

6. APPENDIX

A. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

1. Key Informant Interview Questions

1. Why was the program established?
2. What was happening in AVAC at the time?
3. What was happening in the wider sector?
4. Who were the other players?
5. Who funded it?
6. Who were the other partners?
7. What were the ambitions of the program?
8. How have you measured success?
9. How have you undertaken changes/what prompted adaptation?
10. What have the successes been?
11. What have the greatest challenges been?
12. What does the future look like?
13. What growth is there potential for?

2. In-Depth Interview Guides

a) In-depth Interview Guide – Fellows

1. Why did you apply for the fellowship?
2. What were your expectations of the alumni?
3. What were the highlights of the fellowship?
4. What was your personal success?
5. What did your project achieve?
6. What was the greatest challenge of your fellowship?
7. What skills did you gain through the fellowship?
8. How have these skills helped you in your personal and professional life?
9. Did you have an advocacy network on entering the fellowship?
10. Did the fellowship help build this network?
11. Have you continued to grow this network after fellowship?
12. Do you have an ongoing relationship with AVAC or host organisation?
13. What do you think your project contributed to your host organisation?
14. Are you currently working in advocacy? How are you continuing to influence and contribute to the advocacy landscape in your organisation/community/at a national level?
15. Did your project have an impact in the community in which you worked and how?
16. Did your project result in change at a national level if so what?
17. Do you think the fellowship programme is relevant in your context?
18. What changes would you like to see in the fellowship programme or support for Alumni?

b) In-depth Interview Guide – Host

1. What benefit is there to your organisation to host an AVAC fellow?
2. What is the greatest challenge to this arrangement for your organisation?

3. What have been the successes of hosting a fellow for the organisation
4. What challenges have fellows faced in their fellowship
5. What successes have the fellows had in their fellowship
6. What skills do you believe fellows gain through the fellowship?
7. Have you ever employed an AVAC fellow outside of the fellowship year?
8. Did the project that the fellow do, fit in with the organisation's objectives
9. Did the fellows project change or influence the organisation?
10. Did the fellows project have an impact in the community in which they worked and how?
11. Did the fellows project contribute to changes of policy or approach at a national level? How did the fellows work contribute to any later changes?
12. Do you think the fellowship programme is relevant in your context?
13. What changes would you like to see in the fellowship programme

3. Online Surveys

a) Fellows/Alumni Survey

AVAC Fellows Program Evaluation - Fellows & Alumni

Welcome and thank for your interest in this evaluation.

This survey is being conducted by Tayler Associates Ltd, to learn about individuals who participated in AVAC's Advocacy Fellowship Program between 2009 and 2020. This survey is part of an evaluation commissioned by AVAC and will give us information about the fellowship experience, the advocacy work of alumni since their fellowship and the impact on HIV prevention. This will help AVAC in planning for the future and celebrating a decade of the Fellowship program.

At the end of the survey you will be asked to opt into a longer in-depth interview with one of our team. This is voluntary and if you opt in a member of the team will contact you to arrange a suitable time for a video call.

You are receiving this survey because you are listed in the AVAC database as a former Fellow.

We estimate that it will take approximately 35 minutes to complete the survey.

Participation in the survey is voluntary and nonparticipation will have no impact on you or your organization. You may skip questions on the survey or discontinue participation at any time. There are minimal risks associated with your participation. We take your privacy very seriously and we therefore encourage you to respond candidly about your experiences:

- Your responses to this survey will be protected under the [UK Data Protection Act 2018](#).^[1]
- There is minimal risk of breach of confidentiality, and we have put in place procedures to minimize this risk. All your responses will go directly and only to the evaluation team
- Reports will never identify you by name, and information from the study will only be reported in the aggregate at the program level combined with the other responses.
- We will not store your name or contact details.
- The link to register your interest in being interviewed is completely separate to this survey, so your answers remain anonymous even if you 'opt in'.
- Survey responses will be stored on a secure drive that is only accessible to members on the evaluation team.

- If any survey data files are shared with AVAC at their request, as per the contract, this will only happen after study team members have confirmed the data is free of any information that could help identify participants; this cleaning includes procedures to limit someone from inferring anyone’s identity by analyzing non-identifying data.
- At the conclusion of the study, Tayler Associates Ltd. will destroy all records, electronic or otherwise, that link you to your survey responses.

If you have any questions or concerns about this work, please contact Evaluation Lead, Victoria Tayler, at Victoria@Taylerassociates.co.uk

[1] See "Data Protection Act 2018". UK Government. Accessed 15 April 2020 and "Data Protection Act 2018 Factsheet Overview". UK Government, Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (23 May 2018). Accessed 15 April 2020.

Can you please share some information about yourself?

1. To which gender identity do you identify?

Free text

2. Age;

- a. 18-24,
- b. 25-34,
- c. 35-44,
- d. 45-54,
- e. 55-64
- f. 65 and over.

3. In what year did you start your Fellowship?

- a. 2009
- b. 2010
- c. 2011
- d. 2012
- e. 2013
- f. 2014
- g. 2015
- h. 2016
- i. 2017
- j. 2018
- k. 2019
- l. 2020

4. In which country did you do your fellowship?

- a. Botswana
- b. China
- c. Eswatini
- d. India

- e. Kenya
- f. Lesotho
- g. Malawi
- h. Nigeria
- i. Rwanda
- j. South Africa
- k. Tanzania
- l. Uganda
- m. Zambia
- n. Zimbabwe

Please tell us about the time before your fellowship.

5. What was your highest level of education on entering the fellowship?

- a. Primary School
- b. Some High School
- c. Completed High School
- d. Bachelor's Degree
- e. Master's Degree
- f. Ph.D. or higher
- g. Trade School
- h. Other qualification

6. Were you in paid employment on entering the fellowship?

- a. Yes
- b. No

7. Was the employment in the HIV response?

- a. Yes
- b. No

8. Why did you apply to be an AVAC Fellow? (Check all that apply.)

- a. To work with a specific person or at a specific institution
- b. To collaborate with a foreign partner
- c. To understand what advocacy in my field was like outside of my home country
- d. To access resources for advocacy that I could not find in my home country.
- e. To enhance my skills or knowledge as an advocate
- f. To enhance my resume as a future job candidate
- g. Other (please specify):

Please tell us about your expectations of the Fellowship Program.

9. Please indicate how satisfied you were with various aspects of your fellowship experience:

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
Overall design of Program					
Mentorship & Engagement with AVAC					
Engagement with Host Organization					
Financial Support					
Opportunity to Connect with Other Fellows/Alumni and Other Advocates					
Linkages with Researchers					
Linkages policy-makers and Implementors					
Training and Skills Building					

10. Please tell us more about how your expectations were met in regard to the aspects you found satisfactory

Free text

11. Please tell us more about how your expectations were not met in regard to the aspects you found unsatisfactory.

Free text

12. To what extent did your overall experience of the Fellowship Program align with your expectations?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

13. If you would like to elaborate or comment further on areas of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with your AVAC Fellowship experience, please do so.

Free Text

Please tell us about the skills you developed and the benefits you gained during the Fellowship.

14. To what extent did the Fellowship program and your project increase your skills in the following areas?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Technology Skills					
Presentation Skills					
Grant or Proposal Writing					
Project and Budget Management skills					
Communication Skills					
Networking					
Building Evidence with Community Dialogues					
Writing Reports and Developing Materials					
Developing Policy Briefs					
Analysing Policy					
Influencing Policies and Processes					

Other (please specify)

15. To what extent do you believe that the Fellowship helped you develop personally in the following areas?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Leadership					
Self-confidence					
Independence					
Motivation					
Ambition					
Increased global perspective					
Cultural tolerance/ Multi-cultural view					

Other (please specify)

16. What benefits, in your view, did your host organization gain from hosting you as a Fellow?

Free text

17. What did you gain from your relationship with your AVAC mentor/s?

Free text

Please tell us about the connections you formed during the Fellowship.

18. To what extent did the Fellowship enable you to connect with other individuals/networks working in the prevention field on any level?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Community					
Country					
Regional					
International level					

19. *To what extent do you continue to draw on these connections to support or inform your work?*

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

Please tell us about the challenges you faced during your fellowship.

20. *Did you experience major challenges participating in the Fellows program?*

- Yes
- No

21. *What was the nature of these challenges? Please provide some details about all the challenges that apply to you from the list below.*

CHALLENGE	DESCRIPTION
<i>Lack of Time/Guidance from AVAC</i>	
Lack of Time/Guidance from Host	
Hard to find my place in Civil Society	
Logistical Difficulties	
Barriers or Discomfort based on gender, race/ethnicity, culture, religion, or disability	
Personal Challenges	
Other	

22. To what extent were these challenges managed?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Lack of Time/Guidance from AVAC					
Lack of Time/Guidance from Host					
Hard to find my place in Civil Society					
Logistical Difficulties					
Barriers or Discomfort based on gender, race/ethnicity, culture, religion or disability					
Personal Challenges					
Other					

Please tell us about your project.

23. In which, if any, of the following ways did your project continue to have impact beyond the Fellowship year? (Tick all that apply)

- Added new learning to the field
- Helped inform policy
- Raised awareness
- Helped influence allocation of resources
- Helped reframe an issue
- Helped educate and inform decisionmakers
- Built and/or strengthened CSOs to engage in HIV prevention research
- I have been invited to present at meetings or conferences
- I don't think it had impact beyond the Fellowship year
- None of the above, but it helped influence some other change (Specify)

24. To what extent do you feel your project successfully addressed a gap in HIV prevention implementation, policy, analysis, and/or learning in the field?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

Please tell us about the time since your fellowship.

25. *Since your fellowship have you received any grants, awards or honours based on your work?*

- Yes
- No

26. *Did you pursue further study or professional learning after the Fellowship?*

- Yes
- No

27. *Are you currently in paid employment related to HIV prevention?*

- Yes
- No

28. *Considering the potential influence of your Fellowship experience on your current work, to what extent do you think it has contributed to your:*

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Effectiveness as an advocate					
Ability to develop a professional network					
Technical research					
Writing and presentation skills					

Other (please specify)

29. *Which of the following professional benefits occurred as a result of your participation in the fellowship? (Tick all that apply)*

- My work during the fellowship resulted in an advancement in my career
- I made valuable connections in my country
- I was acknowledged as an advocate in my country and/or globally
- I made important connections with advocates in other countries
- I clarified my life or work goals
- Fellowship participation made me more competitive for jobs I was interested in
- I had new opportunities (conferences, consultancies, grants, jobs, etc)
- My resolve to continue advocacy work was strengthened
- I did not experience any professional benefits
- Other (please specify)

30. *Are you connected with other alumni Fellows either in a professional capacity or collaborating on advocacy work?*

- Yes
- No

31. Post-Fellowship, do you have an ongoing relationship with:

(Tick all that apply)

- AVAC
- Your Host Organization
- Other Fellows

32. How satisfied are you with the level of engagement with AVAC post-fellowship?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

33. How satisfied are you with the level of engagement with your host organisation post-fellowship?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

34. To what extent did you transfer any of the advocacy, knowledge, or skills that you developed during your fellowship to others in any organisation in which you have worked since your fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

35. To what extent did you transfer any of the advocacy knowledge or skills that you developed during your fellowship to others in your community?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

36. To what extent did you influence any strategy or policy at an organisational level during or after your fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

37. To what extent did you influence any strategy or policy at a community level during or after your fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

38. Please describe the contribution your work has made, and the significance it has had, on any prevention-related changes or shifts at your host organisation?

Free text

39. Please describe the contribution your work has made, and the significance it has had, on any prevention-related changes or shifts at any organisation you worked at post-fellowship?

Free Text

40. Please describe the contribution your work has made, and the significance it has had, on any prevention-related changes in the communities in which you work post-fellowship?

Free Text

41. Can you describe how the prevention landscape has changed in your country ?

Free Text

42. Reflecting on these changes in the prevention landscape that you have observed, how do you think you or other Fellows have contributed to these changes?

Free Text

43. Considering the potential influence of your Fellowship experience on your current work, to what extent do you think it has contributed to your:

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Effectiveness as an advocate					
Ability to develop a professional network					
Technical research					
Writing and presentation skills					

Other (please specify)

44. Which of the following professional benefits occurred as a result of your participation in the fellowship? (Tick all that apply)

- My work during the fellowship resulted in an advancement in my career
- I made valuable connections in my country
- I was acknowledged as an advocate in my country and/or globally
- I made important connections with advocates in other countries
- I clarified my life or work goals
- Fellowship participation made me more competitive for jobs I was interested in
- I had new opportunities (conferences, consultancies, grants, jobs, etc)
- My resolve to continue advocacy work was strengthened
- I did not experience any professional benefits
- Other (please specify)

45. Are you connected with other alumni Fellows either in a professional capacity or collaborating on advocacy work?

- Yes
- No

46. Post-Fellowship, do you have an ongoing relationship with: (Tick all that apply)

- AVAC
- Your Host Organization
- Other Fellows

47. How satisfied are you with the level of engagement with AVAC post-fellowship?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

48. How satisfied are you with the level of engagement with your host organisation post-fellowship?

- Very satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

49. To what extent did you transfer any of the advocacy, knowledge, or skills that you developed during your fellowship to others in any organisation in which you have worked since your fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

50. To what extent did you transfer any of the advocacy knowledge or skills that you developed during your fellowship to others in your community?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

51. To what extent did you influence any strategy or policy at an organisational level during or after your fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

52. To what extent did you influence any strategy or policy at a community level during or after your fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

53. Please describe the contribution your work has made, and the significance it has had, on any prevention-related changes or shifts at your host organisation?

Free Text

54. Please describe the contribution your work has made, and the significance it has had, on any prevention-related changes in any organisation in which you work post-fellowship?

Free Text

55. Please describe the contribution your work has made, and the significance it has had, on any prevention-related changes in the communities in which you work post-fellowship?

Free Text

56. Can you describe how the prevention landscape has changed in your country ?

Free Text

57. Reflecting on these changes in the prevention landscape that you have observed, how do you think you or other Fellows have contributed to these changes?

Free text

Please give us your thoughts on the future of the Fellowship Program.

58. In your opinion, are the objectives of the Fellowship program still relevant in supporting or building the HIV prevention advocacy movement?

- Yes
- No

59. What are your recommendations for the future direction of the Fellowship Program based on your experience?

60. Would you be willing to take part in a one-to-one interview with the evaluation team?

- Yes
- No

61. Please follow this link to indicate your availability to be interviewed

[AVAC Evaluation Interview](#)

b) Host Survey

AVAC Fellows Program - Host Organization Survey

Welcome and thank for your interest in this evaluation.

This survey is being conducted by Tayler Associates Ltd, to learn about individuals who participated in AVAC's Advocacy Fellowship Program between 2009 and 2020. This survey is part of an evaluation commissioned by AVAC and will give us information about the fellowship experience, the advocacy work of alumni since their fellowship and the impact on HIV prevention. This will help AVAC in planning for the future and celebrating a decade of the Fellowship program.

At the end of the survey you will be asked to opt into a longer in-depth interview with one of our team. This is voluntary and if you opt in a member of the team will contact you to arrange a suitable time for a video call.

You are receiving this survey because you are listed in the AVAC database as a former Host.

We estimate that it will take approximately 25 minutes to complete the survey.

Participation in the survey is voluntary and nonparticipation will have no impact on you or your organization. You may skip questions on the survey or discontinue participation at any time. There are minimal risks associated with your participation. We take your privacy very seriously and we therefore encourage you to respond candidly about your experiences:

- Your responses to this survey will be protected under the UK Data Protection Act 2018.^[1]
- There is minimal risk of breach of confidentiality, and we have put in place procedures to minimize this risk. All your responses will go directly and only to the evaluation team
- Reports will never identify you by name, and information from the study will only be reported in the aggregate at the program level combined with the other responses.
- We will not store your name or contact details.
- The link to register your interest in being interviewed is completely separate to this survey, so your answers remain anonymous even if you 'opt in'.
- Survey responses will be stored on a secure drive that is only accessible to members on the evaluation team.
- If any survey data files are shared with AVAC at their request, as per the contract, this will only happen after study team members have confirmed the data is free of any information that could help identify participants; this cleaning includes procedures to limit someone from inferring anyone's identity by analyzing non-identifying data.
- At the conclusion of the study, Tayler Associates Ltd. will destroy all records, electronic or otherwise, that link you to your survey responses.

If you have any questions or concerns about this work, please contact Evaluation Lead, Victoria Tayler, at Victoria@Taylerassociates.co.uk

[1] See "Data Protection Act 2018". UK Government. Accessed 15 April 2020 and "Data Protection Act 2018 Factsheet Overview". UK Government, Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (23 May 2018). Accessed 15 April 2020.
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2018/12/contents/enacted>

Please share some information about your organization during the time it hosted a Fellow.

1. How did your organisation become a Host in the AVAC Advocacy Fellowship Program?

- Through a Fellow's Application Process
- AVAC approached us directly
- We approached AVAC directly
- We already had an established relationship with AVAC
- Other (please specify)

2. How many Fellows has your organisation hosted?

Free text

3. Is your organisation currently hosting or involved with hosting Fellows?

- Yes
- No

4. Most recent year in which you interacted with one or more Fellows:

- 2009
- 2010
- 2011
- 2012
- 2013
- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017
- 2018
- 2019
- 2020

5. Please select the primary capacity in which you have interacted with fellows

- Supervisor
- Colleague
- Other (please specify)

6. In which country is your organisation based?

- Botswana
- China
- Eswatini
- India
- Kenya
- Lesotho
- Malawi
- Nigeria
- Rwanda
- South Africa
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

Please tell us about the experience of your organisation.

7. To what extent was hosting an AVAC fellow beneficial to your organisation?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent
- Please explain your answer

8. What elements of the Fellowship program design did you find particularly beneficial to your organisation? Rank in order of importance:

- Duration of Fellowship
- Financial support for Fellowship project
- Interaction/collaboration with AVAC
- Contribution of Fellow to my organization's work
- Networking opportunities with other Fellows
- Networking advocates and Host organizations
- Organizational exposure to HIV prevention research & advocacy

9. Please describe any challenges that you experienced as a host organisation. *Free Text*

10. What benefits, in your view, does/did your organization gain from hosting a Fellow/s? *Free Text*

11. Do you think that the project fellows undertook, contributed to:
(Tick all that apply)?

- The work your organisation does in HIV prevention
- The HIV prevention landscape in the community
- The HIV prevention landscape at a national level
- Raising the profile of your organisation
- Expanded your organization's understanding and/or capacity to engage in HIV prevention advocacy
- Other (please specify)

12. Do you think that the Fellows' project contributed to any of the following? (Tick all that apply)

- Added new learning to the field
- Helped inform policy
- Raised awareness
- Helped influence allocation of resources
- Helped reframe an issue
- Helped educate and inform decisionmakers
- Built and/or strengthened CSOs to engage in HIV prevention research
- Other (Specify)

13. To your knowledge, did the Fellow transfer any learned advocacy knowledge or skills to others in your organisation?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent

Please tell us about the experience of the fellow from your perspective.

14. Did the fellow/s you hosted experience any difficulties during their fellowship? Please describe these challenges.

Free Text

15. Were these challenges resolved adequately?

- Yes
- No

16. Were you (as the organisation) involved in the resolution process?

- Yes
- No

17. In your experience, to what extent do you believe that the Fellowship helped Fellows develop in the following areas?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Leadership					
Self-confidence					
Independence					
Motivation					
Ambition					
Increased global perspective					
Cultural tolerance/ Multi-cultural view					

Other (please specify)

18. In your experience, do you believe that the Fellowship program helped Fellows increase their skills in the following areas?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a moderate extent	To a great extent
Technology Skills					
Presentation Skills					
Grant or Proposal Writing					
Project and Budget Management Skills					
Communication skills					
Networking					
Building Evidence through Community Dialogues					
Writing Reports and Developing Materials					
Developing Policy Briefs					
Analysing Policy					
Influencing Policies and Processes					

Other (please specify)

Please tell us about the HIV landscape in your country.

19. To your knowledge, did the Fellow influence any strategy or policy in your organisation during or after their fellowship?

- Not at all
- To a small extent
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a great extent
- To a very great extent
- Please explain how

20. *Can you describe how the prevention landscape in your country has changed?*

Free Text

21. *How have the fellows contributed to these changes?*

Free Text

Please share your recommendations for the Fellows Program.

22. *In your opinion, are the objectives of the Fellowship program, as you understand them, still relevant in supporting or building the HIV prevention advocacy movement?*

- Yes
- No

23. *What are your recommendations for the future direction of the Fellowship Program based on your experience (e.g.: objectives, scope, format, etc.)?*

Free Text

24. *Would you be willing to take part in a one to one interview with the evaluation team?*

- Yes
- No

25. *Please follow this link to indicate your availability to be interviewed.*

[AVAC Evaluation Interview](#)

B. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND QUESTIONS

1. Evaluation Design

A NOTE ON EVALUATION DESIGN

During the inception stage of the evaluation the global COVID-19 pandemic created significant obstacles to the implementation of the original methodology, which was based on a mixed methods approach, including two in-country visits. The original methodology, set out in the TOR, had to be modified to remove these field visits and any group meetings in order to ensure the safety of all those involved. All evaluation activity is now taking place virtually, through online and telephonic meetings, interviews and analysis. This has meant sacrificing the elements of visual storytelling, as well as, developing a ‘Wave Approach’ to the data collection.

The Wave Approach was specifically designed to respond to uncertainty caused by the pandemic and, in particular, a lack of information regarding respondents’ ability to participate in the face of isolation. By collecting the data in ‘waves’ and creating opportunities to review the situation after each wave is complete, the evaluators are able to consider and revise the evaluation strategy at multiple junctures. The waves are segmented by the delivery of specific outputs:

- Wave 1: Includes all inception activity and is completed upon delivery of the inception report
- Wave 2: Includes administering the online survey
- Wave 3: Includes the delivery of the online Focus Group Discussion

This design allows AVAC and the evaluators the ability to change direction or delay elements of the evaluation if global events change or create barriers to participation.

a) Risks and Limitations

Risks:

The evaluators recognize that the evaluation had a number of risks during the inception stage, particularly at this globally uncertain time. The risks are outlined in the table below alongside the mitigation approach taken.

TYPE OF RISK	DESCRIPTION	MITIGATION
CONTEXTUAL		
Covid-19	<p>The single greatest risk to the evaluation is the current global pandemic. It had already affected the original evaluation plan by preventing overseas travel and face-to-face interviews.</p> <p>The ongoing impact on the AVAC team, alumni, stakeholders, evaluators and the wider community was largely unknown when designing the evaluation. Illness and ongoing lockdown impacted individual’s ability to participate in the evaluation and resulted in delays.</p>	<p>All evaluation activity took place virtually, through online and telephonic meetings, interviews and analysis.</p> <p>Additionally, the ‘Wave’ approach to the evaluation which allowed opportunities to review and revise the strategy at set intervals following the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● inception report ● online survey ● key informant interviews ● and before the final report is written <p>allowed for modification as in shifting from four to two FGD and from focusing</p>

	<p>One scheduled in-depth interview didn't go ahead due to COVID infection and the evaluators believe the low response rate in Malawi was as a result of focus being on other matters possibly Covid -19, however they have no evidence and COVID-19 may have been one of many possible reasons for the low response rate in Malawi.</p>	<p>on Malawi to South Africa where engagement was higher.</p>
Methodological		
Participatory approach	<p>Utilizing a participatory approach is not without challenges, limitations and criticisms. It is particularly time-consuming and is also susceptible to the priorities of power dynamics as the evaluators attempt to determine the weight of suggestions and different voices.</p>	<p>The evaluation team was aware of this limitation and although they are unable to guarantee against it, the external and independent nature of the contract allowed them to challenge the views of any participants or reviewers and to triangulate data wherever possible.</p>
Process		
Labor-intensive and time-consuming approach for evaluation team	<p>The virtual approach represented a significant growth in effort from the evaluators. The focal countries doubled, and the number of interviews ballooned beyond the initial estimates. The target for in-depth interviews was 15 interviews and 23 were conducted.</p>	<p>This undoubtedly led to delays and a significant increase in the level of effort required from the evaluators originally estimated at 60 days increased to 120 days.</p>
Technological limitations – internet connectivity	<p>The online nature of the evaluation meant that access to an internet connection was required to complete the survey and participate in the interviews. This may not have been feasible for some participants particularly those in lockdown who may not have had internet connections at home or money for data during this financially stressful time. This may have impacted response rates. Although the evaluators have no evidence of this AVAC were surprised at what they perceived to be low response rates (48% alumni, 45% hosts) this may have been an effect of connectivity issues. Two interviews had to be suspended part way through and moved to email as the connection was too unstable. 38 interviews were scheduled but only 23 took place in all of these instances the respondent didn't attend the scheduled time and no reason was given, but connectivity or perhaps scheduling conflicts may account for this. This represents a 40% non-attendance rate</p>	<p>AVAC provided valuable support to the evaluation team to set up interviews and particularly when setting up interviews with external stakeholders, for whom it was more appropriate to interview rather than engage within a focus group discussion. The evaluators followed up all missed interviews and attempted to reschedule which brought the original non-attendance rate down from 50% to 40%.</p>

Limitations:

All evaluations have limitations regarding both methodology and findings and the evaluators have identified a number of limitations pertinent to this evaluation.

Type of Risk	Description	Mitigation
<p>Methodological</p> <p>Majority of perspectives weighted towards Fellows' perceptions</p>	<p>Program participants are a valuable source of information for understanding the outcomes of programs. However, the validity of the participants' claims is reinforced when other sources of information are available to corroborate the findings. For instance, a participant might report an outcome about increased visibility of their work or their organization. If this outcome is corroborated by media coverage and documented speaking engagements, then the impact of the finding is significantly strengthened.</p> <p>Unfortunately, triangulating every claim of participants, their supervisors and AVAC staff is time-consuming and labor-intensive. The capacity of the evaluation team to do this kind of systematic, widescale triangulation on every claim, particularly as the survey and interview numbers grew, was limited and beyond the scope of the existing contract.</p>	<p>The use of case studies for a discrete set of countries is intended to mitigate this, by enabling the evaluation to dig deeper and, more broadly, to assess contribution to specific policy outcomes in target countries by looking for independent corroboration.</p>
<p>Attribution of impact</p>	<p>There are methodological challenges in attributing impact at a personal, community or societal level to the program. Proving attribution over contribution is limited. Attribution involves drawing causal links and explanatory conclusions between observed changes and specific interventions. If we wish to draw conclusions about the value of the program and make decisions about its future direction, we are expected to demonstrate that the program contributed to the attainment of particular outcomes.</p> <p>These links could be relatively easy to establish at an output level. It is much more difficult to attribute impact at higher levels (program, agency, sectoral or national outcomes), or in complex systems. Determining whether an outcome was caused by a particular program, partner programs, other donor activities, or societal change, is difficult to substantiate.</p>	<p>During the course of the evaluation it became clear proving attribution at the level of the individual fellow who participated in the project was possible however attribution to change in policy/organizational changes and service delivery changes could not be accurately attributed to the effort of the program. However, the use of case studies for a discrete set of countries is intended to mitigate this, by enabling the evaluation to dig deeper and more broadly to assess contribution to specific policy outcomes in the four target countries.</p>
<p>Attribution of the fellowship program to improve capacity</p>	<p>There are significant conceptual constraints associated with the expectation that the Fellowship on its own would have a sustainable impact on the</p>	<p>During the course of the evaluation it became clear proving attribution at the level of the individual fellow</p>

<p>or performance of the Fellow¹</p>	<p>wider system. A change in performance is commonly based on multiple interventions of which ‘people development’ is only one of the elements.</p> <p>Similarly, there is no conceptual basis to expect that an individual alone would influence the performance of a complex system in the absence of contributing factors, such as: appropriate technology, resources, leadership, favorable internal and external conditions and an enabling political and ideological environment.</p>	<p>who participated in the project was possible however attribution to change in policy/organizational changes and service delivery changes could not be accurately attributed to the effort of the program. However, the use of case studies for a discrete set of countries is intended to mitigate this, by enabling the evaluation to dig deeper and more broadly to assess contribution to specific policy outcomes in the four target countries.</p>
<p>The retrospective nature of the evaluation</p>	<p>This is a 10-year-old program and, as such, some of the respondents are 9 years away from the experience, while others completed the Fellowship recently. This will affect their recall, as well as the amount of time available for changes to have occurred and be recognized and articulated.</p>	<p>Evaluators maintained an awareness of the situation and accounted for these differences in the actual assessment.</p> <p>Evaluators tailored the survey design and their interviews accordingly, i.e. surveys were carefully worded and written in chronological order in a way that prompted memories and evaluators allowed plenty of time for answering during interviews and used additional questioning as needed for those who are viewing the experience from a distance.</p> <p>Additionally, reported answers were cross-referenced against other respondent’s answers and independent information where possible.</p> <p>Finally, evaluators only assessed long-term outcomes in regard to the experiences of Fellows from the earlier years and avoided attempting to correlate recent Fellow projects’ and broad changes in the national HIV landscape.</p>
<p>Bias</p>	<p>There is a risk that respondents are less frank or biased in their reports as the study has been</p>	<p>The independent nature of the evaluation and the anonymity of</p>

¹ Reinelt, C. Foster, P. and Sullivan, S. “W.K Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Outcomes and Impacts: A Scan of 55 Leadership Evaluations”. (Battle Creek, MI: WK Kellogg Foundation. 2002). p: 7

	commissioned by AVAC who are a potentially a future funder/collaborator.	respondents was protected and reiterated by the evaluators to ensure that respondents felt able to remain open and truthful in their answers.
Lack of program monitoring data	This is a 10-year program and expectations about monitoring and evaluation have changed over time. No formal baseline data has been collated and therefore rigorous impact data is not available. A formal baseline of the HIV prevention landscape of each country and the fellows is out of scope of this evaluation.	It is impossible to create baseline data retrospectively, however the evaluators were able to access origin data in several ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Via recall of project participants through a series of guided interviews and surveys ● By utilizing case studies on selected countries and Fellows to access specific information ● Using secondary data and project administrative data such as published outcomes, project reports and other AVAC documentation. As well as publicly available reviews and timelines of events.
Process		
Missing opportunistic discussions	In-country visits have the potential to allow discussion with stakeholders and interested parties who may not be readily accessible by phone or email, especially any relevant government officials. They also provide opportunities for ‘chance’ meetings or introductions. Relying on virtual and telephonic interviews eliminates the possibility of debate with people outside of the AVAC mailing list or network. This may result in a one-sided or more simplistic view of the program. This certainly had an impact as evaluators relied heavily on AVAC staff and alumni to direct us to people they identified as key external stakeholders and to offer introductions to these groups.	The use of case studies for a discrete set of countries is intended to mitigate this, by enabling the evaluation to dig deeper and, more broadly, to assess contribution to specific policy outcomes in target countries by looking for independent corroboration
No possibility for visual storytelling	The evaluators had intended to utilize a visual storytelling approach to case studies by including photo essays about particular fellows in the target countries. This more journalistic method will no longer be possible due to restrictions on movement and travel.	As this visual storytelling is another way to gather independent data (like a visual survey), it cannot be replaced with existing images of the program. It is impossible to mitigate this limitation, aside from planning for the possibility of a post-evaluation trip to document selected experiences recorded in the completed report and for AVAC to consider commissioning an addendum to the report that

		includes the additional imagery and data that is collected.
--	--	---

2. Evaluation Methodology

a) Stakeholder Groups

The stakeholders for the evaluation are the individuals and organisations that have an interest in or are affected by the evaluation and/or its results. Stakeholders provide a reality check on the appropriateness and feasibility of the evaluation questions, offer insight on and suggest methods to access the target populations, provide ongoing feedback and recommendations, and help make evaluation results actionable.

Types of Stakeholders	Definition	Examples
Implementers	Those directly involved in the operations of the Fellows Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program director ● Program managers ● Evaluators
AVAC Decision-Makers	Those in a position to do or decide something about the Fellows Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Program director ● Program managers ● AVAC Director ● AVAC Board
Participants	Those being served or affected by the Fellows Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Current Fellows ● Alumni ● Hosts organization
Partners	Those who actively support and/or have invested in the Fellows Program or in the population it serves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Funders ● Host Organisations ● Partner Organisations (eg: MOH, National HIV Prevention Depts, other nonprofits)

b) Participatory Processes

This evaluation is taking a participatory approach to design, data collection and validation:

1. At the **design phase** a small reference group will be convened to review the data collection instruments and the inception report. This group, which will include AVAC representatives, will support the development of the tools and ensure stakeholder oversight into the methodology and approach.
2. During **data collection**, interviews and focus groups will be conducted with a range of stakeholders. By asking survey respondents to 'opt in' for in-depth interviews and approaching a variety of stakeholders (eg: AVAC program managers, alumni and hosts, partner organisations such as National HIV Prevention and Ministry of Health representatives), we intend to capture the views and voices of a range of participants. The FGD's will be used to allow participants to develop ideas emerging from surveys and interviews.
3. The **analysis phase** offers a particularly fruitful opportunity for participation as it involves several stages: collating data, identifying strong patterns in the data around impacts and their causes, and validation of draft conclusions. When using a participatory approach, analysis should involve those to whom the findings will be relevant, allowing it to coincide with the feedback of results. This will be achieved in two ways:

- a. Through an initial presentation of the findings to a group of people with relevant knowledge to examine the evidence compiled by evaluators – in this case, the AVAC staff, evaluators and alumni. This will allow the reference group to validate the findings and interrogate the evaluator’s assumptions.
 - b. As with the Inception Report, the final report will be shared with a group of stakeholders, determined by AVAC, who will provide comment on its contents and offer recommendations.
4. The **dissemination phase** is led by AVAC and will ensure that the report and its recommendations reach the intended audience of:
- a. the fellows and alumni,
 - b. the host organizations of past and present fellows,
 - c. MoH in different countries,
 - d. the various stakeholders that played key roles during the 10 years of the program.
 - e. Donors and key funding organizations such as PEPFAR and The Global Fund and the funder of this programme the Gates Foundation.

It is understood that AVAC will pursue publication of the findings and presentation at one or more of the major HIV conferences

c) Key Data Sources and Sampling Methodology

Key Data Sources	Sampling Methodology
<p>Desk Review Documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sample of Fellowship Programmatic Reports 2010 – 2019: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work plan Development ○ Interim Reports ○ Final Reports ○ Examples of Monthly Reporting ● Sample of AVAC Reports 2018 – 2020 ● Sample of Conference Abstracts prepared by Fellows or Fellowship Staff ● List of Fellows 2010 – 2020 ● Published materials and final deliverables for Fellowships from 2014 – 2019 ● Biographies of all past and current fellows ● Application Documents and Information Packets ● Independent Review Committee TORs and Evaluation Tool ● Survey on Application Process 2013 ● Secondary Data on the four focus countries – this is a combination of publically available information on country specific HIV landscapes (eg: profiles on AVERT), and any information gleaned from reports in each country 	<p>AVAC provided a sample of documents that included some of the work plans, interim reports, and final reports for each of the Fellows from 2012 to 2019. (There is limited documentation available for Fellows that participated from 2010-2011, but what was available was supplied). Included in the sample were some monthly reports from selected Fellows for each year. For the 2019 cohort of Fellows, AVAC included all of the monthly reports to provide a thorough sense of all the issues they are focussing on, given that they are the current outgoing Fellows.</p> <p>All published materials and final deliverables produced by the Fellows are housed on AVAC’s Fellows and Alumni page. AVAC provided a list of fellows that they suggested the reviewers specifically look at (based on who had produced a number of valuable materials during their fellowship that could be used as indicators of the kind of materials fellows generally created). Materials were only available on this site for fellowships after 2014.</p> <p>AVAC provided a sample of conference abstracts and presentations dating from 2010 to 2019. This included materials AVAC produced about the program and materials fellows produced originating from their Fellowship Program. AVAC also provided the evaluators with a sample of the application forms and information packets available to potential Fellows, as well as TORs and an Evaluation Tool used by the Independent Review Committees. Also included</p>

	<p>was a survey on the application process which was done in 2013.</p> <p>Given the volume of material, AVAC sampled a range of documents across the program. The sample was determined entirely by AVAC, who assembled the documents for the evaluation team. The criteria used by AVAC for sampling was based on geography, gender representation, and which of the Fellows in a given year best represented the key biomedical prevention issue of that year. Each characteristic was not necessarily proportionally represented however, making the selection purposive sampling.</p>
Key Informant Interviews	<p>Utilizing convenience and purposive sampling, AVAC provided a list of ten names of current and past staff(6), board members(2) and donors(2) for the KIIs. The evaluators requested interviews and eight of the informants consented (details available in Appendix 1)</p> <p>Respondent Target #: 10</p>
<p>Survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For Alumni ● For Host Organizations 	<p>AVAC have a database of all fellows/alumni and host organizations and the survey will be sent to the entire database. Although the selection is the whole population, the responses will provide a voluntary sample of the selected group since answering is not mandatory.</p> <p>Alumni Respondent Target #: 77 Host Org Respondent Target #: X² (20% Response Rate Expected)</p>
In-depth Video Interviews	<p>The interviews will utilize voluntary sampling as respondents self-select by indicating that they are willing to be interviewed on the survey. AVAC has also provided the evaluators with a list of five fellows whom the evaluators will specifically target. Similarly, AVAC will provide a list of other stakeholders for the evaluators to approach for interviews. Criteria for these lists are unknown but are presumably purposive.</p> <p>Respondent Target #: 15</p>
Focus Group Discussion	<p>The FGD will be based on key developments, successes, failures or themes that emerge in the other data collection activities in each of the four target countries. The evaluators will select 4-6 individuals whom they identify through purposive sampling, as being able to discuss these topics appropriately, based on answers to the surveys and in-depth interviews.</p> <p>Respondent Target #: 5 per group or 20 in total</p>

Please refer to Inception Report, page 24, for more detailed description of Data collection processes.

d) Analysis Methods

² At the time of writing AVAC had not yet provided a list of Host organisations so exact numbers are unknown.

Data Source	Approach	Relevant EQ
Desk Review Documents	Thematic Analysis	EQ 1 and 5
Key Informant Interviews	Thematic Analysis	EQ5 (Note: the KIIs gave evaluators a good foundation for understanding the program as a whole rather than answering all the evaluation questions)
Surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Exploratory Data Analysis (EDA) ● Basic Statistical Analysis ● Thematic Analysis 	Answer all of the Questions
In-Depth Interviews	Thematic Analysis	Answer all of the Questions
Focus Group Discussions	Thematic Analysis	EQ 4 and 5 (FGDs will also be designed to target any information gaps that may be identified for each question)

3. Evaluation Questions

The following table sets out each question and its sub-question and the indicators or responses that the evaluators will use to answer each question.

Evaluation Question 1. What was the Alumni and Host experience of the fellowship?	
Sub-Question 1	How satisfied were Fellows and host organizations with the Fellowship experience?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● % of Fellows and hosts who indicated satisfaction with the fellowship (disaggregated) ● Fellows' feedback concerning their fellowship experience and the attainment of their goals ● Hosts feedback concerning their experience of the fellowship and what it brought to their organization ● Alignment between Fellow's expectations and program goals/plans ● Aspects of the Fellows program design that Fellows found particularly beneficial/not ● Aspects of the Fellows program design that host organizations found particularly beneficial/not
Sub-Question 2	During the period of the Fellowship, what challenges did Fellows and organizations experience, were they addressed, and how?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● % of Fellows who have experienced major challenges participating in the Fellows program or meeting the conditions of Fellowship participation, due to personal or professional challenges or how the program was executed ● Fellows feedback concerning the major difficulties and the cause of difficulties encountered ● Hosts feedback concerning major difficulties and the cause of the difficulties encountered by alumni (as perceived by hosts) ● Hosts feedback concerning the major difficulties and the cause of difficulties encountered by host organizations ● Extent to which the program addressed challenges related to the program

Sub-Question 3	What were the most significant benefits Fellows experienced?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellows feedback on what they felt they gained or benefitted from during their fellowship year • Fellows feedback on what they felt they gained or benefitted from their mentor/s in their fellowship year and how it has impacted their career and advocacy moving forward • Fellows' feedback concerning their project and the skills they built throughout the program • Hosts' feedback concerning their perception of what skills the fellows developed during the program • Fellows feedback on the success of their project in regard to relevance and impact. • Fellows' feedback about the networks they developed through participation in the program
Sub-Question 4	What were the most significant benefits Host organizations experienced?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hosts feedback on what they felt they gained or benefitted from in their fellowship year • Fellows feedback on what they felt the Host organization gained or benefitted from in their fellowship year • Host feedback on their perception of fellow's project contributions at an organizational, community and national level.
Sub-Question 5	What was the contribution of the Fellows' project during and after the Fellowship?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellows' feedback concerning their project • Extent to which Fellows think their project was important (added new learning to the field, helped inform policy, helped influence some other change) • Extent to which the project achieved what it was designed to achieve • Extent to which the project had impact beyond the project year (integrated into other structures; champions trained continued; network developed was supported by others etc.)

Evaluation Question 2. What have been the long-term impacts of the Fellows Program on its alumni?	
Sub-Question 1	What were the most significant professional impacts of the fellowship on the fellow?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions of fellows, supervisors, subordinates and peers concerning acquired knowledge/skills and contribution of fellows following fellowship (with tangible examples of such contributions) • Reports by the fellows on their perceptions of the program's impact on their career • % of fellows who are employed in relevant positions following fellowship • % of fellows who have been assigned duties that reflect utilization of their acquired competencies • Increased propensity of fellows to continue to work in advocacy • Perceptions about what aspects or benefits of the program contributed to professional impacts
Sub-Question 2	How durable have the benefits of the fellowship been? Which aspects of the fellowship continue to be beneficial after the fellowship year? Which have not?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports by the fellows on the extent to which they experienced benefits over time, by types of benefits (disaggregated by Fellow year)
Sub-Question 3	What personal growth/change did alumni experience?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellows reporting personal growth/change as a result of the fellowship (with tangible examples of such contributions)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of fellows who have accessed further opportunities for education and professional development
Sub-Question 4	To what extent has the Fellows program enabled alumni to develop and access a network in the prevention field?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which Fellows report accessing network to support the quality and effectiveness of their work • Extent to which Fellows report network benefits to professional or career opportunities • Fellows reporting engagement in a network following the fellowship (with tangible examples of such contributions) • Extent to which Fellows are networked with other Fellows
Sub-Question 5	To what extent is there an ongoing relationship with your host and/or AVAC? If so, what kind of relationship is it and how has the relationship changed over time?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellows satisfaction with level of engagement with AVAC and/or host post-Fellowship and usefulness of engagement • Fellows reporting regular and recent engagement with host or AVAC • Fellows reporting additional opportunities through host or AVAC after the fellowship was complete

Evaluation Question 3. How has the program enabled alumni to contribute to long-term impacts at the organizational and community levels (both at host organizations and at organizations alumni have worked at post-fellowship)?

Sub-Question 1	To what extent were there significant prevention-related changes or shifts in the organization/community where the Fellow worked?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alumni/Organization/Community reporting shifts • % of host organizations who say they would apply for or would be interested in hosting another Fellow for the anticipated gains to their organizations
Sub-Question 2	To what extent did the alumni contribute to these changes, either during or following their Fellowship? If so, how and in what ways?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which alumni and organization report that alumni contributed in some way to significant/meaningful changes in organization/community, by types of contribution • Alumni who report having actively transferred advocacy knowledge\skills to others at an organization and/or community level • Alumni report influencing strategies/policy at an organization and/or community level • Hosts reporting perceptions of fellowship’s contribution to organizational change
Sub-Question 3	How did the fellowship prepare alumni to make these contributions?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment between skills/benefits alumni and organizations report and those used to contribute to the changes that took place

Evaluation Question 4. What contributions to the HIV prevention landscape have alumni made as a result of their fellowship opportunity?

Sub-Question 1	How has the prevention landscape changed in the country since the fellowship? What have been the big moments/policy shifts in the HIV field in fellows’ countries?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of Fellows, Hosts, AVAC of changes to the wider prevention landscape • Evidence from public sources reporting changes in each country

Sub-Question 2	How have the fellows contributed to these changes both as individuals and groups? What kind of roles have they played? In collaboration with whom? Has their work post-fellowship continued to affect change?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of Fellows and Hosts, in country of Fellows/alumni influencing key outcomes in the prevention landscape • Perception of Fellows, Hosts, AVAC of project having an impact on the prevention [key outcomes in the] landscape • Perception of Fellows of their ongoing work continuing to affect change

Evaluation Question 5. What is the future direction of the fellowship program	
Sub-Question 1	To what extent are the objectives of the program still valid?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents' perceptions of the program's success over time
Sub-Question 2	What are respondents' recommendations, based on their own experiences?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations from respondents
Sub-Question 3	What are the evaluators' recommendations?
Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations from evaluators

C. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

There were a total of 50 interview attendees across 3 separate interview types, Key informant interview. In depth interview and Focus group discussions.

However this represented 43 individuals as some participants participated in more than one type of method. For example 5 participants in the FGD also took part in IDI. Therefore the data below represents the 50 interview attendees not the 43 individuals.

Number of Respondents by Stakeholder Categories and Data Collection Method

Method	Stakeholder Category	Number
Key informant interviews (KII)	Decision Maker	3
	Implementor	4
	Partner	1
In depth interviews (IDI)	Participants:	
	Host	4
	Alumni	14
	Partner	5
Focus Group Discussion (3 FGD)	Decision Maker	1
	Participants:	
	Host	0
	Alumni	15 ³
	Implementors	3

Stakeholder Group by Country for (All forms of quantitative data ⁴)

Country	Decision Maker	Implementor	Partner	Participants
Kenya			2	4
Malawi				3
Nigeria				1
South Africa			1	3
Uganda			2	13
USA	3	6	1	
Zimbabwe				9

³ Five participants in Zimbabwe and Ten in Uganda

⁴ Please note we have not included survey respondents by country to protect anonymity

D. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Evaluation Stage	Key Activity	Date (week commencing)
Inception Stage	Desk Review of key documents	24 February
	Key Informant Interviews with stakeholder/AVAC staff	2 March
	Draft methodology and tools	2 March to 21 May
	Review by Alumni user panel	22 May
	Finalize eval design and methods/tools	12 May -15 June
	Submit an Inception Report/revised draft of the evaluation proposal	9 June
	AVAC to review draft	10 June to 21 June
	Additional revisions	22 June
Data Collection and Analysis Stage	Online survey in the field	16 June to 2 July
	Telephone Interviews	17 June to 17 August
	Analyze and interpret findings; write first draft	3 July to 18 August
	Present Fieldwork Findings to stakeholders	6 August
Synthesis and Reporting Stage	Write the final report	3 July to 19 August
	Submit draft Report for review	20 August
	Review the draft final report Consolidate AVAC comments on the draft report and submit to the evaluator	20-27 August
	Incorporate comments and revise the evaluation report	28 August to 3 September
	Submit the final report	4 September
Dissemination and Follow-up Stage	Final review and approval of report	AVAC responsibility

E. BIBLIOGRAPHY

AVAC, "AVAC 2020 Advocacy Fellows Program Details," Accessed 24 September, 2020, Available at <https://www.avac.org/application-process-background>

AVAC, *2020 Advocacy Fellows Program Information Packet*, August 2019, Available at <https://www.avac.org/resource/advocacy-fellows-program-information-packet>

AVAC, "Fellows & Alumni: Kenya," Accessed: 24 September 2020, Available at https://www.avac.org/fellows/alumni?title=&field_prevention_option_tid=All&field_country_tid=17&field_year_value%5Bvalue%5D%5Byear%5D=

AVAC, "Fellows & Alumni: Malawi," Accessed: 24 September, 2020, Available at https://www.avac.org/fellows/alumni?title=&field_prevention_option_tid=All&field_country_tid=29&field_year_value%5Bvalue%5D%5Byear%5D=

AVAC, "Fellows & Alumni: Uganda," Accessed: 24 September, 2020, Available at https://www.avac.org/fellows/alumni?title=&field_prevention_option_tid=All&field_country_tid=18&field_year_value%5Bvalue%5D%5Byear%5D=

AVAC, "Fellows & Alumni: Zambia," Accessed: 24 September, 2020, Available at https://www.avac.org/fellows/alumni?title=&field_prevention_option_tid=All&field_country_tid=28&field_year_value%5Bvalue%5D%5Byear%5D=

AVAC, "Fellows & Alumni: Zimbabwe," Accessed: 24 September 2020, Available at https://www.avac.org/fellows/alumni?title=&field_prevention_option_tid=All&field_country_tid=20&field_year_value%5Bvalue%5D%5Byear%5D=

AVAC, "Nomfundo Eland," Accessed: 24 September, 2020 Available at <https://www.avac.org/fellow/nomfundo-eland>

AVAC, "Taiwo Oyelakin" Accessed: 24 September, 2020, Available at <https://www.avac.org/fellow/taiwo-oyelakin>

AVAC, "Yvette Raphaelle" Accessed: 24 September, 2020, Available at <https://www.avac.org/fellow/yvette-raphael>

AVAC, "Ongoing and Planned PrEP Open Label, Demonstration and Implementation Projects, Kenya," PrEP Watch, 15 October 2019, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/resource/kenya-prep-studies/>

AVAC, "Ongoing and Planned PrEP Open Label, Demonstration and Implementation Projects, India," PrEP Watch, 26 July 2019, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/resource/india-prep-studies/>

AVAC, "Ongoing and Planned PrEP Open Label, Demonstration and Implementation Projects, South Africa," PrEP Watch, 15 October 2019, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/resource/south-africa-prep-studies/>

AVAC, "PrEP Initiations by Country Worldwide," 3 April, 2020, Available at <https://www.avac.org/infographic/prep-initiations-country-worldwide>

AVAC and Clinton Health Access Initiative, *HIV Prevention Market Manager*, PrEP Watch, January 2017, Available at https://www.prepwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/PMM_project_2pager_jan2017.pdf

Avert, "HIV and Aids in India," 28 January 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/asia-pacific/india>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in Kenya," 25 August 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/kenya>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in Malawi," 25 August 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/malawi>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in Nigeria," 5 August 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/nigeria>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in South Africa," 15 April 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/south-africa>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in Uganda," 15 April 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/uganda>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in Zambia," 15 April 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/zambia>

Avert, "HIV and Aids in Zimbabwe," 24 August 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-around-world/sub-saharan-africa/zimbabwe>

Avert, "Young People, HIV and Aids." 23 April 2020, Available at <https://www.avert.org/professionals/hiv-social-issues/key-affected-populations/young-people>

Michael Bamberger, "Introduction to Mixed Methods in Impact Evaluation," Better Evaluation, August 2012, Available at <https://www.betterevaluation.org/sites/default/files/Mixed%20Methods%20in%20Impact%20Evaluation%20%28English%29.pdf>

Robert O. Brinkerhoff, "The Success Case Method: A Strategic Evaluation Approach to Increasing the Value and Effect on Training," in *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, February 2005, Available at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Robert_Brinkerhoff2/publication/237773207_Training_The_Success_Case_Method_A_Strategic_Evaluation_Approach_to_Increasing_the_Value_and_Effect_of/links/544114170cf2a76a3cc75b6a/Training-The-Success-Case-Method-A-Strategic-Evaluation-Approach-to-Increasing-the-Value-and-Effect-of.pdf

Anthony Butler, "South Africa's HIV/AIDS policy, 1994–2004: How can it be explained?," *African Affairs*, Volume 104, Issue 417, October 2005, Pages 591–614, <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adi036>

CDC, *Developing an Effective Evaluation Report: Setting the Course for Effective Program Evaluation*, (Atlanta, Georgia: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health; Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity and Obesity, 2013), Available at https://www.cdc.gov/EVAL/materials/Developing-An-Effective-Evaluation-Report_TAG508.pdf

Didier Fassin and Helen Schneider, "The politics of AIDS in South Africa: beyond the controversies," in *BMJ*, 1 March, 2003; 326 (7387): 495–497, Available at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1125376/>

Evans Gichuru, Bernadette Kombo, Noni Mumba, Salla Sariola, Eduard J. Sanders, vElise M. van der Elst, "Engaging religious leaders to support HIV prevention and care for gays, bisexual men, and other men who have sex with men in coastal Kenya," in *Critical Public Health* 2018, 28(3): 294-305, Published online 27 April 2018, Available at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5935049/>

Syed Muhammad Sajjad Kabir, "Methods of Data Collection: Basic Guidelines for Research: An Introductory Approach for All Disciplines," in *Basic Guidelines for Research: An Introductory Approach for All Disciplines*, (Chittagong, Bangladesh: Book Zone Publication, 2016) p.201-275, Available at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325846997_METHODS_OF_DATA_COLLECTION

Judith Kallick & Andrea Brown Murga, *Transformational Leaders and Social Change: IFP Impacts in Africa and the Middle East*, Ford Foundation International Fellowships Program Alumni Tracking Study, Report No. 4 (New York, NY: Institute of International Education, 2018, July)

Donald L. Kirkpatrick, *Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels*, (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler; Emeryville, CA: Publishers Group West [distributor], 1994)

Goldie MacDonald, *Framework for program evaluation in public health: A checklist of steps and standards*, 2013, Available at <https://wmich.edu/evaluation/checklists>

Sarah Masyuko, Irene Mukui, Olivia Njathi, et al. "Pre-exposure prophylaxis rollout in a national public sector program: the Kenyan case study," in *Sex Health*, November 2018, 15(6): 578-586, Available at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7206896/>

Shona McCombes, "An introduction to sampling methods," Scribbr, 19 September 2019, Available at <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/sampling-methods/>

T. Morphy "Stakeholder Engagement – Definition and Overview," Stakeholdermap, Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://www.stakeholdermap.com/stakeholder-engagement.html#stakeholder-engagement-approaches>

Abednego Musau, Daniel Were, Eunice Mutsiya, et al., "Innovative demand creation changes in rolling out oral pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in Kenya - the Jilinde experience," (Abstract for poster presented at IAS 2019, Centro Citibanamex, Mexico City, 21-24 July 2019), Available at <http://programme.ias2019.org/Abstract/Abstract/4676>

National Agency for the Control of AIDS (NACA), *Federal Republic of Nigeria: National HIV and AIDS Strategic Framework: 2017-2021*, (Abuja, Nigeria: NACA, 2017) Available at <https://www.childrenandaids.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/NATIONAL-HIV-AND-AIDS-STRATEGIC-FRAMEWORK.pdf>

National AIDS Control Organisation (NACO), *HIV Sentinel Surveillance 2016-17 Technical Brief*, (New Delhi: NACO, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, December 2017), Available at http://naco.gov.in/sites/default/files/HIV%20SENTINEL%20SURVEILLANCE_06_12_2017_0.pdf

National AIDS Control Organization & ICMR-National Institute of Medical Statistics, *HIV Estimations 2017: Technical Report*, (New Delhi: NACO, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, 2018), Available at http://naco.gov.in/sites/default/files/Fact%20Sheets_1.pdf

NASCOP and Kenya Ministry of Health, *Framework for the Implementation of Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis of HIV in Kenya*, (Nairobi, Kenya: NASCOP, 2017), Available at https://www.prepwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Kenya_PrEP_Implementation_Framework.pdf

Roger Pebody, "How did Kenya build Africa's largest PrEP Programme?" AidsMap, 25 January 2019, Available at <https://www.aidsmap.com/news/jan-2019/how-did-kenya-build-africas-largest-prep-programme>

PEPFAR, "Media Release: US Dept of State, Large National Survey Shows Smaller HIV Epidemic in Nigeria Than Once Thought and Highlights Key Gaps Toward Reaching HIV Epidemic Control," US Department of State, March 14, 2019, Available at <https://www.state.gov/large-national-survey-shows-smaller-hiv-epidemic-in-nigeria-than-once-thought-and-highlights-key-gaps-toward-reaching-hiv-epidemic-control/>

PEPFAR, *People's COP20 Kenya Community Priorities: PEPFAR Country Operational Plan 2020*, Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at - <https://healthgap.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Peoples-COP20-Kenya.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Kenya Country Operational Plan 2020: Strategic Direction Summary*, 24 July 2020, Available at <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Kenya-COP20-SDS-Final.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Malawi Country Operational Plan COP 2019: Strategic Direction Summary*, 18 April 2019, Available at https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Malawi_COP19-Strategic-Directional-Summary_public.pdf

PEPFAR, *Malawi Country Operational Plan 2020: Strategic Direction Summary*, 27 March 2020, Available at <https://copsdata.amfar.org/SDS/2020/Malawi.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Nigeria Country Operational Plan (COP) 2020 Strategic Direction Summary*, March 18, 2020, Available at <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/COP-2020-Nigeria-SDS-Final-.pdf>

PEPFAR, *People's COP20 South Africa Community Priority Recommendations: PEPFAR Country Operational Plan 2020*, Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://healthgap.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Peoples-COP20-South-Africa.pdf>

PEPFAR, *South Africa Country Operational Plan (COP/ROP) 2020: Strategic Direction Summary*, 5 March 2020, Available at <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/COP-2020-South-Africa-SDS-FINAL.pdf>

PEPFAR, *The Peoples Voice Uganda Community Priorities: PEPFAR Country Operational Plan 2020*, Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://healthgap.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Peoples-Voice-Uganda-COP20.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Sustainability Index and Dashboard Summary: Zambia 2019*, Accessed: 24 September 2020, Available at <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/Zambia-SID-2019.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Zambia Country Operational Plan (COP) 2020: Strategic Direction Summary*, 16 March, 2020, Available at <https://copsdata.amfar.org/SDS/2020/Zambia.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Community COP20 Zimbabwe: Community Priorities PEPFAR Country Operational Plan 2020*, Health GAP, Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://healthgap.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Zimbabwe-Community-COP20.pdf>

PEPFAR, *Zimbabwe Country Operational Plan (COP) 2020: Strategic Direction Summary, March 2020*, Available at <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/COP-2020-Zimbabwe-SDS-FINAL-with-Appendix-C.pdf>

PrEP Watch, "Kenya," 9 July 2020, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/country/kenya/>

PrEP Watch, "Malawi," 9 July 2020, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/country/malawi/>

PrEP Watch, "Nigeria," 3 April 2020, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/country/nigeria/>

PrEP Watch, "Uganda" 9 July 2020, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/country/uganda/>

PrEP Watch, "Zimbabwe," 14 July 2020, Available at <https://www.prepwatch.org/country/zimbabwe/>

Wellington Radu and Sandra Banjac, *WRITING IT RIGHT: An Analysis of Zambian Media Coverage of Health Issues*. Media Monitoring Africa, 2012, Available at https://www.mediamonitoringafrika.org/images/uploads/Writing_It_Right_Final_Report.pdf

Republic of Kenya, "Jipende JiPrep," Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://prep.nascop.org/>

Sushena Reza-Paul, Lisa Lazarus, Raviprakash Maiya, et al. "The Ashodaya PrEP project: Lessons and implications for scaling up PrEP from a community-led demonstration project among female sex workers in Mysore, India," *Global Public Health*, 15:6, 889-904, 18 February 2020, Available at DOI: [10.1080/17441692.2020.1724316](https://doi.org/10.1080/17441692.2020.1724316)

Steven Robins, "COVID-19: South Africa should build on HIV activism to foster behaviour change," *The Conversation*, 15 July 2020, Available at <https://theconversation.com/covid-19-south-africa-should-build-on-hiv-activism-to-foster-behaviour-change-142091>

Steven Robins, *From Revolution to Rights in South Africa: Social Movements, NGOs and Popular Politics After Apartheid*, Woodbridge, Suffolk: James Currey, 2008

Arie Rotem, Michael A. Zinovieff, & Alexandre Goubarev, "A framework for evaluating the impact of the United Nations fellowship programmes," in *Human Resources for Health* Volume 8, Article number: 7, 2010, Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-8-7>

South African History Online (SAHO), "HIV/Aids in South Africa Timeline," 27 August, 2019, Available at <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/hivaids-south-africa-timeline-1940s-2009>

Spotlight, "Timeline: Moments in the history of HIV," 1 December 2019, Available at <https://www.spotlightnsp.co.za/2019/12/01/timeline-moments-in-the-history-of-hiv/>

Times of Zambia, "Zambian Official Calls for Increased HIV/AIDS Training for Journalists" in *KHN Morning Briefing*, 11 June 2009, Available at <https://khn.org/morning-breakout/dr00032507/>

Uganda Ministry of Health and ICAP, "Uganda Population-based HIV Impact Assessment (UPHIA) 2016-2017: Extended Summary Sheet: Preliminary Findings," April 2018, Available at https://phia.icap.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/3430•PHIA-Uganda-SS_NEW.v14.pdf

UNAIDS, *Understanding Fast Track: Accelerating Action to end the Aids Epidemic 2030*, (Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS, June 2015), Available at https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/201506_JC2743_Understanding_FastTrack_en.pdf

UNAIDS, *Implementation of the HIV Prevention 2020 Roadmap*, (Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS, March, 2018), Available at https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/jc2927_hiv-prevention-2020-road-map-first-progress-report_en.pdf

UNAIDS, *Seizing the Moment: Tackling entrenched inequalities to end epidemics, Global Aids Update 2020*, (Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS, 2020), Available at <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2020/global-aids-report>

UNAIDS, "Kenya," Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/kenya>

UNAIDS, "Malawi," Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/malawi>

UNAIDS, "South Africa," Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/southafrica>

UNAIDS, "Zimbabwe," Accessed 24 September 2020, Available at <https://www.unaids.org/en/regionscountries/countries/zimbabwe>

UNAIDS & WHO, *Voluntary Medical Male Circumcision*, (Geneva, Switzerland: UNAIDS and WHO, 2019), Available at https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/2019_vmmc-15-esa-countries_en.pdf