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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report looks at one outcome of the United States Agency for International Development’s (USAID’s) District Development and Support Program (DDSP) in South Africa. DDSP is the subject of one of four case studies conducted for an ex-post systems evaluation exploring factors contributing to sustained USAID outcomes. The Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research in USAID’s Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning commissioned this evaluation to address four evaluation questions (EQs):

- EQ 1: Were USAID-intended outcomes sustained?
- EQ 2: What other outcomes resulted from the project (positive/negative) and were these outcomes sustained?
- EQ 3: What has contributed to or hindered sustaining the outcomes?
- EQ 4: How are the outcomes perceived and valued by those with significant stakes in the project?

To address these questions, the evaluation looked at one outcome: enhanced school governance.

The Case: DDSP

Prior to 1994, South Africa was ruled by a white minority government and the education system was fragmented, with 19 racially and ethnically divided education departments. Following a long period of sustained pressure from the international community and the local population, democratic elections in 1994 led to the rapid formulation of policies that focused on redress, equity, quality, and democratic participation. A single national Department of Education (DoE) became responsible for primary, secondary, and tertiary education.

In 1995, USAID and the South African Government signed the Primary Education Bilateral Agreement to improve the quality of education for disadvantaged South Africans, with the goals of equity of access (redress), improvement of quality, and democratic participation. Four of the poorest provinces were identified to receive assistance: Northern Province (now Limpopo), KwaZulu-Natal, the Northern Cape, and the Eastern Cape. To execute the agreement, USAID launched the 10-year South African Basic Education Reconstruction Program (SABER). DDSP, initially known as SABER Phase III, began implementation in 1998 as a continuation of these efforts.

DDSP was a $20.43 million program implemented from January 1998 through December 2003. The program’s goal was to improve the “quality of educational delivery for grades 1-9 in the target areas.” DDSP had four sub-goals:

- Improved quality of curriculum practices;
- Improved quality of district/area and school management;
- Enhanced school governance; and
- Developed theory and best practices for whole school/district development.

DDSP sought to achieve these objectives by delivering training, materials, and technical assistance to public schools with slight variation among program activities, beneficiaries, and implementation structures. Direct beneficiaries of the program were primarily teachers, school managers, and members of school governing bodies at the local level, although it provided some technical support at the district,
provincial, and national levels. DDSP also had cross-cutting activities related to improving education management information systems (EMIS) and assessment.

The program was implemented through five sub-programs (“projects”) delivered in the four provinces. Through these projects, USAID and its partners delivered interventions in 589 schools (out of a total of 26,489 public ordinary schools in the country) in 14 districts across the 4 provinces (out of 136 districts across the country, and 100 districts in the 4 chosen provinces). While DDSP represented a significant commitment of USAID funding, when considered in monetary terms and the number of districts and schools it affected, DDSP was a tiny input into the larger education system. Nonetheless, DDSP sought system-wide impact by experimenting with different models of district development.

After DDSP, USAID initiated the $23 million Integrated Education Program (IEP) to consolidate DDSP gains and work with national and provincial education departments to further develop DDSP’s best practices. DDSP-IEP implementation ran from 1998 to 2009 – more than 10 years.

### Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation used a systems approach as its guiding methodology. USAID defines systems thinking as a “set of analytic approaches—and associated tools—that seek to understand how systems behave, interact with their environment, and influence each other. Common to these approaches is a conviction that particular actions and outcomes are best understood in terms of interactions between elements in the system.” Accordingly, the methodology encouraged a case study that reflects holism; this was not an evaluation of DDSP.

Prior to the case study research, case study team members conducted preparatory activities that informed the research design. These activities included exploratory interviews, document review, and developing early system maps, timelines, and a program description. These activities also informed the case study team planning meeting, during which the team received training on the approach, selected the outcome of interest, refined the evaluation tools (including timelines and systems maps), identified an initial list of key stakeholders, and selected sites at which to conduct the study.

### Outcome Selection

The case study team selected the DDSP outcome of “enhanced school governance” for several reasons. First, DDSP focused on school governance throughout implementation, based upon a theory of change that improvements in school governance contribute to good school performance and good learner outcomes. Second, school governance has broad influence over education decision-making and generally involves many stakeholders, making it more likely that school governance improvements would have contributed to continuing changes in the delivery of basic education. Third, the evaluation team assessed that sufficient data likely existed to investigate this outcome, and data had been collected on a relevant indicator (in at least some schools, albeit not totally comparable to the DDSP indicators) continually since the intervention. Finally, the community-level intervention provided a manageable context to explore, given the constraints of time, resources, and personnel.

The team chose to limit the study to one outcome due to time and resource constraints, and the belief that exploring a single outcome would be a sufficient unit of analysis to begin to understand the influences on sustainability after USAID funding has ceased.

---

Site Selection and Data Collection

To select the DDSP project to study in-depth, the case study team reviewed program documentation to identify the most successful project (as achievement is a precondition of sustainability) with respect to the outcome of enhanced school governance. The team identified the Kimberley Thusanang project as the most successful in its School Governing Body (SGB) work, and it was implemented in 65 out of the 138 public schools in the Frances Baard district between December 1999 and September 2003.

Using information identified during preparatory research, the case study team identified research sites where people familiar with DDSP remained and were accessible. The case study team selected 13 schools (of the 65 schools in the Kimberley Thusanang project) for primary research and conducted 52 interviews with national-, provincial-, district-, and local-level actors for school governance.

Study Limitations and Facilitators

There are several potential limitations to the study, in addition to constraints on resources and time. First, the study was conducted with a small sample of schools in one province of South Africa. It is possible that, were the study conducted in more regions or with more schools and communities, different perspectives and additional factors that contributed to or hindered the sustainment of the outcome of interest in those communities may have been identified. Second, key informants constituted the primary source of information in answering all EQs and the resulting data are prone to cognitive biases from the respondent or the interviewer. The team mitigated such biases using systematic triangulation of interview sources, appropriate selection of a range of interview participants, and expert validation of data. Finally, in focusing conversations on the DDSP school governance intervention, it was often difficult to contain the focus of the conversations to DDSP only, since the IEP was a follow-on project with many of the same aims. Interviewers sought to focus conversations using narrated visual timelines, which succeeded to some degree.

Several factors facilitated the study’s implementation. First, the team had access to extensive program documentation and monitoring and evaluation records. Second, selecting a successful program to investigate encouraged respondents to speak candidly and with enthusiasm, increasing the likelihood of obtaining rich data. Third, the team’s composition combined broad sector knowledge with an understanding of local languages, deep local knowledge, and networks at the national, regional, and local levels. Fourth, USAID/South Africa facilitated a request for the South African Department of Basic Education’s support for the study. Fifth, at the time of the study, many of the principals involved in DDSP were still in schools. Finally, after DDSP ended, units formed at the national and provincial levels focusing on school governance, providing an easily accessible hub of knowledge about current school governance issues, tools, and data.

Case Study Findings

Was the USAID-intended outcome sustained? (EQ 1)

Sub-Outcome 3.1: Democratically Established School Governing Bodies

*SGB elections have become a regular part of the education system in the province.* In 2003, a DDSP evaluation noted that all schools visited had established SGBs, although in not all cases had SGB
members been democratically elected. In 2016, in the schools visited, SGB elections are regular and electoral processes are relatively systematic and well-established.

**Northern Cape DoE has processes and materials for assisting with SGB elections.** DDSP supported the development of SGB processes and materials, which still exist in an evolved form. Lessons learned from DDSP about the process and materials are still not applied.

**SGB elections are regular, yet recruiting and retaining SGB members present a challenge.** SGB members, principals, and provincial and district officials noted that schools faced difficulties in recruiting members to serve on SGBs, especially in poorer communities.

**The SGB database compiled under DDSP is not used; however, a new system is in place.** At the close of DDSP, the Access database used to track school training and performance was not made available to the department or schools. In 2016, there was a database in place: the South African Schools Administration and Management System.

**Sub-Outcome 3.2: Enhanced SGB Performance**

**Pro forma SGB policies, school management templates, and other SGB templates are still in use at most school and district levels.** Training and policy materials developed by DDSP are still being used at most schools. At the school level, all principals interviewed described the ongoing usefulness of the DDSP pro forma policy templates and training manuals. Nearly all of the principals interviewed mentioned that pro forma policy templates were the most valuable resources provided by DDSP that are still used today.

**Principals have varied roles in supporting SGBs.** Principals who received DDSP training and materials reported that they still use the materials for induction training. However, a review of provincial data shows that since the 2015 SGB elections, only half of the principals in the province have sent SGB members to be trained.

**Sub-Outcome 3.3: More and Better Support to SGBs by District Offices**

**District officials’ roles are institutionalized, but still not fully realized.** DDSP addressed the lack of well-defined roles and responsibilities for district officials. In 2016, the job descriptions and related guidelines developed during DDSP exist and have become institutionalized, adapting over time. However, there is no conclusive evidence that it has resulted in sustained district support to SGBs.

What other outcomes resulted from the project (positive/negative) and were these outcomes sustained? (EQ 2)

**The DDSP tool that supported school self-assessment approaches became institutionalized nationally.** In the DDSP schools, the program introduced school self-assessment and associated tools, such as self-assessment templates that formed the basis for the SGB Functionality Tool. DDSP trained SGBs and school managers in their use, and supported the implementation of the self-assessment processes. The SGB Functionality Tool was later institutionalized at a national level.

**There is a strengthened link between school governance and parents.** Parents, principals, and teachers in some communities spoke about the strengthened link between SGBs and parents, as well as the community in general. When mentioned, strengthened relationships were attributed to DDSP.
What has contributed to or hindered sustaining the outcomes? (EQ 3)

**Contributed**

*Retention of good school management helped to sustain organizational knowledge, but not necessarily functionality.* While institutional knowledge may have been retained, the level of institutional knowledge and a better functionality rating did not always correspond. This suggests that despite some evidence that DDSP delivered measurable changes, it did not necessarily translate into better SGB functionality.

*The movement of NGO staff into government positions helped spread good practice.* Some interviewees who worked for the lead NGO in the Northern Cape now work in government positions where they used their knowledge and experience to strengthen the education system.

*DDSP was implemented when the system was ready for input to help build new systems and processes.* First, at the time of DDSP no government department supported or focused on SGBs. Second, the education system was ready for input around formalizing the roles and responsibilities of District Officials in relation to schools and the province. By testing different training formats and support materials, the system could learn about what works and start institutionalizing these aspects.

*DDSP developed practical, adaptable materials for use by districts, schools, and SGBs.* Practical materials that principals and SGB members could easily adapt resulted manuals appearing on bookshelves in school and government offices in 2016.

*Extending DDSP through a follow-on project helped good practices become institutionalized.* The IEP effectively extended the duration of DDSP activities to a 10-year period. This supported practices to become institutionalized at provincial, district, and school levels.

**Hindered**

*The SGB training for parents was not institutionalized in the formal education system.* Limited and often non-existent transfer or knowledge and skills from existing SGB members to new SGB members, and the lack of institutionalizing the DDSP training, was a hindrance to sustainability.

*There are insufficient numbers of district officials to support SGBs.* That role to support SGBs falls to Directorate of Institutional Development, Management, Governance and Support (IMDG) district officials. In 2016, IMDG district officials are often overstretched and unable to offer the level of support provided by DDSP.

*Parents who were targeted as part of the SGB training had limited skills and knowledge.* Poor parental literacy was identified as an issue during DDSP, and remained an issue hindering the effectiveness of SGBs.

*The system in place can be “gamed.”* The SGB system adapted in such a way that school staff and teacher unions could circumvent checks and balances in the system, resulting in corruption.

*Coordinated advocacy for parent and community participation in SGB elections no longer takes place.* Provincial officials and interviewees working at the district and school-level had no recollection of DDSP advocacy materials.
How are the outcomes perceived and valued by those with significant stakes in the project? (EQ 4)

School principals and managers involved with DDSP continue to value the supporting role it played in implementing the South African Schools Act. School managers view the templates provided as useful, and multiple principals still use them. The principals recognized that DDSP helped them to come to grips with changes brought on by the promulgation of the South African Schools Act and the implications for governance in their schools.

Government officials familiar with DDSP value its role in helping schools comply with South African Schools Act requirements. District, provincial, and national officials who recalled DDSP valued the program’s scale and scope.

DDSP implementing partners valued the program for strengthening their organizations and supporting the establishment of local partnerships. Partnerships forged between organizations were sustained after DDSP, and these partnerships supported these organizations to be involved in other education interventions.

Conclusion

DDSP entered the South African political and education context when the government needed assistance to establish systems for electing and training SGBs. Nationally, these systems are still maintained. Individuals who were trained by DDSP and remain in schools value the program’s input and recognize that the tools they received, the knowledge they gained, and the skills they mastered are useful for their current roles within the education system.

Most schools that participated in DDSP have properly constituted SGBs, and most schools visited during the study demonstrated that relevant governance plans, policies, and procedures are in place. However, nearly all schools fail to effectively implement the SGB plans, policies, and procedures. When school-level interview data are considered together with data from a national survey on school functionality conducted by the Department of Basic Education, there is no evidence to suggest that the SGBs of those schools that participated in the Kimberley Thusanang project are more functional than non-project schools.

Many actors in the system valued DDSP and spoke of the program’s influence, and some individuals reflected that being a part of DDSP strengthened them personally and they brought this knowledge to bear in other parts of the education sector. However, factors such as extreme poverty, corruption, and changing education leadership and curriculum appeared to negatively influence DDSP’s organizational-level sustainability. Current challenges appear to be of such a scope that even an ambitious program is not likely to transform poorly governed and managed schools into well-performing ones.
I. INTRODUCTION

This document provides key findings for one of four case studies conducted as part of an ex-post evaluation examining what factors contribute to sustained outcomes from international development interventions. The USAID intervention discussed in this report is the District Development and Support Programme (DDSP).

A. Sustained Outcomes Evaluation Objectives

The evaluation was commissioned by the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research in USAID’s Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning (USAID/PPL/LER), and designed and implemented through USAID’s Bureau for Economic Growth, Education, and Environment (E3) by the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project.2

The primary purpose of the evaluation was to identify factors contributing to sustained outcomes from international development interventions. These factors encompass programmatic characteristics (e.g., the design, management and implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and learning of projects) and contextual features, including local systems. A secondary purpose was to record and learn lessons from the process of designing and implementing an ex-post evaluation taking a systems approach.

1. Evaluation Questions

As per USAID’s approved statement of work and subsequent written evaluation design,3 this study addressed the following evaluation questions (EQs):

- EQ 1: Were USAID-intended outcomes4 sustained5?
- EQ 2: What other outcomes resulted from the project6 (positive/negative) and were these outcomes sustained?
- EQ 3: What has contributed to or hindered sustaining the outcomes?
- EQ 4: How are the outcomes perceived and valued by those with significant stakes in the project?

The evaluation team used empirical evidence to compare the current status/achievement of outcome(s) to the status/achievement at the end of USAID funding, and explored how the USAID activity contributed to whether an outcome was sustained.

---

1. The E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project team consists of a team lead, Management Systems International (MSI), and team partners Development and Training Services, a Palladium company; and NORC at the University of Chicago.

2. “Outcomes” are defined here as the conditions of people, systems, or institutions that indicate progress or lack of progress toward achievement of project/program goals. Outcomes are any result higher than an output to which a given output contributes, but for which it is not solely responsible. Outcomes may be intermediate or end outcomes, short- or long-term, intended or unintended, positive or negative, direct or indirect (USAID Automated Directives System [ADS] 200-203).

3. “Sustained” refers to something that has been maintained or continued over time. In this evaluation, the reference is to the intended outcome of the USAID activity and its condition in the present time, i.e., some years after the activity’s funding ended.

4. “Project” refers to a set of executed interventions over an established timeline and budget that are intended to achieve a discrete development result by resolving an associated problem. It is linked to the Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) Results Framework. More succinctly, a project is a collaborative undertaking with a beginning and end that is designed to achieve a specific purpose. Based on consultations, the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project team and USAID/PPL/LER agreed that case study research for this evaluation would focus on what the Agency currently defines as an “activity,” or a sub-component of a project that contributes to a project purpose.
2. Evaluation Audience

The primary audience for the evaluation is USAID/PPL, which may use the evaluation to inform program cycle guidance and tools related to the design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of projects and activities. This includes changes in USAID’s approach to sustainability analysis during project design and guidance, and identifying factors that may foster sustainability in project design and implementation.

Other audiences include USAID Missions and individuals involved in the design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of international development projects. While the evaluation may be of special interest to USAID staff who work on basic education programs, the evaluation findings on factors that influence sustainability may be of interest to USAID staff working in areas other than education.

B. Overview of the District Development and Support Programme

RTI International implemented the $20.43 million7 DDSP in South Africa from January 1998 through December 2003. DDSP’s goal was to improve the “quality of educational delivery for grades 1-9 in the target areas.”

The program was implemented through five sub-programs (called “projects”) delivered in four out of nine South African provinces: Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal (KZN), Limpopo (formerly known as the Northern Province) and Northern Cape. These were regarded as the poorest provinces in South Africa. The five sub-programs were:

- Eastern Cape Isithole Project
- KZN Zikhulise Project
- KZN Mthonjeni Project
- Limpopo Fanang Diatla Project
- Northern Cape Kimberley Thusanang

Through these projects, USAID and its partners delivered interventions in 589 schools (out of a total of 26,489 public ordinary schools in the country) in a total of 14 districts across the 4 provinces (out of 136 districts8 across the country, and 100 districts in the 4 chosen provinces).9

While the program represented a significant commitment of USAID funding, the total DDSP spend for the duration of the project represented only approximately 0.26 percent of South Africa’s annual public education budget10 in 2002 and equivalent to about 7.81 percent11 of the estimated annual corporate social investment in education spent by the 100 biggest companies in South Africa for 2001.

---

7 According to Aguirre International’s Evaluation of the District Development Support Project USAID/South Africa 2003, the contract amount was $24.27 million, later reduced to $20.43 million.
8 Mpumalanga did not have districts in the 2002/2003 financial year, and instead had three regions. These are counted as districts in the case of Mpumalanga.
10 The total amount budgeted for education in the 2002 budget was R59.5 billion or (USD) $7.77 billion (when converted at $1= ZAR 7.65 which was the average exchange rate for the period March 1, 1998, to February 28, 2003). See Highlights from 2002 Budget, Republic of South Africa, available at: http://www.treasury.gov.za/documents/national%20budget/2002/other/highlights.pdf
11 Trialogue estimates that total CSI spend for 2001 was approximately ZAR 2 billion, which is the equivalent to $261.44 million (when converted at $1= ZAR 7.65 which was the average exchange rate for the period March 1, 1998, to February 28, 2003). Approximately half of this spend is usually directed into education initiatives. Source: Trialogue (2016). Overview of the state of
When considered in monetary terms and in terms of the number of districts and schools it affected, DDSP was a small input into the bigger education system. Nonetheless, DDSP aimed for a system-wide impact by experimenting with different models of district development.12

**Key Project Objectives**

DDSP had four sub-goals:

- Improved quality of curriculum practices,
- Improved quality of district/area and school management,
- Enhanced school governance, and
- Developed theory and best practices for whole school/district development.

The primary program focus was to achieve these objectives by delivering training, materials, and technical assistance to public schools with slight variation among the DDSP activities, beneficiaries, and implementation structures. DDSP direct beneficiaries were most often teachers, school managers, and members of school governing bodies at the local level, although some technical support was also provided at the district, provincial, and national levels. DDSP also had cross-cutting activities related to improving Education Management Information System (EMIS) and assessment.

A grantee, supported by consortia of local and international service providers, delivered DDSP in each province. Figure 1, adapted from the DDSP Final Report prepared by RTI International, shows the five DDSP projects and two cross-cutting activities and their main implementers.

**FIGURE 1: DIAGRAM DEPICTING THE DDSP PROJECTS AND IMPLEMENTERS**

Additional details on DDSP are provided in Section IV.

**DDSP Follow-On: The Integrated Education Program**13

At the conclusion of DDSP, USAID initiated the $23 million Integrated Education Program (IEP), which was also delivered by RTI International and many of the DDSP implementing partners. The purpose of IEP was to consolidate DDSP gains and work with the national and provincial education departments to further develop DDSP’s best practices. Implemented between 2004 and 2009, IEP initially targeted many of the DDSP schools and districts, and later broadened implementation to non-DDSP districts. In total, IEP targeted 1,284 schools in 17 districts and reached approximately half a million children. IEP, like

---


13 This section draws from RTI (2009) PROGRAM (IEP) Final Report.
DDSP, worked in only a small fraction of the schools and districts in South Africa. The combined period of implementation of the DDSP and IEP is noteworthy, since it ran from 1998 to 2009—a period of more than 10 years.

IEP was intended to help develop a national primary school improvement model which could be sustained and replicated. Its goal was to improve student performance in numeracy, literacy, mathematics, and science. Within IEP, there were nine lower-level objectives which related somewhat to the initial DDSP objectives. Table 1 provides a comparison of the DDSP and IEP outcomes.

**TABLE 1: COMPARISON OF DDSP AND IEP OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DDSP</th>
<th>IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-goal 1:</strong> Improved quality of curriculum practices</td>
<td><strong>Result 1:</strong> Increased subject matter knowledge for teachers in the targeted subject areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result 2:</strong> Improved ability of teachers to develop and apply continuous assessment strategies and techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result 3:</strong> Increased number of teachers being trained (in-service) and new teachers trained (pre-service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result 4:</strong> Increased number of teachers that are teaching literacy, numeracy, mathematics, and science in a manner consistent with the National Curriculum Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result 5:</strong> Improved teachers’ ability to develop and use classroom materials that support learner centered instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-goal 2:</strong> Improved quality of district/area and school management</td>
<td><strong>Result 6:</strong> Improved instructional leadership skills for school management teams (SMTs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-goal 3:</strong> Enhanced school governance</td>
<td><strong>Result 7:</strong> Improved management and administrative capacity of schools to collaborate with school governing bodies (SGBs) and communities to develop and effectively implement school development plans (SDPs) to improve school functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-goal 4:</strong> Developed theory and best practices for whole school/ district development</td>
<td><strong>Result 8:</strong> Improved district capacity to develop and effectively implement a strategic plan for school support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Result 9:</strong> Support to national Department of Education (DoE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key points:** This section has three key points. First, while DDSP and IEP represented a relatively small financial input into the South African educational system, and affected only a small fraction of the total number of public schools and education districts in the country, the fact that together they ran over a period of longer than 10 years made them noteworthy programs.

Second, DDSP and IEP were designed to learn about different models of district development. This meant that these projects had the potential to have system-wide impacts if the learning could be successfully institutionalized in the South African educational system. Finally, USAID’s continued support to DDSP schools and districts through its follow-on project, the IEP, may have influenced whether and to what extent DDSP outcomes were sustained.

---

II. CASE STUDY METHODOLOGY

This section describes:

- The overall design of the study, including the use of a systems approach to address the evaluation questions;
- The research approach that enabled the team to identify appropriate outcomes for analysis and sites and informants for primary research;
- The methodologies and approaches used to analyze primary and secondary evidence; and
- Limitations and factors that hindered or facilitated the collection and analysis of data to address the evaluation questions.

Annexes C and D of the Evaluation Design Proposal provide the criteria used to identify the South Africa DDSP as an appropriate case for inclusion.15

A. Evaluation Design

As USAID requested, the case study team used a systems approach16 as the guiding methodology. USAID defines systems thinking as a “set of analytic approaches—and associated tools—that seek to understand how systems behave, interact with their environment and influence each other. Common to these approaches is a conviction that particular actions and outcomes are best understood in terms of interactions between elements in the system.”17 Accordingly, the methodology encouraged a case study that reflects holism—this was not an evaluation of the DDSP activity, nor does its presentation reflect a typical program evaluation.

To implement the systems approach, the team was guided by three specific concepts in collecting and analyzing data.

1. Commitment to multiple perspectives: The team explicitly probed to understand how different groups and persons perceived issues/situations, differentiating between an individual’s or group’s common role (e.g., teachers) and their values or motivations.

2. Understanding interrelationships: The team was mindful specifically of the importance of understanding relationships among actors within the system, including how these relationships change over time and have nonlinear and emergent aspects.

3. An awareness of boundaries: The team recognized the need to establish explicit boundaries for in-depth research encompassing some or all of the considerations of context, actors, relationships, and perspectives, with due consideration of available resources and research capacity.

In addition to the Evaluation Design Proposal, the evaluation team lead created an Evaluation Guide to translate the more conceptual description of systems methods from the design document into what was intended to be a practical guide to help case study team members apply systems approaches during field work.

---


16 This approach requires that donors and evaluators resist conceptualizing solutions in overly simplistic, acontextual, and ahistorical ways (Miller, 2016). Systems thinking demands avoidance of a single perspective (Flood, 1999; Midgley, 2000) and is the antidote to dogmatism in social problem solving (Reynolds & Holwell, 2010). Applying systems thinking to problem solving has the potential to lead to the identification of solutions that bring in broader, innovative thinking, and do not place the donor’s intervention at the center of change, or at the heart of an evaluation (Meadows, 2008).

17 USAID’s Local Systems: A Framework for Supporting Sustained Development (April 2014)
work for each of the country case studies. The Evaluation Guide is available as Annex ___ to the Final Evaluation Report.18

Guided by the systems approach, the evaluation team used mixed methods to answer the evaluation questions. All primary data collection was qualitative, while the team drew on both qualitative and quantitative secondary data sources, all of which were administrative. The approaches used to answer each evaluation question are described below, and further described in the Evaluation Guide.

Evaluation Question 1

*Were USAID-intended outcomes sustained?*

The team sought both qualitative and quantitative data to understand whether USAID’s intended outcomes were sustained. The team identified relevant indicators of outcome achievement and attempted to collect the same data for the present day, although in the case of DDSP, the relevant data were not routinely collected in a comparable format following the cessation of the program. The team also collected qualitative data to trace forward in time the condition of the outcome to understand how the outcome may have changed over time, and what else it may have influenced.

This analysis considered a temporal aspect, as it was possible that an outcome was sustained for a period, but not up to the present. During the preparatory research, where possible, the team made a preliminary determination of the extent to which outcomes have been sustained; then, during the in-depth field research, it confirmed and, where possible, elaborated on the determination through open and semi-structured interviews, program documents, and literature reviews.

Evaluation Question 2

*What other outcomes resulted from the project (positive/negative) and were these outcomes sustained?*

The case study team purposively sampled key actors in the system, and in open and semi-structured interviews, probed for unanticipated outcomes with a focus on processes and outcomes linked to USAID’s efforts. The team also reviewed program documents and literature reviews and gathered data using systems methods such as maps and timelines.

Evaluation Question 3

*What has contributed to or hindered sustaining the outcomes?*

The team gathered data from sampled actors in the system, and in semi-structured interviews, probed for in-depth information. It also drew information from document and literature reviews. The team used systems maps and timelines to gather data that described activity achievements and results over time, noting how the activity contributed to changes in the system (specifically changes in structures, processes, quality, and behaviors).

---

18 [Link to Final Evaluation Report]
**Evaluation Question 4**

*How are the outcomes perceived and valued by those with significant stakes in the project?*

The team relied on qualitative methods, such as open-ended and semi-structured interviews, to gather data with which to develop an in-depth understanding of how intended and unanticipated outcomes were and are perceived and valued by a wide range of actors and institutions.

**B. Phase I Evaluation Research and Planning**

1. **Document Collection and Review, Literature Review, and Exploratory Interviews**

**Activity Document Review**

Following the selection of the case, the evaluation team collected available DDSP activity documents that could be identified from public and non-public sources. Documents included a book published on the DDSP, program reports, monitoring and evaluation reports, and a variety of other documents provided by DDSP contractors and grantees.

The evaluation team also reviewed published EMIS data and examination data for relevant schools, districts, and provinces. The team lead and researchers sourced system data on schools from the national EMIS database (drawing on SNAP Survey of Ordinary Schools and Annual School Survey data), from official statistical publications by the DoE, from annual reports of the DoE, and from reports and source data on a survey of the functionality of school governance (period 2013 to 2016).

The team lead and two researchers reviewed documents over a six-month period and identified a wealth of information. The evaluation team used these documents and information to identify the outcomes achieved by the project and to understand the actors, dynamics, and events that influenced and/or continue to influence education delivery with respect to these outcomes. Further, the evaluation team identified an early list of key actors to interview.

**Literature Review**

The team reviewed literature to develop a better understanding of the formal education system and formal and informal actors that influence the delivery of education. The team used the literature review, in conjunction with the activity document review, to inform the exploratory interviews, draw initial systems maps, and begin a timeline of key events. A list of documents consulted is available in Annex F.

**Exploratory Interviews**

The team lead and a researcher conducted four exploratory interviews with key informants who served as lead persons on the initial implementation team. These interviews had two purposes. First, they explored which DDSP outcomes were most likely to be sustained, and which ones would be less likely to have been sustained. Second, they aimed to identify additional key documents, data sources, and key actors.

These initial steps were critical to the evaluation and yielded important evidence with which to further refine the evaluation process. The all South Africa-based team spent considerable time prior to the

---


20 The evaluation focused on one outcome of interest which activity documents indicated was achieved during the life of the activity.
planning and scoping trip identifying and accessing documents through its local connections, conducting interviews, and piecing together evidence through an intensive triangulation process. It was this process that identified data needed to advance the evaluation to the next step, and eventually construct a holistic narrative.

2. Planning and Scoping Trip

During February 2016, the case study team conducted a planning session that included two South African education experts who were familiar with the DDSP activity and the changing education system in the period before, during, and since the completion of the project. The planning session had four objectives:

- Introduce systems evaluation and the evaluation approach to the case study team.
- Identify the outcome to be explored, the boundaries of that system, and the geographical areas, and generate a list of key actors.
- Collect information to adapt the evaluation tools and further inform context timelines.
- Identify logistical and other issues related to the evaluation and plan a way forward.

Based on initial research, the team lead and overall evaluation team lead worked together to prepare a presentation that summarized the DDSP and its outcomes and identifiable results, and developed an initial context timeline that described political, cultural, economic, and educational changes in the identified timeframe. The team lead then provided the project summary and context timeline to the two education experts prior to the event.

The education experts identified additional documents for review and worked with the case study team to supplement the draft descriptions by identifying additional educational, political, cultural, and economic events from DDSP implementation to present. With the support of the education experts, the case study team selected an outcome on which to focus and identified potential key informants (discussed in more detail below). The team also worked with the education experts to identify research boundaries for that outcome—boundaries of the “system” in which education sector change took place—and developed a focused system map that the team would subsequently use as a tool in interviews with key informants and as part of the data analysis.

**Key points:** The planning session provided a process that engaged with the information needed to select the outcome of interest for the case study and laid the foundation for an empirical and transparent evaluation that enables cross-case comparison. To accomplish this, the team lead and overall evaluation team lead prepared information prior to the planning and scoping trip, and worked together to lead an organized process during the week in country for an intensive, guided review of data. The team reviewed data and used that process to create draft maps that identified key actors and relationships, and develop an extensive timeline that identified and contextualized economic, educational, social, and global initiatives, activities, actions, or policies for the time under study.

3. Outcome Selection

The case study team selected for the outcome of interest DDSP sub-goal three: **enhanced school governance**.

---

21 Two criteria were used to establish the boundaries for the system of enquiry: (1) Were the elements/factors likely to be connected to the potential outcomes and are they likely to have influenced sustainment? (2) Were the elements/factors accessible, and could they potentially be investigated within the time and resources of this evaluation?
Choosing one outcome resulted from several factors. First, in-depth, empirical knowledge required substantial resources, which only permitted exploring one outcome. Second, this is not a performance evaluation of DDSP; instead, it is an evaluation that aims to understand what influences sustainability in a setting long after USAID funding has ceased. Selecting one outcome can provide a solid place from which to begin to understand this and address USAID’s evaluation questions. Third, the evaluation approach had only recently been tested in Namibia. Testing the approach in South Africa to see if it resulted in useful information also suggested the need to begin by looking at one outcome.

The case study team considered each of the DDSP sub-goals as potential outcomes of interest:

- Sub-goal 1: Improved quality of curriculum practices;
- Sub-goal 2: Improved quality of district/area and school management;
- Sub-goal 3: Enhanced school governance; and
- Sub-goal 4: Developed theory and best practices for whole school/district development.

Working with the education experts in the planning session, the case study team, informed by the Evaluation Guide, used four criteria to select the outcome(s):

1. Intensity of intervention: Did DDSP activities relating to this outcome continue for the duration of the project?
2. Sufficiency of data: Is it likely that there will be sufficient data available to understand the nature of the outcome and the extent to which it was sustained?
3. Centrality to improving learning performance: Recognizing that improved student learning is the ultimate objective of basic education, was the outcome likely to have contributed to this objective?
4. Existence of “ripple effects”: Is the outcome likely to have contributed to continuing changes to the delivery of basic education following the completion of the project?

The outcome of enhanced school governance met all the selection criteria:

1. Intensity of intervention: School governance was a focus of the project throughout DDSP.
2. Sufficiency of data: It was likely that sufficient data existed to investigate this outcome, and there existed a relevant indicator (discussed below) for which data had been collected (in at least some schools, albeit not totally comparable to the DDSP indicators) continually since the intervention.
3. Centrality to improving learning performance: There is a clearly articulable theory of change that improvements in school governance contribute to good school performance and good learner outcomes.
4. Existence of “ripple effects”: School governance has broad influence over education decision-making and generally involves many stakeholders, making it more likely that school governance improvements would have contributed to continuing changes in the delivery of basic education.

**Project Selection**

DDSP consisted of five distinct projects implemented by different grantees. Although these projects worked towards the same objectives, the implementation approaches were not uniform. To select a project on which to conduct further in-depth study, the case study team reviewed the activity documentation to identify the project for which there was the greatest success (as achievement is a precondition of sustainability) with respect to the outcome of enhanced school governance. Based on the end of project performance monitoring and evaluation information, the team identified DDSP’s Kimberley Thusanang project as the most successful in its School Governing Body (SGB) work when compared to the other three provinces (and four projects) where DDSP was implemented.
The Kimberley Thusanang project was implemented in 65 out of the 138 public schools\(^\text{22}\) in the Frances Baard district between December 1999 and September 2003. Frances Baard was one of the four education districts in the Northern Cape in 2002. The Kimberley Thusanang project focused on school management training, training of SGB members, and training of grade 1 to 3 teachers. Management training focused on topics such as school leadership, instructional leadership, financial management (which included governance training), and development of school policies and SDPs. The activities included a combination of workshops held at centrally based venues and an intensive program of school support visits.

**Available Monitoring Data for “Enhanced School Governance”**

DDSP collected monitoring data on a range of indicators related to SGBs. This data was collected until 2002, and some of this data was validated as part of an external evaluation of DDSP conducted in 2003.

DDSP used the following indicators to reflect on the functionality of the schools:

- Existence and evidence of democratically elected SGBs,
- Increase in the percentage of women serving on SGBs,
- Increase in the percentage of SGBs/schools that fully meet the policy documentation requirements of the South African Schools Act (SASA),
- Increase in the percentage of DDSP SGBs/schools that show evidence of applying SASA policies,
- Percentage of schools that have audited or examined budgets,
- Percentage of schools that maintain bank accounts,
- Percentage of schools with approved annual budgets, and
- Increase in the number of district office SGB support visits.

Where possible during the data collection for this case study, the case study team assessed the current performance of schools against the indicators for which data were accessible.

**C. Phase II Evaluation Research**

Primary field research for this case study took place between April and September 2016, with visits to the National and Provincial Education Department earlier in the study, and visits to districts and schools in the Northern Cape between August 22 and 26, 2016.

**1. Sampling Approach**

This section describes the sample and the criteria that the case study team employed to select the DDSP project sites and key informants for research.

**Site Selection**

The case study team worked with the education experts during the planning session and applied two selection criteria to identify the specific sites at which to conduct research:

- Sites should be data rich (e.g., sites have people who were there when the implementation took place; sites have previous evaluation data).
- Sites should be accessible (e.g., the team can physically get there within the evaluation time and budget; the team is likely to be granted permission to visit that site).

---

The team applied the criteria using information collected during the preparatory research, supplemented and validated by the education experts, and selected Frances Baard District in Northern Cape. The Kimberley Thusanang project worked in 65 schools across three out of the four local municipalities in the Frances Baard District. Visiting a sample of sites in each of the three targeted clusters within the district proved feasible for data collection within the evaluation’s time and budget allocations.

The case study team sought to focus research on several schools in each of the three local municipalities where DDSP was implemented:

- Dikgatlong cluster around the towns of Delportshoop and Barkly West;
- Magareng cluster around the town of Warrenton; and
- Phokwane cluster around the towns of Hartswater and Jan Kempdorp.

There was one additional local municipality within the Frances Baard District: Sol Plaatjie, which surrounds the provincial capital city, Kimberley. As DDSP was not implemented in any of the schools in this local municipality, none of these schools were approached for inclusion in the sample.

Of the 65 DDSP schools in the Kimberley Thusanang project, the case study team applied the above site sampling criteria and approached 22 for potential inclusion in the study—although it would not have been feasible within the constraints of the study to conduct research at all 22 of these sites.

- Four of the contacted schools declined to participate, either because there was no one left who could talk about DDSP, or because they were not interested in participating in the study.
- Two of the contacted schools initially agreed to participate, but became unresponsive when the team attempted to schedule interview times.
- Three schools were contacted but later excluded because they were ultimately too remote to be reached within the fieldwork period.

Thirteen schools were ultimately selected as appropriate for research within the constraints of the study, and the team scheduled site visits. However, on the day of the scheduled interviews, the principal of one school was not available and the planned fieldwork at the school had to be canceled.

Table 2 lists the 12 schools where the case study team undertook primary research.

**TABLE 2: SCHOOLS VISITED IN FRANCES BAARD DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Closest Town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Mohapanele Primary School</td>
<td>Dikgatlong Municipality</td>
<td>Delportshoop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN Pressly Intermediate School</td>
<td>Dikgatlong Municipality</td>
<td>Longlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosalakae Public Primary School</td>
<td>Dikgatlong Municipality</td>
<td>Barkly West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pniel Landgoed Primère Skool</td>
<td>Dikgatlong Municipality</td>
<td>Barkly West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reakantswe Intermediate School</td>
<td>Dikgatlong Municipality</td>
<td>Winsorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laerskool Warrenton</td>
<td>Magareng Municipality</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth Primary23 (conducted at Monshwiwa Primary)</td>
<td>Magareng Municipality</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolihlahla Primary School</td>
<td>Magareng Municipality</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrenton Primary School</td>
<td>Magareng Municipality</td>
<td>Warrenton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Kempdorp Primary School</td>
<td>Phokwane Municipality</td>
<td>Jan Kempdorp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laerskool Andalusia</td>
<td>Phokwane Municipality</td>
<td>Jan Kempdorp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 Nazareth Primary had closed down, but the principal was interviewed at his new school, Montshiwa Primary.
Key Informant Selection

The team lead worked with data generated through the initial interviews and with the education expert during the planning session to identify potential key informants for the research. The case study team applied four selection criteria:

- High likelihood of being able to contact the potential informants, and of their willingness to engage;
- High relevance in terms of their ability to talk about the topic (e.g., they are in contact with the initial implementation area; they are knowledgeable about the technical and/or local area);
- Ability of the range of respondents to yield different perspectives on the outcome of interest; and
- Three actors in each of the categories of respondents (e.g., implementation staff, direct beneficiaries; see Annex J of the Evaluation Guide), to the extent possible with higher representation in the implementer and beneficiary categories.

Although the team identified many potential informants (roles or individuals) during the planning session, the process allowed for the probability of identifying additional persons during research from whom valuable information could be obtained. To identify these additional respondents, the team used snowball sampling, i.e., obtaining names from one informant about other possible informants. Instances where snowball sampling was used included the following:

- An informant provides the name of an additional respondent with specific valuable information about either the condition of an intended outcome or an unplanned outcome;
- An informant provides information about an individual or individuals who can speak knowledgeably from a unique (or relatively unique) perspective about why the outcome was or was not sustained.

Potential Bias of Purposeful Sampling

The case study team used purposeful sampling strategies at all levels, from case selection, to site selection, to the selection of individuals. The primary reason for adopting this sampling approach was practical. To gather data in a school system for a project that ended 14 years prior, the team needed to identify individuals who remembered and, at best, were involved in the program and familiar with the context today. Randomly selecting schools and hoping to find people who remembered DDSP would likely not have provided the data necessary to answer the evaluation questions.

Schools and respondents were selected because they were more likely to provide information of sufficient depth and detail to rigorously identify key factors influencing outcome sustainment—and which could credibly inform future decision-making with regards to program cycle planning. While purposeful sampling enabled solid empirical data collection and contributed to an effective evaluation, it is important to remember that this sampling approach is inherently biased. While findings drawn from this study may

---

24 The two interviews conducted at Laerskool Hartsvaal were with four persons. Two persons in one interview were able to comment on Ganspan Primary, which was part of DDSP and had closed down, in addition to Laerskool Vaalharts. Two persons in the other interview were able to comment on Tirisano Primary, which had closed down, in addition to Laerskool Vaalharts.
be analytically generalizable, they are not representative of either DDSP or USAID education interventions more generally.

Further discussion of and justification for the team’s adopted sampling approach can be found the Evaluation Guide.25

Triangulation

Triangulation is a method that avoids dependences on the validity of any one source. Denzin26 and Patton27 distinguish four types of triangulation, all of which the case study team used throughout its research: multiple research methods, multiple sources within one method, multiple analysts, and multiple theories and perspectives.

2. Primary Data Collection

The team conducted 52 interviews with actors involved at the national, provincial, district, and local levels of school governance. The interview guide used by the team is available in Annex D and the list of interviewees in Annex E. The team interviewed individuals in the national office of the Department of Basic Education (DBE), the provincial office of the Northern Cape DBE, the Frances Baard District office, and 12 of the 65 DDSP schools in the Northern Cape, as well as with various contractors and grantees who implemented the DDSP. Interview data were supplemented with photographs of physical evidence where appropriate. Tables 3 and 4 break down the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Number of Individual/Group Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National DBE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial DBE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District DBE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partners</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSP Northern Cape schools</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Municipality and School Name</th>
<th>Number of Interviews Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dikgatlong Municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Mohapanele Primary School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GN Pressly Intermediate School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosalakae Public Primary School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pniel Landgoed Primère Skool</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reakantswe Intermediate School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magareng Municipality</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laerskool Warrenton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazareth Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolihlahla Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrenton Primary School</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phokwane Municipality</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Kempdorp Primary School</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Municipality and School Name</th>
<th>Number of Interviews Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laerskool Andalusia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laerskool Hartsvaal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Data Analysis**

The data analysis for the case study took place in four iterative phases.

**Pre-Fieldwork**

The case study team lead and researchers analyzed existing DDSP documents (plans, progress reports, publications, evaluations, monitoring data), external literature to understand the activity and outcomes associated with DDSP, and the nature and modalities of the interventions implemented. This happened between February and April 2016. The two researchers conducted additional key informant interviews to clarify and gain additional insights between April and August of 2016.

**During Fieldwork**

The case study lead and two researchers conducted field visits to schools and district and provincial offices in the Northern Cape between August 22 and 26, 2016. At the end of each day of fieldwork, the case study lead and her team members reviewed their interview notes against the evaluation questions and their understanding of the various systems to incorporate insights gained from the research conducted that day. This approach created structured time for the team members to reflect on the data to inform and identify data gaps, confirm and disconfirm evidence, and use this information to guide subsequent interviews and focus the narrative. The team lead adapted the interview guide throughout the process, refining and narrowing questions. This iterative process enabled the case study team to identify initial findings.

Following the site visits, the case study team lead and her researchers conducted interviews with implementing agencies and representatives at the national and provincial DoEs. During these interviews, the team collected available EMIS data relevant to the evaluation. (e.g., DBE’s School Functionality Survey data).

**Data Analysis Workshop**

Upon the conclusion of data collection, the case study lead, researchers, and education specialists convened for a two-day analysis workshop. Prior to the data analysis workshop, the case study lead and researchers cleaned and typed their own interview notes. During the analysis workshop, the team members shared their notes, reflected on the qualitative data, analyzed it against the evaluation questions, and identified themes through qualitative thematic analysis.

While the initial stages of data collection were generative and emergent, the analysis workshop represented an opportunity to deepen the team’s understanding and insights and confirm (or disconfirm) emergent trends and patterns. The South Africa case study lead and overall evaluation team lead led the workshop which took place in several analytical stages:

- The first analytical stage of the workshop focused on identifying what remained of USAID-intended outcomes and whether unanticipated outcomes (and activities or structures, for example) existed that could plausibly be linked to the USAID activity. Each team member, using the cleaned data sets, engaged in a general analytical discussion that probed into “what remains.”
This general discussion enabled an empirical understanding of what remained that was plausibly linked to the USAID intervention.

- During the second stage of the analytical process, the team sought to identify those factors that may have contributed to the sustainment (or not) of outcomes. During this stage, the team applied the data to each of the analytical rubrics outlined in the Evaluation Guide. This enabled a transparent discussion around the key actors, their contributions, and the system’s push/pull factors by sorting data per “motivations,” “expertise,” “control,” and “legitimacy.” Throughout this process, the team drew or revised system diagrams/maps based on triangulation of data interpretation, and revised the narrative as necessary. At the end of the analysis session, the team members discussed their findings and compared alternative system maps, drawing on data that confirmed or disconfirmed the findings, and again revised the narrative, as appropriate.

- During the third stage in the analytical process, the team reviewed the same data using a different lens (e.g., from different actors’ perspectives) to identify how outcomes were perceived and valued by those with significant stakes in the project.

- During the final stage in the process, the group collectively discussed the findings to identify relevant systems dynamics from the data and analysis undertaken. Here, the discussion drew on Annex M of the Evaluation Guide, Systems Dynamics Analysis, which both contained and guided the discussion.

Post-Workshop

After the workshop, the researchers placed all interview notes into a qualitative data organizer, MaxQDA Miner, and coded the data using the themes identified in the workshop and the roles as defined in the guide. This process was part of data triangulation and provided a different method to analyze the same data. The data analysis process confirmed the workshop’s findings. With the findings confirmed, the South Africa case study lead wrote the initial narrative, which the evaluation team lead reviewed using the findings from the analysis workshop. Working together, they conducted additional data triangulation with respect to the draft findings. Several additional clarifying interviews took place, and then one education expert and one team member reviewed the draft analysis to ensure a consistent and empirical narrative. The draft was then shared with USAID South Africa to elicit feedback. Early reviews resulted in slight changes, which once made, resulted in confirming the narrative provided in this report.

E. Study Limitations and Facilitators

I. Study Limitations

The case study team identified three limitations to the study.

Resource constraints: Due to resource constraints, the case study team focused the research on one area in South Africa, and within that region, 12 schools and school communities. It is possible that were the study to have been conducted in a larger number of regions or with a larger number of schools and school communities, different perspectives and additional factors that contributed to or hindered the sustainment of the outcome of interest in those communities may have told a different story. However, the region and district chosen had achieved relative success at the end of DDSP, and retained the principals trained during the DDSP, and therefore had the highest probability of yielding data to answer the evaluation questions.

Respondent cognitive biases: Key informants constituted the primary source of information in answering all evaluation questions. As is well known, interview data are prone to cognitive biases on the
part of the respondent and/or the interviewer. These include social desirability or acceptability bias—the tendency of individuals to provide responses that they believe will be “socially desirable” in the context or desirable from the point of view of the researcher/sponsor. The evaluation team mitigated potential cognitive biases in the research to ensure the validity and reliability of its findings using systematic triangulation of interview sources, appropriate selection of a range of interview participants, and expert validation of data.

**Focusing conversations on the DDSP school governance intervention:** In interviewing teachers and officials in the education system, especially at the district and provincial levels, it was often difficult to contain the focus of the conversations to the DDSP project only, since the IEP was a follow-on project with many of the same aims. Interviewers made attempts to focus the conversations using narrated visual timelines, which succeeded to some degree. Interviewees also needed additional prompting to focus on the SGB component of the DDSP. Many of the interviewees’ first comments indicated that the component they most commonly recalled was the teacher training, where grade 1 to 3 teachers were trained in mathematics and literacy teaching. Interviewers used tools such as a visual depiction of the DDSP components, outcomes, and sub-outcomes to focus the conversations.

2. **Facilitating Factors**

Several key factors facilitated the evaluation’s implementation.

**Access to project documentation and monitoring and evaluation records:** The case study team had access to extensive project documentation and monitoring and evaluation records. This included internal monitoring records, data, and reports compiled by the service provider appointed under DDSP to support the monitoring and evaluation. The team obtained other valuable data from two externally conducted evaluation reports on the DDSP. As part of its knowledge sharing and learning aims, the DDSP also compiled a book rich with information about the DDSP projects and performance, which it made available to the team. This enabled the team to be well prepared before accessing the sites for additional data collection.

**Guide, training, and support for the local team:** A structured guide, thorough training on the methodology, and continued support from the evaluation team lead ensured that the local team was well prepared and supported during fieldwork and data analysis. Further, selecting a successful program to investigate encouraged respondents to speak candidly and with enthusiasm to the case study team and increased the likelihood of identifying fluid outcomes, which in turn influenced the richness and depth of the data. A highly experienced case study team lead brought solid evaluation and mixed methods research knowledge, an understanding of systems evaluation, and process facilitation skills. Moreover, two education leads brought knowledge of multiple education contexts, and two highly skilled researchers contributed strong field and evaluation experience; the local case study team mentioned these personnel as facilitating factors. The team’s composition played a critical role in data collection and analysis, combining broad sector knowledge with an understanding of local languages, deep local knowledge, and networks at the national, regional, and local levels.

**Support from the Department of Basic Education:** The USAID South Africa office facilitated a request for the South African DBE’s support for the study. Although the study secured the support much later than anticipated, the approval ensured that the head of department of the Northern Cape DoE and staff at all levels of the education system made themselves available for the data collection processes. At the level of schools, however, the practical realities of time constraints, and the fact that some of the staff who were centrally involved in the DDSP SGB training component have moved on, prevented some schools from participating in the study.
Continuity of staff in DDSP schools: At the time of the study, many (though not all) of the principals who were involved in the DDSP initiative were still in schools. The age profile of the principals, combined with limited mobility options within the education system in the province, ensured that a surprising number of the schools still had participants who could recall being part of the DDSP. As many of the principals interviewed in this study were reaching retirement age (one of the interviewees was in fact a recently retired principal), it is likely that if this study had been conducted three years later, a much larger proportion of schools may have had to be excluded from the possible sample.

Post-project changes in the education system: After DDSP ended, units formed at the national and provincial levels focusing on school governance specifically. This meant that the issue of school governance has been receiving constant attention since the end of DDSP, and an easily accessible hub of knowledge about current school governance issues, tools, and data were accessible to the team.

F. Case Study Team

The case study team was led by Benita Williams and included a team of South African researchers, Fazeela Hoosen and Gabby Kelly. Two South African education experts provided invaluable guidance, insight, and validation of findings: Pat Sullivan (lead South African education expert) and Vanessa Scherman (education expert). Profiles of the case study team members is available in Annex G to this report.
III. THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

This section provides a description of the context in which DDSP was delivered. This section begins with a broad overview of the South African country context followed by descriptions of the context for education policy and the formal and informal structures that govern the delivery of basic education.

A. Broad South African Context

South Africa is divided into 9 provinces and is a multi-lingual country that recognizes 11 official languages, namely: Afrikaans, English, isiNdebele, isiXhosa, isiZulu, Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, SiSwati, Tshivenda, and Xitsonga. While children in South Africa have the right to be educated in whichever official language is their home language this is not often a realistic option.

Prior to 1994, South Africa was governed by a white minority government that eventually gave way to democracy after a long period of sustained pressure from the international community and the local population. The period after the 1994 democratic elections was characterized by the rapid formulation of policies in all areas of government, including the education sphere, which was faced with the task of providing education with a focus on redress, equity, quality, and democratic participation. The government introduced major policy reforms affecting the structure and processes of education and training.

Although South Africa has made significant strides in the political, economic, and social spheres since 1994, a variety of problems persist. Poverty and inequality are the main problems, undergirded by factors such as poor educational outcomes, high unemployment, a high disease burden, inefficiencies of the public service in its delivery to the poor, concentration of rural poverty, declining public infrastructure, the inability to realize the full benefit of natural resources, and corruption.

B. The South African Education System

Under apartheid, the education system in South Africa was fragmented, with 19 racially and ethnically divided education departments. After the new government was formed in 1994, there was only one national DoE, which was responsible for primary, secondary, and tertiary education. In 2009, the DoE was divided into the DBE and the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). The DBE is responsible for all education up to grade 12. The DHET is responsible for tertiary education including universities and other education programs beyond grade 12. An Education Systems Map is available as Annex C.

In 2015, there were 12.25 million students enrolled in 23,905 public schools in South Africa. An additional 566,000 students were enrolled in 1,786 independent (private) schools. Both historically and at present, the Northern Cape and Free State have the lowest learner enrollments and smallest number of schools, while KZN, Gauteng, and Limpopo have highest learners enrollments and greatest number of schools. The average educator-to-learner ratio at public schools is 1 teacher to 32 students, although this varies considerably depending on whether the school is situated in a rural, peri-urban, or urban area. Peri-urban and urban schools generally have more (sometimes double) learners per class.

---

Legislative Standards

“Moving from the inefficient and unequal education system of the apartheid era, the post-1994 education system was marked by a proliferation of education policies that aimed at redressing apartheid inequalities and meeting the needs of a democratic society.”

There are four legislative acts that are relevant to understanding the role of DDSP and its government partners and stakeholders.

- In 1996, the government published the National Education Policy Act. The act was consequential in three ways. First, it codified the policy, legislative, and monitoring responsibilities of the minister of education. Second, it stipulated a formal relationship between national and provincial education departments. Third, it established the Council of Education Ministers and the Heads of Education Departments Committee—two independent bodies with statutory education responsibilities.
- In 1996, government passed the South African Schools Act (SASA). SASA aims to ensure that learners have access to quality education and redress the apartheid legacy. It made schooling compulsory from ages 7 to 15 and defined independent (private) and public schools. It also addressed governance issues and introduced the idea of democratic school governance in the form of governing bodies.
- The Employment of Educators Act of 1998 provided the legislative framework that stipulates the professional, moral, and ethical responsibilities to which all educators must adhere.
- In 2005, the Education Laws Amendment Act amended SASA, making provision for poverty-stricken schools to be classified as no-fee schools.

Formal Structures

The South Africa DBE is responsible for implementing national education policy in South Africa in conjunction with other key actors. DBE shares its role with provincial DoEs for basic schooling and early childhood development, although provincial DoEs are responsible for financing and managing their schools directly. District offices are the faces of the provincial DoEs and work closely with schools. The district offices gather essential information and diagnose problems taking place at schools. The district offices provide support to schools and implement interventions as deemed fit by the province. Districts are organized into circuits, and each circuit office is responsible for supporting and monitoring several schools.

Each school has an SMT and SGB that play important roles within the governance structure of schools. The SMT’s role was set forth in SASA; it is composed of the school principal, deputy principal, and other key school managers. Its role is to assume responsibility for the day-to-day professional management of the school and for the implementation of its policies.

The SGB is partially appointed and partially elected. It is made up of the principal in his/her official capacity, parents, teachers, and in the case of secondary schools, also learners. SASA defined the roles and responsibilities of SGBs, which are:
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• Supporting school staff in the performance of their professional functions;
• Determining the school times within guidelines provided by the department;
• Administering and controlling the school’s property, buildings, and grounds;
• Encouraging parents, learners, and school staff to render voluntary services to the school;
• Making recommendations about the appointment of educators and staff; and
• Making the school facilities available for educational programs conducted by other role players.

SGBs have the option of joining one of seven national federations that assist with capacity building, legal representation, and a range of other support services.

Schools may also apply once to the provincial DoE to obtain “Section 21 status” which allows them additional roles and responsibilities as per Section 21 of SASA. These additional responsibilities include:

• Maintaining and improving the school’s property, and buildings and grounds occupied by the school, including school hostels, if applicable;
• Determining the extramural curriculum of the school and the choice of subject options in terms of provincial curriculum policy;
• Purchasing textbooks, educational materials, or equipment for the school;
• Paying for services to the school; and
• Providing an adult basic education and training class.

When the government introduced SASA, it radically changed the way in which schools and the community were required to relate to each other. DDSP was well timed to help schools and SGBs grapple with the SASA requirements and their own roles and responsibilities.

**Curriculum Changes**

Several significant curricular changes that took place in South Africa provide relevant context for DDSP support. In 1998, the government introduced a new national curriculum for grades R (reception) through 9 that focused on outcomes-based education and was to be fully implemented by 2005. In 2002, due to several challenges experienced in the education system, the government published the Revised National Curriculum statements. Here the learning outcomes and assessment standards were designed using the critical and developmental outcomes as a starting point. In 2012, further refinements to the curriculum landscape took place with the introduction of the Curriculum Assessment Policy Statements (CAPS). CAPS is viewed as a comprehensive policy document and replaced all other documents.37 Although the curriculum changes did not impact school governance per se, they significantly affected the way in which teachers taught, and had an impact on the possible longevity of the curriculum-focused training that was provided under the other sub-components of the DDSP.

---

IV. DDSP AND IEP ACTIVITIES

A. Context for DDSP

In 1995, USAID and the South African Government signed the Primary Education Bilateral Agreement and agreed to work together to improve the quality of education for disadvantaged South Africans with the goals of equity of access (redress), improvement of quality, and democratic participation. Four of the poorest provinces were identified to receive assistance: Northern Province (now Limpopo), KZN, the Northern Cape, and the Eastern Cape. This case study focuses on the Northern Cape.

To execute the agreement, USAID launched the 10-year South African Basic Education Reconstruction Program (SABER). The DDSP, initially known as SABER Phase III, began implementation in 1998 as a continuation of these efforts.


In January 1998, USAID began implementation of DDSP, the goal of which was improved quality of educational delivery for grades 1–9 in the DDSP target areas—education districts within four of the poorest South African provinces. DDSP focused on improved teaching and learning through better instructional leadership, management, and governance at the primary school level, and on management and instructional leadership at the district, circuit, and school levels. A key feature of DDSP was the development of approaches, practices, models, structures, and systems, with a view to replicate them in other schools and districts.

DDSP worked in selected districts across four of the nine provinces in South Africa (1) to improve the curriculum practices of teachers, (2) to improve the quality of district and school management, (3) to enhance school governance, and (4) to support school and district development with the development of theory and best practices. The third sub-goal of DDSP, enhanced school governance, is the outcome of interest for this evaluation.

The interventions took place at three levels: (1) the school level, which included SGBs, teachers, and principals; (2) the district level, where they focused on district officials; and (3) the provincial level, where they focused on provincial officials.

One key requirement of SASA was that schools needed support to establish a democratic process for SGB elections. Relatedly, capacity building of schools and SGB members was necessary to help them understand their envisioned roles and responsibilities. Transformative messages about promoting gender equality also needed to be delivered.

These requirements are reflected in the structure of the DDSP itself and its three objectives under the enhanced school governance sub-goal.

Objective 3.1 Democratically Established School Governing Bodies (SGBs)

SGBs were still a very new concept when DDSP implementation began in 1998—the first SGB elections were held in 1997 when the SASA of 1996 became operational. At the provincial level, advocacy and outreach were needed to promote the SGB concept and encourage parents, particularly women, to participate in elections. DDSP provided support to schools in running democratic SGB elections in 2000 and 2003.
“This involved working with education management development officials at the provincial level to prepare the various documents for the elections, an advocacy program, and a database to help provinces capture details for the new SGBs... Within the advocacy program, special emphasis was placed on involving parents who were not literate, developing illustrative materials in local languages, training master trainers, and training district officials.” 38

The Center for Policy and Development (CEPD), a subcontractor for DDSP, developed election preparation materials for schools in local languages that could be used to educate parents, many of whom had low levels of literacy, on the purpose and importance of SGBs and the SGB election process. CEPD also produced the necessary election documents and trained district officials to oversee the elections.

Objective 3.2 Enhanced SGB Performance

DDSP supported improved SGB capacity through training and resource development. DDSP delivered training to SGB members on issues related to school development, SGB roles and responsibilities, school policy, school financial management, holding effective meetings, and conflict resolution. SGB training was also complemented with training under DDSP outcome 2 focusing specifically on school managers. The training on financial management, for example, was a topic that was covered in both the SGB and SMT trainings.

To assist SGBs in drafting school policies, DDSP developed a School Policy Manual containing pro forma for necessary and mandatory school policies. The Northern Cape provincial DoE subsequently adopted these manuals, and district officials began to use them to support non-DDSP schools and districts.

Objective 3.3: More and Better Support Provided to SGBs by District Offices

Grantees in all four provinces conducted capacity-building programs for district officials to enable them to better support SGBs. Since the roles and responsibilities of district officials were not clearly defined by the time DDSP started, the program had an opportunity to assist with this. DDSP provided guidance to district officials on the kind of support they would need to provide to SGBs, and ultimately helped to define the roles and responsibilities of the district officials in relation to schools. In many cases, district officials got an opportunity to conduct joint visits with grantee facilitators to schools to address SGB issues. 39 This provided an opportunity for a mutual exchange of skills, knowledge, and tools between the district officials and the facilitators.


A DDSP grantee, Link Community Development (LCD), delivered the Kimberley Thusanang project in the Northern Cape. Due to the distance between schools, DDSP/LCD grouped 65 schools, which were spread across three of the four local municipalities within the Frances Baard District, into five geographic clusters, and facilitated a combination of workshops for each cluster.

In addition to the workshops, DDSP/LCD supported schools with visits during which facilitators assisted schools with their specific needs, such as developing the appropriate policies and procedures, lesson plans, and timetables. For the workshops and on-site support, the DDSP/LCD trainers used training

materials that contained example policies, procedures, schedules, lesson plans, and other relevant materials.

DDSP/LCD aimed to establish highly functioning and engaged SGBs in a context that was constrained by lack of parental involvement in the past, low levels of adult literacy, and the frequent absence of effective coordination between the schools and local political and social institutions. DDSP/LCD delivered the SGB component primarily through training. Initially, DDSP/LCD offered skill-based training through large Kimberley-based workshops with documents in English. However, the results of these workshops were not as anticipated, and DDSP/LCD later made attempts to incorporate visual images and games with school-based SGB training. This was more successful. It is possible that the Kimberley Thusanang project approach of combining workshop-style training with on-site support at schools, rather than relying only on workshop-style mass training, led to better outcomes as compared to the other sub-programs.

The Kimberley Thusanang project targeted some (not all) of the members of the SGBs. The SGB chair, together with the principal and other parent/teacher members of the SGBs, were trained on financial management, the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the school, and how to ensure continuity from one elected SGB to another. The governance training helped those SGB members who commenced their three-year term in 2000, and concluded around the time that the 2003 elections of SGBs took place.


Following the conclusion of the DDSP, the IEP continued the work started under the DDSP, and attempted to strengthen the integration into the work of the education department. IEP focused on improving instructional leadership, management of schools, and school planning and governance. To accomplish this, education management and district governance specialists in the provincial DoEs and IEP trainers provided regular training and on-site support to school principals, SMTs, and SGB members. Officials responsible for governance and management at the district level conducted joint school support visits with IEP trainers, enhancing the district’s understanding of school needs, integrated planning, and improving service delivery.

IEP continued to support SGB members who were elected in 2003, and ensured that support was available as the term of SGB members came to an end in the middle of 2006 and as new SGB members were elected. On request of the provincial EMGD, IEP delivered three training modules through cluster training workshops between August and November of 2006 which focused on transitional matters between the old and the new SGBs, their roles and responsibilities, and school development planning. The provincial and district officials frequently monitored SGB training, and in some instances co-
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facilitated workshops. According to the final IEP implementer’s report (RTI, 2009), there was good integration between the project activities and the initiatives of the District and Provincial office (RTI, 2009). However, IEP faced the same language and scheduling issues as DDSP.

IEP also focused on the development of School Development Plans (SDPs), which is a mechanism through which SGBs and School Management Teams do a self-assessment of their schools, plan for their schools’ continuous development and decide on a school infrastructure improvement plan. The SDP policy had been newly introduced by the national DoE at the time the IEP was implemented. The end of project evaluation identified an increase in the number of schools effectively implementing the school development plans.42

Key points: The targeted DDSP school governance component in the Northern Cape allowed for an opportunity to strengthen the school governance of a significant portion of schools in a whole education district. The DDSP worked on multiple paths to improve school governance, such as material development, advocacy campaigns around election time, training of SGB members and school governors, and training of district officials on school governance. Through the implementation of the IEP— the gains made through DDSP could be consolidated in some of the same schools, and an opportunity for “catch-up” was provided for new SGB members. Further, the IEP had the advantage of working with a government structure that was not in existence during the DDSP, which encouraged the likelihood of sustainability.

D. DDSP Outcome Achievement

The case study team relied on contemporaneously conducted end-of-project evaluations to determine the extent to which DDSP achieved its school governance outcomes.

The 2003 performance evaluation conducted by Aguirre International made the following conclusion with respect to DDSP: “DDSP has accomplished a great deal and laid the groundwork both for completion of the current scope of work and future activity…[but] DDSP’s sustainability and replicability objectives are threatened by its incomplete integration into the national education system to date, of a fully sustainable model supported by RSA education authorities” (Aguirre, 2003).

This conclusion is largely supported by the evaluation findings with respect to the outcome of Enhanced School Governance. The evaluation makes clear that across the four provinces, school governance structures had been strengthened through training and school support, although to a lesser extent than improvements in school management. Given that no provincial or national offices for school governance existed during DDSP, DDSP was presented with an opportunity to influence the establishment of these structures and provided DDSP with an opportunity to fill a crucial gap in the education system. The evaluation notes that beneficiaries were generally satisfied with the DDSP’s SGB intervention because DDSP provided services that the government had not been able to provide and supported schools and communities to understand and meet the SASA requirements.

Other observations contained in the evaluation report include:

- By the end of the project and at the time of the evaluation all schools visited had established SGBs.
- SGB members themselves were generally laudatory of DDSP and many declared that the program had helped them to understand the larger and more important roles they should be playing in school governance.
- Most SGB has female members but in nearly all cases, the chairperson of the SGB was a male.

---

• Not all SGBs had been filled through a democratic process. In at least two schools, SGB members were appointed or volunteered for the role.

The Kimberley Thusanang project specifically achieved gains around the SGB indicators at the end of the project. When compared to the other sub-programs, the Kimberley Thusanang project did particularly well. The end of project evaluation identified one factor that likely contributed towards the relative success of the Kimberley Thusanang project; it targeted all schools in three educational circuits. This resulted in limited cascading, which is the process whereby those that attend the training return to their sites, and then train others (Aguirre, 2003). Below, Table 5 provides these data.
### TABLE 5: COMPOSITE INDICATOR TABLE FROM DDSP INTERNAL DDSP MONITORING RECORDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective 3.2: Enhanced SGB performance</th>
<th>Objective 3.3: More and better support provided to SGBs by district offices.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Cape Kimberley Thusanang</td>
<td>Eastern Cape Isithole Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base 2001 2002</td>
<td>Base 2001 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limpopo Fanang Diatla</td>
<td>KZN Mthonjeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base 2001 2002</td>
<td>Base 2001 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Increase in the number of Section 21 Schools % of schools with full status</td>
<td>12.2% 12.5% 28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Increase in % of women serving on SGBs % of female SGB members</td>
<td>No Data 52.5% 55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the % SGBs that fully meet the policy documentation requirements of SASA % of schools</td>
<td>0.0% 11.3% 48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in % SGBs which show evidence of applying SASA policies % of schools</td>
<td>38.8% 55.7% 67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of schools that have audited or examined budgets % of schools</td>
<td>25.4% 32.3% 65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of schools that maintain bank accounts % of schools</td>
<td>47.6% 79.0% 95.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of schools with approved annual budgets % of schools</td>
<td>17.5% 24.2% 51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the number of DO SGB support visits Ave number of visits in previous 12 months</td>
<td>2.2 2.3 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the number of SGB training days provided and coordinated by DO to SGBs Ave number of training days in previous 6 months</td>
<td>No Data 0.7 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in the customer satisfaction score on DO performance % of possible score</td>
<td>2.0.9% 28.80% 51.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The evaluation report also highlighted some contextual differences and factors that influenced the achievement of outcomes, including the outcome under study: Enhanced School Governance.

SGB functionality depended on and was influenced by many context specific variables. These included: community ethnic divisions, parental involvement in the schools, tensions such as school fees, and the relative difference in status of school managers and parents (i.e. where parents tended to be poor and less educated, school staff made most of the governance decisions). The evaluation noted that DDSP governance activities often faced difficulty due to erroneous assumptions about the homogeneity of communities, inadequate understanding of politics within communities, variable community receptivity to taking on new responsibilities and limited prior experience of community involvement in school decision-making about schools. The idea of realizing democracy through SGBs essentially needed to happen at the same time as the DDSP started working in schools (Aguirre, 2003).

By the time the DDSP follow-on project (IEP) started, the government established the Directorate of Institutional Development, Management, Governance and Support (IMDG). In 2016, IMDG manages SGB elections, monitors SGB functionality, and builds the capacity of SGBs and principals through training programs. However, its lack of human resources severely hampers its ability to visit schools or review policies developed by SGBs. In the Frances Baard District, there are only three IMDG officials to support 125 schools. Other districts face similar resource constraints.

**Key points:** Since DDSP started soon after the idea of SGBs were introduced through the South African Schools Act, there was an exceptional moment in time to help the system achieve a phase shift. DDSP helped the schools, the districts and the provinces in which it worked to define and come to terms with roles and responsibilities around School Governance, as implied by SASA. Institutionalization was unlikely to take place during DDSP due to the lack of a government partner. As DDSP ended, USAID initiated the follow-on IEP program which directly addressed school governance and did so in partnership with the newly created IMDG. DDSP and IEP together supported provincial DoEs for ten years, which likely contributed towards sustaining DDSP and IEP achievements.
V. CASE STUDY FINDINGS

The data identified and analyzed in this section resulted from the case study team’s explicit awareness of boundaries, which enabled in-depth focused research and data triangulation. The guiding principle that enabled this section to focus on and stay grounded in empirical evidence was holding true to the systems thinking that honors “holism” from a practical perspective. The question of what is in and what is out is critical and not often easy to determine when exploring further than the initial USAID-intended outcome. In this case, the themes identified in this section emerged through iterative analysis of multiple perspectives within one geographical location and within a specific timeframe.

A. Evaluation Question 1

Was the USAID-intended outcome sustained?

The case study team relied primarily on qualitative data to assess the sustainment of “Enhanced School Governance.” Although the DDSP collected monitoring data for several relevant indicators, data has not been collected on these indicators since (at the latest) the completion of the IEP program, and in some cases, changes in education policy would have rendered indicators meaningless as a measure of school governance.

At present, the national DoE routinely collects data on school governance through the SGB functionality survey implemented in a sample of schools. However, the survey is conducted only with a small sample of schools (four were included in our sample) and the metrics included in the survey are not directly comparable with those collected contemporaneous with the DDSP.

The next section presents the evidence collected during the case study data collection period to comment on the degree to which the results were sustained. Findings are categorized by the DDSP sub-outcome to which the findings correspond for ease of reference and understanding.

Sub-Outcome 3.1: Democratically Established School Governing Bodies

Finding A.1

SGB elections have become a regular part of the education system in the province.

The Final Evaluation of DDSP in 2003 noted that all the schools visited as part of the evaluation had established SGBs, although in not all cases had SGB members been democratically elected. The case study team found that it is currently the case that SGB elections are regular and electoral processes are relatively systematic and well-established as compared with the end of the DDSP.

---

43 In some cases, indicators are no longer measured because the intended targets have been fully achieved. For example, DDSP measured the number of SGBs that meet SASA’s policy documentation requirements. As noted below, this objective has been fully achieved over the last twenty years and DBE no longer measures policy documentation.

44 For instance, one DDSP indicator already abandoned under IEP was “the number of schools that achieved Section 21 status.” At the time of the DDSP program, this represented a meaningful metric for school governance. Per SASA, under Section 21 provincial DoEs could grant to SGBs responsibility for some school functions in cases where SGBs were found to be competent. However, subsequent practice became to award Section 21 status to all schools, depriving the metric of its validity as a measure of school governance.
Since 2006, holding SGB elections has been guided by national guidelines (DoE, 2014), and the Northern Cape Regulations for the Election of School Governing Bodies, which outline the roles and responsibilities of provincial and district-level officials and schools.

Elections take place every three years. By-elections take place when a member resigns or is no longer eligible to continue as a member, although district-level officials reported that schools are not always compliant in this regard. Elections are advertised by the district and province through letters, newspaper advertisements and radio spots and election training is held for District and School Electoral Officers.

Several templates exist to standardize the election process—e.g. nomination form, voters’ roll and election monitoring instrument. The election process is overseen and results verified by electoral officials, as well as circuit managers who monitor and support schools in their respective clusters. In 2012, the DOE developed a training guide linked to national guidelines that they report as the factor that notably improved the adherence of schools to the guidelines and regulations (DoE, 2014). A national EMGD official provided statistics that showed 100 grievances in 2012 were reduced to 34 in 2015.

At the district level, the SGB elections seem to be more politicized than during the DDSP, especially in the rural areas. One interviewee noted that:

*Now the ANC must have a seat, the EFF [Economic Freedom Fighters] must have a seat. They come with their own interests, money, politics...mandates from their party. This interferes with the running of the SGB...leads to people wanting to run who do not have children at the school.*

Despite the higher politicization of the elections, a provincial IMDG district official provided data that showed 58% of SGBs in the province were elected successfully at the first election meeting. “Successful” is defined as the required number of SGB members were nominated, there was an adequate quorum of parents present at the election meeting, and there were no irregularities in the election process. Although not a high success rate, the IMDG district official stated that these numbers suggest an improvement since 2006.

**Finding A.2**

*Northern Cape DoE has processes and materials for assisting with SGB elections. However, lessons learned from DDSP about the process and materials are still not applied*

The DDSP supported the development of SGB processes and materials, which still exist in an evolved form. Examples of materials include Department of Basic Education’s *A Training Guide for Electoral Officers on School Governing Body Elections (2014)* and *National Guidelines for School Governing Bodies (2009)*. One key informant, for example, mentioned how, in his later role in the School Governance unit in the national DoE, he used the tools, protocols and instruments developed under DDSP to put National guidelines in place. He mentioned: “There was the DDSP light blue book. I used it more than anyone else. I even used some of the text.”

Although election materials no longer resemble those that were developed under DDSP, informants clearly expressed how the DDSP election preparation materials influenced the development of later products. Several provincial DoE officials and district level interviewees noted that the election preparation materials had been adapted and revised on a yearly basis since the time of the DDSP.

---

45 A training guide for Electoral Officers on SGB elections, 2014
46 Official Notice 14 of 2014, Gazette No. 1860, Northern Cape Province, 3 December.
A Provincial DoE official and several district level interviewees stated that the DDSP goal to provide processes to support to elections was never fully achieved, listing two specific barriers: the translation of materials into local languages, and ensuring materials were accessible for people with low levels of literacy. While DDSP did identify these as barriers to providing processes to support elections, the lessons were never acted upon by DDSP or after DDSP ended, the government. A key purpose of the DDSP was to implement and learn. However, despite DDSP learning about this gap, interview and document review data show that translation of election materials into local languages only started in 2012 (and this was done informally by teachers), and material is still not friendly towards illiterate people. This provides an example of how a critical lesson learned from DDSP was simply not incorporated.

Thus, while Northern Cape DoE has a set of processes and materials for assisting with SGB elections, it does not mean that the material or process is accessible to everyone. This finding suggests that while DDSP left in place a process and materials that have been adapted and revised, the gap that they did not address yet identified, which is making the process more accessible to low literacy and non-English speaking parents and community members, is still a challenge today.

**Finding A.3**

*SGB elections are regular yet recruiting and retaining SGB members presents a challenge.*

SGB members, principals and provincial and district officials noted that schools faced difficulties in recruiting members to serve on SGBs especially in poorer communities. Interview data suggest that the disinterest results from the expectation that elected SGB members serve as volunteers, in a culture where remuneration is expected for participation. SGB members and the principal at one school in Warrenton mentioned having to call multiple meetings to recruit sufficient nominees for elections. This SGB also struggled with regular resignations, both from parent and teacher members who struggled to make time to participate in SGB activities.

A principal noted that “People aren’t that interested in participating… [we] have to have more than two meetings for nominations and sometimes elect even if don’t have a quorum…” This was echoed by a District Official who noted that they “struggle with recruiting parents as most parents don’t want to serve on the SGB.”

We found examples at two schools (Jan Kempdorp & Hartsvaal) where SGB parents assumed that they would be paid, and thus agreed, if elected, to be members of the SGB. After they were elected, and then trained on their roles and responsibilities, they realized that it was not a paid position. Thereafter, these elected SGB members simply didn’t attend any meetings.

**Finding A.4**

*The SGB database compiled under DDSP is not used; however, a new system is in place.*

At the close of DDSP, the Access database used to track school training and performance was not made available to the department or schools. According to a book produced by DoE, USAID and RTI (2003), the Access database was not designed to be sustained. While the question of whether this was a design oversight is raised, the book concludes that the lack of IT infrastructure in DDSP districts would have not permitted the Access database to be implemented by the department or the individual schools.
In 2016, there is a database in place, called the South African Schools Administration and Management System (SASAMS)\textsuperscript{47} database. Schools collect data to verify the eligibility of SGB members, the SGB members’ details, and data on SGB training. These data are then entered in the SASAMS\textsuperscript{48} database. A few interviewees suggest that this information is not always collected by schools, particularly training information.

**Sub-Outcome 3.2: Enhanced SGB Performance**

**Finding A.5**

*Pro forma SGB policies, school management templates and other SGB templates are still in use at most school and district level.*

Training and policy materials developed by DDSP are still being used at most schools. At the school level, all principals interviewed specifically described the ongoing usefulness of the DDSP pro forma policy templates and training manuals. Of the principals interviewed, nearly all mentioned that pro forma policy templates were the most valuable resources provided by DDSP that are still used today.

At a DDSP school with a principal who was there during the DDSP, the principal stated: “We started with policies at the USAID training [DDSP] and since then I used the templates given to us in the training and I am still using the policy format up till today.” These pro forma even continue to be used by DDSP principals who have moved to new schools to help them develop new policies. In a non-DDSP school which has a DDSP trained principal (who moved from a DDSP school) the principal reported: “The proformas provided by DDSP helped to get policies and the SGB structure in order…it was an example that came from DDSP. It was still in the floppy disk era. We adapted for own school.”

There are also data that showed the usefulness of these templates in DDSP schools that have a new principal since DDSP. At a DDSP school with a new (non-DDSP trained) principal, a principal stated: “I inherited this all [DDSP pro formas] from the previous headmaster and…use the DDSP info as a guideline to fix the new policies and develop those that didn’t have.”

District and provincial officials confirmed these findings, commenting that these DDSP materials were used to review and update school policies on an annual basis, indicating that current materials used by the department bear strong similarities to original DDSP materials.

**Finding A.6**

*Principal’s role in supporting SGBs exists, yet varies*

DDSP trained Principals in their responsibilities vis-à-vis the SGBs as outlined in the South African Schools Act No 84 of 1996 – specifically to provide induction training and additional SGB trainings, and in general support the SGB). The trainings were conducted via workshops and on-site support targeted at the school managers and the SGBs. According to Section 16 A of the Act, principals are required to perform the following functions in relation to the SGB:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Pro forma SGB policies, school management templates and other SGB templates are still in use at most school and district level.}
  \item \textbf{Principal’s role in supporting SGBs exists, yet varies}
\end{itemize}
- Inform the governing body about policy and legislation;
- Be a member of the SGB’s finance committee, assist with the management of the school funds, and manage any matter that has financial implications for the school;
- Give advice to the governing body on the financial implications of decisions relating to the financial matters of the school [Para. (h) added by s. 9 of Act No. 15 of 2011];
- Attend and participate in all meetings of the governing body;
- Provide the governing body with a report about the professional management relating to the public school; and
- Assist the governing body in handling disciplinary matters pertaining to learners.

The district holds principals accountable against these responsibilities.

In the schools visited by the team with principals who received DDSP training and materials, the principals reported that they still use the DDSP material for induction training. One principal indicated that the DDSP had introduced a strategic planning method which continued to be useful to the SGB. However, a review of provincial data shows that, since the 2015 SGB elections, only half of the principals in the province have sent SGB members to be trained, and only half have updated the SASAMS database. This suggests that adequate training of SGB members are likely still a widespread problem, with the implication the SGBs are unlikely to function as effectively as they are supposed to, without significant input from the principal.

To support principals in their role to ensure a smooth transition between old and incoming SGBs after elections, the Kimberley Thusanang project had a two-day training workshop. Since 2009, the DBE has implemented a Handover Checklist that principals may use and that election officials are trained on.

**Sub-Outcome 3.3: More and Better Support to SGBs by District Offices**

**Finding A.7**

*District officials’ roles are institutionalized, but still not fully realized.*

“At the time of the DDSP there were no job descriptions that delineated what the role of the various school district and provincial stakeholders were, and the material developed by the DDSP made this clearer.” (Provincial Official, Northern Cape.)

DDSP addressed the lack of well-defined roles and responsibilities for district officials which created a major gap in the education system in the Northern Cape. DDSP supported districts to clarify the district official’s role and responsibility. DDSP worked with the district to develop policies and tools to be used in carrying out their work, including providing support to SGBs (Aguirre International, 2003). In 2016, the job descriptions and related guidelines developed during DDSP exist and have become institutionalized, though adapted over time.

However, there is no conclusive evidence that these job descriptions and guidelines have resulted in sustained district support to SGBs. DDSP aimed to establish a pattern of District Officials visiting schools to provide school governance support. While these visits still take place to some degree, the intensity and frequency of the support visits have been greatly reduced since DDSP, with most occurring

---

when directly requested by a Principal. Further, while principals send reports, such as policy updates, to the district office, the principals very rarely receive comments, replies or advice based on those updates reports. One principal noted: “District officials provide support, but not enough...you don't really ever get feedback.” This view was echoed by nearly all the principals with which the case study team conducted interviews.

Finding A.8

District training for SGB members continues to occur, but with lower intensity than during DDSP.

DDSP designed a training program and delivered trainings for SGB members. While regular training for SGB continue to take place, and are still considered critical by principals and SGB members, documents and interview data demonstrate that the current training programs are less intense than during DDSP in several ways, resulting in inadequate training.

First, while the DDSP SGB training lasted three days, the current training is held for one day. Second, the DDSP SGB training involved extensive in-school support by a trained facilitator, whereas now in-school support is provided by a district official who has many other areas of responsibility at the school. Third, respondents who have participated in the current training confirm that the training does not cover all SGB members as it did during DDSP. Finally, the frequency and duration of the trainings are not sufficient as compared to the model during DDSP. As one principal who conducts the training noted:

“The department focusses on training the chairperson, the principal and treasurer and not the whole SGB. I do cascade the information as a principal but it comes across differently to SGB members so it would be better if we all have consistent training.”

The field data specifically show that the Northern Cape Education Departments’ training program exists in several variations owing to a lack of institutional capacity to train all SGB members. In some schools, principals are required to give an induction training and then train SGB members in other areas as the need arises (e.g. when recruitment of staff needs to take place). In other schools, the district trained the executive committee (secretary, chair and treasurer) and then these three people are responsible for training the remaining SGB members. Others reported being trained by the district circuit manager, and then receiving an induction training by the principal. One SGB member said,

“They would rush through the materials, which was fine for him as an old principal, but it might be difficult for a new one. The training was cluster training and only the executive would attend. Only the induction training was ever conducted during the period of an SGB.”

Regardless of the approach, not one interviewee found the training to be sufficient or an adequate approach for supporting the SGB members.
B. Evaluation Question 2

What other outcomes resulted from the project (positive/negative) and were these outcomes sustained?

Finding B.1

DDSP tool that supported school self-assessment approaches later became institutionalized nationally

In the DDSP schools, DDSP introduced school self-assessment and associated tools, such as self-assessment templates that formed the basis for the SGB Functionality Tool. DDSP trained SGB and school managers in their use, and supported the implementation of the self-assessment processes (200252). The DDSP SGB Functionality Tool was later institutionalized at a national level, becoming part of the national system.

The process of school self-assessment became institutionalized in the National Education Department’s policy on Whole-School Evaluation.53 This policy requires the School Governing Body and School Management team to conduct a self-assessment, develop a school development plan, and document a school infrastructure improvement plan. The degree that DDSP influenced national policy to institute school self-assessment is likely small, as DDSP constituted such a small part of interventions taking place during that period. At the same time, the National Department of Basic Education’s Education Management and Governance Development directorate (EMGD) did adapt the DDSP SGB Functionality Tool in 2014 to supplement the schools’ self-assessment with an external measure. Circuit managers use the adapted tool to collect data on a yearly basis from approximately 2000 schools to assess key processes in school governance. (DoE, 2015). These tools, which are completed by schools and verified by district managers, represent the institutionalization of the principle of self-assessment and reporting introduced in DDSP schools. The system relies on principals reporting SGB-related problems or the need for further training and support to circuit managers during their visits to schools, who then refer these issues to the IMDG.

Finding B.2

Strengthened link between school governance and parents

In some communities, parents, principals and teachers spoke about the strengthened link between SGBs and the parents, as well as the community in general. Although the advocacy efforts of the DDSP specifically targeted outreach to parents, interview data from school stakeholders did not identify SGBs as the mechanism through which parents and the community became more involved. Data suggest that DDSP, in the training of SGBs on their roles and responsibilities, challenged SGBs to think about options for achieving the goals. The role of the SGB in reaching out to parents and organizations in the community, such as nonprofits and businesses, were something that wasn’t anticipated, but reportedly did occur. Where the strengthened relationships were mentioned, it was attributed to the DDSP. As one principal noted:

“Now that SGB members are involved in planning, managing the plan and meeting with parents about their work…the community is more involved and committed…”

---


feel that the DDSP built this capacity and strengthened the link between school governance and parent.”

C. Evaluation Question 3

What has contributed to or hindered sustaining the outcomes?

A variety of contributing factors supported the sustainment of some outcomes, while other factors provided a hindrance.

Contributing Factors

Finding C.1

Retention of good school management helped to sustain organizational knowledge, but not necessarily functionality

Based on interview data, the functionality of SGBs for eleven of the twelve visited schools could be assessed via indicators observable to interviewees. 54 The assessment showed:

- Three schools were at a good level of functionality.
- Six at an acceptable level of functionality (see figure below).
- Two were at a poor level of functionality.

Four of the eleven schools had a current principal or deputy principal that had been involved in the DDSP. Those who were involved with the DDSP and still working in a school could reflect on the positives of the DDSP project, quoting and demonstrating examples of knowledge gained that are still in use. These principals/deputy principals are, however, close to retirement age, and it is expected that the institutional knowledge that may have been built during DDSP may soon be lost.

While institutional knowledge may have been retained, the level of institutional knowledge and a better functionality rating did not always correspond. This suggest that despite some evidence that the DDSP did deliver measurable changes, this did not necessarily translate into better functionality of all SGBs. Further, as time passed and new SGBs have been elected, a few principals in the visited schools indicated that new challenges arose that interfered with the functioning of the SGB. The general sense was that despite the resources and training provided by DDSP, SGB functioning is still constrained.

---

54 Researchers collected evidence and rated indicators on a three-point scale. The indicators were chosen because they were similar to the ones used in the end-of-project DDSP monitoring and evaluation reports. The indicators were: 1) All required policies are in place 2) Meetings of the SGB happen frequently. 3) Assets of the School are adequately tracked. 4) Financial Management is adequate 5) School does Planning and Reporting on Curriculum Matters 6) School has a democratically elected SGB 7) The school fully meets the policy documentation requirements, 8) SASA policies has been updated and adapted since end of DDSP 9) Schools are fundraising without any investigation into reported or suspected irregularities. Ratings were averaged with relevant indicators weighted appropriately, and an overall score calculated. Distribution of scores were reviewed and then rated as poor, acceptable and good.
Finding C.2

Movement of NGO staff into government positions helped to spread good practice.

A few people interviewed who worked for the lead NGO in the Northern Cape indicated that they had moved on to work in government positions where they used their knowledge and experience to strengthen the education system. For example, an NGO project director moved on to become a director in the national DoE with responsibility for school management and governance, districts and school safety. He reported that he ‘extensively used’ the DDSP resources and experience to help to write the initial national department policies and guidelines.

A second person was the training coordinator on the Northern Cape project who currently works in the Northern Cape Education Departments’ Early Childhood Development directorate. She reported that she occasionally uses the materials that DDSP developed. She stated: “It is still a useful resource because of the and because of the summary that it provides of the South African Schools Act. I still use it. Most recently I got a task from my supervisor…to help develop language policies for schools. It is not easy for someone to complete the development of policies. But the proformas help a lot.”

Finding C.3

The DDSP came at a time when the system was ready for input to help build new systems and processes
The timing of DDSP was auspicious. First, at the time of the DDSP, there was no government department that supported or focused on SGBs. Second, the education system was ready for input around formalizing the roles and responsibilities of District Officials in relation to schools and in relation to the Province. In the absence of established systems and processes the work conducted by the DDSP for SGBs filled an important gap. By testing out different training formats and materials for support, the system could learn about what works, and start institutionalizing these aspects.

Finding C.4

**DDSP developed practical, adaptable materials for use by districts, schools and SGBs.**

The availability of practical materials that principals and SGB members could easily adapt, resulted in finding manuals on bookshelves in school and government offices in 2016. Some principals indicated that the current school policies originated from the work they had done in DDSP. One principal noted,

“Yes, the SGB has a constitution - it was an example that came from DDSP… the floppy disk era. We used a Proforma… Where we made inputs to make it adopted for own school.”

Finding C.5

**Extending the DDSP through a follow-on project helped good practices to be become institutionalized**

The IEP, a follow-on to the DDSP, effectively extended the duration of the project activities to a 10-year period. This supported practices to become institutionalized at provincial, district and school level.

Hindrances

Finding C.6

**Lack of institutionalizing the SGB training for parents in the formal education system**

Some DDSP interventions were sustained in part because of principals and teachers who have remained in the education system since the end of DDSP (e.g. many principals and teachers interviewed had been in that position or in the education system for more than 25 years). These kinds of time frames enabled principals and teachers to use their DDSP learning, skills, pro-formas, and knowledge, in their role, to influence others, institutionalize what they had learned and for those who have moved to new schools or positions, to carry these knowledge, skills, proformas and ideas with them. These actors remained in the system.

By comparison, SGBs members have a different role as actors in the education system and serve for a short time in these capacities. The South African Schools Act makes provision for SGB elections every three years, which means that SGB members trained by DDSP (or anyone) are unlikely to remain in the education system for more than three years. Thus, when SGB members trained by DDSP left, the knowledge and skills obtained left with them.

SGB members interviewed were not familiar with the DDSP training and other data (e.g. school documents, SGB documents) did not identify any instances where the DDSP SGB training had been institutionalized or is currently in use to train SGB members. Therefore, a constraining factor is the limited and often non-existent transfer or knowledge and skills from existing SGB members to new SGB members, and the lack of institutionalizing the DDSP training.
Finding C.7

There are insufficient numbers of district officials to support SGBs

DDSP provided strong and consistent support to SGBs. That role to support SGBs now falls to IMDG district officials. The IMDG district official’s role is broader than supporting SGBs, as these officials also provide support to whole school evaluation activities, and respond whenever an issue requiring departmental input occurs. Data suggested a picture of IMDG offices that are often short staffed, and where IMDG district officials are often overstretched and unable to offer the level of support provided by DDSP. In the areas visited, the IMGD district officials who are currently responsible for SGB support do not have capacity to visit all schools regularly or consistently. For example, in the Frances Baard district, there are 98 schools, and one IMGD official. The research team identified similar examples other researched DDSP areas.

Finding C.8

Limited skills and knowledge among the parents who were targeted as part of the SGB training

Towards the end of DDSP, the evaluators concluded that SASA set forth a set of “overly optimistic ambitious goals and assumptions regarding SGBs” and that “the DDSP, operating within its mandate, focused on strengthening SGBs to perform the roles per the prescriptions of SASA, without addressing the related characteristics and needs of the surrounding communities, e.g., adult literacy or the frequent absence of effective coordination between the schools and local political and social institutions.”

Interviewees pointed out that poor parental literacy remained an issue hindering the effectiveness of SGBs.

“They are our parents –SGBs are illiterate… they need support and guidance of teachers… [they are] not putting the interests of the learners ahead [first].”

The roles and responsibilities set out by the SASA, involves a range of tasks that would be difficult to conduct if an SGB member is unable to read. For example, holding the school to account on financial matters, or reviewing CVs in preparation for interviews for new appointments. In some South African communities, these illiterate parents are not dissuaded from volunteering for SGB duty – in part because illiteracy is wide spread, and because schools often struggle to get parents to volunteer for SGB duties.

The unemployment that sometimes accompanies poor education levels also has a negative influence on the degree to which parents are available for SGB duties.

“We got external motivation [for poor parental involvement]: joblessness. Most parents who are unemployed… they negate voluntary service at the school. [They rather] Try to do something to get money. They affect the smooth running of the school.”

Therefore, while the SGB training may be useful for literate parents, even with DDSP training parents to understand their role in the SGB, illiterate parents are unable to implement their role due to lack of an ability to read and write.

Finding C.9

System in place can be “gamed”

The SGB system adapted in such a way that school staff and teacher unions found ways of circumventing the checks and balances in the system, resulting in corruption. A principal relayed how undue political influence played out:
“The SGB is also challenged…they come with political agendas. Last time certain political parties’ agendas tried to be pushed in the school. They will sit in the village, and tomorrow there is an SGB election, so they campaigned. When they came here they were already organized, and then they colluded with the administration in the school. Currently the parent component of the SGBs are not so well. If you don’t have a good back bone…they will put you down as principal.

Besides the influence of political parties over aspects such as appointments at schools, and the managing of finances, examples of how corruption can play out were also mentioned.

“We were negotiating a contract for new office machines like the printers and faxes. When the new SGB came in we already arranged for new machinery (from a different provider). But the new SGB they consulted with previous service provider – he gave them little money pockets [i.e. small bribes]. Then we collided…”

The occurrence of corruption in schools in the form of embezzlement of school funds or improper appointments of staff (in exchange for political or financial gain) has increased to such an extent that it has been investigated and reported on by organizations like Corruption Watch since 2013. This suggests that there is insufficient oversight from, amongst others, school governing bodies and district officials.

**Finding C.10**

**Coordinated advocacy for parent and community participation in SGB elections no longer takes place.**

Data show that coordinated advocacy efforts to encourage parent and community participation in elections no longer takes place. Provincial officials and interviewees working at the district and school-level were unable to recall the advocacy support provided by CEPD during the elections and further, had no recollection of DDSP advocacy materials.

Although the national guidelines mention the necessity of advocacy work to ensure that communities have an understanding that schools are a societal responsibility (DoE, 2014), data show that that less advocacy work is carried out in 2016 than during DDSP implementation. One respondent noted that: “No real outreach happens in terms of educating the parent community or encouraging them to participate.”

The case study team did identify a few SGB election advertisements in some areas visited, but the team found no evidence of advocacy materials being distributed to the parent community by schools or the district.

**D. Evaluation Question 4**

*How are the outcomes perceived and valued by those with significant stakes in the project?*

**Finding D.1**

**School principals and managers involved with DDSP value the supporting role it played in implementing the South African Schools Act.**

School Managers who participated in DDSP and still manage schools value the inputs provided by the DDSP for various reasons. At the most basic level, the templates that were provided are still seen as useful, and multiple principals mentioned how they still use them. More strategically, the principals recognized that the DDSP helped them to come to grips with the changes brought on by the promulgation of the South African Schools Act and the implications for governance in their schools.
Principals reflected that they may not have been as confident in dealing with SGB if they did not have the DDSP SGB training. Most principals recognized that the DDSP training provided them with a firm base from which to start the skills transfer to SGB members who have limited background knowledge, and to some extent can support the continuous change of members in accordance with SGB election cycles. Some principals valued the DDSP training as an opportunity to be exposed in a forum of peers and for some, lead to new career opportunities.

Finding D.2

**Government officials familiar with DDSP likewise value its role in helping schools comply with South African Schools Act requirements**

District, Provincial and National Officials who could recall DDSP, valued DDSP for the scale and scope of its intervention. One senior interviewee indicated that the DDSP helped with ensuring that schools met the requirements that would allow Section 21 governance (where schools instead of the Department procure goods and services) status to be awarded to schools.

Finding D.3

**DDSP implementing organizations value DDSP for strengthening their organizations and supporting the establishment of local partnerships**

Local organizations that implemented DDSP valued its impact on the trajectories of their organizations’ development. Individuals at these organizations reported that DDSP helped to train them on rigorous procurement and financial reporting requirements, and provided an opportunity to test and learn about implementation and programmatic issues; these learnings have been carried forward to other education projects. Partnerships between organizations were forged that were sustained after DDSP came to an end, and these partnerships then supported these organizations to be involved in other education interventions.

Finding D.4

**Individuals in implementation organizations valued DDSP for the knowledge and professional opportunities it afforded to them.**

Individuals who worked with implementing organizations during DDSP also commented on the value that DDSP experience had on their own personal career paths. Some of the individuals still work in the same organizations and have used their DDSP experience and knowledge gained to implement of other similar projects. A few people involved in the DDSP have since moved jobs, also into positions within the DoE, and report having benefitted from their time in the DDSP.
VI. CONCLUSION

The DDSP entered the South African political and education context at the exact moment when the government needed assistance to establish systems for electing and training SGBs. Nationally, these systems are still maintained. Those individuals who were trained by DDSP and remain in schools, value the input of the DDSP, and recognize that the tools that they received, the knowledge that they gained, and skills that they mastered, are useful to them in their current roles within the education system.

Most schools that participated in DDSP have properly constituted SGBs, and most schools visited during the study demonstrated the existence of relevant governance plans, policies and procedures in place. However, most schools fail to effectively implement the SGB plans, policies and procedures. When school level interview data are considered together with data from a national survey on school functionality conducted by the Department of Basic Education, it seems that there is no evidence to suggest that the SGBs of those schools who participated in the Kimberley Thusanang project are more functional than non-project schools.

Schools that exist in the poorer areas of South Africa have been consistently plagued by low levels of parental involvement in the schools, and for the parents who are involved in SGBs, high levels of illiteracy. It is likely due to this low level of literacy that even after parents have been through the more intensive training provided through DDSP and more recently the limited training provided by the Education Departments, that they are unable to fully participate in SGBs. The increase in reports of school-based corruption is one indication of what happens when schools are not effectively governed by parents.

While many actors in the system valued the DDSP and spoke of DDSP influence, and some individuals reflected that being a part of the DDSP strengthened them personally and they brought this knowledge to bear in other parts of the education sector, factors such as extreme poverty, corruption, changing education leadership and curriculum, are among some of the factors that appeared to negatively influence DDSP’s organizational level sustainability. Data strongly suggest that current challenges are of such a scope, that even a very ambitious program is not likely to transform poorly governed and managed schools into well-governed, well-performing schools.
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ANNEX A: EDUCATION SYSTEM TIMELINE

Timeline of Major Trends & Events in SA (Political, Socio-economic, Aid, Education Context & SA Case Study)


- Trained master trainers & district officials, SGB -- Training
- Capacity building programs for district officials
- Pre-service training programs for Maths & Science teachers
- Support to Prov. & Nat. Dept through special activities

- Annual National Assessments (2012 onwards)
- National Curriculum Statement (CAPS)
- National Action plan to 2014: Schooling 2014
- Dept: Basic Education
- Dept: Higher Education

- Integrated Education Program (2004 & 2009)
- Integrated Quality Management System (IQMS)
- Teaching Degrees/Diploma's in Universities

- District SGB Training ongoing across 9 Provinces
- National Department of Education
- Dept: Basic Education
- Dept: Higher Education

- Formation of SGB's, RCL & SMEs
- Schools change to Section 21 School
- Revised National Curriculum Statement 2001
- Employment of Educators Act No. 19 of 1994
- South African Schools Act No. 84 of 1996

- National Policy on Whole School Evaluation 2001
- Curriculum 2001 OBE
- National Action plan to 2014: Schooling 2014
- Dept: Basic Education
- Dept: Higher Education

- Teacher Training Colleges Closed
- Teacher Training Colleges Reopened
- Education Aid International & Local
- DND
- PADF
- ZENEX
- ZEP
- Macufe Alumina & Bursary Fund
- Kgalema Motlanthe & Foundation
- Kallegg
- Sisonke School Development

- Socio-economic
- Value Added Tax Act, 1991

- Increase in HIV/AIDS - Influence on education/parents
- Social Assistance Act, 2004
- Economic Recession (2008)
- Devaluation of ZAR

- National Department of Education
- Dept: Basic Education
- Dept: Higher Education

- Education Amendment Act, 2008
- Constitution (Act 108 of 1996)

- NDP (2013 - 2020)
- MTSF 2014 - 10

- Political
- Democratic Elections, 27 April 1994
- Absence in Parliament

- ANC
- Jacob Zuma (2009 - present)

- Presidents
- Thabo Mbeki (1999 - 2008)
- Kgalema Motlanthe (2009)

- Education Ministers
- Janet Diabia (1994 - 1999)
- Noël Pillay (2004 - 2009)
- Angie Motshekga (2012 - present)
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ANNEX B: FOCUSED EDUCATION SYSTEM MAP

Focused Map: Role Players

- Research Triangle International (RTI)
- MSTP consortium (the Mthonjeni Project)
- READ (Isithole Project)
- District Department of Education
- SADTU (Union)
- Circuit Offices
- NGOs
- Business
- Community Members
- Tribal Authorities
- Parents
- Principal
- School Staff
- Students (SRL)
- SGB (School Governing Body)
ANNEX C: EDUCATION SYSTEM INSTITUTIONAL MAP

Institutional Map: Education System in South Africa
## ANNEX D: CASE STUDY INTERVIEW GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Title:</th>
<th>SOBE – South Africa DDSP and IEP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer(s)</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee(s)</td>
<td>Organization/Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>Location of interview/Type of interview (phone, Skype, in person, group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Given</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Analysis (Emerging themes, key issues, items to test in next interviews). Hot topics of this interview, things to follow up on, analysis hints and guides, crib notes, bingo or aha moment.
Introduction

- My name is ____________ and I am working on behalf of MSI, who is contracted by USAID. Thank you for making the time to meet with me.

- I am here today to ask some questions about [the District Development and Support programme or DDSP].
  - It was implemented between 1998 and 2003.\(^{55}\)
  - It aimed to improve the quality of educational delivery for grades 1-9

- USAID is running a study in 4 countries looking to learn lessons from basic education support projects that were successful to help shape their work. We are not here to evaluate or make any judgments about the results or your role in DDSP.

- Our aim is to understand why some activities and results were sustained and others not, and what remains that can be linked to DDSP.

- We have [45 minutes - 1 hour] for our time together. Are you available to respond to some questions during this time?

- (Consent) This interview is entirely voluntary and you may choose not to participate. If you agree to participate, you can choose to stop at any time or to skip any questions you do not want to answer. Your answers and your participation in this interview are completely confidential. We will not share any information that identifies you with anyone outside of the evaluation team.

- Please feel free to stop this interview at any time to ask questions you may have about this consent or anything else. Do I have your consent to proceed? (Record, yes / no)

(Transition) Do you have any questions for me before we start?

---

\(^{55}\) The DDSP had a follow on called the Integrated Education Program (IEP). It was a $23 million primary education improvement program funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), Southern Africa DDPS and was implemented between 2004 and 2009. It continued working on SGB issues.
Introduce the DDPS Project Background

- Since it is a long time since DDSP was implemented, let me remind you what it did.
- The DDSP had four areas of work (See the Outcomes sheet) and one was aimed at enhancing school governance.
- For our conversation, I want to focus on the work done by DDSP on SGBs. There were three key activities focusing on the SGBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Outcome 3.1 Democratically established School Governing Bodies (SGBs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity:</strong> The Center for Policy and Development (CEPD) supported election preparations for SGBs by assisting in the preparation of documents, advocacy programs, and databases. For the advocacy program, CEPD developed illustrative materials in local languages trained master trainers and trained district officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Outcome 3.2 Enhanced SGB performance

**Activity:** Trained SGBs on school development planning, roles and responsibilities of SGB, school policy, school financial management, effective meetings and conflict resolution

Sub-Outcome 3.3: More and better support provided to SGBs by district offices

**Activity:** Provided capacity building programs for district officials to better support SGBs

- The key outcome was to support the newly established SGBs which came into existence because of the 1996 South African Schools Act\(^{56}\).
Interviewee Profile

1. How were you involved in the **District Development and Support (DDSP) programme**? (Was not involved – Skip to Question 4)
   
   (Probe: Organization and role, the timeframe involved)

### Past & Current Parents:

- **I understand you were a parent at … school.**
  - a. How long have you been a parent?
  - b. Tell me about your role as a Parent? What are you supposed to do? What do you do (Probe – ask about involvement in School governance)
  - c. Have you received any type of training?
  - d. How is the involvement of parents at your school?
  - e. How is the involvement of the teacher unions at your school?
  - f. Have you ever served as a member of the school governing body? If yes
    - i. When
    - ii. Do you receive training as a SGB member?
  - g. Were you involved in the DDSP project? If not, were you aware of the DDSP activities? How were you aware? Can you tell me a bit about this?

### Current or Past SGB members (Also teachers who served as SGB member)

- **I understand you were / are a member of the SGB at … school.**
  - a. How many women and men serve(d) on the SGB?
  - b. When were you elected?
  - c. When will your term of office come to an end?
  - d. Is it a section 20 or 21 School?
  - e. Do you know what quintile (1: poorest, 5:least poor) your school is?
  - f. Tell me about your role as an SGB member? What are you supposed to do? What do you do? (Probe – ask about involvement in School self-evaluation, Strategic planning, School improvement plan, school development plan, setting budgets, fundraising, recommending appointments, setting the extra-curricular curriculum
  - g. How regularly does / did the SGB meet?
  - h. Does/ Did the SGB have a constitution?
  - i. Does/ Did the SGB have a mission statement for the school?
  - j. Does/ Did the SGB have a code of conduct for learners at the school
  - k. What other policies have you set for the school?
  - l. Did the SGB set a language policy for the school
  - m. How does the SGB interact with the school management and teachers?
  - n. How does the SGB interact with other parents?
  - o. Have you received any type of SGB training?
  - p. How is the involvement of parents at your school?
  - q. Were you involved in the DDSP project? If not, were you aware of the DDSP activities? How were you aware? Can you tell me a bit about this?
## Current or Past Principal

I understand you are the principals and are a member of the SGB at … school.

- **a.** When were you appointed as principal? How long have you taught at this school? How long have you taught since the start of your career?
- **b.** (if past principal): When did you retire
- **c.** Thinking back to the last SGB you worked with: How many women and men serve(d) on the SGB?
- **d.** Is it a section 20 or 21 School?
- **e.** Do you know what quintile (1: poorest, 5: least poor) your school is?
- **f.** Tell me about the functioning of the SGB? What were they supposed to do? What do they do? (Probe – ask about involvement in School self-evaluation, Strategic planning, School improvement plan, school development plan, setting budgets, fundraising, recommending appointments, setting the extra-curricular curriculum)
- **g.** How regularly does / did the SGB meet?
- **h.** Does/ Did the SGB have a constitution?
- **i.** Does/ Did the SGB have a mission statement for the school?
- **j.** Does/ Did the SGB have a code of conduct for learners at the school?
- **k.** What other policies were set for the school?
- **l.** Did the SGB set a language policy for the school?
- **m.** How does the SGB interact with the school management and teachers?
- **n.** How does the SGB interact with other parents?
- **o.** Have the SGB received any type of SGB training?
- **p.** How is the involvement of parents at your school?
- **q.** Were you involved in the DDSP project? If not, were you aware of the DDSP activities? How were you aware? Can you tell me a bit about this?

## Provincial / District Official

I understand you are and official in the District office / Province

- **a.** When did you start working as a district / provincial official? How long have you been working in education?
- **b.** How many section 20 or 21 Schools do you have in your district / province? (Ask for a list if available)
- **c.** How many schools do you have in each of the quintiles? (1: poorest, 5: least poor) (Ask for a list if available).
- **d.** Tell me about the functioning of the SGBs in your District / Province? What are they supposed to do? What do they do? (Probe – ask about involvement in School self-evaluation, Strategic planning, School improvement plan, school development plan, setting budgets, fundraising, recommending appointments, setting the extra-curricular curriculum)
- **e.** How is your office involved in school governance, and how well is it doing? (Probe: Preparing for and supporting election time, with regards to SGB training, monitoring school governance)
- **f.** Were you involved in the DDSP project? If not, were you aware of the DDSP activities? How were you aware? Can you tell me a bit about this?
2. From your description, it sounds like your role in the initiative could be best described as [Provide Name from Column 1 in the table below], because you did [Provide description from table column 2] Do you agree? (Mark in table, if confirmed, and add any comments).

3. Did you hold any other roles in the DDSP during the implementation period? (Mark table, add comments)

4. You mentioned that you were not involved. Were you aware of this DDSP activities\textsuperscript{57} taking place? (If yes, skip to Q5. If no, skip to Initiative Background)

5. You say you were aware of these activities. Can you explain how you were aware? For example, were you consulted or informed about these activities or their outcome? Can you tell me a bit about this? (Mark table if applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in *the initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mark with x if yes. Write which was main role</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>Provided resources for the initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Provided oversight and control on the initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementer</td>
<td>Conducted the initiative activities – either a grantee or contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted with Implementation</td>
<td>Provided support for the implementation of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted</td>
<td>Those whose opinions are sought; and with whom there is two-way communication.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed</td>
<td>Those who are kept up-to-date on progress; and with whom there is one-way communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>Not directly involved with the programme activities, but was aware of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detractor</td>
<td>Shows resistance to the [outcome] or its aims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Activities were directed at this person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{57} The person may not know the project or programme name, but may remember the activities that were implemented.
6. Has your role changed over time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role during DDSP (Use choice from Section 1)</th>
<th>Role now (specify if and how related to the idea, activity, outcome or resource)</th>
<th>Describe change and reason for change. (If appropriate, ask about link to outcome or involvement in the USAID intervention)</th>
<th>Probing to understand their role and relationships to other key stakeholders) (DRAW ON MAP) Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You as a professional</td>
<td>(eg. Teacher)</td>
<td>(eg. Principal)</td>
<td>(e.g. got trained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization you represented then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization you represent now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Activities & Resources**

We are interested in finding out if any of the activities or resources introduced by the DDSP for SGBs has been sustained. The DDSP had the following SGB related activities and resources. Which of the activities are still taking place? (Tick and provide a short comment)

| DDSP Activity 1 | Center for Policy and Development (CEPD) supported **election preparations for SGBs** by assisting in the preparation of documents, advocacy programs, and databases. For the advocacy program, CEPD developed illustrative materials in local languages trained master trainers and trained district officials.  
**Resource 1: SGB Advocacy program materials in local languages and for non-literate parents**  
**Resource 2: SGB Database for provinces to capture details for new SGB** | 1. Is it still around? | a) Yes, continuing as in the project | b) Continuing as in the project, taken over by someone else. Specify who: | c) Changed into something else. Specify what, Specify who | d) No. Specify why it ended |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk about beneficiaries and detractors</td>
<td>a) Who is benefitting from these activities?</td>
<td>b) Who sees these activities as important or useful?</td>
<td>c) Anyone who does not provide support / prevents?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anything else that contributes to it being sustained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DDSP Activity 2 | Trained SGBs on school development planning, roles and responsibilities of SGB, school policy, school financial management, effective meetings and conflict resolution  
**Resource: SGB Training Material for SGBs** | 1. Is it still around? | a) Yes, continuing as in the project | b) Continuing as in the project, taken over by someone else. Specify who: | c) Changed into something else. Specify what, Specify who | d) No. Specify why it ended |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

---

58 In Kimberley, the design for the SGB training program took into consideration the need to be accessible to semiliterate SGB members from farm schools. An important aspect of this work in Kimberley was a two-day continuity workshop to ensure a smooth transition between one SGB and the next.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DDSP Activity 3</th>
<th>Provided capacity building programs for district officials to better support SBGs</th>
<th>Resource SGB Training material for District Officials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is it still around?</td>
<td>a) Yes, continuing as in the project</td>
<td>b) Continuing as in the project, taken over by someone else. Specify who:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk about beneficiaries and detractors</td>
<td>a) Who is benefiting from these activities?</td>
<td>b) Who sees these activities as important or useful / valuable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anything else that contributes to it being sustained?</td>
<td>c) Anyone who does not provide support / prevents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Activity</td>
<td>All provinces: Trained SGB members through cluster training and school support visits from Education Management and Governance Development (EMGD) specialists and trainers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Is it still around?</td>
<td>a) Yes, continuing as in the project</td>
<td>b) Continuing as in the project, taken over by someone else. Specify who:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk about beneficiaries and detractors</td>
<td>a) Who is benefiting from these activities?</td>
<td>b) Who sees these activities as important or useful / valuable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anything else that contributes to it being sustained?</td>
<td>c) Anyone who does not provide support / prevents?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

59. **Northern Cape**: cluster training comprised 2 sets of modules for different cohorts. The first set included transitional matters between old and new SGBs, roles and responsibilities, and school development planning. The second set addressed roles and responsibilities, HIV policymaking and action planning, school development planning, budgeting and fundraising, and school financial management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Talk about beneficiaries and detractors</th>
<th>a) Who is benefitting from these activities?</th>
<th>b) Who sees these activities as important or useful / valuable?</th>
<th>c) Anyone who does not provide support / prevents?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Anything else that contributes to it being sustained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activities not mentioned?</td>
<td>1. Is it still around?</td>
<td>a) Yes, continuing as in the project</td>
<td>b) Continuing as in the project, taken over by someone else. Specify who:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Talk about beneficiaries and detractors</td>
<td>a) Who is benefitting from these activities?</td>
<td>b) Who sees these activities as important or useful / valuable?</td>
<td>c) Anyone who does not provide support / prevents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anything else that contributes to it being sustained?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcomes

1. Tell me about the need for supporting SGBs. (Then and now)
2. Does support for SGBs still exist? Describe what this looks like now.
3. Who is responsible for this support to SGBs
4. Who holds this organisation/group accountable for this [outcome]?
5. What is the link between support to SGBs and learner achievement? (Probe: How does this contribute to the student obtaining better grades, getting a better education?)
At the time of the DDSP, there were a few indicators used to track success. Let’s go through the list, determine if they are still relevant and talk about your organizations’ performance on these indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DDSP Indicator</th>
<th>9 Still Relevant?</th>
<th>9a) If relevant, how is your organization performing on these?</th>
<th>9b) If no, why are these indicators not relevant anymore?</th>
<th>9c) If there are alternative indicators that relate to the [outcome], what are they and how is your organization performing on them? (Ask for copy of results or where we can obtain them)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Increase in the number of Section 21 Schools</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Existence and evidence of democratically elected SGBs</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Increase in the percent of women serving on SGBs</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Increase in the number of SGBs / schools that fully meet the policy documentation requirements of SASA</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Increase in the number of SGBs schools which show evidence of applying SASA policies</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Percentage of schools that have audited of examined budgets</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Percentage of schools that maintain Bank accounts</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Percentage of schools with approved annual budgets</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Increase in the number of DO SGB support visits</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Increase in the number of training days provided and or coordinated by DO to SGBs (SGB training days)</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Increase in the customer satisfaction score on DO performance</td>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>Worse, Same, Better, I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships

1. Let's look at the Focused Systems Map. [Show Focused Map]. Would you change anything on this map to make it more accurate as it was then? For example, are there any actors not shown? Tell me about the roles and relationships? E.g. which actors were more influential than others? How did those relationships support enhancing school governance? (Change map as needed to reflect how it was). Be sure we understand clearly how it worked.

2. Let's Look again at the Focused Map. Considering now in 2016, who are the major actors who ensure that school governance is working? In other words, how have roles and relationships changed, if at all?

3. How did DDSP activities contribute to these relationships (Probe: Strengthen, weaken, change communication structure, changed power structure, changed accountability structure, brought in new actors?)

Context Mapping

This is our last section, and I am trying to understand what else was happening between DDPS and now that influenced what we have been talking about.

1. Are there events that were particularly important?

2. What significant changes have taken place since the DDSP project ended? e.g. social, political, infrastructure, leadership change, natural/ environmental events.

Conclusion of Interview

Thank you for your time. This concludes the interview. We are going to use the information that you provided to us, to try and understand how an outcome, activity or idea can be sustained. Before I go,

1. Do you have anything else you would like to add, or you think we should know before we leave?

2. Who else do you think I should talk to that can provide a different viewpoint?

3. Do you have any questions for me?

TO BE COMPLETED BY INTERVIEWER

1. Sex of respondent Female Male Other / Do not know
2. Living in country of project Yes No Not sure / Do not know
3. Role changed Yes No Not clear/ Do not know
ANNEX E: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name of Organization / School</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION INTERVIEWS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Ndlebe</td>
<td>Department of Basic Education - National</td>
<td>Director: Education Management Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Department (EMGD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jo (Mothei) Mpuang</td>
<td>Provincial Department of Education</td>
<td>Project Manager of DDSP at the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr T Pharasi</td>
<td>Provincial Department of Education</td>
<td>HOD DOE NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr Mckenzie</td>
<td>Frances Baard District Office</td>
<td>Circuit manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr Daniels</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy chief education specialist (DCES), School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management and governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DDSP Implementing Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Melinda Taylor</td>
<td>RTI, COP under IEP</td>
<td>Key Contractor M&amp;E of DDSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meredith Fox</td>
<td>USAID/Southern Africa Office</td>
<td>Education &amp; Youth Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Martin Prew</td>
<td>Link Community Development Lead</td>
<td>Head – implementer of Kimberley Thusanang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jennifer Bisgard</td>
<td>Khulisa Management Services</td>
<td>Key Contractor M&amp;E of DDSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kedi Mokgwanbone</td>
<td>Previously part of Link Community</td>
<td>DDSP Trainer On Link Community Development Team,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Team</td>
<td>Now a subject advisor for ECD in NC DBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mary Metcalfe</td>
<td>The Programme to Improve Learner Outcomes</td>
<td>Head - PILO Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PILO) Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Francis Baard DDSP Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Isaac Ruiters</td>
<td>Nazareth Primary School (no longer</td>
<td>Former Principal of Nazareth Primary, current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>operational)</td>
<td>Principal at Montshiwa Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr Langeveld</td>
<td>GN Pressly Intermediate School</td>
<td>Retired Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr Terence Langeveld</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mrs Orion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (not on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mrs Emily Kasper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr Oliphant</td>
<td>Francis Mohapanele Primary School</td>
<td>Current Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr. LO Tshekoeng</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr B Maruping (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mrs K. Motshabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGB Chair (current parent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lebogang Thomelang</td>
<td>Mosalakae Public Primary School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mrs Jammer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mrs Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>J Ndlovu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M Ngwenza</td>
<td>Reakantswe Intermediate School</td>
<td>Current Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr Job</td>
<td></td>
<td>HOD (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr Rolibokae</td>
<td>Rolihlahla Primary School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ms Poss</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (not on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ms Mavis Mokolo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (not on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lorraine Lencwe</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mrs Sononahi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Leviet Kok</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Russell Pitchers</td>
<td>LaerSkool Warrenton</td>
<td>Current Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ina Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lynette Pitchers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mr Mokola</td>
<td>Warrenton PPS</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Geraldine Boikano</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Christo Makgari</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Drienie Le Roux</td>
<td>Pniel Landgoed Primary School</td>
<td>Current Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Francis Woolsen</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Secretary (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Rainy Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (was on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>JS Nel</td>
<td>Andalusia Primary School</td>
<td>Former Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mercia louw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (currently &amp; was previously on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Magda Brand</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Matilda Joubert</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mrs Thabethe</td>
<td>Jan Kempdorp Primary School</td>
<td>Current Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Unice Thatane</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mrs Sebogodi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mrs Comfort Secwalo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (not on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Elmien Nel</td>
<td>Hartsvaal Primary School</td>
<td>Acting Principal (was Principal of Tirisano a DDSP school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Esther (Nana) Dikano</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (not on SGB was at Tirisano a DDSP school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Daniel Depone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (currently on SGB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mrs Diane Thole</td>
<td></td>
<td>Educator (not on SGB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX F: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED


Official Notice 14 of 2014, Gazette No. 1860, Northern Cape Province, 3 December.


USAID’s Local Systems: A Framework for Supporting Sustained Development (April 2014)

ANNEX G: CASE STUDY TEAM MEMBER PROFILES

Benita Williams, Case Study Lead (South Africa)

Ms. Benita Williams has designed, implemented and managed evaluations in the sectors of Education, Youth Development, Income Generation and Health initiatives in Southern Africa for corporate donors, government departments and community based NGOs. She has experience in the sophisticated qualitative and statistical analysis of education data, Voluntary Counselling and Testing (VCT) / health behavior survey data, skills-audit data, diagnostic organizational audit data and project data from global monitoring databases.

Ms. Williams has academic training in the field of Research Psychology (University of Pretoria) and at Masters level. In August 2009, she completed a three- year term as treasurer for the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA) and in July 2010 completed a term as Executive Board member and secretary for the African Evaluation Association (AfEA).

Fazeela Hoosen, Case Study Research Specialist (South Africa)

Ms. Fazeela Hoosen has experience in undertaking evaluations (utilization focused) in the education sector that includes all aspects of the evaluation process. Her data collection skills include both quantitative and qualitative methods, ranging from undertaking surveys, focus groups, key informant interviews, and telephonic interviews, which range across education, health and development focused research and evaluation projects. She has undertaken and assisted in the design of quasi experimental control group designs to monitor learner results in ICT education programs within schools.

Ms. Hoosen has recently been appointed for a three-year term on the Board of Directors of the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association. She has a Post Graduate Diploma in Monitoring and Evaluation from the University of Stellenbosch and a Masters in Human Geography from the University of Witwatersrand.

Dr. Gabrielle Kelly, Case Study Research Specialist (South Africa)

Ms. Gabrielle Kelly is a post-doctoral researcher and evaluator with experience in both qualitative and quantitative research design, data-collection methods, and technical analysis. She has five years of experience in evaluating the impact of grant-making and corporate social investment in the fields of health and education. She also has a strong interest in children’s rights, and has evaluated programs for orphans and vulnerable children.

Ms. Kelly has a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Cape Town and a Masters in Social Science Methods from Stellenbosch University (South Africa).

Dr. Amelia Kleijn, Case Study Research Specialist (South Africa)

Dr Kleijn is an experienced programme developer, assessor and evaluator. Her professional practice includes interventions with schools, donor-funded development projects that respond to gender-based violence; sexual offending and child abuse; orphans and vulnerable children; HIV/AIDS; cranio-facial abnormalities; and rendering de-briefing, psychosocial, emotional, administrative and educational services to children and adults as well as researchers and professionals.

Dr. Kleijn is a Member of the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association and has a PhD in Philosophy from the University of the Witwatersrand.
**Patricia Sullivan**, Case Study Education Specialist (South Africa)

Ms. Patricia Sullivan has spent a large part of her working life assisting South African provincial and national departments of education and higher institutes of education to set up systems, structures, procedures and courses that have affected change either through large Organizational Development interventions, or through the introduction of innovative courses, or through discrete consulting activities. Ms. Sullivan's experience in conceptualizing interventions, designing and writing materials for new curricula, establishing non-government organizations and overseeing financial, administrative and educational work places her well to advise and support many different types of programs and structures.

Ms. Sullivan has Masters of Management in Human Resources, from the University of the Witwatersrand Johannesburg and Certificate in Education from Southampton University in the United Kingdom.

**Dr. Vanessa Scherman**, Case Study Education Specialist (South Africa)

Dr. Vanessa Scherman specializes and teaches in the areas of research methodology, child development, teaching and learning, theories and methods of education, psychometry, and program evaluation. She is an experienced education researcher, with experience on research initiatives such as the Third International Mathematics and Science Study, Quality Learning Project, Department of Labor Investigation of the Labor Market, Survey of Science and Technology Centers, and Link Community Development Project.

Dr. Scherman has authored and co-authored more than 20 background papers for distinguished conferences around the world, including the Association for the Study of Evaluation in Education in Southern Africa and American Psychological Association Annual Convention. She received her PhD in Assessment and Quality Assurance from the University of Pretoria, from which she also holds a Masters in Research Psychology.