Independent Evaluation of

Kang Guru Indonesia (KGI) - MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Prepared by: Zullia Saida, KGI Evaluation Manager, Education Section, Jakarta Post   *18/7/11*

Through   :   Katheryn Bennett, Unit Manager and Evaluation Delegate, Education Section, Jakarta Post   *15/7/11*

Cc: Hannah Birdsey, Counsellor, Education & Scholarships, Jakarta Post   *21/7/11*

Approved by: Sam Zappia, Chief of Operations   Date Approved: *22/7/11*

Aid Activity Objective

The goal of the KGI program is to contribute positively to the Australian and Indonesian bilateral relationship. The purpose of the program is to promote the Australia-Indonesia Partnership (AIP), and to contribute to the learning and teaching of English in Indonesia.

KGI is expected to have positive impact on the following:
- bilateral relationship focusing on knowledge of Australia and the Australia Indonesia Partnership
- English language teaching practices
- levels of English language proficiency for individuals
- sustainability of English Language networks and use of KGI materials and resources.

Aid Activity Summary

Aid Activity Name			
AidWorks initiative number	INF867		
Commencement date	1 January 2005	Completion date	30 June 2011
Total Australian $	AUD4,385,565.01		
Total other $	n/a		
Delivery organisation(s)	Indonesia Australia Language Foundation (IALF)		
Implementing Partner(s)	n/a		
Country/Region	Indonesia, Asia		
Primary Sector	Public Affairs/Education		

Overview of the Aid Activity

Kang Guru Indonesia (KGI), formerly known as Kang Guru Radio English, was established in 1989 with the agreement of the Government of Indonesia (GoI). The program has been managed since its beginning by the Indonesia Australia Language Foundation (IALF). A second phase of the program commenced in 2005. This new phase of the program was informed and shaped by a program review conducted in 2004, which resulted in the refinement of program objectives and the development of a structured Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system.

Independent Evaluation Summary

The purpose of the independent completion review (ICR) of KGI was to assess the program's achievement against key objectives outlined in the 2005-2011 M&E Plan; and to assess what the program had achieved, what had worked, what did not, and why. The ICR assessed overall program performance, focusing on four criteria, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, monitoring and evaluation and lessons learned.

The evaluation was intended to provide lessons learned to inform the development and implementation of the next phase of Australia's support to the education sector in Indonesia through Australia's new Education Partnership, particularly the visibility outreach services planned to be delivered. An ICR was also required

Independent Evaluation Management Response, registered #158
Business Process Owner: Director, Performance Systems and Support
UNCLASSIFIED   page 1 of 5
Template current to 30 June 2010

given the long running nature of the program, and the resulting investment that AusAID's has made (approximately AUD4.3million) over the past six years.

Overview of the Evaluation

Given the modest scale of KGI and the numerous reviews and lessons learned activities that have been undertaken by AusAID and the managing contractor both before and during the second phase of the program, the ICR was tightly focused, and was to primarily be undertaken using past review, lessons learned and progress reporting documentation. While provision was made for the evaluators to undertake interviews with key program stakeholders (up to 30 people), this was not the main focus of the evaluation.

The ICR Team (led by Mr Ty Morrissey with inputs from Ms. Erlinda Ekaputri) was conducted over 12 input days, consistent with AusAID ICR Guidelines. The team conducted data collection and processing from 18 April to 3 May 2011. The draft ICR was submitted on 6 June 2011 and the final report on 10 June 2011.

The evaluation utilised a rapid mix-method approach. This involved a mix of evaluation methods of documents analysis, phone and face-to-face interviews and group discussions. A semi-structured interview was designed to collect data and information against the evaluation questions.

The ICR team was able to conduct limited consultations with a range of key stakeholders, including AusAID, the KGI implementation team, personnel from other education programs that KGI has worked with, and beneficiary groups (such as teachers and students). The ICR Team was also not able to consult the local education office (*Dinas Pendidikan*) to ascertain KGI contribution to the quality of education at the regional level. However, the ICR noted that KGI followed Dinas' policy on its teacher-training packages, which is in line with GoI curriculum policy.

Key Messages of the Evaluation's Findings

- Overall the ICR revealed that KGI is a well-regarded, targeted and effective program, which has been able to demonstrate strong people-to-people linkages with minimal investment of resources and at minimal risk to AusAID and to the Australian Embassy. The program was identified primarily as a public affairs program with English language as a key means to achieve visibility of the aid program in Indonesia. In this sense, the program does not fit traditional development models.

- In terms of program management, it was concluded that KGI should remain under the management and guidance of AusAID, specifically the Education Section, but that more formal communication structures and linkages should be established with key public affairs areas, namely between AusAID Public Affairs and DFAT Public Affairs within the Australian Embassy, to enable enhanced coordination and use of resources.

- **Relevance**: The KGI program remains relevant and has made a positive contribution to Australia's broader bilateral aid program. The relevance of the program could have been enhanced through a clear definition of its role and function, namely that it is a public affairs program with English language training. The key **achievements** of KGI include:
  - successful provision of information about Australia (culture and society) to an Indonesian audience.
  - English language training to a targeted audience;
  - use of appropriate technology to communicate public affairs and English language messages (e.g. newsletter, magazine and radio);
  - ability to access schools and communities in remote locations to provide public awareness and language training; and
  - demonstration of results based on a small and targeted budget.

- **Effectiveness**: The ICR concluded that KGI is a very effective program. KGI is able to provide 'access' to areas where other public affairs programs are unable to reach. This highlights a need to better communicate and coordinate program activities with that of AusAID and DFAT Public Affairs units at the Australian Embassy, and to better utilise the access to communities that the program offers. The use of appropriate technology also contributes to relevance in that students and teachers are better able to interact and engage with KGI and improve English teaching and learning skills. Teachers report strong interest in the teaching resource packs, and highlight that they have improved teaching approaches and have enhanced motivation to teach English.

- **Monitoring and evaluation**: Despite running since 1989, KGI only had a formal 'program structure' from 2005 when it established a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to define program objectives,

outputs and outcomes. The ICR verified the current M&E approach for KGI as sound, but found that the current M& E system primarily focuses at 'output' level reporting and does not consider broader changes in perceptions, understanding and impact. This approach is only telling 'half the story' and there is a unique opportunity to present more 'outcome focused' information. M&E to date has been limited by available resources and time but its framework could be adjusted at minimal cost to capture this pertinent information.

- **Lessons learned**: the ICR identifies five key lessons learned as important for moving forward.

    1. **KGI Management**: that uncertainly associated with short term contracts or extensions should be removed, as the continued short-term extension approach that has been adopted by AusAID has reduced the ability for long term strategic planning. Detailed succession planning is needed to reduce reliance on one or two individuals.

    2. **Use of appropriate technology**: that the use of simple and appropriate technology has been a critical success factor. Technologies such as the radio, newsletter and magazine are cost effective and have high impact.

    3. **Monitoring and Evaluation**: that re-defining the program to have a clear public affairs focus would provide clarity to management and assist in defining objectives and M&E more generally. The M & E system should be broadened to adequately measure changes in perception, capacity and impact.

    4. **Capacity support to partners**: that the program needs to identify partners who need capacity support and focus on particular areas of engagement. The program should also continue to enhance its engagement with other AusAID programs, enabling KGI to leverage its communication tools and for more two-way communication between Australia and Indonesia to take place.

    5. **AusAID management**: not to change what works. The program is working well, is having a positive impact and is meeting a defined need. Any significant change to the program could potentially result in losing access, losing participants and listeners.

Management Response

Overall, the ICR report is comprehensive and provides practical recommendations and lessons to inform and guide future programming. The Business Unit agrees with all recommendations. The ICR Team recommendations and Business Unit responses are laid out in this section.

Recommendation One

English language training and development to be considered a key part of future public affairs/diplomacy programs.

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: The provision of English language training and development will be delivered under the Education Partnership Outreach Services (EPOS).

Recommendation Two

Continue to utilise public affairs to promote the Australian Aid program generally, particularly the emergence of the new ESSP.

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: Under the Education Partnership, the Business Unit will have primary responsibility in the implementation and management of the contract under the EPOS and will work and coordinate closely with DFAT and AusAID Public Affairs.

Recommendation Three

Clearly define target audiences and relevant messages (i.e. KGI to focus on young people and schools and Embassy to focus on opinion leaders).

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: Business Unit has defined the target audiences under the EPOS, and AusAID will guide the EPOS managing contractor in developing the appropriate key messages for the target audiences.

Independent Evaluation Management Response, registered #158
Business Process Owner: Director, Performance Systems and Support

UNCLASSIFIED   page 3 of 5
Template current to 30 June 2010

Recommendation Four

Public Affairs to maintain the use of cost-effective appropriate technologies in communicating messages to target audiences (i.e. magazines).

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: Business Unit will ensure that the new managing contractor for EPOS: 1) implement its public affairs activities based on the principle of cost-effectiveness; and 2) use appropriate technologies in communicating messages to target audiences, including drawing on the experience of KGI in the use of particular communication technologies that have been proven cost-effective.

Recommendation Five

Build in strengthened coordination and communication mechanisms between AusAID and Australian Embassy around public affairs/diplomacy approaches.

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: Business Unit will work closely with DFAT and AusAID's Public Affairs Unit in the implementation and management of the EPOS. The EPOS Activity Manager will ensure that mechanisms are put in place to ensure close coordination between the EPOS managing contractor, AusAID Education Section, AusAID Public Affairs and DFAT Public Affairs (for example: through quarterly coordination meetings).

Recommendation Six

Develop, where appropriate, tools and methods to collect information around perceptions of Australia and the aid program through KGI to complement and feed into existing perception studies.

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: Business Unit, working with AusAID's Public Affairs, will direct the EPOS managing contractor to develop appropriate tools and methods (as part of EPOS monitoring and evaluation) to collect the required information, including supporting future AusAID's Public Affairs Perception Surveys.

Recommendation Seven

Strengthen existing local partner networks (Component 3) to contribute and communicate public affairs messages, particularly in remote and isolated locations.

Response: Business Unit **agrees** with the recommendation.

Actions: Business Unit will direct the EPOS managing contractor to explore feasible approaches to communicate public affairs messages to remote and isolated locations through engagement with local partner networks established by KGI, where possible.

Recommendation Eight through Sixteen

Recommendations and Response: Business Unit generally **agrees** with the following recommendations to improve the implementation of KGI if an extension were required beyond 31 December 2011:
1. Program focus to remain on public affairs with a defined English language (i.e. education) objective.
2. Greater focus on strengthening and maintaining partner networks to complement strong focus on individuals (i.e. students and teachers).
3. M&E for KGI to be refined to include a greater focus on outcomes while continuing to collect and report on key outputs.
4. Appropriate M&E tools representing both qualitative and quantitative approaches to be developed to capture more outcome related information.
5. National M&E adviser added to management team to support recommended improvements to M&E system.
6. Budget support could increase without significant changes to current scope and management.
7. Incorporate lessons learned into future implementation and management and provide analysis on how lessons are contributing to improved outcomes.
8. More robust approaches developed to improve gender and sustainability considerations.
9. Consider management arrangements and possible 'succession planning' options if the current model is followed.

Actions: If a KGI extension is required beyond 31 December 2011, Business Unit will direct the managing contractor to incorporate the recommendations in to the program's implementation.

Learning and Dissemination Actions

- Presentation of preliminary findings to AusAID and DFAT
- public release of the report on the AusAID internet website (subject to approval)
- attaching the final report in AidWorks
- sending the final report with management response to ODE (ODE@ausaid.gov.au) to use for analysis of AusAID's aid effectiveness
- use of the final report and the management response, for discussion within the program to inform the design of new activities and Annual Program Performance Reports.

Public Release

In preparing the ICR for public release, we propose the following actions:

- Ensure the report is of good quality, does not contain any typos or grammatical errors.
- Share the full final report with key stakeholders (including IALF) prior to releasing the report publicly.
- Liaise with AusAID Public Affairs for advice on the public release of the report.

Distribution List

Stakeholder	Management Response Included?	Distribution Method
AusAID Canberra: Senior Management (Rod Brazier), OPS	Yes	Email the full report (through Desk)
AusAID - Post	Yes	Upload on the Intranet/Share Point and Aidworks
Public Affairs DFAT (Whole-of-government at Post)	Yes	E-mail the full report
Contractor (IALF)	No	Email the full report (**DONE** – 17 June 2011)
Australian Public	Yes	Upload to AusAID Website

Learning and Dissemination Activities

Activity	Target Audience	By When?	Who Responsible?
Presentation	AusAID staff, DFAT Public Affairs	9 May 2011 (**DONE** - before the ICR team finished their assignment)	Evaluation Manager
Attaching the final report in AidWorks	AusAID staff	22 July 2011	Evaluation Manager
Distribution of the Report	Whole-of-government	22 July 2011	Evaluation Manager
Public release of the Final Report (through AusAID website)	General Australian Public	22 July 2011	Desk at Canberra (Kate Fuller)

Independent Evaluation Management Response, registered #158
Business Process Owner: Director, Performance Systems and Support

UNCLASSIFIED   page 5 of 5
Template current to 30 June 2010