

MEETING NOTES

Presentation by Marina Vayanos and Erica Jacobs providing programme description and evaluation.

Below are the questions and answers posed at the evaluation briefing for the KGS Programme Evaluation. Any further questions and answers will be sent by close of business, 30 Jan 2018.

Questions and Answers

1. Can the evaluation objectives be re-grouped / re-organised?

Yes, the TOR outlines the key questions that the evaluation needs to answer. As long as the evaluation adequately addresses these the evaluator can propose a different arrangement of the questions.

2. Does NACOSA want the different implementation models to be compared?

Yes. It is important to consider the success of the different components of the model and whether the needs of the beneficiaries are met by some models and not others. However, this is not an impact evaluation and the design should be consider this and the sample and within the available budget. But it is important to understand the different implementation models on the ground.

3. Is there a prescribed sample size?

No

4. Does the budget include or exclude vat?

The budget is R1 058 000 and this excludes VAT.

5. Budget template not attached to TOR

See attached.

6. Is there a programme theory of change?

There is a draft theory of change, this will be shared with the successful evaluator

7. What data will be provided?

All NACOSA programme data will be shared – data at individual beneficiary level. Also NACOSA list of schools and geographic locations.

Other PRs – NACOSA will assist with access to their data, which will be in a different format from the NACOSA data.

All Principle Recipients are required to report the number of girls reached by 3 Health Education sessions in a year as a minimum.

8. Is ethics approval from a professional ethics board required?

Department of Basic Education Approval is required. Ethics approval from a professional board will depend on the evaluation design and the type of information collected and the evaluation participants. As the evaluation would involve children as participants, ethics approval would be required.

9. What is the unit of analysis for the sample?

It is recommended that the school be used as the site; but to use purposive sampling.

10. Will the other evaluations on the Young Women and Girls programme also be in the schools?

No, the other evaluations are for the other programme components which are not based in the schools.

11. Can NACOSA assist with DBE permission to access schools

Yes, DBE are on the Technical Advisory Committee and NACOSA will assist with this coordination. However, it is very important for the evaluator to ensure the correct processes are followed when accessing schools.

12. Is there a conflict of interest if I have previously worked on the Soul Buddyz programme?

No, it is separate from KGS programme component.

13. Is cost effective analysis a question for this evaluation?

The goal is to inform future YWGs programming and to understand the best way to use resources. A formal cost effectiveness evaluation is not required

14. What certificates is the TOR referring to?

BEE certificate and tax certificates are required. Academic certificates are not required.

15. Any forms needed and in what format is proposal?

The proposal itself is to be completed in a word document, with attachments.

16. If and to what extent the KGS programme is being implemented in the districts that are covered by other PRs, and if so how is the monitoring and evaluation data on KGS managed?

Please see the Table 3 in the TOR for the districts in which each PR is implementing, and the targets per district.

Each PR manages their own data. Each has an M&E specialist that oversees their M&E. NACOSA collects the data using biometrics. Other PRs are in different stages of implementing biometrics. Most of them currently have parallel systems of paper based data collection. Each PR currently consolidates data across their own districts only. The PRs do not currently have a system of consolidating data across PRs.

17. How LO teachers interface with the health education programme,

Peer group trainers (PGT) (learner supports agents (LSA) in some districts) and health educators interface with the LO teacher and school management, mainly on coordination of practicalities, referrals and raising students specific concerns. The LO teachers may or may not attend the sessions.

18. If this programme is offered to all those at the selected school within the age range or only to a subset of girls who are enrolled in the programme.

Who is reached is dependent on the number of girls in the school and what is agreed regarding access to classes. For example, in some schools PGTs and health educators cannot go into Grade 11 classes because they are busy with matric preparations. Who we offer it to is based on who we can access successfully. The programme does not just work with a subset of girls – we try to offer the programme to as many girls as possible and as many classes as possible at the school. Currently our SR is significantly exceeding targets. Please be reminded that we don't specifically exclude girls in a class that are out of the age range.

19. I have a question regarding the school sites. It was mentioned in the presentation that some of the districts already had LSA (Learner support agent) operating and the KGS programme had to operate through Rise Young Women's Clubs.

Some districts use LSA instead of PGT. The KGS programme is offered as a standalone full package, whether LSA or PGT are used. See the components of KGS in slide 17 which comprise the KGS programme. However, where LSA's are operating, instead of doing peer education, the Rise clubs in school are offered. So where LSA's are operating, peer education is replaced with Rise clubs in school.

20. I was wondering if these districts are the ones you mention in page 8 from the TOR? If yes, then I was also wondering if there are also some schools in these districts operating under the KGS model or is only through Women's Clubs?

Reminder, the KGS programme consists of the components in slide 17. In the districts where there are LSA, the one component of peer education in schools is replaced by Rise young women's clubs in school. The other components will continue. You need not worry about districts where this is in at this stage as it will not make a difference to numbers sampled.

- 21. Table 3 talks about number of girls per year (e.g. 8000 girls per year for Gauteng). Regarding this, we would like to know whether girls graduate from the programme after one year or whether 8000 girls are added cumulatively to the programme every year.**

Grade 11 learners will graduate out of the programme at the end Grade 11. Learners who leave the school at any point will graduate out of the programme. New Grade 8's will commence the programme (graduate in). In essence the bulk of the cohort remains the same throughout the grant. Targets are set on an annual basis and start from zero at the beginning of each year. The attendances accumulate throughout the year, but not across grant years.

- 22. Will quantitative data be collected for this evaluation? Table 4 has only qualitative methods of data collection including KIIs and FGDs. Will data on indicators be collected using qualitative methods?**

Yes, quantitative data is required. We would like a mixed methods approach. You as evaluators can decide on the optimal mixed methods approach.

- 23. Confirmation of email address as the one provided (proposals@nacosa.org.za) bounces back**

The e-mail address is operating for others. Please check your e-mail. We will check though on the NACOSA side too.

- 24. On page 21 under price, of the TOR, it indicates that a max of R1.6 has been budgeted but budget and QnA confirms R1 million. Does the R 1 million reflect fees budget and R1.6 including travel? Could you kindly provide clarity on this.**

No, this was an error. Apologies. The budget is R1 058 0000 and is all inclusive.

- 25. On page 18 of the ToR, below the table, you indicate that the team has to possess extensive research experience and demonstrate experience in undertaking similar evaluations. Is there a specific format you would like us to use? Is a detailed cv adequate in which the studies are mentioned? Do you want to see evaluation reports or executive summaries thereof? Please clarify.**

The TOR asks for two samples of work from the bidding organisation. The proposal document could have a paragraph or slightly longer (not longer than half a page) summarising each key team members' studies, background experience and related / relevant evaluations. Then all CV's of the team must be attached to the proposal.

26. Are we correct in assuming that the evaluating of KGIS activities are to be done in Limpopo, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu Natal (i.e. there where Nacosa as principal recipient is active)?

No, the TOR states that the evaluation is to cover all districts of the PRs in Table 3.

27. Page 9 of the RFP: The first paragraph below the table says that the SRH programme for adolescent girls will not form part of the evaluation. Does this refer to the row in Table 2 labelled 'Health education'? Does this mean that the KGS evaluation will cover the peer education, academic support, home visits and career jamborees components of KGS?

No SRH is done over and above the prevention components in slide 17. Health education is one of the prevention components. Only the prevention components in slide 17 are to be evaluated. SRH is a health services / testing etc component. The two must not be confused.

28. In terms of the impact assessment, specifically objective one "What is the impact of the way KGS is being implemented on realising the outcomes of the programme?" – is there already secondary data that can be used to establish this for example : evaluation and monitoring data or will this need to be established through the primary research using a counterfactual for comparison? / The second evaluation question which falls under the first objective asks: "What is the impact of the way in which KGS is being implemented on realising the outcomes of the programme?"

a. What is meant by impact in this phrase?

This is a programme evaluation and not an impact evaluation. Thus the question is aimed at determining: Is the programme designed so that outcomes of KGS are maximised? / Is the design benefiting the girls? / Can the programme be better designed given the limited time provided at schools? / Could there be an improved way of implementing the programme so that it better reaches objectives?

29. Will lists be made available of the various stakeholders with their contact details or will this listing exercise be up to the research company?

The service provider can develop the template. NACOSA will coordinate with other PRs in getting the contact template completed. More on this can be discussed at the Planning meeting with the chosen service provider.

30. Will the research company need to obtain ethical approval for the project on our side (this is not mentioned in the table on page 18)? If so , we usually go through the HSRC – would this be acceptable?

Ethics approval is essential as the study involves children. Furthermore, the DBE may also have a research committee that may need to consider the/ an ethics application. We suggest that you look at timelines of the HSRC or educational institutions ethics' committees and choose accordingly.

31. Was any additional information provided during the briefing which might be useful in creating the sample and project plan? (Please accept our sincerest apologies for not attending this briefing session as the proposal only came to our attention yesterday)

We had explained at the briefing there is no pre-determined sampling ratio or sampling size requirement. This is up to the service provider. Any discussions on sampling are recorded in this document.

- 32. NACOSA mentioned in the briefing session that a draft ToC exists which is yet to be developed with SRS but will be shared with the successful service provider.**
- a. **Is this ToC specific for only the KGIS programme or does it map out how all components of the YWG programme fit together?**
 - b. **In addition, has the ToC been formulated in a manner that relates to the intended programme outcomes as per the briefing session presentation:**
 - i. **Decrease new HIV infections in girls and young women**
 - ii. **Decrease teen pregnancies**
 - iii. **Retain girls in school until matric**

The TOC is for the whole of the YWG programme. It is not KGS specific. It does not map out how components fit together. Furthermore, it does speak to the broader outcomes of the YWG programme, instead of the specific KGS outcomes.

- 33. How do SRs identify at-risk adolescent girls (i.e. how are programme beneficiaries selected) in no- and low-fee schools?**
- a. **Are there specific selection criteria applied by SRs?**

All girls at these schools are considered vulnerable / at risk. See also the answer to question 18 above.

- 34. The first evaluation question which falls under the first objective asks for evaluation to assess the extent to which the programme was implemented as planned.**
- a. **Aside from the guidelines and programme material listed in the briefing session which is used by SRs to implement programme content, are SRs provided with guidelines for the training of peer group trainers (PGTs) and health educators?**

NAXOSA's implementer of KGS developed the KGS programme in conjunction with the DBE. They are responsible for training the HEs and PGTs implementing the programme. There is material for the training.

- 35. Do PRs have a particular definition for what is meant when referring to programme effectiveness?**

Please be guided by the key questions, and then we would rather you include in the proposal your own interpretations of what is best.

- 36. What was thinking behind observations as part of methodology?**
- a. **Was this envisioned to be classroom-based observation?**

It was just a suggestion. It is up to the service provider to put forward their suggested methodology. Also bear in mind what DBE would allow, and consider practical data collection methods around that.

37. The ToR notes that evaluators should have experience in participatory evaluation techniques.

a. Is this something NACOSA would like included in the evaluation specifically?

Yes, there should be some participatory methods included. A mixed methods approach is required.