Graduation Data Quality and Sustainability Assessment for Orphans and Vulnerable Children Programs

USAID FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PEPFAR

MEASURE Evaluation

Graduation Data Quality and Sustainability Assessment for Orphans and Vulnerable Children Programs

MEASURE Evaluation
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
123 West Franklin Street, Suite 330
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516
Phone: +1 919-445-9350
measure@unc.edu
www.measureevaluation.org

This publication was produced with the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of the MEASURE Evaluation cooperative agreement AID-OAA-L-14-00004. MEASURE Evaluation is implemented by the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partnership with ICF International; John Snow, Inc.; Management Sciences for Health; Palladium; and Tulane University. Views expressed are not necessarily those of USAID or the United States government. MS-18-157

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PEPFAR

MEASURE
Evaluation

1. BACKGROUND

1.1. Overview of OVC_SERV and Graduation

OVC_SERV is one of the two primary indicators with which projects serving orphans and vulnerable children (OVC) report their activities to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). OVC_SERV captures the total number of OVC served, disaggregated by age and gender, and also includes a disaggregate for graduation. Graduation is assessed at the household (HH) level, meaning that all members of a HH (as defined under OVC_SERV) graduate together when they have met all applicable graduation benchmarks. There are eight graduation benchmarks, as shown in Appendix 1.

1.2 Objective of the Data Quality and Sustainability Assessment

The objective of the Data Quality and Sustainability Assessment is to assess performance of OVC projects, particularly the process by which HHs are graduated from projects, and support project improvement. If a project is shown to be applying graduation processes correctly, it can move on to assess the sustainability of the graduation outcomes by assessing whether the well-being of graduated HHs is being maintained, improving, or worsening after graduation. Toward these objectives, the following questions will be answered:

Question 1: Is the community-based organization (CBO) routinely and accurately assessing HHs using the graduation benchmarks, and are graduation data being properly documented by the CBO?

Question 2: Are data on graduation transmitted with fidelity throughout the entire data flow process, from CBO casefiles to Data for Accountability Transparency and Impact Monitoring (DATIM), including the following steps?

- CBO casefiles to CBO management information system (MIS)
- CBO MIS to implementing partner (IP) MIS
- IP MIS to DATIM/USAID

Question 3: Do graduated HHs continue to meet the criteria for graduation (i.e., eight graduation benchmarks) 6–12 months after being graduated from the OVC project?

METHODS AND SAMPLING

The Graduation Data Quality and Sustainability Assessment will employ several methods to address the following questions. Data should be collected by a group of trained data collectors who have the appropriate skills and capacity to conduct the assessment, and who have received specific training on the methods below. Ideally, all data collectors should be external to project service delivery, in order to reduce bias and potentially improve data quality.

Questions	Method	Sample (per CBO)
Question 1: Is the CBO routinely and accurately assessing HHs using the graduation criteria, and are graduation data being documented properly by the CBO?	A) Qualitative interviews with monitoring and evaluation (M&E) officer or other project staff	A) Per CBO, 1 or more project staff
	B) Review of casefiles to verify whether HHs are being assessed for graduation, frequency of assessment, how many HHs were assessed multiple times, and whether graduation data were documented properly (i.e., all primary source documents were available and complete)	B) Per CBO, 60 casefiles • 40 graduated HHs • 20 HHs that were assessed for graduation but did not graduate
	C) Graduation verification assessment to determine whether the CBO accurately assessed graduated HHs	C) Per CBO, all HHs that were assessed in B (above) (60 HHs per CBO)
Question 2: Are data on graduation benchmarks and status transmitted with fidelity throughout the entire data flow process, from CBO casefiles to DATIM?	D) Cross-checks of data sources to assess whether data have been transmitted with fidelity from the primary source documents to the IP MIS, including a forward cross-check (comparing a subsample of primary documents to the IP MIS) and a reverse cross-check (comparing a subsample of records in the IP MIS to primary documents)	D) Per CBO, 20% of HHs (or 20 HHs, whichever is larger) that have been graduated in the most recent reporting period (Semi-annual Program Results [SAPR] or Annual Program Results [APR])
	E) Recount of all graduated HHs using primary source documents (registers, casefiles) and comparison to counts in DATIM	E) Per CBO, all HHs that were graduated in the most recent reporting period (according to CBO paper casefiles)
Question 3: Do graduated HHs continue to meet the criteria for graduation 6–12 months after being graduated from the OVC project?	F) Sustainability assessment of HHs assessed in the graduation verification assessment to re-assess them 6–12 months after graduation	F) Per CBO, all *graduated* HHs that were assessed in B (above) (40 HHs per CBO). *Note that this assessment will be carried out 6–12 months after the Graduation Verification Assessment (C).*

Sampling and Sample Sizes

Sampling: For Methods B, C, D, and F, a multistage cluster sample will be conducted as follows:

First, IPs will be selected in consultation with the country USAID Mission. This document gives an example of a data quality assessment (DQA) involving three IPs, although the actual number of IPs may be higher or lower, depending on how many are operating in the country and other context-specific considerations.

Second, two or three CBOs per IP will be selected purposively, in consultation with the IP or USAID Mission and according to country- or IP-specific considerations. CBOs may be selected purposively by performance (selecting CBOs with high, low, and medium performance), or by overall caseload (selecting CBOs that have graduated a large, small, and medium number of HHs).

Third, all HH casefiles that the CBO has recently assessed for graduation (ideally in the past month) will be reviewed. Using the casefiles, HHs will be stratified into two groups: HHs that have been assessed recently and graduated, and those that have been assessed recently for graduation and *not* graduated. If either group contains 20 or fewer HHs, all HHs in the group will be included. If the group contains more than 20 HHs, they will be rearranged into a randomly ordered list and only the first 20 on the list will be included. Ideally the DQA should be conducted at a time when there is a large cohort of recently graduated HHs, such as at the end of a reporting period, to ensure sufficient numbers of recently graduated HHs.

Sample size: Each CBO will ideally contribute 40 HHs: 20 HHs that have been graduated recently and 20 that have been assessed recently and not graduated. Thus, the total sample size will be determined by the number of CBOs. As an example, if there are three IPs and three CBOs per IP, the total sample size would be as follows:

3 IPs x 3 CBOs x 40 HHs per CBO = 360 HHs

Methods

A. Qualitative interviews

At least one semi-structured qualitative interview will be held with an M&E officer or other staff member at each CBO. The first interview should be held at the beginning of the DQA to ensure that the DQA team has a clear understanding of how data flow as they conduct the assessment. The interviewer should ask the M&E officer to explain the data flow process and assist the interviewer in filling out the Data Flow Map (Appendix 8). Additional rows can be added to the Data Flow Map if there are additional steps in the process beyond those shown.

A second goal of the interview is to explore any known issues in graduation assessment, data collection and reporting procedures, data management, and data flow. If the DQA reveals significant issues that need further discussion and explanation, the interviewer should conduct a second interview with the M&E officer at the end of the DQA.

The following questions can be used to guide the interviews:

- Please describe to me how the graduation process is documented (collection forms and reporting forms).
- Please describe to me how data flow from the paper casefiles to DATIM/USAID.
- Please describe your MIS database(s).
- What are your procedures for handling late, inaccurate, or missing incoming reports? Are these procedures written down? (Verify or ask to see.)
- What are your procedures for handling double entries? Are these procedures written down? (Verify or ask to see.)

- What quality controls exist for entry of data from paper-based forms into computerized systems? Are these quality controls documented? How often are they conducted?
- How are electronic data backed up? How often are data backed up?
- Do supervisors carry out routine visits to assess data quality? If yes, how often do they conduct these visits, and what is the standard procedure for these visits?
- Are data validation meetings held? If so, how often?

B. Review of Casefiles

The DQA team will review the sampled casefiles to verify the following:

- Typical frequency at which the CBO conducts graduation assessments
- Whether graduation data were documented properly (i.e., all primary source documents are available and complete)
- Number of HHs that were assessed multiple times
- Length of time between HH graduation assessments

C. Assessment for Verification of Graduation Criteria

The graduation verification assessment will use the Graduation Verification Assessment Tool (available here: https://www.measureevaluation.org/our-work/ovc/routine-monitoring-of-pepfar-orphans-and-vulnerable-children-programs) to verify graduation criteria among 60 HHs per CBO (both the 40 HHs that were graduated and the 20 HHs assessed for graduation and not graduated).

Informed consent and confidentiality: Before the survey is conducted, the interviewer must obtain informed consent from each member of the HH who is asked questions, according to the instructions about consent in the Graduation Verification Assessment Tool. If any participant declines to participate, the HH will not be included in the survey. Caseworkers or community volunteers will assist the DQA team in locating the HHs to be interviewed for the survey; for the sake of privacy and confidentiality, however, they should *not* be present for the interviews.

Call backs: The DQA interviewer should make three attempts to interview the HH. If the caregiver or other members of the HH who must be interviewed are away from the house at the first visit, or are too busy to be interviewed at that time, the interviewer should make two more visits to the HH to attempt to complete the interview.

Data analysis: Data from the graduation criteria verification will be summarized in the Graduation Criteria Verification Summary Table (Appendix 2). This table will summarize what proportion of graduated HHs were assessed in the same way in the Graduation Benchmarks Assessment Tool and the Graduation Verification Assessment Tool, which graduation benchmarks were assessed, and whether the HH was deemed to have met the benchmark. The table will give the percentage of HHs with a total match for each of the eight benchmarks.

D. Cross-Checks

For Method D (forward and reverse cross-checks), sampling will be carried out as follows. Cross-checks compare a subset of cases from a primary data source to a secondary one. The value reported for the cross-check indicates the percentage of the source records that also were reported in the comparison document. Two types of cross-checks will be conducted, both for the same CBOs or specific projects selected for the graduation criteria verification assessment.

Forward cross-check: The external evaluator systematically selects 20 percent of HHs (or 20 HHs, whichever is larger) from the paper (hard copy) casefiles of HHs that have been graduated in the most recent reporting period (SAPR or APR). These casefiles are Data Source 1. The evaluator then locates each of these HHs in the IP MIS (Data Source 2) and verifies whether the HH (1) can be located in the IP MIS and (2) is recorded as graduated in the IP MIS. The evaluator then records the results on the Forward Cross-Check Worksheet (Appendix 3). The indicator reported is the percentage of HHs from Data Source 1 (paper casefiles) verified as graduated in Data Source 2 (IP MIS). This indicator is reported in the DQA Summary Table (Appendix 6).

Reverse cross-check: The external evaluator systematically selects 20 percent of HHs (or 20 HHs, whichever is larger) of HHs listed in the IP MIS as having graduated in the most recent reporting period (SAPR or APR). These cases in the IP MIS are Data Source 1. The evaluator then locates each of these HHs in the paper casefiles (Data Source 2) and verifies (1) whether the HH can be located in the paper casefiles and (2) is recorded as graduated in the paper casefiles. The evaluator then records the results on the Reverse Cross-Check Worksheet (Appendix 4). The indicator reported is the percentage of HHs from Data Source 1 (IP MIS) verified as graduated in Data Source 2 (paper casefiles). This indicator is reported in the DQA Summary Table.

If caseworkers are collecting data electronically on tablets rather than using paper reports and files, only the forward cross-check is needed. The evaluator should randomly select 20 percent of HHs (or 20 HHs, whichever is larger) and verify that each case has been uploaded to the MIS system and the HH recorded as graduated. Because mistakes in data transmission are not expected, a reverse cross-check from the MIS system to the paper files is not needed. The key question is whether all data on HH graduation are being uploaded from tablets to the MIS system.

E. Recount of Primary Data Source and Comparison to Secondary Data Sources

An external evaluator will review *all* paper casefiles of HHs graduated in the most recent reporting period (SAPR or APR) for the CBOs selected for the DQA assessment. The evaluator counts each file and tallies the data on the Recount Worksheet (Appendix 5). This count can be compared to the data reported at each step of the data flow process (the CBO MIS, IP MIS, and reported to USAID/DATIM). Comparison of the primary data source (recount of paper casefiles) to each indicated secondary data source will generate a verification factor (VF). These counts and VFs are recorded in the DQA Summary Table (Appendix 6).

A VF is calculated by dividing the number reported in the secondary data source (numerator) by the recount verified as part of the DQA exercise (denominator). The acceptable range of the VF is 90 percent to 110 percent. An error rate (ER) can be calculated as equaling VF - 1.

The DQA report should attempt to identify the reasons for a high ER, based on one or more qualitative interviews with the M&E officer and direct observation of the office, casefile management, and the MIS system.

F. Sustainability Assessment

The sustainability assessment will use the following method to assess Question 3:

The 40 graduated HHs per CBO sampled previously for the graduation verification assessment will be reassessed 6–12 months after graduation, using the Graduation Sustainability Assessment Tool (available here: https://www.measureevaluation.org/our-work/ovc/routine-monitoring-of-pepfar-orphans-and-vulnerable-children-programs). The 20 HHs that were assessed for graduation but did not graduate will not be included in the sustainability assessment.

Informed consent and confidentiality: Before the survey is conducted, the interviewer must obtain informed consent from each member of the HH who is asked questions, according to the instructions about informed consent in the Graduation Sustainability Assessment Tool. If any participant declines to participate, the HH will not be included in the survey. Caseworkers or community volunteers will assist the DQA team in locating the HHs to be interviewed, but for the sake of privacy and confidentiality they should *not* be present for the interviews.

Call backs: The DQA interviewer should make three attempts to interview the HH. If the caregiver or other members of the HH who must be interviewed are away from the house at the first visit, or are too busy to be interviewed at that time, the interviewer should make two more visits to the HH to attempt to complete the interview.

Data analysis: Data from the sustainability will be summarized on the Sustainability Assessment Tool Summary Table (Appendix 7). This table will summarize what proportion of graduated HHs were assessed in the same way in the Graduation Benchmarks Assessment Tool and the Graduation Sustainability Assessment Tool, which graduation benchmarks were assessed, and whether the HH was deemed to have met the benchmark. The table will give the percentage of HHs with a total match for each of the eight benchmarks.

APPENDIX 1. GRADUATION BENCHMARKS

Benchmark	Short title and description
Benchmark 1 (1.1.1)	**Known HIV status (or test not required)**: All children, adolescents, and caregivers in the household (HH) have known HIV status or a test is not required based on risk assessment
Benchmark 2 (1.2.1)	**Virally suppressed**: (a) All HIV+ children, adolescents, and caregivers in the HH with a viral load result documented in the casefile have been virally suppressed for the last 12 months *Or if viral load testing results are not available in the casefile:* (b) All HIV+ children, adolescents, and caregivers in the HH have adhered to antiretroviral therapy (ART) for at least the last 12 months
Benchmark 3 (1.3.1)	**Knowledgeable about HIV prevention**: All adolescents 10–17 years of age in the HH have key knowledge about preventing HIV infection
Benchmark 4 (1.4.1)	**Not malnourished**: No children <5 years of age in the HH are undernourished
Benchmark 5 (2.1.1)	**Improved financial stability**: Caregivers are able to access money (without selling productive assets) to pay for school fees and medical costs for children ages 0–17
Benchmark 6 (3.1.1)	**No violence**: No children, adolescents, or caregivers in the HH report experiences of violence (including physical violence, emotional violence, sexual violence, gender-based violence, or neglect) in the last six months
Benchmark 7 (3.1.2)	**Not in a child-headed household**: All children and adolescents in the HH are under the care of a stable adult caregiver
Benchmark 8 (4.1.1)	**Children in school**: All school-age children and adolescents in the HH regularly attended school and progressed during the last year

APPENDIX 2. GRADUATION CRITERIA VERIFICATION SUMMARY TABLE

Date of review _____ Province _____

District IP name _____ CBO name _____

	Total match*	**Not total match**
Graduation benchmark 1	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 2	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 3	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 4	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 5	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 6	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 7	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 8	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
HH graduated	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Total HHs assessed: XX (X%)		
Total HHs not assessed (HH not found or refused to participate): XX (X%)		

**Note:* To be considered a total match, the Graduation Benchmarks Assessment Tool and the Graduation Verification Assessment Tool must (1) asses the same graduation benchmarks for each member of the HH and (2) make the same designation about whether the benchmark is met.

APPENDIX 3. FORWARD CROSS-CHECK WORKSHEET

Instructions: Systematically select 20 percent of graduated HHs in the paper casefiles (or 20 HHs, whichever number is larger) and enter them by ID in the first column. Check Yes or No in the first column according to whether each HH can be found in the CBO MIS. Check Yes or No in the second column according to whether that HH was listed as graduated in the CBO MIS. Use additional pages as necessary (if assessing more than 20 HHs).

Date of review _____ Province _____

District IP name _____ CBO name _____

Household (HH) ID	Can the HH be found in the CBO MIS?	Is the HH listed as graduated in the CBO MIS?
1.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
2.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
3.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
4.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
5.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
6.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
7.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
8.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
9.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
10.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
11.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
12.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
13.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
14.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
15.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
16.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
17.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
18.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
19.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
20.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
A: Total HHs for which <u>both</u> questions are answered Yes: _____ **B: Total HHs assessed: _____**		**Divide A by B and enter below:** **%**

APPENDIX 4. REVERSE CROSS-CHECK WORKSHEET

Instructions: Systematically select 20 percent of graduated HHs in the CBO MIS (or 20 HHs, whichever number is larger) and enter them by ID in the first column. Check Yes or No in the first column according to whether each HH can be found in the CBO's casefiles. Check Yes or No in the second column according to whether that HH was listed as graduated in the CBO's casefiles. Use additional pages as necessary (if assessing more than 20 HHs).

Date of review _____ Province _____

District IP name _____ CBO name _____

Household (HH) ID	**Can the HH be found in the CBO's paper files?**	**Is the HH listed as graduated in the CBO's paper files?**
1.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
2.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
3.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
4.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
5.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
6.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
7.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
8.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
9.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
10.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
11.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
12.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
13.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
14.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
15.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
16.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
17.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
18.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
19.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
20.	Yes ☐ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☐
A: Total HHs for which <u>both</u> questions are answered Yes: _____ **B: Total HHs assessed: _____**		**Divide A by B and enter below:** **%**

APPENDIX 5. RECOUNT WORKSHEET

Instructions: Count the number of graduated HHs using the paper casefiles (primary source documents). Record the total in the last column. The SAPR or APR total may be calculated, depending on the timing of the DQA and available data. It is not necessary to calculate the total at both SAPR *and* APR.

Date of review _____ Province _____

District IP name _____ CBO name _____

	Graduated households	**Total**
Quarter 1		
Quarter 2		
	SAPR total: Q1 + Q2 =	
Quarter 3		
Quarter 4		
	APR total: Q1 + Q2 + Q3 + Q4 =	

APPENDIX 6. DQA SUMMARY TABLE

Date of review _____ Province _____

District IP name _____ CBO name _____

Instructions: SAPR or APR data may be examined, depending on the timing of the DQA and available data. It is not necessary to present data from both SAPR *and* APR. Depending on how data flow and are aggregated between CBOs, IPs, and DATIM, not all variables may be available. All available data should be entered, and the verification factor (VF), calculated based on available data.

Cross-check of primary source to database (forward cross-check):					**XX%**
Cross-check of database to primary source (reverse cross-check):					**XX%**
Graduated households	Recount of graduation (from recount worksheet)	Count from CBO MIS	Count from IP MIS	DATIM/ USAID reports	Verification factor (VF)
SAPR	A		C		**C/A (%)**
SAPR	A			D	**D/A (%)**
APR	E		G		**G/E (%)**
APR	E			H	**H/E (%)**
Total number of beneficiary files reviewed for recount: XX					
VF = 100% indicates a perfect match between recounted and reported HHs. VF >100% indicates a degree of over-reporting by the site on the indicator. VF <100% indicates a degree of under-reporting by the site on the indicator. VF in the range **90%–110%** is considered to be within the DQA "acceptable" range.					

* *Note:* If the data use mapping process reveals other steps in the data flow process, additional columns can be added so the count at each step can be included.

APPENDIX 7. SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT TOOL SUMMARY TABLE

Date of review _____ Province _____

District IP name _____ CBO name _____

	Total match*	**Not total match**
Graduation benchmark 1	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 2	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 3	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 4	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 5	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 6	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 7	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Graduation benchmark 8	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
HH graduated	XX (X%)	XX (X%)
Total HHs assessed: XX (X%)		
Total HHs not assessed (HH not found or refused to participate: XX [X%])		

**Note:* To be considered a total match, the Graduation Benchmarks Assessment Tool and the Graduation Sustainability Assessment Tool must (1) assess the same graduation benchmarks for each member of the HH and (2) make the same designation about whether the benchmark is met.

APPENDIX 8. DATA FLOW MAP: OVC_SERV

	Data Collection	Compilation	Storage	Analysis	Reporting	Use
CBO						
IP MIS						
DATIM/ USAID						

Example

	Data Collection	Compilation	Storage	Analysis	Reporting	Use
CBO	Data collected in paper files		Data stored in CBO MIS			
IP MIS		Data compiled in quarterly reports	Data stored in IP MIS			
DATIM/ USAID					Reported semi-annually (at SAPR and APR)	

MEASURE Evaluation
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
123 West Franklin Street, Suite 330
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27516
Phone: +1 919-445-9350
measure@unc.edu
www.measureevaluation.org

This publication was produced with the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) under the terms of the MEASURE Evaluation cooperative agreement AID-OAA-L-14-00004. MEASURE Evaluation is implemented by the Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partnership with ICF International; John Snow, Inc.; Management Sciences for Health; Palladium; and Tulane University. Views expressed are not necessarily those of USAID or the United States government. MS-18-157

USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PEPFAR

MEASURE
Evaluation