) Evaluation of assistance to systems and structures	Page 6
b) Evaluation of equal opportunities	Page 6
c) Evaluation of local development and global grants	Page 7
d) Evaluation of sustainable development	Page 7
e) Evaluation of the information society	Page 8
Programme implementation	Page 8
Measuring the impact of Objective 3	Page 8
Cost-benefit analysis of Objective 3	Page 9
Feeding evaluation findings into the UK National Action Plan	Page 9
Timing	Page 10
Dissemination	Page 10
Annex 1 Indicators for each Policy Field	Page 11

Further information

If you would like further information on ESF programme evaluation please contact one of the team.

Jacqui Hansbro	0114 259 4514	e-mail jacqueline.hansbro@dfee.gov.uk
Caroline Berry	0114 259 4441	e-mail caroline.berry@dfee.gov.uk
Adam Hardy	0114 259 3717	e-mail adam.hardy@dfee.gov.uk

Address: DfEE , W626, Moorfoot, Sheffield, S1 4PQ, UK

EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND OBJECTIVE 3 IN ENGLAND: EVALUATION STRATEGY 2000 - 2003

Introduction

1. With the introduction of a performance reserve on ESF programmes there is an increased emphasis placed on evaluation. The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to review the impact of the programme, its success in meeting objectives and propose any improvements to the programme. The allocation of the performance reserve will also be partly based on the mid-term evaluation. This paper sets out an approach to the evaluation of the Objective 3 programme in England leading to the mid-term evaluation in 2003. The strategy will need to be agreed and discussed with both the Evaluation Standing Group and with the new Objective 3 Monitoring Committee. The broad framework for Objective 3 evaluation is set down by the European Commission in its publication "*Guidelines for systems of monitoring and evaluation of ESF assistance in the period 2000-2006*". This evaluation strategy broadly follows these guidelines. Separate evaluation strategies will need to be agreed for the other ESF programmes running in the UK.

Labour market rationale for ESF funded activity under Objective 3

2. Before outlining the key elements of the evaluation strategy, it is important to briefly set the evaluation in context by re-stating the underlying labour market rationale for ESF activity under Objective 3. The implementation of Objective 3 in England sits within the wider labour market policy of the UK. In broad terms, it is designed to support employability and human resource development activities and to raise the overall skills level of the labour force. A fuller account of the rationale is included in the "*Operational Plan for England & Gibraltar Objective 3 2000-2006*".

Programme Objectives

3. The broad focus of activity under ESF is to ensure that all, including those currently unemployed or inactive, have the skills they need to allow them to access employment opportunities. Activity funded under Objective 3 will be carried out under five policy fields¹:

- *Active labour market policies.*

Strategic objectives

To reduce long-term unemployment in England through the use of active labour market measures and assist the unemployed and economically inactive into employment.

To reduce the flows into long-term unemployment in England through the use of active labour market measures targeted at those recently unemployed or about to become unemployed.

Key questions to be answered by the evaluation

To what extent has Objective 3 helped the long-term unemployed into jobs?

Has Objective 3 been successful in preventing those recently unemployed from becoming long-term unemployed?

What actions work best at helping people into jobs?

- *Equal opportunities for all, promoting social inclusion.*

Strategic objectives

To reduce the impact of disadvantage faced by excluded groups and support their

¹ The Operational Plan for England and Gibraltar gives more detail of the types of action funded under each of the five policy fields.

integration into the labour market.
To promote equality through research into direct and indirect discrimination in the labour market and support follow-on actions to combat the institutional aspects of discrimination.

Key questions to be answered by the evaluation

How successful was Objective 3 in targeting those from disadvantaged groups onto the programme?

To what extent has Objective 3 helped excluded groups enter/move towards the labour market?

How well have equal opportunities issues been addressed across the Objective 3 programme?

- *Lifelong learning.*

Strategic objectives

To widen participation in lifelong learning so that more people continue throughout their lives to develop their knowledge, skills and understanding and improve their employability in a changing labour market.

Key questions to be answered by the evaluation

How many people took part in lifelong learning as a result of being on Objective 3?

How many people gained qualifications while on Objective 3?

Has Objective 3 improved attitudes towards lifelong learning?

- *Adaptability and entrepreneurship.*

Strategic objectives

To improve the skills base and adaptability of the employed labour force in England.

To increase the level of entrepreneurship in England.

Key questions to be answered by the evaluation

To what extent has Objective 3 promoted a culture of entrepreneurship?

How has Objective 3 helped the workforce adapt their skills to suit changing working practices?

- *Improving the participation of women in the labour market.*

Strategic objectives

To reduce the level of disadvantage faced by women in the labour market.

Key questions to be answered by the evaluation

How well has Objective 3 helped women gain jobs or qualifications?

Is Objective 3 tackling labour market segregation?

What are the barriers for women coming onto Objective 3?

These policy fields reflect the European Employment Strategy and are clearly related to the four pillars of the National Action Plan (NAP): employability, adaptability, entrepreneurship and equal opportunities.

4. Under each Policy Field there are specific measures which detail the areas where ESF support will be concentrated .

5. The Operational Plan estimates the impact of ESF-funded activities under Objective 3:

41% in work on leaving

80% gaining positive outcome on leaving

87% young people unemployed less than 6 months

56% adults unemployed less than 12 months

75% beneficiaries completing their courses

50% gaining a qualification

The OP also sets out more detailed indicators under each of the five policy fields. These are shown at Annex 1.

Overall evaluation strategy

6. Our evaluation strategy will evaluate the success of the programme in meeting all of its objectives and assess the contribution of each Policy Field to the Programme as a whole. Evaluation plans for 2000-2003 build on the evaluation strategy set up for the previous programming period. In doing so the plan follows the broad approach suggested by European Commission guidelines.

7. One of the main aims of the evaluation is to identify the added value of ESF. The European Commission guidelines suggest that evaluation of added value should be based around four principles:

- *Relevance* i.e. How relevant was the activity in the social and economic context?
- *Consistency* i.e. What value does the programme add to national policies?
- *Effectiveness* i.e. Has the programme achieved its expected outcomes?
- *Efficiency* i.e. What are the costs of the interventions in relation to the effects?

Our evaluation will aim to address these issues.

8. In essence, our evaluation is based on a bottom-up approach. This focuses on measuring the impact of Objective 3 on the individuals, companies and organisations who have received support rather than attempting to look at the macro-economic impact of the programme. The four main tools in delivering the evaluation strategy are:

- monitoring information based on administrative data;
- follow-up survey data on the labour market experience of individual programme participants around six months after leaving the programme;
- survey of companies receiving ESF support;
- ad hoc research into any emerging issues.

9. This approach worked reasonably well in evaluating Objectives 3 and 4 in the previous programming period. It provided the sort of evaluation and monitoring information needed to inform the direction and implementation of the programmes and to inform the development of the 2000-2006 programme. It makes sense to roll forward the basic approach to cover the 2000-2003 period.

10. Another aspect of the evaluation of the new Objective 3 programme will be to look at the impact of the programme on systems and structures. To some extent this will build on the previous evaluation of Objective 3 Priority 4 (capacity building). It is crucial that any evaluation of actions on systems and structures takes into account the indirect impact on the ultimate beneficiaries i.e. the longer term effects on the ESF target groups.

Organisation and funding of monitoring and evaluation

11. The Evaluation Standing Group has been set up to ensure that all structural fund programmes in the UK carry out an effective evaluation of ESF interventions. As part of its remit, the ESG will oversee the Objective 3 evaluation strategy for England. In doing this, the

ESG will feedback to the Objective 3 Monitoring Committee any relevant lessons for programme implementation emerging from the evaluation.

12. The evaluation of Objective 3 in England will be managed by The ESF Evaluation Team. The team is made up of economists and researchers in Analytical Services of DfEE. The team will be responsible for carrying out economic analysis of monitoring and survey data, commissioning external evaluators to carry out specific research and managing the follow-up surveys. Individual research projects will be guided by a steering group made up of a number of ESF partners.

13. Funding for the national evaluation of Objective 3 in England will come from two sources: the DfEE research budget and ESF technical assistance. Funds from DfEE require Ministerial approval. The ESG will make recommendations to the Monitoring Committee requesting the use of technical assistance to support the research programme.

Monitoring

14. The ESF Unit's administrative database system has the prime aim of supporting the processing, approval and payment of project claims. However, the system will also be designed to gather a range of information to feed through into programme monitoring and evaluation. The aim is to keep information asked of projects to a minimum, whilst ensuring it is sufficiently robust to:

- judge the success of the programme, and
- to identify any areas needing remedial action to ensure the programme remains on track.

15. Of particular importance for evaluation is the administrative information on: costs, number and characteristics of participants (including gender), project activities, number and type of qualifications gained and, crucially, the labour market destinations of participants. This information supports an assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme and is essential to monitor the targets set out in the Operation Plan. There are, however, limitations in the use of administrative data.

Leavers' Surveys

16. The monitoring data generated through the administrative systems can produce useful aggregate data on the progress of the programme. However, it cannot provide very detailed information on the impact of the programme on particular groups of individuals. The administrative data is only collected at the project level and it is not possible to look in detail at the individuals who are on the programme. A leavers' survey provides the only source of information at the level of the individual participant.

17. The Objective 3 Leavers' Survey was used throughout the previous programming period. The survey involved sending beneficiaries a self-completion questionnaire around 6 months after leaving their Objective 3 project. The design of the survey was changed in 1997 which resulted in an increase in co-operation from projects in providing names and addresses of their beneficiaries. Response to the survey from individual leavers is now in line with that from other follow-up surveys (around 45%). Work is currently underway to investigate alternative methodologies to improve response to the survey. The methodology for future leavers' surveys will be discussed at an ESG meeting later this year. The evaluation of the Objective 4 programme involved telephone follow-up surveys of employees and companies. There was a response rate of 70% to the survey of employees and 65% to the survey of companies.

18. The evaluation of the new Objective 3 programme in England will involve three separate follow-up surveys of :

- individuals out of work prior to joining ESF;
- individuals in work while receiving ESF support;
- companies receiving ESF support.

19. Data from the follow-up surveys will be merged with the administrative data to provide a powerful tool for assessing the impact of particular packages of support on the labour market prospects of programme participants overall, and for those in specific target and sub-target groups.

20. In evaluating the new programme we would like to add a longitudinal element. Our evaluation strategy is centred around individual projects. However, many individual participants move from one ESF-funded project to another. Previously we have not evaluated this element of the programme. We have not been able to see how individual projects link together to provide an overall package of support to an individual. We would like to carry out a longitudinal study tracking a sample of individuals over time. As well as giving us information on those receiving a number of ESF-funded packages of support it would also allow us to look at the longer term labour market outcomes of the individuals and to look at the effectiveness of different exit strategies.

Adding a qualitative dimension

21. There is a risk that our monitoring and evaluation effort may ignore the qualitative factors underpinning any quantitative indicators. Some issues are better examined using qualitative research which can add to the quantitative information we already have. Qualitative research can allow exploration of some issues in greater depth than is possible using quantitative methods. It can also be used to identify examples of good practice at the project level. Qualitative work will be carried out by means of ad hoc research projects commissioned to independent research organisations.

22. Quantitative indicators of job outcomes or qualification rates are important in assessing outcomes from the programme. However, such indicators fail to take account of the positive contribution which activities funded through ESF can make in helping to bring people closer to the labour market. Given the nature of some of the ESF client groups, a better assessment of the success of projects might come from looking at the progress of individuals against their own aims set whilst on the project. Some measure of 'distance travelled' towards joining the labour market might provide a more accurate measure of the contribution of ESF in supporting some of the more disadvantaged beneficiaries. Work is currently underway to develop a set of qualitative indicators for use in monitoring ESF programmes. The mid-term evaluation will consider these qualitative measures of 'distance travelled' as well as the quantitative indicators.

23. In evaluating a programme it is useful to carry out qualitative interviews with key stakeholders. This approach was found to be useful in evaluating the Objective 4 programme. The interviews will look at the objectives of the new programme in the different English regions and see how it is operating in the social and economic context. They will provide a useful source of information on the implementation of the programme and possible areas for improvement. Stakeholders would include regional representatives and other members of the Monitoring Committee representing different sectoral interests.

Ad hoc research

24. The following issues will be the subject of ad hoc research projects. A more detailed evaluation strategy/research specification for each of these issues will be drafted and agreed with the ESG before the research is commissioned.

a) Evaluation of assistance to systems and structures

25. Some of the measures under the five Policy Fields involve assistance to systems and structures. This involves actions such as:

- generating improvements in local training infrastructure,
- encouraging local partnership approaches for projects helping the unemployed,
- building capacity for community development where this leads to improved labour market opportunities for those excluded from the labour market.

This type of activity is best evaluated using qualitative research. This will involve carrying out qualitative case studies to identify the types of activities being carried out under these actions. Research will also look at the immediate results of the actions on the systems and structures and will then consider the longer term impact this will have on the ultimate beneficiaries of ESF. We will be carrying out further work to look at the long-term impact of capacity building funded under the 1994-99 Objective 3 programme. Findings from this will feed into the evaluation of capacity building under the new programme. Other issues to be investigated include the types of partnerships formed and sustainability of these partnerships.

b) Evaluation of equal opportunities

26. Equality of opportunity is a crucial principle running through all structural funds. Equal opportunities runs across all Objective 3 Policy Fields and all ESF supported actions must ensure equality of access. Any evaluation of equal opportunities must take into account the evidence across all policy fields and not just those specifically targeting equal opportunities issues. Based on evidence from the evaluation of the previous Objective 3 programme, the definition of equal opportunities has been widened to encompass equality between different groups in society (e.g. ethnic minorities, the disabled) rather than just gender.

27. The aims of this work are:

- to look at participation of different disadvantaged groups on the programme and to understand the factors affecting participation.
- to look closely at the types of activity undertaken by different groups on ESF projects.
- to compare the outcomes from the projects obtained by different groups.
- to look at mainstreaming of equal opportunities.
- to look at the organisational policies of project promoters as they relate to equal opportunities
- to make recommendations for good practice to encourage equal opportunities on ESF projects.

28. The evaluation of equal opportunities will use the same type of research tools as the main evaluation:

- *Administrative monitoring data.* Administrative data can provide information on the number of beneficiaries from different target groups.
- *Survey data.* Secondary analysis of the survey data will allow an individual level study of the proportions, characteristics, types of training, satisfaction, and outcomes

- of disadvantaged groups.
- *Qualitative case study* work to look at some of the issues in greater depth.
- Logistic regression analysis looking at how the characteristics of individuals may affect their chances of a successful outcome from the project. This will look at what characteristics are important in determining job outcomes of the individual.

29. The qualitative case study work will be commissioned to external research contractors. The ESF Evaluation Team will then draw together the available information on equal opportunities and draft a section for inclusion in the mid-term evaluation report.

30. In addition, the evaluation strategy includes specific work to look at mainstreaming of gender equality. This work will assess the effectiveness of the gender mainstreaming plan, details of which are contained in a separate paper.

c) Evaluation of local development and global grants

31. ESF policy actions should take account of local initiatives concerning employment. There should be synergy between ESF and domestic programmes which are targeted and delivered at the local level. Evaluation of local development will overlap to some extent with the evaluation of support to systems and structures. It would make sense to include this as an additional issue to be covered in the qualitative case study work evaluating support to systems and structures.

32. A minimum of 1% of the programme budget will be used for global grants to non-government organisations. The aim of this is to target resources on organisations who are unable to access mainstream ESF. This will be done via intermediary organisations. It will be important for the evaluation to look at who the intermediary organisations are and how well they are working in allocating global grants. This will be done using a qualitative case study approach.

d) Evaluation of sustainable development

33. 'Sustainable development' is 'development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'. Sustainable development deals with both environmental development and social and economic development and the interaction between them. Education and training supported by ESF can contribute to both these issues. For example, in terms of environmental development projects it can promote environmentally-friendly working practices. However, ESF will have most impact on social and economic development in terms of enhancing and sustaining the social development of communities. For many ESF projects the issue of sustainability will be a new one. It will be important in the first half of the programme to identify examples of best practice and make sure these are disseminated widely.

34. In order to carry out an evaluation we will need to identify projects which deal either with environmental issues or which aim to sustain social and economic development. This may be best done by means of a short postal survey sent to all projects. This would give us some quantitative information on the extent to which projects were promoting sustainable development. Once projects have been identified, independent research contractors could carry out in-depth case studies with the aim of identifying good practice. This good practice would be widely disseminated to all Objective 3 projects. The qualitative case study work could be done as part of the work to evaluate support to systems and structures. The postal survey would also give us some baseline information to allow us to compare the changes in organisational policies regarding environmental issues over the course of the Objective 3

programme.

e) Evaluation of the information society

35. Objective 3 will help increase England's competitiveness by increasing relevant skills at all levels in relation to the Information Society for both the employed and the unemployed. Projects in all policy fields will be encouraged to demonstrate how ICT is integrated into their activities. The Objective 3 application form has been designed so that we can identify projects that are offering support in IT. We can then use this information to select a sample of projects to look at in more detail either by means of a postal survey or by interviewing project staff and beneficiaries.

Programme Implementation

36. The evaluation will include an assessment of the implementation of the programme. The major change between the old and the new programmes is the decentralisation of the Objective 3 programme across the countries of Great Britain. Scotland and Wales are responsible for implementing and evaluating their Objective 3 programmes. The English Objective 3 programme will be delivered regionally and each region will be required to submit a Regional Development Plan (RDP). The RDP will outline where ESF support should be targeted to meet the needs of the region. Another big change in implementation is the removal of the annual cycle for projects and an increase in the length of time projects can be funded for. The emphasis on working in partnership continues in the new programme. The interviews with key actors will be the main means of gathering information on programme implementation.

Measuring the impact of Objective 3

37. Our evaluation of Objective 3 will focus on the impact of the programme on the individual participants (including beneficiary companies). In evaluating ESF activity it is important to have an understanding of the links between actions and impact. The impact of the programme is the long-term effect (as opposed to *outcomes* which are the *short-term* effects). It is easy to focus solely on the gross impact of a programme i.e. how many participants are in work on leaving the programme or how many participants gain qualifications as a result of the programme. However, of more value is an assessment of the net impact. Typically this will involve making a judgement about whether those finding work would have done so without the support of ESF (deadweight), whether those finding work do so at the expense of others who did not benefit from the programme (substitution) and whether ESF support to one group gives them competitive advantage over others not getting support (displacement).

38. The final evaluations of the 1994-99 Objectives 3 and 4 programmes attempted to estimate the net impact using the following sources of analysis:

- comparing ESF monitoring data with information on unemployment outflow rates (from JUVOS²) to assess the level of dead-weight at the programme level;
- drawing on evidence from research studies of other labour market programmes in which more formal techniques had been used to measure net impact;

² JUVOS stands for the Joint Unemployment and Vacancies Operating System. It is a 5% sample of people on the unemployment register which tracks individual claims from signing on to signing off the register.

- looking at the relative impact of the programmes on different groups of beneficiary by comparing leavers' survey data with information on single employment probabilities from the Labour Force Survey.
- asking employers whether Objective 4 had impacted on the company's performance.

39. We would use similar methods to look at the impact of the new Objective 3 programme. The use of ESF to fund national programmes such as New Deal makes it much harder to measure the impact of the ESF programme as it is difficult to separate out the impact of ESF from the impact of the national programme. The ESF Evaluation Team will carry out some methodological work to investigate alternative ways of measuring net impact of ESF. We will also consider the possibility of looking at the macro-economic impact of the programme by looking at the success of work that has been done on the macro-economic evaluation of the New Deal programme. Methodological work on measuring impact will be presented and discussed at the ESG.

Cost-benefit analysis of Objective 3

40. In order to make judgements about the success of Objective 3 it is essential to quantify and value the full costs and benefits arising from it. Ideally these could then be combined into a single measure of the net present value of the programme. However, given the complexity of the Objective 3 programme this is not possible, although consideration of a wide range of measures of effectiveness is. A "cost-benefit framework" type approach would help capture both the resource costs of the programme and its short term and long term benefits. The framework will include an assessment of the resource costs and measures of success in meeting both the immediate objectives outlined earlier and the longer term objectives of the programme. These could be presented in a way which would allow an overall assessment of the cost effectiveness of the programme.

Feeding evaluation findings into the UK National Action Plan

41. It is important that evaluation findings are fed into the UK National Action Plan. Results from the evaluation of the English Objective 3 programme will be combined with those from the other programmes to provide information on ESF in the UK to feed into the National Action Plan. The ESG is the forum to ensure consistency in the approach to evaluation across all ESF programmes. Agreement has already been reached on common definitions of ESF indicators and the ESG is currently considering the possibility of running UK-wide follow-up surveys. Information from the NAP will also feed into the Objective 3 evaluation.

Timing

42. The mid-term evaluation is due to be completed by the end of 2003. However, the evaluation will be an on-going process carried out over the next three years. Timings for some of the key evaluation results are given below:

Surveys of individual ESF beneficiaries	(2001 survey results available end 2002) (2002 survey results available end 2003)
Surveys of beneficiary companies	(2001 survey results available end 2002) (2001 survey results available end 2003)
Analysis of monitoring data	carried out annually

Ad hoc research

Evaluation of support to systems and structures/Evaluation of local development and global

grants (April 2002-September 2003) We may also want to look at the longer term effects in the second half of the programming period.

Evaluation of equal opportunities - report in September 2003

Evaluation of sustainable development - report in September 2003

Evaluation of the Information Society - report in September 2003

Dissemination

43. A key part of the evaluation strategy is to make sure that findings are disseminated as widely as possible. One of the purposes of carrying out research and evaluation is to improve the way things are done. This can only happen if people are aware of the findings. It is important to make sure that colleagues in the ESF Unit, in Government Offices and people working on ESF-funded projects are aware of our evaluation work and make use of relevant findings. All research carried out as part of the evaluation will be published through DfEE. Where appropriate, evaluation work will include production of good practice material which can be distributed to projects. Findings will also be publicised via *ESF News* and by means of dissemination seminars where relevant. The ESF Evaluation Team will produce a dissemination strategy which will be discussed with the ESG. Dissemination of evaluation findings will also be covered in the overall communications strategy which is being produced by the ESF Unit.

Annex 1 Proposed Indicators for each Policy Field

OVERALL OP PERFORMANCE INDICATORS		
Indicator	NAP Guideline	Frequency
% in work on leaving	Pillar I	mid term
% gaining positive outcome on leaving	Pillar I, III	mid term
% young people unemployed less than 6 months	1	annual
% adults unemployed less than 12 months	2	annual
% beneficiaries completing their courses	-	annual
% gaining a qualification	6,11	annual

ACTIVE LABOUR MARKET POLICIES			
Type	Indicator	NAP Guideline	Frequency
<u>Resource</u>	Funding (£)	1,2,3	annual
<u>Output</u>	Number of beneficiaries	3	annual
	Number participating in ESF ' <i>training</i> '	3	annual
	% of young people receiving help before 6 months	1	annual
	% of women receiving support	19	annual
	% of beneficiaries completing their courses	-	annual
	% of adults receiving help before 12 months	2	annual
	% working towards a qualification	Pillar I	annual
<u>Results</u>	% positive outcomes on leaving (and at 6 months)	1, 2	mid term
	% in work on leaving (and at 6 months)	1,2	mid term
	% moving into self-employment	1,2,11	mid term
<u>Impact</u>	Number of unemployed in work after ESF support (net of deadweight)	Pillar I	mid term

SOCIAL INCLUSION			
Type	Indicator	NAP Guideline	Frequency
<u>Resource</u>	Funding (£)	9	annual
<u>Output</u>	Number of beneficiaries	9	annual
	Number receiving ESF ' <i>training</i> '	9	annual
	% of women receiving support	19	annual
	Number of trainers trained	5	annual
	% working towards a qualification	Pillar I	annual
	Number of capacity building projects	5,6	annual
	Number of research projects	5,6	annual
<u>Results</u>	% positive outcomes on leaving (and at 6 months)	9	mid term
	% in work on leaving (and at 6 months)	9	mid term
	% moving into self-employment	9,11	mid term
<u>Impact</u>	Numbers in work 6 months after ESF support (net of deadweight)	Pillar I	mid term

LIFELONG LEARNING			
Type	Indicator	NAP Guideline	Frequency
<u>Resource</u>	Funding (£)	5, 6	annual
<u>Output</u>	Numbers participating in lifelong learning	5,6	annual
	% of women receiving support	19	annual
	% completing their courses	-	annual
	% working towards a qualification	Pillar I	annual
	Number of research/labour market analysis projects	6	annual
	Number of trainers trained	6	annual
	Number of capacity building projects	5,6	annual
<u>Results</u>	% of leavers gaining a qualification	6	annual
	% in work or further study on leaving (and at 6 months)	6, Pillar III	mid term
<u>Impact</u>	Net increase in participation in lifelong learning from ESF support	6	mid term

ADAPTABILITY/ENTREPRENEURSHIP			
Type	Indicator	NAP Guideline	Frequency
<u>Resource</u>	Funding (£)	Pillar II & III	annual
<u>Output</u>	Number of beneficiaries getting self-employment help	11	annual
	Number of companies helped	11	annual
	Number of employees helped (given ESF ' <i>training</i> ')	11	annual
	Number of trainers trained	18	annual
	% of women receiving support	19	annual
	% working towards a qualification	18	annual
	Number of research/labour market analysis projects	18	annual
<u>Results</u>	Survival rate of self-employment at 18 months	11	mid term
	% of beneficiaries gaining a qualification	11	annual
<u>Impact</u>	Net number of new businesses running after 18 months	11	mid term
	Net number of jobs safeguarded by ESF support	Pillar III	mid term
	Net number of jobs created through support for self-employment	Pillar II	mid term

GENDER EQUALITY			
Type	Indicator	NAP Guideline	Frequency
<u>Resource</u>	Funding (£)	Pillar IV	annual
<u>Output</u>	Number of beneficiaries	19	annual
	% women beneficiaries	19	annual
	% of projects offering childcare facilities	21	annual
	Number of research projects	19	annual
<u>Results</u>	% positive outcomes for women	20	mid term
	% of parents with children under 5 in work 6 months after ESF	20, 21	mid term
	% of women setting up in business	11, 20	mid term
	% of women trained in non-traditional occupations	20	mid term
<u>Impact</u>	Net % increase in female labour market participation of beneficiaries after ESF support	20	mid term