

Annex D: Evaluation Methodology

The evaluators designed the in-Uganda data collection with as broad and representative set of respondents as possible through a stratified sample of stakeholders – including GoU respondents, CSF managers, Partnership Fund managers, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), NNGO managers and staff, grant recipients and their beneficiaries/service users, projects supported with Danida earmarked funds, representatives of MARP and key populations – from national to community level. To increase the quality of the evaluation findings, and increase local ownership of the results, two Ugandan stakeholders – independent of the donor-funded intervention and its activities – were engaged as interpreters and cultural facilitators for the field data collection. One facilitator, Rev. Evatt Mugarura, is a Church of Uganda minister who has a Master of Public Health degree and has participated in evaluations of faith-based organisations (FBOs) that have received PEPFAR subgrants. The other facilitator, Ms Flavia Kyomukama, is a human rights activist living openly with HIV. Neither facilitator has benefitted directly from the CSF, Partnership Fund or Danida's direct or earmarked funding, but both have scope to apply findings from the evaluation to strengthen their professional activities.

The evaluation used both primary data – qualitative and subjective from key informant interviews, semi-structured discussions and site visits – and secondary data including policy documents and frameworks, published papers and unpublished programmatic documents. Qualitative interviews were used to generate more in-depth accounts from individuals for exploration of specific issues and to generate a comprehensive understanding of the context allowing an inductive process where underlying structures and meaning can emerge. A key informant interview guide with open-ended questions addressing specific areas was used to guide key informant interviews, and a thematic question guide was used for semi-structured group discussions during primary data collection. The key informant interview guide and semi-structured group discussion guide relate back directly to the evaluation questions and the overall purpose of the evaluation. The key informant interview guide and the semi-structured discussion guide helped facilitate the work in planning, collecting and managing the data and in preparing a feasible structure addressing core issues to help the evaluators freely explore, probe, and ask questions to elucidate and illuminate important evaluation themes. Each theme contained several questions allowing the evaluators to word questions spontaneously, but within the required thematic area.

The evaluation collected evidence/data from multiple sources and triangulated the data by source, method and observer/evaluator wherever possible. For week two of the field data collection in Uganda, the team divided into two to enable data collection from a larger number of respondents. This permitted triangulation of findings between the two sub-teams. The evaluators requested additional documentation from respondents to support the evidence they provided, when needed. The evaluation used five methods of data collection, triangulation and verification:

1. Document review and analysis: the package of memoranda of understanding, programme reports, evaluation reports, implementing partner publications and other documents provided by Danida, Irish AID, USAID and stakeholders, and additional documents collected during the field data collection.
2. Analysis of secondary data reported by the UAC from the MoH Management Information System/M&E system including UNGASS reports; CSF M&E data reported to PEPFAR through the MEEPP project, and relevant published research/studies including Medical Research Council/Uganda Virus Research Institute and Rakai Health Sciences Program studies, Demographic and Health Surveys and the Demographic and Health Survey 2011 HIV/AIDS indicator survey, the UNAIDS Uganda Modes of Transmission analysis report, and the AMICAALL Kampala MARP survey. The team

analysed primary and secondary data from civil society implementing partners including those receiving earmarked funds from Danida and others receiving grants through the CSF and the Partnership Fund.

3. Key informant interviews with the three donors' personnel who have oversight of the package of support to the Uganda AIDS response (Danida and Irish Aid) and through the CSF and Partnership Fund (USAID); other donors to the CSF or Partnership Fund (DFID & Sida); Government of Uganda (GoU) stakeholders including personnel from Uganda AIDS Commission (UAC) and Ministry of Health nationally and at district level; other stakeholders including UNFPA, and civil society including the CSF and its implementing NNGOs/CSOs. Representatives of PLHIV and of MARP – MSM and LGBT; sex workers, vulnerable fishing communities, were included through key informant interviews or in semi-structure group discussions according to their comfort levels when meeting with the evaluation team. Engaging in discussions with older girls and young women engaged in transactional sex – “something for something love” – and cross generational sex was not possible but the team met with Straight Talk Foundation that has long experience in this area.

4. Structured discussions with implementing CSO, frontline staff; semi-structured group discussions with implementing CSO activists, beneficiaries and support group members, and community leaders in the communities served.

5. Observation of NNGO and CSO service provisions in prevention, care & support; of the CSF Annual Review Meeting, Day 1; a district coordination meeting for AIDS Stakeholders in Mukono District; a district community dialogue with leaders in Mbarara.

Qualification to the Findings (on Reliability of Data)

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation suggested that the evaluation use secondary data, thus the evaluation team did not collect primary data from throughout Uganda, only a small sample of district and community stakeholders could be involved. The sample allowed for a qualitative review but not a quantitative analysis, and the findings may not be generalisable to the whole of Uganda. The evaluators intended that the stakeholder workshop in September 2013 would include representation of government and CSO stakeholders from additional districts to those where the evaluation team collected primary data. This would have allowed for feedback from these stakeholders on whether the evaluation findings and recommendations ring true for their districts, too. However, participants from other districts did not participate in the stakeholder workshop.

Most of the key informant interviews and group discussions were conducted in English. Some activities observed were in local languages: the team depended on concurrent translation by the cultural facilitators. All the professional respondents were fully fluent in English; many beneficiaries and members of various associations visited were not competent to discuss matters in depth in English. The local cultural facilitators ensured that all protocols were observed in the evaluation meetings and discussions, and interpreted questions and answers. They also reviewed the evaluation team notes from the discussions to ensure that they were an accurate record. Before participating in the interviews, the evaluators informed the respondents that whatever they reported to the evaluators would be “in confidence” – nothing they said would be attributed to them personally nor their organisations. The evaluators assured respondents that they would ensure that statements would not be traceable to individuals or specific organisations. These assurances allowed respondents to speak freely, even if they were being critical or detailing difficulties with the donor support. Some of the interviews were with people representing the MARP including LGBTI and sex workers, whose activities are illegal in Uganda. In order protect these individuals they are not named in the findings.