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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This paper documents and discusses the multi-stakeholder process and methodology designed and applied to develop a national vocational education and training (VET) strategy for the agriculture, forestry and fisheries (AFF) sectors in South Africa.

The Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF), with the support of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) undertook a multi-stakeholder process (MSP) to develop a national VET strategy for the AFF sectors. The need for a VET strategy grew out of National Education and Training strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development in South Africa, a more general strategy exclusively for the agriculture sector first published in 2005 and updated in 2015 to include the forestry and fisheries sectors. This strategy addressed broad issues across the whole education and training field, and was aimed primarily at increasing the coherence and quality of education and training at all levels for the AFF sectors. However, the original strategy was generally biased towards higher education qualifications, particularly those with high levels of theoretical learning. Further consideration, set the stage for developing a strategy that would specifically address VET – both as a band of learning in the South African qualifications framework and as an educational concept relevant to all levels of qualifications.


2 DAFF. 2015. National Education and Training strategy for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries was developed with the express purpose of integrating forestry and fisheries after they were brought under the same ministry as agriculture. It was published in 2015. [also available at: http://www.nda.agric.za/doaDev/sideMenu/educationAndTraining/docs/NATIONAL%20EDUCATION%20AND%20TRAINING%20STRATEGY%20FOR%20AGRICULTURE,%20FORESTRY%20AND%20FISHERIES%20.pdf]
CHAPTER 2

THE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PROCESS (MSP) APPROACH

2.1. DEFINITION, PRINCIPLES AND RATIONALE

DEFINITION

Multi-stakeholder processes (MSPs) are processes that seek to bring stakeholders together to participate in the dialogue, decision-making, and implementation of solutions to common problems or goals. They are based on democratic principles of transparency and participation, and aim to develop partnerships and strengthen networks among stakeholders (Brouwer et al., 2015; Hemmati, 2001; UNDP, 2006; REDD+ 2018).

KEY PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MSPs

Multi-stakeholder processes (MSPs) operate around a few key principles and characteristics. As shown in Figure 1, first among the key characteristics is a common goal. Through commitment, equity, dedication to learning, agreement on the operational rules, staying focused to bring about change, and being transparent and accountable, MSPs result in mutual benefits for all stakeholders. This is the framework for making MSPs sustainable.

PURPOSE AND RATIONALE

Complex problems require innovative solutions by bringing together different actors and disciplines. MSPs can be an appropriate way of supporting change processes, for example for conceptualizing and formulating new policies to ensure civil participation and relevance.

The importance of MSPs is based on the fact that such processes enhance the capacity and motivation of organizations to achieve their goals and to better fulfil their mission. The success of the MSPs lies ultimately in the learning process, the gaining of new insights and developing a collective commitment and capacity to turn these new ideas and plans into action (Wageningen Centre for Development Innovation).
Through the involvement in such processes, organizations can influence the enabling environment (legal frameworks, policies, rules and norms) in which they operate, and the relations existing among the participating organizations.

Additionally, MSPs have distinct advantages that lead to impacts beyond the immediate purpose of the specific process. Generally, an MSP multiplies organizational capacities by:

- providing access to more resources by drawing on the full range of technical, human, knowledge, physical and financial capital existing within the various organizations;
- enhancing mutual understanding of values and attributes of each actor, thus creating more stable relations and trust;
- encouraging coordination of activities, resulting in synergies;
- bringing innovation to complex challenges of sustainable development;
- stimulating the creation of networks and mutual learning;
- offering the possibility to access channels for engagement and partnerships with actors at different levels; and
- bringing about changes in policies through regular dialogue and advocacy.
In the context of developing the VET strategy, some of the advantages include:

- raising awareness among the stakeholders on the VET strategy development, experiences and developments elsewhere relevant to the strategy, and about the need for changes and the need for preparing for the changes ahead;
- exchanging knowledge (e.g. experiences, vision and priorities) among the stakeholders in the MSP, and drawing on that knowledge to establish a shared understanding on core issues of the VET strategy;
- shaping the policy governing the strategy, which in turn determines with whom the stakeholder organizations will work and partner in the future;
- strengthening the identification of the stakeholders with the future VET strategy, thereby fostering ownership and commitment to the future system;
- contributing to the organizational development of VET stakeholders and their roles and tasks in the future VET system;
- facilitating the desired performance of the future VET system resulting from jointly clarifying the future roles and tasks of the VET stakeholders.

The main purpose of the process in South Africa was to develop and formulate within the existing legal framework a new policy and strategy for VET, including an outline of an implementation plan. Based on the MSP concept as shown in Figure 1, the underlying principles of this initiative were to:

- develop a VET strategy for the AFF sectors in South Africa to enhance the performance of VET and its relevance for the enhancement of the economy and society;
- initiate a first step for a long-term multi-stakeholder process required for implementing the changes defined in the national VET strategy needing collaboration and partnerships among stakeholder with complementary strengths;
- enhance ownership of the key elements of the VET strategy by sharing information and different perspectives, including discussing of divergent views in order to crystallize out the main issues and to find a common denominator;
- work across a wide range of VET stakeholders involved (public, private and civic) which exercise different roles (VET providers, VET clients/users and VET governance institutions) in all the three AFF sectors;
- consider the voices of the various public, private and civic VET stakeholders and VET governance institutions in developing the strategy;
- take into account the specific VET needs of particular disadvantaged groups such as women, smallholder farmers, etc.;
- design a participatory, people-centered process through workshops and consultative meetings in which everybody involved takes responsibility of/for the outcome;
- raising awareness and open up perspectives by bringing in VET experiences from other countries;
> assess and adapt the process and its methodologies as required throughout the process;
> root the VET strategy in the experiences of the VET stakeholders, including the private sector, and hereby increase relevance of the national VET strategy given that the stakeholders concerned understand best the challenges they face and how they can be realistically addressed;
> increase transparency regarding the development of the VET strategy; and
> strengthen linkages and induce further partnerships by providing opportunities for exchange, building consensus and trust as well as defining common goals.

### 2.2. THE PROCESS, ITS PHASES AND METHODOLOGY

The MSP was spearheaded and managed by a core team, composed of DAFF and FAO (see support process in Figure 2). The entire MSP took place over a period of 15 months (December 2016 to February 2018) and was conducted in several phases (see Figure 2):

> conceptualization and planning of the process (December 2016 to February 2017);
> nine provincial workshops with VET stakeholders, including preparation (March to May 2017);
> conceptualization and writing up of the draft VET strategy based on literature review and provincial workshops (June to August 2017);
> two national validation workshops, feedback and reviews of the draft VET strategy after each workshop (October and November 2017);
> a number of individual consultation meetings with important national stakeholders, specifically the Quality Council for Trades and Occupations (QCTO), and three line functions of the Sector Education and Training Authorities (SETAs);
> feedback and reviews of the draft VET strategy based on these individual consultation meetings (June to November 2017); and
> two consultation meetings between the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) and DAFF to refine and finalize the VET strategy and to determine the next steps (January and February 2018).

To understand the dimensions of an AFF VET strategy, nine provincial consultative workshops (one in each province of the country) were held with a wide range of public-, private-, and NGO-sector VET stakeholders, including the users of VET. Individual consultations were also held with relevant SETAs and other national-level stakeholders, most notably the DHET, which is responsible for all post-school education and training. Specialists in each of the AFF industries were also
Figure 2: Key elements of the multi-stakeholder process
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consulted. The outcomes of these consultations highlighted some of the principal issues related to the provision of VET for the AFF labour markets to meet both current and future needs, and helped in the process of refining the focus, direction, objectives and initiatives that formed the core of the VET strategy that was ultimately developed.

PARTICIPANTS OF THE WORKSHOPS

A total of 213 people were involved in the nine provincial workshops. The workshops comprised a wide range of VET stakeholders. The majority of participants (67 percent) were male; roughly one-third (32 percent) were female. The largest stakeholder representation was from private VET providers (35 percent), followed by public VET providers (18 percent) and public higher education (HE) providers (13 percent). Government and government agencies (including educational regulators) comprised 14 percent of the participants. Just over 19 percent of the participants came from the private sector (value chain), comprised of farmers, students, farmer associations and business. Similar spread of representation was present at the national and validation workshops (see Table 1).

Table 1: Aggregated participation at provincial and national workshops by stakeholder groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROVINCIAL WORKSHOPS (PERCENT)</th>
<th>NATIONAL WORKSHOPS (PERCENT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government other than DAFF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Departments of Agriculture</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private VET providers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private HE providers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public VET providers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public HE providers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer associations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agency (e.g. parastatal)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Private VET providers had the largest representation in the MSP; this suggests that there is keen interest in the VET system. This keen interest shown by these stakeholders is consistent with two issues that emerged from the consultations. One was that VET is heavily influenced by the state which is often seen as a (unnecessary) gatekeeper that delays various processes related to the practical functioning of the VET system (e.g. accreditation, flow of information, contract approvals). The other was the highly volatile existence of smaller-scaled private sector VET providers needing to create a more stable and sustainable revenue system, part of which includes having a voice in the decision-making processes. This level of participation by private VET providers suggests that they saw this MSP as a means to define their stake in the VET system.

The low level of attendance by farmers and students (who represent key clients of the VET system) is indicative that the system is geared towards the supply side of the VET system (particular providers and regulators). Students and farmers are often less mobile and have less time and resources available to participate in such processes – as such they perhaps have (or perceive themselves to have) less power than other stakeholders.

The lower representation of women in MSPs is also highlighted by these records. Part of this is somewhat beyond the immediate control of those designing MSPs. Additionally, in this case, it was observed that substantially fewer women are in senior positions than men who are generally represented in management positions in the VET stakeholder institutions. As noted by StatsSA (2017), “Despite women making up just over half of the population, they remain relatively unrepresented in positions of authority and power”. This will be a vital challenge going forward with the VET strategy. Finally, these statistics also appear to reflect the current relationship between the VET system and the private sector. Business is seen as a client or end-user of the system, not so much as a governance partner of the system and only to some extend as a VET provider.
METHODOLOGY

The MSP had three main components: the provincial workshops; consultation with key national stakeholders; the national stakeholder and validation workshops.

The provincial and national stakeholder workshops were one-day events; the validation workshop was a day and a half. The limited time necessitated developing a methodology that would enable each of the participants to have a voice and to minimize undue influence by more ‘powerful’ or confident participants. It also required a methodology that would engage participants and capture their input efficiently and consistently across all nine provincial workshops.

At the provincial and national stakeholder workshops, three main instruments were used:

- **Mapping engagement with VET (Annex 2):**
  Participants indicated in what way they were engaged in VET. This included whether they were in the public or private sector, providers of VET programmes, employers of VET graduates, or customers (students and farmers) of VET and what their actual roles and activities are in connection with VET.

- **Mapping best practice (Annex 3):**
  Participants articulated their vision and ideas about best practice in relation to governance and coordination of VET, funding of VET, policy, teaching and learning, curriculum and work integrated learning. Inputs of individual participants were grouped with similar inputs of other participants to slowly highlight critical best practices.

- **Identifying barriers, stumbling blocks and possible solutions (Annex 4):**
  Participants identified and described issues, processes, etc. that were inhibiting the provision and/or uptake of VET by potential learners. They explained why it was a stumbling block or barrier, and suggested policy and/or practical measures to address the shortcoming.

In addition to being designed to engage participants and capture input efficiently, these instruments also facilitated discussion during plenary sessions at the workshops and analysis after the workshops. After the first provincial workshop, the workshop methodology was reviewed: The input-capturing instruments were simplified and amended to allow for a more analytical and interactive process. No further substantial changes were required to the methodology applied at the subsequent workshops.

The participants at the workshops were invited to evaluate the workshop itself. They were asked to identify one aspect that represented the most positive characteristic of the workshop and one that represented the most negative. Similarly, the core team also reflected after each workshop specifically with the purpose, among other things, to review the process, particularities and results.

The validation workshop used a similar approach to engage participants. Most of the participants at the validation workshop had been at either a provincial or national workshop. Critical sections of the proposed strategy were copied into tables that allowed the participants to work in groups.
to check that the text was a fair reflection of the input from the provincial and national workshops (see Annex 5). Space was provided to raise concerns and to record suggested alternative text. The sections reviewed were those covering the challenges in the VET system, the vision and objectives for the strategy, and the strategic initiatives. Feedback sessions facilitated consensus on specific elements in the draft strategy that required attention. After the workshop, the written inputs from each group were collated and used, together with the results of the plenary discussion, as a basis for revising the strategy.

The meetings with key national stakeholders were designed along the lines of focus group discussions. The core team prepared lead questions to ensure that the exchange generated information that was relevant to the drafting of the strategy. The one variation was the meeting with the TVET unit of DHET which combined both the lead questions and a summary presentation of selected sections of the draft strategy on which the participants were able to comment. The results of these consultations were used to adjust orientation and augment the contents of the strategy (see Section 3.2.2).

2.3. THE ROLES OF THE VARIOUS STAKEHOLDERS IN THE CORE PROCESS

The Government of South Africa, through DAFF, requested assistance to develop a strategy to address specifically VET for the AFF sectors. This was to be a coherent expansion from earlier more general education and training strategies developed by DAFF for the AFF sectors. The Directorate of Sector Education and Training (DSET) of DAFF was the principal agency driving the process from the government side.

DSET held the policy space on behalf of DAFF, contributing to framing the scope of the strategy based on existing policies and legal frameworks, the terminology used, and providing direction for collaboration with DHET. DSET also provided much of the logistical and administrative support for the workshops and other sessions. Furthermore, DSET will be the custodian of the VET strategy, responsible for taking it through the various government channels required for approval, adoption and implementation.

The VET strategy core team was composed of representatives of DAFF and FAO. Collectively the team designed the multi-stakeholder process and its components and parameters and elaborated the roadmap for developing the VET strategy. The team participated, evaluated and adjusted the workshops and stakeholder consultations along the process, assessed all the inputs gathered from the workshops and reviewed in detail the drafts of the AFF VET strategy drafted by the FAO
consultant who also facilitated the workshops. The primary focus of the team was to drive and manage the process and ensure that the strategy was sufficiently rigorous to provide the impetus required to improve and strengthen the VET system and make it more relevant and responsive to the current and future requirements of the AFF sectors in South Africa.

**Provincial stakeholders** were invited to participate in the consultative workshops in their respective provinces. The participants at the workshops comprised primarily public and private-sector VET providers as well as private-sector AFF industry representatives. Students and producers (farmers, fishers and growers) had also been invited, but few attended the workshops.

The provincial stakeholders were the primary source of the detailed understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the current VET system and gave voice to stakeholders of what needs to be changed. Additionally, the workshops were designed to provide insight in the direction and focus of the overall strategy. Specifically, the provincial stakeholders contributed extensively to establishing a vision of ‘good practice’ in the South African context.

A selection of the workshop participants from each province also participated in the national validation workshop run to review the draft VET strategy. Other provincial stakeholders (including those who had been invited to, but did not attend, the consultative workshops) received the draft strategy and were able to contribute to the validation process via email. Unfortunately very few did so.

The provincial stakeholders were keenly concerned that the current system be made more efficient and accountable – particularly with reference to the relevance of curricula, teachers’ qualification and training as well as throughput and employability of graduates.

**National stakeholders**, as a collective, comprised representatives of organized agriculture, commodity organizations, nationally operating private sector VET providers and national public sector role-players in VET including DHET, the Department of Basic Education (DBE), SETAs and the QCTO. The input of these stakeholders was to provide additional insight into the direction and focus of the VET strategy and to review potential initiatives to foster change in the VET system. They largely supported the views raised by the provincial stakeholders, particularly in connection with the relevance of VET qualifications to the AFF labor markets and with the inefficient and generally unresponsive functioning of the current VET system. Not unexpectedly, the public sector stakeholders held more positive views of the functioning of the current public TVET system than those expressed at the provincial workshops.

**The Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET)** is the official authority implementing all educational legislation relevant to the post-school education and training, including VET. Two face-to-face sessions were held with DHET, specifically with the Directorate of Technical and Vocational Education and Training responsible for TVET. These sessions provided useful insight into some of the practical issues related to offer VET programs. These sessions also laid the
groundwork for establishing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the DHET and DAFF to ensure the collaborative inter-departmental implementation of the AFF VET strategy.

One of the critical inputs from DHET was suggesting that the strategy use the acronym VET in all its references to the concept and the wider system governing vocational education and training. This would help avoid any confusion that may arise that the strategy was addressing exclusively the formally and legislated sector referred to as TVET.

THE ROLE AND INPUTS OF FAO IN THE SUPPORT PROCESS

FAO provided technical and financial assistance for developing the VET strategy by:

- providing expertise regarding the MSP process and the development of the VET strategy, including identifying and collating relevant government policies and documents related to VET and the AFF sectors, preparing a literature review on international good practice, and developing the methodology and research tools to engage stakeholders in assessing VET in South Africa;
- organizing and guiding the core team meetings and facilitating the process, including the workshops;
- providing financial support for the workshops, the consultant and his travel, etc.;
- documenting the process and writing up the VET strategy, including the incorporation of comments and inputs provided by VET stakeholders and the core team throughout the process; and
- submitting the finalized VET strategy to government.

2.4. KEY DATA INFORMING THE PROCESS

Key data informing the process came from three sources: the literature review on VET strategies and experiences in South Africa; the analysis of training and employment data published by agencies such as the SETAs, Statistics South Africa (StatsSA), the Department of Labour and the DHET; and awareness raising on VET experiences elsewhere. These data and information helped on the one hand to broaden views and, on the other, to open up discussions to focus the nature and range of themes to be examined and discussed by the stakeholders at the provincial and national workshops and the individual consultative meetings. This also informed the analysis and interpretations of the results of the various workshops, and they provided context and parameters for benchmarks used for the formulation of the proposed VET strategy’s vision, strategic objectives, outcomes and initiatives derived from the MSP.
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CHAPTER 3

EXPERIENCE AND ASSESSMENT OF THE PROCESS

3.1. CHALLENGES OCCURRING IN THE PROCESS AND WHAT HELPED TO OVERCOME THEM

CHALLENGES WITH PROJECT LOGISTICS

At times it was difficult to orchestrate logistical elements of the MSP. This was particularly the case with some of the provincial workshops. The net effect was short notice periods for travel arrangements and lower than anticipated attendance. This fundamental challenge arose due to the tight timeframe and limited budgets for conducting the workshops. To make travel cost-effective and to meet deadlines, all nine provincial workshops were held within two months – necessitating holding in most cases two workshops in a given week. Additional challenges were the time required for administrative and financial procedures, the establishment of the stakeholder lists for each province to cover a wide range of organizations and the search for appropriate workshops venues.

These challenges were addressed through close communication within the core team and between the officers from FAO and DAFF. Skype conferences by the core team were used to increase the organizational efficiency – obviating the need to travel and saving time and resources.

CHALLENGES WITH STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

As noted above, many more stakeholders were invited to the workshops than actually participated. Part of this was due to delays in identifying the stakeholders (no established lists of VET stakeholders were available) and setting up the workshops. Another contributing factor was that stakeholders had to pay their own way to attend the provincial workshops. Other than Gauteng Province, the other provinces cover substantial territory, requiring travelling long distances to wherever the workshop was held.
Public sector stakeholders were generally able to mobilize transport, as were larger private-sector stakeholders. The smaller private-sector stakeholders (including VET providers, farmers and businesses) tended to be those that were situated in or close to the city in which the workshop was held.

Few of the stakeholders communicated outside of the formal workshops. The participants of the validation workshop were selected from the participants of the provincial and the national stakeholder workshops. However, participants who were not invited to attend the validation workshop were also invited to contribute to the review of the draft strategy; yet, no input was received other than the oral and written inputs from the participants at the validation workshop itself.

3.2. STRENGTHS OF THE PROCESS

There were three main strengths of the process: the multi-stakeholder workshops; input from key stakeholders, in particular selected SETAs, QCTO and DHET; and the spirit of collaboration from government and within the core team.

3.2.1. THE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS

Provincial consultative workshops: The provincial workshops were highly participatory. Every participant in attendance had an equal opportunity to express their viewpoints and contribute to the discussions. In terms of input into the strategy, participants were able to directly record their ideas in particular with reference to best practice and identifying barriers and how to overcome them. Participants worked in small groups in which they discussed and shared ideas, views and concerns about VET in general and about the functioning of VET in South Africa. While working in groups, individual participants were able to record their own ideas and views (which did not need to reflect consensus of the group). This provided the process with rich and varied data and information from which to draw.

The participation of the stakeholders at the workshops was lively, informed and substantial, reflecting keen interest and genuine concern for the efficient and effective operation of the VET system.

National stakeholder workshop: This one-day workshop was constrained by time. Therefore, the workshop focused on the three main aspects of the draft strategy: focus and direction of the strategy; structures and mechanisms to implement the strategy; and the strategic initiatives.
The input from this workshop was particularly helpful in refining the focus of the strategy as well as shaping and prioritizing the initiatives. The major strength of this workshop was the frank and open feedback provided by the participants. Several of them raised insightful questions about some of the initiatives and making practical suggestions for changes. Written comments and inputs to the draft VET strategy were submitted by the participants at the end of the day. These were carefully analyzed and incorporated into the VET strategy.

**National validation workshop:** This workshop was designed to give provincial, national and other key stakeholders an opportunity to review the actual text of an advanced version of the proposed VET strategy and validate it as a true reflection of the discussions held throughout the MSP. Due to time constraints, the validation process focused on three critical parts of the strategy: the challenges faced by the VET system; the vision and objectives for the VET system; and the strategic initiatives to drive the strategy forward. The discussions were technical and focused. Participants gave special attention to the details of the strategic initiatives which, to them, represented the practical expression of the vision and objectives of the strategy. They gave particularly valuable input into the milestones and indicators for the initiatives.

***

The participants evaluated the provincial, national and validation workshops which they attended. They indicated that the principal strength of the workshops was the interactive approach used. It was well designed and executed and ensured a high level of participation, brainstorming and freedom for individuals to express views safely. Another significant strength was the opportunity given to industry and the private sector to contribute to the strengthening of the VET system. And the third crucial strength was that, in keeping with the principle of transparency and accountability, all of the information gathered at the various workshops was circulated to the participants and was freely available. Ancillary to this was the fact that the input from the stakeholders who participated in the MSP was well reflected in the content of the draft VET strategy.

### 3.2.2. INPUT FROM KEY NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS THROUGH CONSULTATIVE MEETINGS

The VET team was able to secure face-to-face sessions with representatives of three of the SETAs that are key role-players in the South African AFF VET, namely the Agricultural SETA (AgriSETA); the Fibre Processing and Manufacturing SETA (FP&M SETA); the Food and Beverage SETA (FOODBEV SETA), as well as with the QCTO and DHET.

Each of these sessions added substantial input into the direction and focus of the VET strategy. The participants from the SETAs and the QCTO highlighted two important aspects that proved
to be critically important to developing the strategy. First was confirming that VET for the AFF sectors extended well beyond primary production, fishing and harvesting. Second was deepening the understanding of the status, need and challenge with respect to workplace-based learning.

Two meetings were required with DHET as the main government stakeholder and the official guardian of VET in South Africa. These meetings helped to clarify the framework as well as the scale and scope of the strategy (and hence language) and to ensure the VET strategy fell within existing regulations. The strategy developed was much broader than the existing TVET, hence to ensure it was not confused with the formally regulated public sector TVET, the strategy was called "VET strategy", whereby TVET is part of this wider VET.

Ultimately, the strategy would have to be implemented by DAFF in collaboration with DHET. This consultation yielded the support of DHET for the VET strategy covering the AFF sectors. Both parties agreed to develop a formal working arrangement for this collaboration.

3.2.3. SPIRIT OF COLLABORATION OF GOVERNMENT AND WITHIN THE CORE TEAM

*Spirit of collaboration of government:* Critique of processes that are largely governmentally delivered and controlled can often be met with resistance and denial of facts and reality. In this instance, the team comprised of representatives from the government – working with stakeholders that were directly affected by the particular shortcomings and failings raised through the MSP – were open to the criticism and willing to listen to concerns raised. The government representatives expressed genuine interest in identifying and understanding the challenges faced by VET stakeholders, and in jointly finding lasting solutions to them.

*Spirit of collaboration within the core team:* Processes, such as the one followed in developing the VET strategy, run the risk of being self-confirming. In this instance, the core team which comprised of DAFF and FAO, was generally able to look objectively at the process and its results. Eight of the nine provincial workshops were evaluated by the participants in terms of their 'most positive' and 'most negative' aspects. These evaluations and exchanges among the core team after each workshop were used to improve each next workshop, and to check the overall progress and direction of the process. There was rarely, if ever, a defensive response to criticism of the process (e.g. logistical delays, limited time in workshops). There was a great felicity of the team to listen to various perspectives expressed and to adjust to concerns raised and incorporate them throughout the process.

This spirit of collaboration was also manifest in the iterations in drafting the VET policy. The core team was openly critical of content, structure and even wording of the VET policy. Discussions
were extremely frank and often intense, but they did not paralyze the process of further developing the strategy, rather they informed it. Points of view varied at times greatly, but the core team was able to create unity of thought and delivered a document that was genuinely owned by the stakeholders involved and the core team.

### 3.3. Weaknesses of the Process

**Provincial workshops:** The participants identified a number of weaknesses related to the provincial workshops. The principal weaknesses in terms of the workshops themselves were:

- limited attendance and representation – particularly from farmers, fishers, growers and VET students; short notice about the meetings and thus insufficient time for participants to prepare; other commitments by participants – which potentially affected the depth of understanding and capturing input of the ‘voiceless’ stakeholders;
- insufficient time and limited capacity at the individual level to deeply interrogate the contributions, resulting sometimes in superficial feedback by participants; and hence necessitating facilitation for further deepening of their reflections; and
- the participants raised concern that the exercise would not bear fruit – specifically there were fears that the inputs would not be taken seriously. Some participants have had substantial engagement with government-led consultative processes, the outcomes of which did not reflect stakeholder input and/or which led to plans that were never implemented and contributed to some not attending at all.

**Public-sector national stakeholders:** While the SETAs, QCTO and DHET were very cooperative and supportive of the process, they generally did not express views beyond their specific functions and implementation of policy and legislation. Some were concerned primarily with budget expenditure and control. DHET appeared concerned with technical details rather than the ‘big picture’. This limited creative exploration of VET and its governance and provision. The TVET section of DHET, however, provided useful guidance on the positioning of the VET strategy within existing policy to avoid duplication of effort and potential misunderstanding among stakeholders involved the DHET TVET system, but also others.

**Validation process:** There was insufficient time to validate the entire document of the VET strategy in the national workshops. Hence, as mentioned above, the three main parts were selected and discussed. Additionally, after the validation workshop, the structure of the outline needed to be changed in the objective to keep the VET strategy concise, while keeping the spirit, concept and content developed.
3.4. RESULTS OF THE STAKEHOLDER PROCESS

The national VET strategy: The primary purpose and result of the MSP was the development of the VET strategy which was critically reviewed by the stakeholders who had contributed to it through participation in the various workshops. The strategy provides the context and rationale for a VET strategy for the AFF sectors, embeds VET in AFF labor markets and existing educational policy, provides a vision, strategic objectives, corresponding outcomes and initiatives, and outlines implementation structures and timelines to bring about substantial changes and improvements to the current VET system serving the AFF sectors.

Provincial and national workshops: The multi-stakeholder process relating to the provincial and national workshops yielded very rich information which directly informed the development of the VET strategy. It helped to identify issues that were of particular concern to those on the frontline of providing VET in contrast to the tendency to focus on issues that concerned the government. This helped to ensure that the final VET strategy addresses issues identified from practical experience, rather than from theory. There was also a critical learning process regarding the need to establish partnerships at provincial and national level between different stakeholders to enhance performance and create synergies.

Consultation with national stakeholders: Consultation with the SETAs, QCTO and DHET formed a real foundation for future collaboration and partnership which will be essential to gain government approval of and thereafter implementation of the VET strategy. Each of the SETAs and QCTO expressed interest in working together with DAFF on VET issues. DHET and DAFF committed to establishing a formal working arrangement (e.g. a Memorandum of Understanding) between them with respect to implementing the VET strategy.

Critical content: An important result of the MSP was identifying the priority issues for improving VET for the AFF sectors in South Africa. The MSP highlighted the critical elements of the role of the private sector in the governance of the VET system and in the provision of workplace based learning; the financing of the VET system through multiple sources and diverse financing mechanisms and the need for greater relevance of VET programs to the AFF labor market – including the need to increase the occurrence of workplace-based learning.

In addition to developing the VET strategy, the MSP also achieved the following results:

- expanding the understanding of the concept and nature of VET;
- broadening the understanding of the role and place of VET in developing knowledge and skills for the AFF labor market;
- more detailed understanding of the key issues and challenges facing VET for the AFF sectors;
greater awareness of the stakeholders and their particular roles in VET;

establishing connections between and among stakeholders operating on the frontline; and awareness for the need to develop stronger partnerships, particularly between the public and private sectors, to the benefit of the learners, the economy and society;

creating possibilities for partnerships between DAFF and DHET, and between DAFF and the SETAs and the QCTO;

accepting the critical need for direct involvement by private sector industry in VET and making provision for this; and

accepting the critical need for additional resource mobilization and more diverse financing mechanisms for VET and making provision for this.
3.5. DRIVERS OF THE MSP AND SUCCESS FACTORS FOR CHANGE IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING (VET)

**DRIVERS OF THE MSP**

The main driver of the MSP was the core team composed of DAFF and FAO who had the mandate to develop the VET strategy for the government.

At this point in the process, the VET stakeholders cannot be expected to drive such a process as they are not sufficiently linked and coordinated. Yet, thanks to the MSP, the stakeholders involved have seen the need for enhanced collaboration and partnerships. The participants were committed to contribute and see the VET system move forward along the lines set out in the strategy to which they were direct contributors. However, the principle of driving the MSP by the collective of stakeholders is the key to its long-term sustainability. Fostering this is a main feature of the strategy.

**SUCCESS FACTORS FOR CHANGE IN VET**

Many factors emerged as success factors for ensuring effective change in VET in South Africa. The most “important” are highlighted below:

**Leadership and ownership:** The MSP clearly highlighted that VET is currently led by the supply side and, within that context, it is led primarily by the government. Further, the state has tended to manage rather than to govern and lead VET jointly with key stakeholders and in doing so, it has
focused primarily on public-sector VET providers. In this MSP, the government, as represented by DAFF, led but did not dominate the process and sought clearly to advance collaboration among all stakeholders. The willingness and anticipation of stakeholders to contribute to change and to move forward with implementing the VET strategy was, in large measure, due to their perceiving that they would be co-owners of the VET system. The VET strategy will initially be implemented throughout the country through DAFF and the provincial Departments of Agriculture. As this exercise unfolds, it is essential that the state acts as a catalyst in the process, fostering collaboration and partnerships among all stakeholders - who will collectively and ultimately become the owners of the VET system and the champions of its enhancement.

**Governance and partnerships within a common vision and framework:** An important part of leading with the intent of fostering ownership by stakeholders is recognizing the need for an overall multi-stakeholder governance both of the MSPs and the implementation of the strategy. In the context of a MSP, effective governance requires partnerships among stakeholders and unifying around a common vision and framework guiding both the MSP itself and the transformation of VET as outlined in the VET strategy.

**Posture of learning:** Demonstrating a genuine willingness to listen and to learn and to adjust according to that learning also emerged as an important success factor for change. Learning as a mode of operation is characterized by a reflexive process of analyzing, planning, acting and reflecting. It requires manifesting humility among all stakeholders, where the success of the collective (rather than the individual stakeholder) is the focus. Applied effectively, a posture of learning will foster willing and informed participation of additional stakeholders as they are brought into the MSP as it moves forward into implementation of the strategy.

**Coordinated dynamic process:** By its very nature, change is a dynamic, innovative process. This dynamism is fueled by the commitment to learning, taking risks and trying out new ways of working together. Given the social, legal and economic ramifications of educational initiatives such as the VET strategy, the strategy will be effective when the dynamic process gives space to stakeholders to take initiatives and is well-coordinated and facilitated, a key element of which is communication and information sharing.

**Active experimentation and pilot initiatives:** Effecting change in a system as extensive as the AFF VET system is a complex and long-term process given the structural changes required and the number of stakeholders and initiatives involved. The AFF VET strategy itself is planned for a minimum of 10 years. The MSP highlighted the value of embedding the notion and space of active experimentation and the use of pilot initiative as an indispensable element of ensuring successful change in the AFF VET system. These are the tools of inducing motivation, fostering commitment and ownership as well as joint learning and collaboration. Such dynamic processes reinforce an iterative, learn-as-you go approach that avoids over-planning and top-down management of what is essentially an organic process.
CHAPTER 4

CONDITIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE VET STRATEGY

While there is every intention for a genuine working partnership between DAFF and DHET, the reality is that DAFF, as subject-matter department, will carry the greatest share of responsibility for ensuring the implementation of the AFF VET strategy. Although the strategy outlines the agencies, structures and processes for implementing the strategy, successful implementation will require new governance modalities and dynamics as well as adequate funds, as well as sustained information, guidance and encouragement at the operational levels (nationally and provincially). Given the multi-stakeholder nature of VET, it is essential that the MSP which was started during the policy formulation continues and is reinforced during the VET strategy implementation.

The implementation plan implies that the provincial Departments of Agriculture, as the primary provincial-level structures related to the governance of the AFF sectors, will be the main conduit for initiating and initially coordinating the provincial-level processes upon which the implementation of the strategy is dependent. Ultimately, implementation of the strategy is meant to be taken up by the collective structures and platforms called for in the strategy.

Because of this decentralized nature of the government departments, DAFF will need to guide and encourage operatives in the provincial departments to ensure the structures in their care get off to a good start and are provided with the necessary support for spearheading the formation of the anticipated collective governance structures. This will require buy-in from the Ministers and Heads of Department of the nine provincial Departments of Agriculture. An essential part of this will be to hold dedicated sessions to further orient provincial structures and VET stakeholders about the VET strategy and the changes it requires and to facilitate setting up the required structures and processes for enhancing performance of VET.

The provincial Departments of Agriculture will play a key role in mobilizing, orienting and facilitating provincial stakeholders to jointly implement the VET strategy. Success of the multi-stakeholder implementation process rests in increasingly widening the range of stakeholders engaging in governance of the VET system, ensuring that the process remains a collective and collaborative process, becoming more and more institutionalized through multi-stakeholder partnerships, platforms and other arrangements as well as in taking deliberate steps to avoid unilateral implementation by any single institution or stakeholder grouping.
Furthermore, this requires fostering and establishing sustainable multi-stakeholder collaboration and partnerships among public and private VET stakeholders in the various elements of the VET system including developing curricula, learning programs and qualifications, enhancing the provision of VET training and the training of trainers, and especially a new way of governing the AFF VET system.

A critical aspect of implementing the VET strategy and giving credence to the essential multi-stakeholder collaboration is engaging private sector (particularly AFF industries) to be a much stronger part of VET and the implementation of the strategy. The private sector roles range from participation in VET governance, training provision, particularly workplace based learning, to co-financing of VET. This will require developing and implementing a strategic advocacy and communication plan aimed specifically at informing and soliciting the support of private sector stakeholders. An important part of this will be to ensure that the private sector stakeholders are not overwhelmed by the presence of the public sector stakeholders, which have heretofore dominated the VET system, and that their role in the process develops to one of co-owners and champions.
Monitoring and evaluation are essential to the successful implementation of the VET strategy. Again, due to the decentralized nature of structures and implementation, DAFF will need to ensure that data requirements are defined, learning cycles are captured, the monitoring and evaluation processes established and the information and feedback obtained at national level are analyzed and acted upon objectively and in good time. An essential part of this will be establishing the monitoring and evaluation systems and processes nationally and provincially, as well as mechanisms to feedback results and lessons learned into decision-making for the enhancement of the VET system.

Finally, it is all-important that implementation, as well as monitoring and evaluation, are undertaken as a learning process. The temptation to implement the strategy as a final solution as a directive from ministerial or national level cannot bear the desired results. Implementation will be successful and sustainable only when it is carried out through a deliberate, collaborative and coordinated process of planning, acting and reflecting leading to new insights, building understanding and capacity amongst all stakeholders so that they collectively find their way forward.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONDUCTING MSPs

A number of important lessons were learned in carrying out this first phase of a MSP to strengthen the AFF VET system. They provide helpful benchmarks which can be applied in MSPs in similar contexts.

Collaboration and maintaining unity: In a resource-constrained environment, which applies to the AFF VET system, competitiveness emerges almost as a norm of operation. Similarly, false dichotomies emerge which can lead unnecessarily to win-lose dynamics. Competition and false dichotomies hamper real progress as they tend to adversely influence information sharing and prioritizing. The methods used in this MSP contributed to navigate through this, to develop excellent collaboration and unity of vision and direction. Common aspects were reinforced in the facilitation process and hence contributed to consensus building.

Honoring and validating contributions: A principal underpinning of the MSP and the methods employed was to ensure that everyone participating, particularly those attending the workshops, were able to contribute without fear or judgement. In this way, the contributions of each were honored and validated. This contributed to reinforcing common aspects for building consensus.

Transparency: Sharing all the results of the workshops as well as drafts of the VET strategy helped to build trust in the process, willingness to engage and confidence in DAFF’s commitment to implement the strategy, once it is approved.

Interactive approach: In settings such as the MSP workshops, it is very easy to lose control of the interactive process and for the proceedings to devolve into top-down information sharing and/or domination by a few ‘powerful’ voices. Often there is an intention for workshops to be interactive, but the methodologies used often do not facilitate interaction. The simple methods used to engage and capture the inputs of the participants of the various workshops highlighted the value of planning for interaction. The provision of sufficient time to discussions was critical for creating dynamic interactions. Again, the diversity of stakeholders was enriching the informative character of the interactions.
Efficiency of information gathering: The methods used at the workshops to record the information and experiences shared by the stakeholders proved to be efficient. The information, while varied in its content, was uniform in its presentation which facilitated analysis and interpretation. The methods also lent themselves to visual feedback at the workshops which (within the acknowledged limitations of time constraints) facilitated group discussion and on-site analysis.

Leadership from government: In South Africa, education is very much in the hands of the government. It is highly regulated with the aim of redressing imbalances from the country’s divided past. In this MSP, the leadership demonstrated by the government officials who were part of the core team as well as their superiors and subordinates proved to be key to winning the trust and confidence of the VET stakeholders. It is highly doubtful that without such collaborative and incorporating leadership that the MSP would achieve or maintain any momentum or direction.

Consistent but flexible approach: The MSP was analogous to walking a path. It necessitated a logical sequence, but, when needed permitted deviations and the exploration of opportunities. The positive and negative evaluations of each workshop provided by the participating stakeholders were used to consider improvements and strengthening of the process in subsequent workshops. The fundamental methods and instruments were not changed significantly (thus providing consistency), but time allocations, feedback processes, and on-site reflection were adapted as needed.

Staying on target: One of the challenges of MSPs is that the stakeholders often have very different reasons for participating and very different expectations as to the potential outcomes of the process. When, as was the case with this MSP, the stakeholders perceive a high level
of dysfunction at the micro-level, it can lead to generating long lists of symptoms without determining possible causes. And it is identifying causes that enable change. Thus, an important lesson learnt was the need to find the balance between stakeholders needing to tell their stories (perhaps in excessive detail), and ensuring that the discussions stayed on track in terms of the objectives of the MSP (i.e. developing a strategy to strengthen the governance of the AFF VET system and to make the system more effective).

Overall, the MSP was a positive, intense and productive process that resulted in a realistic, credible and informed national VET strategy for the AFF sectors. However, the process could be improved in a number of specific ways, which can be applied as the VET strategy is implemented, but which is also of value in the planning of other MSPs:

- Ensuring the participation of more and a wider representation of stakeholders, particularly those with less power, resources and confidence – in this case, farmers, fishers, growers and VET students. In case stakeholder lists are not available, start early enough to establish them.
- When designing MSPs, planners should identify upfront the potentially ‘voiceless’ or less powerful stakeholders (whether this is perceived or real) and consider a parallel process for these stakeholders in order to take their specific situation into consideration and to help them to develop a joint position and voice in the core process.
- Effective management of time; this has two aspects: the time allocated to complete MSP; and the time allocated to key elements of the process [e.g. the provincial workshops]. While staying with the overall timeframe of the MSP, ensuring that the number and geographic spread of multi-stakeholder workshops facilitate participation from small-scale stakeholders.
- Similarly, providing sufficient time at each workshop for the participants to interrogate more thoroughly the results of their discussions. The aim is to find the balance between efficiency and breadth and depth of participation.
- Providing well-managed communication with stakeholders particularly with reference to obtaining feedback throughout the various phases of the MSP, especially outside the workshops.
- Providing sufficient rounds reviewing drafts of the policy document[s] intended for publication [e.g. the VET strategy] by stakeholders, and, if necessary extending the timeframe needed for the process, to facilitate rigorous review and refinement of the document[s]. This will also contribute to transparency and to building trust in the MSP.

Finally, applying the ‘leadership and ownership’ approach, deliberate efforts need to be made to foster greater ownership of the process, particularly by the private sector reflected in more intensive participation and in contributing to the costs of the process. Specifically, smaller-scale stakeholders need to see the value of participation. This can only be done over time, and seeing value of participation will depend largely on the space stakeholders have to make an impact and so being encouraged to take ownership. Hence, the need for the fostering of ownership to be pursued consciously, systematically and methodically.
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## ANNEX 1

### DEFINITIONS (FROM THE VET STRATEGY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFF</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors. Refers to the collective sector embracing pre-production, production and post-production value chain actors, activities and economic pursuits as well as all support and advisory services supporting and enabling the value chain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAFF</strong></td>
<td>Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. Refers to the national level service for the AFF sectors with a political head appointed by the State President, reporting to the Cabinet and managed by a non-political Director General. DAFF is responsible for setting and governing the implementation of policy related to the AFF sectors. Each province has an independently appointed Department of Agriculture responsible for implementing national and provincial specific policies, plans and programmes. See: <a href="http://www.daff.gov.za">http://www.daff.gov.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHET</strong></td>
<td>Department of Higher Education and Training. Refers to the national level service governing higher education which is loosely defined as Post-School Education and Training which includes TVET. It has a political head appointed by the State President, reporting to the Cabinet and managed by a non-political Director General. DHET specifically has oversight of all of South Africa’s public and private universities, universities of technology and institutions of higher learning as well as the TVET system. See: <a href="http://www.dhet.gov.za">http://www.dhet.gov.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DSET</strong></td>
<td>Directorate of Sector Education and Training. Refers to an administrative unit within DAFF resorting specifically under the Chief Directorate: Food Security and Agrarian Reform. DSET was created to ensure that farmers and other stakeholders access appropriate agricultural skills for the development of agriculture as an industry. Priority is given to the development of appropriate agricultural skills among those previously excluded to ensure equitable participation in the agricultural sector. See: <a href="http://www.daff.gov.za/daffweb3/Branches/Food-Security-Agrarian-Reform/Sector-Education-Training">http://www.daff.gov.za/daffweb3/Branches/Food-Security-Agrarian-Reform/Sector-Education-Training</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QCTO</strong></td>
<td>Quality Council for Trades and Occupations. Refers to the regulatory agency created by South African parliament. Its role is to oversee the design, implementation, assessment and certification of occupational qualifications, including trades, on the Occupational Qualifications Sub-Framework. This agency is in the process of taking over the responsibilities of the SETAs. See: <a href="http://www.qcto.org.za/index.php">http://www.qcto.org.za/index.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SETAs</strong></td>
<td>Sector Education and Training Authorities. Refers to a collection of regulatory bodies charged with the responsibility of raising the skills profile in their designated sectors and bringing skills to the employed and/or to people who are not employed but who want to be in their respective sectors. Specifically, the SETAs develop and implement sector skills plans, develop and administer learnerships, provide quality assurance for their respective programmes, and disburse levies collected from employers in their sector through the Skills Levy Act. There are 21 SETAs, three of which impact on VET in the AFF sectors: AgriSETA, FOODBEV SETA, and FP&amp;M SETA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TVET</strong></td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training. TVET is the official nomenclature used in South African legislation, generally referring to a band of education corresponding to levels 2, 3 and 4 on South Africa’s 10-level National Qualifications Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VET</strong></td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training. In the context of this strategy, VET is a generic reference to the concepts and practices applied to vocational education and training. The VET system mentioned in the strategy refers to the still informal organization of actors and stakeholders in the provision and use of VET. The VET system embraces the formal TVET system, is subject to any relevant TVET legislation, but is not governed directly through the DHET.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 2

**Mapping Participants’ Engagement with VET**

**DAFF/FAO TVET strategy Workshop:** Interactive session 1: Mapping participants’ engagement with TVET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province: __________________________</th>
<th>Date: ________________</th>
<th>Group: __________________________</th>
<th>Sector: __________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>PUBLIC TRAINING SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>PRIVATE TRAINING SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>REGULATOR</th>
<th>POLICY DEVELOPMENT/REVIEW</th>
<th>WORKPLACE PROVIDER</th>
<th>TVET ADMINISTRATION</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of involvement</td>
<td>Priority rating [1 - 2 - 3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of involvement</td>
<td>Priority rating [1 - 2 - 3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of involvement</td>
<td>Priority rating [1 - 2 - 3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of involvement</td>
<td>Priority rating [1 - 2 - 3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of involvement</td>
<td>Priority rating [1 - 2 - 3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of involvement</td>
<td>Priority rating [1 - 2 - 3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 When the MPS was designed, the term Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) was used. After consulting with DHET, it was changed to VET so not to be confused in the strategy with the legislated TVET system managed by the DHET. This distinction was implicit in the original MSP design, but using VET help make the distinction explicit.
## ANNEX 3

### MAPPING BEST PRACTICE

**DAFF/FAO TVET strategy Workshop:** Interactive session 2: Mapping of Best Practice

Province: ___________________________ Date: _______________ Group: ___________________________   SECTOR: ☐ AGRICULTURE ☐ FISHERIES ☐ FORESTRY

Area of Best Practice: indicate with an X: [X]
☐ Governance and Coordination ☐ Funding ☐ Policy ☐ Work-Integrated Learning/Apprenticeship/Learnership ☐ Teaching and Learning
☐ Curriculum ☐ Other ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUCCESS FACTOR/AREA OF ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF BEST PRACTICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 4

### BARRIERS AND STUMBLING BLOCKS TO TVET

**DAFF/FAO TVET strategy Workshop:** Interactive session 3: Barriers and stumbling blocks to TVET (Access, Provision, Success)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province: __________________________</th>
<th>Date: __________</th>
<th>Group: ________________</th>
<th>SECTOR:</th>
<th>AGRICULTURE</th>
<th>FISHERIES</th>
<th>FORESTRY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the barrier options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOCIAL/CULTURAL</td>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL/LEGAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATURE OF THE BARRIER/STUMBLING BLOCK</th>
<th>BRIEF DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THE BARRIER/STUMBLING BLOCK? WHO IS AFFECTED?</th>
<th>POLICY OR PRACTICAL ACTION REQUIRED TO MAKE IT A STEPPING STONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5

VALIDATION EXERCISE (EXTRACTS)

**DAFF/FAO TVET STRATEGY: VALIDATION EXERCISE**

Name of Participant: ____________________________  
Agency: ________________________________  
Province ________________________________________

3. **PROBLEM STATEMENT: CHALLENGES IN TVET FOR AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FISHERIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERARCHING ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immobility of labour in the market, there are some people who are not willing to relocate to where their skills may be required;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are some people who enter into the agriculture sector especially at low levels without a passion for it;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to the geographical spread of the farms, it is difficult to get a critical mass to be trained;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining skilled individuals interested in the sector after training;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are high costs involved in bringing individuals to urban centres for training which uses much of the budget that could otherwise increase the number of learners trained; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The young generation is not willing to start at the bottom and work their way up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. VISION AND OBJECTIVES for a performant TVET system for AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND FISHERIES

TEXT

Preamble

The vision of a performant and future oriented TVET system falls within the vision of the wider NETSAAF which is to ensure accessible, responsive, quality education and training for the South African AFF industries. This strategy specifically addresses the development of technical and vocational knowledge and skills.

The vision of the future TVET system is to see the AFF sectors provided with human resources at all levels – from ground-level workers to senior management to entrepreneurs – who have the specialised knowledge and skills required to ensure the continued advancement and strengthening of the AFF industries as well as to ensure that learners have a life-long career path.

The mandate of the structures proposed in this strategy is to support and otherwise contribute to planning, developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating policy, programmes, assessment practices and systems for technical and vocational education and training related to the fields of agriculture, forestry and fisheries.

7. STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative 1</td>
<td>Promoting the concept of technical and vocational education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Unity of thought among all AFF TVET stakeholders (including producers, businesses, educators, learners, and public agencies) about the concept and practical manifestation of vocational education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Engage AFF VET stakeholders in workshops, seminars and individual sessions on technical and vocational education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and implement a range of vehicles to engage stakeholders, e.g., internet based chat rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products</td>
<td>Proposals and plans for engagement vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reports of outcomes of Actions, including follow-up actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On-going discourse and learning about effective technical and vocational education and training for AFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>TVET policies of AFF TVET stakeholders articulate vocational education on a framework of theory, applied theory and work experience and reflect that understanding in their TVET plans and budgets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Project:</td>
<td>Plan and hold substantive seminars on vocational education and training. At least 1 national seminar and 1 seminar in each province</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OCCASIONAL PAPERS ON INNOVATION IN FAMILY FARMING
Multi-stakeholder participation is essential to address complex challenges and opportunities requiring multi-disciplinary inputs and ownership by all concerned. Multi-stakeholder processes (MSPs) can be used at various stages in policy processes be it for planning, design and governance of a system, decision-making and implementation or monitoring and evaluation.

This Occasional Paper presents a multi-stakeholder process conceptualized and implemented for developing a national vocational education and training (VET) strategy for agriculture, forestry and fisheries in South Africa. The MSP was spearheaded by a team from the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The MSP involved public, private and civil society stakeholders through nine provincial and two national workshops to capture the diverse voices, experiences and visions of VET and to enhance their engagement and ownership of the VET strategy. National stakeholders further shaped and reoriented the VET strategy. This publication outlines the MSP, the role of the different stakeholders and the results of the MSP; it assesses the MSP to draw conclusions for the implementation of the VET strategy and for general recommendations for conducting MSPs for policy development.