Evaluation Concept Note

Adolescent Girls Initiative- Rwanda

FINAL

**Background**

The Promoting Economic Empowerment of Adolescent Women and Young Girls project in Rwanda is part of a Bank-led Adolescent Girls Initiative (AGI) to promote the economic empowerment of adolescent girls and young women in eight low-income and post-conflict countries (Afghanistan, Haiti, Jordan, Lao PDR, Liberia, Nepal, Rwanda, and South Sudan). All the projects in the AGI offer skills training and complementary services to facilitate young women’s transition to productive work. These programs are seen as pilots in which to experiment with innovative approaches, measure the results, and provide quantitative evidence for possible scaling-up of similar interventions in the future.

Because the evidence on what works in facilitating the transition of adolescent girls and young women to productive work is limited, impact evaluations are an essential part of this initiative. Seven out of eight AGIs were designed to include a rigorous impact evaluation to measure the effects of the training and life-skills programs on the socio-economic well-being of young women and their households. The goal of these impact evaluations was to develop, by the end of the three year initiative, a core evidence base on promoting the economic empowerment of young women.

As originally designed, the AGI in Rwanda included a rigorous impact evaluation component, as described in the official project paper. However, due to delays in project preparation and implementation, limited oversubscription to the first round of training, and capacity constraints to implement an impact evaluation,[[1]](#footnote-1) the original impact evaluation design has been scaled back. The revised design will no longer focus on comparing project beneficiaries to a control group of non-beneficiaries. Instead, the evaluation will consult project beneficiaries at each stage of the project to seek their feedback on the project, as well as track a limited number of quantitative outcomes for a random sample of participants.

**Revised evaluation design**

The dual objectives of the evaluation of the Rwanda AGI are a) to examine how well the project delivered the planned activities and b) to measure the change in beneficiary outcomes before and after the program. For the first objective, the evaluation will engage the beneficiaries in a participatory process to elicit their perception of the quality and usefulness of the services they received. In support of the second objective, the evaluation will conduct short surveys to capture information on a core set of quantitative indicators relating to the project’s objective of promoting productive work. Because the evaluation does not include a comparison group, the emphasis will be on developing a descriptive understanding of how well the program worked rather than demonstrating a causal impact of the program on specific outcomes.

According to the revised project design presented in the project’s Restructuring paper, Component 1 will consist of three rounds, or batches of skills trainings. Each batch of training will include 675 beneficiaries and will have 3 phases: induction, training, and follow-up. The two week induction phase is meant to orient the beneficiaries to the project and allow them to choose a trade from among the offered courses (e.g., culinary arts, etc.). The six month training phase will include classroom and hands-on vocational training in the beneficiaries’ chosen trades. The five and a half-month follow up phase will focus on transitioning the trainees to productive work, primarily by facilitating the start-up of new cooperative microenterprises.

Figure 1. Timeline of Component 1 of AGI project in Rwanda

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Months 1-6 | Batch 1(n=675) |  |  |
| Months 7-12 | Batch 2(n=675) |  |
| Months 12-18 |  | Batch 3(n=675) |
| Months 19-24 |  |  |

The evaluation will focus on the second batch of beneficiaries under Component 1 (Vocational Training) of the project[[2]](#footnote-2). By focusing on the second of three batches of training, the evaluation will examine what might be considered a “typical” batch, after the project has had time to find its footing and incorporate the early lessons from the first batch. At the same time, focusing on the second batch will allow enough time for processing and analyzing the data so as to deliver results when the project ends. The batches are not expected to differ in content or eligibility criteria, so the results from the second batch might reasonably be expected to broadly representative of the project as a whole, aside from any improvements through learning-by-doing and any differences in the characteristics of the beneficiaries.

**Data Collection**

The evaluation will synthesize various sources of data, which will be collected in the following planned activities:

1. Baseline survey prior to Batch 2 induction phase (Month 0): a short survey will be administered to approximately 150 randomly sampled beneficiaries that have been chosen for the second batch of training. The survey will be conducted just prior to the two-week induction phase to collect demographic information and key outcomes indicators (listed below).
2. Focus group discussions in the last month of classroom training (Month 6) to elicit feedback on the quality and usefulness of the classroom training. At least one focus group will be held in each of the four project districts, and the focus groups will contain a mix of students from various trades/ classrooms. Participants who have dropped out of the program will be actively recruited for a separate focus group.
3. Focus group discussions in the last month of follow up (Month 11) to gain insight into the perceptions of participants on the challenges and successes they have faced in transitioning to work as well as the quality of the support services they are receiving from the project. The discussions will also examine some qualitative dimensions of social and economic empowerment, including aspirations. At least one focus group will be held in each of the four project districts, with a mix of students from various trades/classrooms. If possible, the research team may also conduct focus group discussions with parents, spouses, and other family members of program participants to elicit their feedback on the program and how it has impacted households.
4. Quantitative follow-up survey in the last month of follow up (Month 11): a short follow-up survey will be administered to the same 150 beneficiaries that responded to the baseline survey. The survey will also include questions based on the findings of the focus group discussions. Special efforts will be made to follow up with individuals who did not complete the program. The survey will be short (30 minutes or less) and will focus on the key outcome indicators listed below, in addition to basic demographic information.

In addition to these activities, the evaluation team will also review training materials used, attendance registers, monitoring and progress reports, and conduct classroom visits and interviews with administrators and trainers to gain an overall understanding of the program as it was delivered.

The following list of key outcome indicators for the quantitative surveys (baseline and follow-up) are based on a subset of outcomes used in other AGI impact evaluations. The wording of questions will endeavor to maximize comparability to the indicators used in the other AGI impact evaluations.

* ***Employment***: Does the respondent engage in any activities to earn money? What is the nature of that work (self or wage employment, nature of the enterprise, location of the work)? How many such activities does she have? How much time does she devote to employment?
* ***Earnings***: Does the respondent earn any money or in-kind payments? What are her individual earnings from the various income generating activities? How stable are these earnings? With whom does she share her earnings? Does she have any sources of non-earned income?
* ***Economic assets***: Savings, Debt, Access to credit, Physical assets (e.g., furniture, mobile phone), Productive assets (e.g., sewing machine)
* ***Social assets***: Friends, Mentors, Colleagues, Support from partner, Support from family
* ***Empowerment***: Self-confidence, control over household resources, access to money in an emergency
* ***Child well-being*** (if respondent has children): children’s educational enrolment, spending on children’s education and health, reliance on help from others for child-related expenses

**Sample Size**

The sample size of 150 respondents for the quantitative surveys was based on a computation of the minimum sample needed to detect the employment rate of the full cohort of 650 with 95% confidence. Using data from the Rwanda 2010 DHS survey, in which the employment rate of young women aged 15-19 was 52%, the sample size was calculated using the following assumptions: 95% confidence, 5% maximum error rate, 650 finite population size.

**Outputs**

A consultant (or team of consultants) will be engaged to conduct the evaluation activities described above, under the guidance of the AGI Impact Evaluation team based in Washington DC. The main output of the evaluation will be a final report that synthesizes the data gathered through all of the activities outlined above. The report will cover the design and implementation details of the evaluation, summarize the project activities, and the findings of the qualitative and quantitative work. The report is expected to be completed by the time the project ends so as to inform the project’s Implementation Completion Report.

**Budget**

The budget for this evaluation is approximately ---- and will be funded from the AGI impact evaluation trust fund, which is Bank-executed. The number of focus group discussions or respondents for the quantitative surveys may be modified depending on budgetary considerations.

**Timeline of Activities**

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |
| Recruitment of applicants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Procurement of evaluation consultants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preparation of survey questionnaires |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selection of trainees (no lottery required) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Induction (2 weeks) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baseline quantitative survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Classroom training (6 months) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Focus group discussions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow- Up Phase (5.5 months) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Focus group discussions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-up quantitative survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data analysis and final report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. These implementation challenges, as well as efforts to address them, are outlined in the project’s Aide Memoire from March 2013, which includes an annex on impact evaluation, as well as the project’s Restructuring Paper from April 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Component 2 (Scholarships) has a much smaller number of beneficiaries and its evaluation will be conducted by the Imbuto Foundation. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)