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PREFACE

Khulisa Management Services (Khulisa) is pleased to submit this summative evaluation report on the developmental evaluation of BRIDGE carried out over the period January 2013 – January 2015. Khulisa has developed this report based on information provided by BRIDGE management and facilitators, the ZENEX Foundation, core members of the Maths and Science Learner Support Group and the Tertiary Access Focus Group¹, donors, and other participants purposively selected for specific case studies. The report also incorporates the evaluators’ observations at various BRIDGE sessions.
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¹Note: The Tertiary Access Focus Group has decided to change its name to better reflect its scope of work. The term ‘tertiary’ is generally understood to refer primarily to university issues; however, the group has been looking at a wide range of other post-school pathways and dynamics. There was general support for bringing its terminology in line with that used in the sector, and by bodies such as SAQA and DHET, which refer to ‘post-school education and training’. So, it has now been re-named the Post-School Access Focus Group within the National Maths & Science Learner Support Community of Practice.
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# ACRONYM LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>Community of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHET</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEDT</td>
<td>Gauteng Education Development Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECT</td>
<td>National Education Collaboration Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM</td>
<td>Outcome Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMB</td>
<td>Rand Merchant Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAQA</td>
<td>South African Qualifications Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAESC</td>
<td>South African Extraordinary Schools Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCTO</td>
<td>Quality Council for Trades and Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Khulisa Management Services (Khulisa) is pleased to submit this summative evaluation report to the Zenex Foundation for a developmental evaluation of BRIDGE carried out over the period 2013 – 2015.

Khulisa’s developmental evaluation has been conducted in two phases: (1) an interim evaluation carried out over the period January – December 2013 and (2) a final summative evaluation carried out over the period January 2014 – January 2015. The interim evaluation report provided interim findings and recommendations to enable BRIDGE implementers to refine and guide a redesign of the program. This final summative evaluation incorporates the interim evaluation’s findings and recommendations, and provides overall findings and final recommendations on: the BRIDGE model and CoP methodology; BRIDGE’s National Maths and Science Learner Support CoP; and the Tertiary Access Focus Group2 - a sub group of the larger Maths and Science CoP.

This summative evaluation report includes:

1. A progress update on how the interim evaluation’s recommendations have been implemented to date;
2. The main findings of the summative evaluation, which answer the evaluation research questions and are arranged around four distinct themes that underpin these questions; and
3. Current recommendations for BRIDGE based on the findings of the summative evaluation.

---

2 Now named the Post-School Access Focus Group within the National Maths & Science Learner Support Community of Practice.
The research questions addressed in this evaluation are as follows:

1. Does the BRIDGE model and applied methodology provide an innovative model for developing communities of practice which are sustained over time?
2. Does participation in communities of practice result in practice and policy change at the level of the participant's organisation and government?

The final phase of this evaluation breaks these questions down into three thematic areas – “innovation”, “policy and practice”, and “sustainability” – and adds a fourth thematic area, “knowledge generation and management” for investigation in this report.

Khulisa’s developmental evaluation methodology was selected for its effectiveness in helping to answer the evaluation questions and for its iterative learning approach. A developmental evaluation is defined as “an evaluation approach that can assist social innovators develop social change initiatives in complex or uncertain environments”\(^3\). In this type of evaluation, both the evaluators and the implementing practitioners are part of a team. The role of the evaluator extends beyond collaboration on the evaluation to collaboration on the development of the innovative programme.\(^4\) The evaluation employs a non-experimental descriptive research design. Data collection methods that were used in the final phase of the evaluation include desk review, observations, and in-depth, semi-structured Key Informant Interviews. The design of the data collection tools was guided by the evaluation questions and sub-questions, in collaboration with BRIDGE. Primary analysis methods include Social Network Analysis and Case Studies.

### PROGRESS UPDATE

The first phase of Khulisa’s developmental evaluation of BRIDGE, conducted over the period January – December 2013, comprised an interim evaluation which made a number of recommendations for the improvement of (1) the BRIDGE model and methodology (2) the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP and (3) the Tertiary Access Focus Group. The interim evaluation findings and recommendations were presented to BRIDGE and to the Zenex Foundation in early 2014.

As a follow on to the interim evaluation, this final summative evaluation report provides a progress update on how the interim evaluation’s recommendations have been implemented to date:

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Recommendation</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRIDGE MODEL AND METHODOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Check-in sessions are consciously considered with respect to the relevant CoP lifecycle phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that facilitation methodology reflects the phase it is in</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE staff and facilitators recognise that the CoP and focus groups move in and out of phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse the database for participation trends by focus group. This can also be assessed through the check in at the beginning of the session</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE has ensured that all facilitators are briefed on the lifecycle model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, organisations and the larger education sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE facilitators participated in an evaluation workshop, which resulted in changes in their CoP facilitation approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, organisations and the larger education sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The ‘BRIDGE Way’ is currently in its eleventh iteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, organisations and the larger education sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE updates their methodology annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, organisations and the larger education sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE is testing and refining its model with a provincial audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, organisations and the larger education sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE has started to experiment with radio/television broadcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, organisations and the larger education sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cross-cutting themes feature across CoPs/focus areas. BRIDGE made changes to accommodate this concept: (1) create thematic knowledge products, (2) facilitate thematic feedback sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly define the role of this CoP within the Learner Support Focus Area, and how it should relate to its focus groups. More structure. Clearer agenda</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE has defined and implemented a much more overt link between what is happening in the major CoP communities, how this filters down to CoP subgroups, and vice versa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know your audience and differentiate certain activities accordingly</td>
<td></td>
<td>• BRIDGE has made a good effort to better ‘know their audience’. For example, through updating many membership profiles and disaggregating these profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update membership profiles for the database of the main community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MATHS AND SCIENCE LEARNER SUPPORT COP**

**TERTIARY ACCESS FOCUS GROUP**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interim Recommendation</th>
<th>Level of Implementation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Use the Tertiary Access Group as a catalyst to CoPs that are not focused on access, but for whom their mapping methodology, messaging and database building work might be applicable | 📊 | • Different focus groups report back to one another at larger meetings  
• Subgroups provide feedback on the content and outcomes of their sessions to the larger CoP meetings  
• This feedback is then reciprocated – the outcomes of larger CoP meetings are shared with sub-group members  
• These are often recorded and shared in meeting highlights (documented on the website’s knowledge hub) and on YouTube |
| The Main Group would benefit from hearing members of the Tertiary Access Group present their work and reflecting on their own journey as a CoP | 📊 | |
BRIDGE has developed an effective model and methodology for linking stakeholders and sharing working practice and knowledge in key leverage areas. This summative evaluation report presents the main findings of the evaluation as well as current recommendations for BRIDGE based on these findings. The main findings answer the evaluation research questions, which are incorporated under four thematic areas (innovation, policy and practice, knowledge generation and management, and sustainability)\(^5\), as summarised below:

**Innovation**

BRIDGE has developed an innovative model and methodology that, in turn, spurs on innovation within its Communities of Practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does innovation mean for BRIDGE, in the current context?</td>
<td>✓ BRIDGE has a complex view of innovation; as the replication and improvement of working practice through innovative processes and products</td>
<td>Continue to document and share innovation in such a way that it becomes more easily recognisable and searchable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ BRIDGE documents and shares innovation, but more can be done to promote innovations within and outside the BRIDGE network</td>
<td>Continue to facilitate innovation by providing support to CoPs in uncovering common challenges; identifying and mentoring change champions; and fostering the development of trust by encouraging sharing of successes and failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there an example of innovation that has been deepened, recombined or scaled?</td>
<td>✓ The case study (see main report) provides an example of an innovative course of action undertaken by the Ekurhuleni North Principals’ Community of Practice that was both deepened and scaled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What methods does BRIDGE use to receive and distribute information about innovation?</td>
<td>✓ Through an innovation colloquium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Through Maths and Science CoP meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Through BRIDGE’s ‘knowledge management’ function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) The original evaluation questions were refined to incorporate a subset of the Review Day questions
Policy and Practice

BRIDGE is beginning to create a robust link between practice on the ground and provincial and national policy creation and implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What methods are BRIDGE using to share the work of the COP with the larger public education community?</td>
<td>✔ BRIDGE links knowledge, practice and policy by sharing the work of the CoPs through its:</td>
<td>Develop a formal strategy for BRIDGE’s role in facilitating a link between knowledge, policy and practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Newly-launched website &amp; knowledge hub</td>
<td>• This strategy would need to be developed in line with BRIDGE’s vision and wider strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Online portal</td>
<td>• It could entail the articulation and documentation of a set of tactics to actively engage government’s participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social media networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are BRIDGE members linked (via social media, COP meetings, and special projects)?</td>
<td>✔ Social media platforms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On what platforms, are BRIDGE members collaborating around the issue of policy?</td>
<td>✔ CoP and sub-group meetings (4 per year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Many special projects (see report)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ At CoP &amp; focus group meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Via Twitter &amp; Facebook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Via BRIDGE’s online collaboration Wiki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ Via special projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a case where vertical integration is taking place - where, and how?</td>
<td>✔ The case study (see main report) provides an example of where vertical integration is taking place in the Maths and Science CoP’s Tertiary Access Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence that policy makers are engaging with BRIDGE as an important education stakeholder?</td>
<td>✔ Policy makers are engaging with BRIDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ BRIDGE is engaging via social media with multiple government and policy individuals/ organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔ BRIDGE engages actively with the Gauteng Department of Education, the DPME (formerly, the National Planning Commission), and DST in its work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge Generation and Management

BRIDGE has significantly improved its knowledge generation and management function, positioning the organization as a go-to place for accessing information within the education community. The evaluation proposes that BRIDGE further capitalise on its social media strategy to strengthen existing communities of practice, establish new virtual communities, and spread knowledge further afield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a case where Knowledge Management is being used to document and share knowledge within/outside of COPs?</td>
<td>✓ Yes. A case study provides an example of increasing requests for Knowledge Management services that BRIDGE is receiving from various organisations</td>
<td>Continue to use Social Network Analysis (SNA). SNA will help BRIDGE to understand which of their community members are establishing close networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are effective practices being spread through Knowledge Management techniques?</td>
<td>✓ BRIDGE has developed new mediums of communication and a new suite of knowledge products</td>
<td>Further enhance attendance data and record keeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ BRIDGE actively spreads effective practices through social media platforms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ BRIDGE has the capacity to provide knowledge management services</td>
<td>Optimise social media strategy. Specific recommendations include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Deliberate sharing mechanisms, such as the development of knowledge platforms</td>
<td>• Develop easily searchable names for each social media group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What knowledge management models can be used to expand BRIDGE’s reach in the future?</td>
<td>✓ What’s Trending Updates</td>
<td>• Actively improve BRIDGE’s LinkedIn network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Working Practice Profiles</td>
<td>• Post information on SANGONET’s news alert service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Impact Stories</td>
<td>• Send out a monthly update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Fact Sheets</td>
<td>• Schedule five minutes before each CoP session to orient members to BRIDGE’s website, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Meeting Highlights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Tools and Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Maps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Videos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability

BRIDGE as a whole is a stable organisation, but the CoPs themselves will naturally shift and develop over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| According to BRIDGE and selected donors/members, how important is the stability  | ✓ BRIDGE as a whole is a stable organisation, but the CoPs naturally shift and develop  
✓ The Tertiary Access Focus Group, and the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Group, no longer belong as a “sub-group” but rather have evolved into their own communities | Consider various funding models. The evaluation presents several possible funding models. BRIDGE could consider each in relation to costs and potential benefits to increasing sustainability |
| of the Maths and Science COP, specifically the Tertiary Access Group, in relation  | ❌                                                                                                                                  | Continue to increase stakes in BRIDGE by inviting stakeholders to participate in meetings, present at meetings, engage via social media, and via other targeted strategies                                 |
| to the larger BRIDGE community?                                                   | ❌                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Is there evidence for the feasibility of BRIDGE to operate as a service provider  | ✓ BRIDGE has been operating as a service provider since inception  
✓ The percentage of income earned is about 15% annually  
✓ BRIDGE does not monetise its in-kind contributions  
✓ If these contributions were monetised, it would add an additional 3 to 5% to the overall budget |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| in the sector?                                                                     | ❌                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Is there an example of how BRIDGE resources are being optimised to promote        | ✓ Service provision contracts  
✓ Corporate Social Investment  
✓ Foundations  
✓ Donations from users/members  
✓ Matching Funds campaign  
✓ Crowd funding particularly from the South African diaspora  
✓ Bi-lateral or Multi-lateral donors  
✓ Membership fees | Consider various funding models. The evaluation presents several possible funding models. BRIDGE could consider each in relation to costs and potential benefits to increasing sustainability |
| sustainability?                                                                    | ❌                                                                                                                                  | Continue to increase stakes in BRIDGE by inviting stakeholders to participate in meetings, present at meetings, engage via social media, and via other targeted strategies                                 |
| What funding models could be considered that may contribute to BRIDGE sustainability? | ✓ Service provision contracts  
✓ Corporate Social Investment  
✓ Foundations  
✓ Donations from users/members  
✓ Matching Funds campaign  
✓ Crowd funding particularly from the South African diaspora  
✓ Bi-lateral or Multi-lateral donors  
✓ Membership fees | Consider various funding models. The evaluation presents several possible funding models. BRIDGE could consider each in relation to costs and potential benefits to increasing sustainability |
|                                                                                                                                                                                      | ❌                                                                                                                                  | Continue to increase stakes in BRIDGE by inviting stakeholders to participate in meetings, present at meetings, engage via social media, and via other targeted strategies                                 |
Additional Recommendations

The summative evaluation also provides additional recommendations specifically for (1) the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP and (2) the Tertiary Access Focus Group as follows:

Review the role of science in the CoP. Consider pursuing an active strategy to integrate issues related specifically to science in the community meetings.

Redefine what success looks like for the CoP. Consider the composition of the CoP and potentially redefine its purpose and functions taking this into account.

Improve understanding of how the Focus Group can be better supported by organizations and donors. Consider facilitating a session where group members align their expectations and roles

CAPACITY BUILDING

Khulisa conducted a number of capacity building activities with BRIDGE in the final months of the evaluation to facilitate a handover to BRIDGE staff. In addition to numerous formal and informal consultations among the evaluation team and BRIDGE, the following specific activities were carried out over this period:

- Khulisa staff members capacitated a BRIDGE staff member to build more sophisticated social media analytics into BRIDGE’s monitoring system.
- Khulisa trained a BRIDGE staff member to use the Gephi Tool, Node Excel, and other relevant tools for social network mapping and visualisation and data gathering.
- During the BRIDGE Day Review, Outcome Mapping (OM) was suggested as an appropriate Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) strategy for BRIDGE. Three Khulisa and one BRIDGE representative attended a workshop in which Khulisa supported the BRIDGE representative to integrate OM into BRIDGE’s M&E approach. Khulisa held a one-day session in January 2015 to introduce the other BRIDGE team members to the methodology and plan for the integration of the OM approach into BRIDGE’s M&E system. BRIDGE is currently working on integrating OM.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, BRIDGE has fully implemented almost all of the recommendations from the interim evaluation and has made significant progress towards achieving its objectives. BRIDGE is an agile and committed organisation that has embraced the developmental nature of this evaluation; often taking recommendations beyond what was initially expected. The organisation is not static, but rather is committed to iterative learning and improvement. They are flexible in method but inflexible in goal; strongly committed to their vision but constantly reflecting on, and changing, their own practice.
1. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation Background

In 2012, Khulisa conducted a formative evaluation of BRIDGE’s National Maths and Science Learner Support Community of Practice (CoP). As a follow-on to this assignment, the Zenex Foundation commissioned Khulisa to conduct an ongoing developmental evaluation with a particular focus on:

1. The BRIDGE model and CoP methodology
2. BRIDGE’s National Maths and Science Learner Support Community of Practice
3. The Tertiary Access Focus Group\(^6\) - a sub group of the larger Maths and Science Community of Practice

Khulisa conducted an interim evaluation over the period January – December 2013. The interim evaluation report provided BRIDGE and the Zenex Foundation with interim findings and recommendations to enable BRIDGE implementers to refine the program and guide the redesign for 2014. This was followed by an evaluation status report, covering the period January - August 2014, which included an update on how the interim evaluation’s recommendations were being implemented to date and recommendations for the final six months of the evaluation.

Evaluation Purpose

According to the ToR, the overall aims of Khulisa’s developmental evaluation of BRIDGE are to:

- Provide a detailed description and analysis of all formative aspects of the BRIDGE model and methodology.
- Assess the quality and effectiveness of the Maths and Science CoP and the Tertiary Access CoP in relation to the BRIDGE outcomes.
- Build the capacity of BRIDGE to implement and track participation levels and analyse feedback from participants as to the effectiveness of the communities of practice.
- Assess whether the evaluation findings could influence policy and future thinking as it pertains to the bridge between education policy and practice, and provide recommendations on how this could be done.
- Highlight new knowledge and insight that this model has presented.
- Provide information on aspects of the model which have worked well as well as areas for improvement.

The specific purpose of this final summative evaluation report is to provide overall findings and final recommendations on the effectiveness of the model and methodology as well as the community of

---

\(^6\) Now named the **Post-School Access Focus Group** within the National Maths & Science Learner Support Community of Practice.
practice under review (i.e. National Maths and Science Learner Support CoP and its Tertiary Access Focus group).

Evaluation Questions

The overarching research questions frame the evaluation and remain the same as per the ToR:

1. Does the BRIDGE model and applied methodology provide an innovative model for developing communities of practice which are sustained over time?
2. Does participation in communities of practice result in practice and policy change at the level of the participant’s organisation and government?

Evaluation Themes

Khulisa, in collaboration with BRIDGE, have identified three distinct themes that emerge from the compound research questions above. These include:

I. INNOVATION (“INNOVATIVE MODEL”)
II. SUSTAINABILITY (“SUSTAINED OVER TIME”)
III. POLICY AND PRACTICE (“PRACTICE AND POLICY CHANGE”)

In addition, the evaluation team has identified a fourth theme that underpins and supports the BRIDGE model.

IV. KNOWLEDGE GENERATION AND MANAGEMENT

This structure is represented in the diagram below. The themes are represented by the “bridge”, and public education is represented by the “river”. The five focus areas within BRIDGE comprise a collective strategy designed to help bridge this divide. Knowledge generation and management is the mechanism through which the “silos” (focus areas) combine to create one coherent strategy.
Khulisa structured the final phase of the evaluation around the higher order themes identified above. The evaluation questions are incorporated under each theme, and have been refined to incorporate the Review Day findings.

2. EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Final Evaluation Activities

Khulisa conducted a number of capacity building activities with BRIDGE in the final months of the evaluation to facilitate a handover to BRIDGE staff. In addition to numerous formal and informal consultations among the evaluation team and BRIDGE, the following specific activities were carried out over this period:

- Khulisa staff members capacitated a BRIDGE staff member to build more sophisticated social media analytics into BRIDGE’s monitoring system. These tools will allow BRIDGE to continue to track information about how community members interact using social media, and to establish what sub-communities exist within the larger BRIDGE community, based on modularity classes. BRIDGE was capacitated to move from conducting a manual analysis of Twitter followers (including Hashtags for specific events, Tweets, Re-Tweets and Mentions) to an automated extraction process that will allow BRIDGE to analyse and visualise this information.

- Khulisa trained a BRIDGE staff member to use the Gephi Tool (social network mapping and visualisation software), Node Excel (a “leaching” tool in the form of an Excel template that will allow BRIDGE to gather data from different platforms including YouTube, Facebook, Twitter and Flicker) and other relevant tools.
During the BRIDGE Day Review, **Outcome Mapping (OM)** was suggested as an appropriate Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) strategy for BRIDGE. The core evaluation team attended the course together with BRIDGE’s then intern and now Strategic Information Officer. Khulisa worked closely with the BRIDGE officer over the three-day workshop to integrate OM into BRIDGE’s M&E approach. In addition, Khulisa and BRIDGE held a one-day engagement session in January 2015 to introduce the other BRIDGE team members to the methodology and plan for the integration of the OM approach into BRIDGE’s M&E system. The BRIDGE team is currently working on integrating OM.

3. METHODOLOGY

Khulisa’s evaluation approach utilises a developmental methodology selected for its effectiveness in helping to answer the evaluation questions and for its iterative learning approach. A Developmental Evaluation is defined as “an evaluation approach that can assist social innovators develop social change initiatives in complex or uncertain environments”\(^7\). It engages evaluators and implementing practitioners in a sustained relationship and its processes include “asking evaluative questions and gathering information to provide feedback and support developmental decision making and course corrections along the emergent path.”\(^8\) In this type of evaluation, both the evaluators and the implementing practitioners are part of a team. The role of the evaluator extends beyond collaboration on the evaluation to collaboration on the development of the innovative program.\(^9\) In the same way, implementing practitioners play a significant role in the evaluation as part of the evaluation team. The methodology was designed to help the evaluation team understand the contribution of BRIDGE’s model and methodology to developing functional communities of practice.

The evaluation employs a non-experimental descriptive design. Non-experimental research involves the collection and analysis of information as it occurs naturally. Descriptive studies are one type of non-experimental research design in which the researcher observes, describes and documents information that can describe associations or relationships. A descriptive design is one of “the best methods for collecting information that will demonstrate relationships and describe the world as it exists”\(^10\). It focuses primarily on qualitative techniques for data analysis and reporting but also incorporates some basic quantitative data analysis\(^11\).

---


\(^11\) In collaboration with BRIDGE staff, Khulisa confirmed the strategy for the final phase of the evaluation and developed a “Phase 3 Evaluation Plan”.
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Data Collection

Data collection methods employed in the final phase of the evaluation include: Desk review, observation, and semi-structured KIIs.

1. Desk Review

The Evaluation Team carried out a comprehensive desk review of relevant documents and reports. This included documentation from BRIDGE, previous evaluation reports, and online research. The document review provided the evaluation team with key background and contextual information relevant to the evaluation themes and questions.

2. Observation

The evaluation team used qualitative observation methods to understand the contextual factors influencing BRIDGE on the ground. Observation was used to learn about BRIDGE’s operations and outcomes, relationships among stakeholders, interactions among BRIDGE personnel, and other relevant factors that are essential to answering the evaluation questions. Unstructured observation was used throughout the evaluation to examine BRIDGE’s model and methodology, and evaluate its implementation. Understanding the processes and context of implementation was crucial for the evaluation team to appreciate how the program was delivered and to make meaningful recommendations for the way forward.

3. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

The evaluation team conducted 14 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with: BRIDGE staff members; representatives from the Zenex Foundation, the Sasol Inzalo Foundation, Barloworld, the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, the RedCap Foundation and Rand Merchant Bank (RMB); a representative from Treharne Africa; a representative from the South African Qualification Authority (SAQA)/Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET); a member of the Principals and School Leadership Community of Practice, and a representative from Tshikululu Social Investments. The team developed a series of KII tools (see Annex 4) to ensure consistency across the evaluation and to ensure that the interviews followed a semi-structured format. The questions included in the interview guidelines were designed to extract information relevant to specific evaluation questions. Informed consent was obtained from key informants prior to audio recording of the interviews. The KIIs were carried out by three evaluation team members. The evaluation team developed partial transcriptions of the interviews, and took notes, using these to review and cross-check findings.
Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis techniques were used to synthesise and interpret qualitative data gathered through the evaluation. The evaluation team partially transcribed the KIs and triangulated qualitative data from various sources to inform the case studies.

4. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BRIDGE was established in 2009 following the Development Bank of Southern Africa’s Roadmap process and the promulgation of the 10-point plan on education. The outcome of this process was a common understanding that a critical part of the education crisis in South Africa is that stakeholders do not sufficiently share, adopt and implement what works\(^\text{12}\). Education stakeholders felt that collaboration was crucial to address these challenges and strengthen the South African education system. BRIDGE has subsequently cultivated a membership of over 3000 stakeholders from more than 650 organisations within the South African education sector.

The timeline below provides the reader with an overview of the evolution of national BRIDGE Communities of Practice over time, focusing on the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP and its sub-groups, to contextualise the evaluation’s findings. In 2010, four national CoPs were established: the Maths & Science Learner Support CoP, the School Leadership CoP, Teachers Upfront and the South African Extraordinary Schools Coalition (SAESC). In 2011, four focus groups (now called working groups) were established as sub-groups within the Maths & Science CoP; Tertiary Access, M & E Colloquium, Learner Selection and Saturday Schools. Two additional national CoPs were formed in 2012 and 2013 respectively; ICTs in education and the Early Childhood Development. In 2013, two of the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP focus groups reached maturity and disbanded; Learner Selection and Saturday Schools. In 2014, the Teacher Development focus group was formed as an additional sub-group to the Maths & Science Learner Support CoP.

As described earlier in this report, Khulisa has structured the final phase of this evaluation around the higher order themes identified: innovation, policy and practice, knowledge management and sustainability. The evaluation questions are incorporated under each theme, and have been refined to incorporate a subset of the Review Day questions.

**Innovation**

Innovation in BRIDGE does not simply refer to the creation of something new, but also refers to deepening, recombining and scaling of new approaches and ideas. In the final phase of the evaluation, Khulisa investigated some of the key innovations that have evolved out of BRIDGE over the course of the evaluation, and how/whether any of these innovations have been deepened, recombined and scaled\(^\text{13}\). A subset of questions identified during the course of the evaluation that fit within the innovation theme include the following:

What does innovation mean for BRIDGE, in the current context?

Community Intelligence Limited defines ‘Innovation’ in Communities of Practice (COPs), as follows:

“**Innovation means, fundamentally, change, being responsive to life in her full splendor of constant dance and fluctuation. Responsiveness to quickening change in technologies and market conditions starts with the capacity to sense both the dangers of staying the way we have always been and how we do things, and the opportunities to innovate**\(^\text{14}\).”

---

\(^{13}\) Adapted from ‘The BRIDGE Way’

From this perspective, innovation is about turning away from maintaining the status quo and toward disrupting and changing the existing state of affairs. On a continuum from incremental to radical, approaches to innovation depend on the needs and goals of the innovators. Incremental innovation is about linear, slow-paced and incremental change whereas radical innovation refers to non-linear, fast-paced and sporadic improvement.

BRIDGE has a more complex view of innovation than the perspective above; not only as a departure from the status quo but also as the replication and improvement of best practice through innovative processes. As articulated by a BRIDGE representative, “...process is the innovation in a sense... it’s in the process that the innovation takes place”. In other words, innovation is not only about the end product but about what happens in the “black box” between the initiation of an innovation and the final result. Within this process, explains the BRIDGE representative, ideas are recombined and linked in a series of non-linear transformations:

“...the innovation for BRIDGE is the recombining and linking. So there’s something rooted in the practice, in the process, that’s the innovation for us... it’s in the process that the transformation takes place.”

Innovation processes are initiated in different ways within BRIDGE. Some innovation is evolutionary, as it develops out of a natural internal process within CoPs that leads to a departure from the status quo and/or the replication and improvement of best practice. For example, in the Ekurhuleni North Principals CoP, the community members decided internally to develop teachers in their schools in maths instruction. Although the CoP’s facilitator was involved in that she was aware of the intention (as it was discussed in the principals’ community of practice), she did not drive the innovation – it emerged.

Other innovation is agenda-driven, whereby the community members define the intended innovation from the start and act in a deliberate way towards achieving a pre-determined end result. For example, in the Early Childhood Development (ECD) CoP, the community identified members to participate in a working group that developed qualification processes within the Quality Council for Trades and Occupations (QCTO). In this case, the innovation was pre-defined and intentionally implemented.

Innovation can also be facilitated, particularly when a community needs to be supported in recognising opportunities to innovate. One example is the facilitated guidance of the Tertiary Access Focus Group towards the web-based mapping of the tertiary access chain; a systems map that supports career guidance. The facilitator played a large role in supporting the group to take the innovation forward. Facilitated innovation does not mean that the facilitator drives the innovation, but rather that the facilitator supports the community in defining where innovation is needed and how it could potentially be achieved. This self-organising quality of a CoP is central to BRIDGE’s methodology.
Another innovation process in BRIDGE involves making a positive contribution to the sector by combining what many projects are doing in a way that enhances the systemic impact and ensures that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. This works by aligning the focus of multiple projects with a key government strategy (for example, the National Development Plan) maximising the resources of the multiple projects by reducing duplication and spreading resources across the projects, spreading learnings and successful practice amongst projects so as to increase impact and to use collective power and knowledge to engage more effectively with government on adoption and implementation of policy.

BRIDGE recognises that, while replication and improvement of working practice is a key type of innovation in the BRIDGE context, product innovation is also an important innovation type. Product innovations involve the development of innovative products that have the potential to create optimal solutions where innovation does not exist. For example, the BRIDGE Western Cape Learner Support Community of Practice has worked with the Western Cape Education Department to create the EduCollaborate portal (http://educollaborate.westerncape.gov.za/), which is an online collaboration tool that enables both government and NGOs and other organisations working in the same areas and schools to identify one another and potentially create opportunities for partnership. The data on this portal supports collaboration and co-ordination. It helps to reduce duplication, supports the sharing of resources, and allows stakeholders to work together with greater knowledge about the many innovations of the Non-Profit Organisation (NPO) sector in the Western Cape Province.

Is there an example of innovation that has been deepened, recombined or scaled?

The case study summarised below provides an example of an innovative course of action undertaken by the Ekurhuleni North Principals’ Community of Practice that was both deepened and scaled. The full case study is available in Annex 1.
BRIDGE CASE STUDY: INNOVATION

The case involves the implementation of a maths diagnostic test at a number of primary schools in the Ekurhuleni North district of Gauteng and an innovative course of action taken by the Ekurhuleni North Principals' Community of Practice (CoP) in response to the test results.

The principals within the CoP came up with an idea to administer a district-wide mathematics (maths) test so that they could gain insight into the gaps within maths learning and teaching both within their own schools and within the community as a whole. BRIDGE analysed the results and fed the results of this test back to the COP through the COP's facilitator. The principals in the CoP subsequently recognised that there were common challenges across all the schools. In response, they independently decided to engage in a workshop to support the professional development of teachers in their schools. The CoP members shared responsibility and each hosted a session. The innovation was deepened from simply strengthening Grade 7 maths teaching to changing the way teachers teach from earlier grades all the way up, and scaled through the teachers themselves deciding to set up their own informal community following the workshop.

The key findings are (i) when CoPs have a common purpose and members trust one another and share resources, innovation can take place; (ii) When a CoP has a "compelling goal or challenge that can be met only through innovation", innovation is more likely to occur; (iii) although the CoP may come up with the innovative idea together, it is necessary for the CoP to have at least one "champion" to drive the innovation forward and; (iv) good facilitation of the CoP is a key factor for igniting the innovative idea and supporting the CoP in planning to take it forward. These factors drive the process of innovation.

What methods does BRIDGE use to receive and distribute information about innovation?

One of the ways in which BRIDGE has received and distributed information about innovation is through a Maths and Science CoP innovation colloquium\(^\text{15}\), held in 2013. The colloquium focused on technology solutions that could improve learning in maths and science in the country. Subsequent innovations have been shared through the maths and science community of practice, which has had an increasing interest in technology innovations. Another way in which BRIDGE receives and distributes information about innovation is through its 'knowledge management' role. Knowledge management is the process of capturing, developing, distilling and sharing knowledge that improves practice. BRIDGE manages knowledge which flows from and among members and Communities of Practice, and shares this with the broader educational community through various media.

Although BRIDGE shares information about innovation through knowledge management strategies and knowledge products, it is not easy to recognise when an innovation is being presented. One of the evaluation’s recommendations is that BRIDGE consider labelling and defining innovative processes and products in such a way that they become more easily recognisable and searchable. In addition, the evaluation team recommends that BRIDGE consider sharing innovations across communities to inform and motivate community members. This is actively happening as BRIDGE expands its knowledge management function.

Policy and Practice

The concept of “Policy and Practice” in BRIDGE refers to BRIDGE’s function in facilitating participation and linking knowledge, policy and practice. One of BRIDGE’s intended outcomes is to create a link between practice on the ground and provincial and national policy creation and implementation. As stated in “The BRIDGE Way”, this can involve (1) sharing the work of a community of practice at a provincial and national level and with other provinces, (2) learning from each other to create more effective processes to co-create policy and collaboratively implement and plan, or the (3) creating collective power around what is working in order to ensure adoption of what is working.

Some of the strategies that BRIDGE have implemented to achieve this outcome include: facilitating linkage/collaboration between members and practitioners (for example through social media); convening members to influence policy; and involving policy makers in the process of generating knowledge. Khulisa investigated the extent to which BRIDGE has shared the work of the community of practice to help spread effective practice, and generate a link between policy creation/policy implementation and practice. A subset of questions identified during the course of the evaluation that fit within the policy and practice theme includes the following:

What methods are BRIDGE using to share the work of the COP with the larger public education community?

Hearn and White (2009) note that;

“The knowledge gained by research is often trapped at the point of origin, caught in the language of research, or simply isolated from those who actually apply that knowledge – the practitioners in the field. Likewise, tacit knowledge from the field rarely reaches the researchers or those making decisions. More effective bridges between knowledge, policy and practice are needed, with communities of practice (CoPs) well positioned to do just that.”

Capturing and distributing knowledge is therefore a crucial part of facilitating practice and policy change. This concept is covered in more detail in the knowledge generation and management section in this report. However, summarised below are some of the methods which BRIDGE uses to share the work of the CoP both internally and with the larger public education community:

- Through its newly-launched website, particularly its knowledge hub.
How are BRIDGE members linked (via social media, COP meetings, and special projects)?

Social Media

BRIDGE communicates with a variety of organisations on different social media platforms. Their communication strategy includes virtual engagement activities with various stakeholders, such as “following” “liking” “retweeting”, starting discussions, directed hashtags and “sharing”, on a daily basis. Platforms include Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and LinkedIn.

The social network diagram below depicts the relationships and connections between people, groups, organisations linked within the BRIDGE network on Facebook. Each circle represents an individual, organisation or entity. The proximity of one individual/organisation/entity to another, and a link (a line from one circle to the other) between them, signifies a close relationship. Proximity is determined by frequency and type of interactions between the individuals/organisations/entities. Likes, Shares and mentions play a part in determining how closely two entities are placed to one another.

If individuals/ organisations/entities have many connections or close relationships with one another, they form a sub-community called a “Modularity Group”. Using software called Gephi, one is able to extract data via a clustering algorithm (“Modularity”) that finds patterns within the BRIDGE network. According to Parkin (2014) Gephi is a network analysis and visualisation desktop application.

“Modularity looks for groups of people who are more densely connected to each other than would be expected if they were connected by chance. A network with high modularity has dense connections between nodes within clusters, but sparse connections between nodes in different clusters. As a result all individual nodes (people) in a network can be attributed to a specific cluster, as determined by the modularity algorithm.”

BRIDGE holds a central role within the education stakeholder network on Facebook, as evidenced below:

The graphic above distinguishes the modularity groups within BRIDGE by colour (the colour does not represent anything significant but helps distinguish the different modularity groups visually). Larger circles identify nodes with a large following within the network and are frequently the core of a
modularity group. This analysis demonstrates that BRIDGE holds a central role within the education stakeholder network on Facebook. They have links all with other organisations within the network and have established relationships with a large variety of stakeholder types – policy makers, NGOs, donors, CSOs and others. In some cases, individual BRIDGE CoPs have established themselves as an important player within a particular modularity group. For example, the South African Extraordinary Schools Coalition is key in a modularity group that includes other stakeholders such as the Department of Basic Education and the Gauteng Department of Education.

This analysis is a first step towards helping BRIDGE understand which of their community members are establishing close relationships within their network. It is valuable because it says something about what is happening among BRIDGE members outside of CoP meetings, and the virtual sub-communities that are beginning to form and can be attributed to BRIDGE.

Community of Practice Meetings

The figure below demonstrates the number of community meetings (both the National Maths and Science CoP meetings and the Tertiary Access Focus Group meetings) held over the period of the evaluation (January 2013 - December 2014). Community members are linked primarily through attending, presenting, problem-solving, and collaborating at these meetings.

Figure 1: CoP Meetings January 2013 – December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Maths and Science Learner Support CoP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Access Focus Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Khulisa conducted an analysis for this period using the attendance data provided by BRIDGE. However, while the Maths and Science CoP attendance data provided was complete, some of the data in other areas of the database was entered inconsistently in places. For example, some of the organisation names captured on the attendance and organisation sheets did not match, e.g. “Dept. of Basic Education” versus “Department of Basic Education” and “Dinaledi” (the name of a project) instead of “Department of Basic Education”. This made it difficult to run analyses using formulae. For accurate analysis, the names would have to be identical. A similar issue was found with the column header names on the attendance spreadsheet. Some column data could not be picked up by the analysis formula due to variations in spacing.

A few issues with BRIDGE’s database were apparent in the interim evaluation. However, following the interim evaluation, the evaluation team made recommendations that BRIDGE subsequently implemented. As a result, BRIDGE’s attendance data and record keeping has improved dramatically.
To enhance the database further, Khulisa suggests that BRIDGE consider implementing the following:

1. Introduce drop-down lists for organisation names.
2. Introduce drop-down lists for session types.
3. Account for when people switch organisations. Comments in the attendance database need to indicate when a person has left an organisation.

Khulisa will provide formulae to BRIDGE project managers and staff to incorporate into the attendance database so that they can implement the first two recommendations.

Special Projects

The National Maths and Science Learner Support CoP and Tertiary Access Focus Group have carried out a number of special projects over the period January 2013 – January 2015. These special projects link individuals and organisations in deliberate ways to achieve a particular goal. For example, in 2014, the Tertiary Access Focus Group formed sub-committees to carry out particular assignments. Examples of the types of special projects undertaken by these sub-committees include:

- **Mapping sub-committee.** This sub-committee of the Tertiary Access Focus Group met to initiate the development of a web-based mapping of the tertiary access chain. The sub-committee defined categories of potential users who would use the website, as well as their purposes for accessing the site. They are currently creating the site’s architecture and starting to gather data to inform each of these potential categories.

- **Messaging sub-committee.** This sub-committee of the Tertiary Access Focus Group was brought together to implement a special project that focused on messaging to change attitudes around education. In particular, they have focused on messaging to caregivers to make them aware of their role. The sub-committee has met with the media about their ideas and plan to convert their planned messages into a package for distribution.

BRIDGE facilitates sharing of the experiences of these special projects at main community meetings via report-back sessions.

On what platforms, are BRIDGE members collaborating around the issue of policy?

BRIDGE members collaborate on a number of platforms around the issue of policy. These include:

- At CoP meetings
- At focus group meetings
- Via Twitter
- Via Facebook
- Via BRIDGE’s online collaboration Wiki
- Via special projects (see section above)
Is there a case where vertical integration is taking place - where, and how?

According to BRIDGE’s methodology, vertical integration refers to, “utilising the communities for effective practice to create a link between practice on the ground and provincial and national policy creation and implementation”. The case study summarised below provides an example of where and how vertical integration is taking place in the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP’s Tertiary Access Focus Group. The full case study is available in Annex 1.

BRIDGE CASE STUDY: POLICY AND PRACTICE

This case study investigates the concept of “practice and policy change” in BRIDGE’s Maths and Science Learner Support Community of Practice (CoP), specifically in its Tertiary Access Focus Group. The study follows up on a previous interview with a member of the CoP who explains the link between policy and practice within the Tertiary Access Focus Group and how it has evolved over time.

According to the government representative interviewed for this case, the tertiary access focus group has begun to build trust and collaboration among its members. In addition, the focus group’s ideas and practice are being incorporated into the drafts of the national policy for careers development, signifying the vertical integration of policy and practice.

The key findings are (i) BRIDGE has an important role to play as an “honest broker” that brings government, donors and the NGO sector together in a first step towards effecting policy and practice change (ii) actively involving policy makers in the process of generating knowledge facilitates their engagement and strengthens the link between policy and practice; and (iv) practice and policy change is ideally bi-directional, with practice influencing policy and vice versa.

Is there evidence that policy makers are engaging with BRIDGE as an important education stakeholder?

An analysis of the organisations represented at the National Maths and Science CoP and Tertiary Access Focus Group meetings demonstrates that government (policy makers) are engaging with BRIDGE, although the graph below demonstrates that they only make up a small proportion of the sectors represented at these meetings:

Figure 2: Analysis of Participation by Sector

---

17 This graph is based on an analysis of the Maths and Science CoP database. The organisation names were not captured consistently between the “attendance” and “organisation” tabs and so the number of representatives for each sector captured in this graph may not be wholly accurate.
The BRIDGE Maths and Science Learner Support CoP maintains participation from a wide range of sectors. Currently, 31% of the organisations that attend CoP meetings are NGOs, 20% are funders and Corporate Social Investment (CSI) organisations, and 17% are For-Profit organisations. The remaining sectors represented at CoP meetings include research and academic institutions, other innovators, schools, and government organisations.

In addition, Social Network Analysis (see page 15) shows that BRIDGE is engaging via social media with multiple government and policy individuals/organisations/entities such as the Department of Basic Education, the Gauteng Department of Education, the Department of Science and Technology (DST), the Presidency of the Government of South Africa, the National Planning Commission of South Africa\(^\text{18}\), and the Centre for Education Policy Development.

BRIDGE also engages actively with the Gauteng Department of Education, the National Planning Commission, and DST in its work. GDE is currently exploring a regional partnership with BRIDGE.

\(^{18}\text{Now part of the Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (DPME)}\)
**Knowledge Generation and Management**

Knowledge generation and management is an underlying theme which supports sustainability, innovation, and linking policy and practice. Within BRIDGE, **knowledge generation** takes place in the context of CoPs and focus groups with a common purpose, effective support and trust among members. BRIDGE facilitates the development of new knowledge, collects and collates knowledge which is generated by the CoPs, and sources and organises existing knowledge. In its **knowledge management** role, BRIDGE distributes and shares this knowledge both internally and more widely to the education sector. The following definition of knowledge management highlights its role in creating strategic value for an organisation:

“Knowledge management is the systematic management of an organisation’s knowledge assets for the purpose of creating value and meeting tactical & strategic requirements; it consists of the initiatives, processes, strategies, and systems that sustain and enhance the storage, assessment, sharing, refinement, and creation of knowledge.”

According to the BRIDGE website:

“Knowledge is the currency of social networks and learning communities.”

BRIDGE processes for gathering and sharing knowledge can be described as both techno-centric (through the use of technology platforms such as Facebook, Twitter and online community interactions) and ecological (focusing on the interaction and collaboration of people with common interests and identities through the convening of Communities of Practice and other events). In this report, Khulisa explores knowledge generation and management within BRIDGE, how far it has come, and where it is likely to go. A subset of questions identified during the course of the evaluation that fit within the knowledge generation and management theme include the following:

Is there a case where Knowledge Management is being used to document and share knowledge within/outside of COPs?

The case summarised below provides an example of the increasing requests for Knowledge Management services that BRIDGE is receiving from various organisations. For example, the Gauteng Education Development Trust (GEDT), asked BRIDGE to analyse 36 evaluations and document the lessons that emerge from these evaluations in a use-friendly repository. The full case is available in Annex 1.

---


Another example of BRIDGE’s role as a service provider is the collaboration between BRIDGE and the National Education Collaboration Trust (NECT). In October 2014, BRIDGE was appointed by the NECT to review the role of social investment in maths and science education and develop tools, guidelines, systems and processes for social investors in the sector in order to maximise their investment. BRIDGE is working in collaboration and partnership with Tshikululu Social Investments, NECT and the DBE on this project, primarily to make the link to the learnings of the FirstRand Maths Chairs Initiative as well as to the MST Directorate in the DBE. However, this is also an opportunity for BRIDGE to share the work of the CoP with the larger sector, and to ensure that the CoP engages with this content. BRIDGE has built in with NECT a “focus group” role for the CoP.

In both cases of knowledge management service provision to the GEDT and NECT, BRIDGE was specially commissioned by these organisations to conduct meta-analyses and distil and distribute the learnings. Both of these organisations have ties to policy-making bodies. These cases provide evidence that BRIDGE is starting to play an important role in knowledge generation and management, both in terms of documenting and sharing knowledge internally within the BRIDGE network and more widely within the education sector.

How are effective practices being spread through Knowledge Management techniques?

In 2014, BRIDGE reviewed its knowledge management strategy and has consequently developed new mediums of communication and a new suite of knowledge products. In response to the interim evaluation’s recommendation that BRIDGE “Build on the BRIDGE website so that it can be used as an easily searchable repository for all the knowledge products that are generated and collected”, BRIDGE has developed its new website. The website hosts a knowledge hub that contains all BRIDGE knowledge products, video, resources, tools and guides developed from the organisation’s inception to date. This integrated platform will serve as BRIDGE’s main knowledge repository, where open
source materials, resources, information and tools will be made available to the wider education sector in South Africa. The website went live in January 2015 (see www.bridge.org.za). The new BRIDGE Knowledge Hub can be found at http://www.bridge.org.za/knowledge-hub/.

BRIDGE also actively shares and spreads effective practices through a variety of online social media platforms. These platforms reach a large number of people, beyond BRIDGE community members, as detailed below:

**Twitter - Bridge Project @BridgeProjectSA**

The BRIDGE twitter page has over 2500 followers and since October 2010 has posted over 7500 tweets. The account is very active and has regular updates. Follower interaction is good and their tweets have made 114,995 impressions (number of times posts have been seen).

**YouTube – Bridge RSA**

The BRIDGE YouTube page has 32 subscribers and, for the 61 videos posted, the channel has received over 11000 views. However, the videos are posted in bulk, too many videos being posted over a short space of time can be overwhelming for the viewers. Videos posted over time, at regular intervals, would be easier for the viewers to consume. The page would benefit from having a name similar to that which BRIDGE has used on other media platforms.

**Facebook - Bridge - Linking Innovators in Education**

The BRIDGE Facebook page has 453 likes, 141 of which are from other Facebook pages. BRIDGE uses Facebook to share relevant resources on a consistent basis which generates engagement through comments and likes. The Facebook pages that like Bridge are dominantly non-profits and education-focused organisation.

**LinkedIn - Bridge Innovation in Learning Org**

BRIDGE’s LinkedIn page has 25 followers but has infrequent interaction from these followers. The page has not had a post in 7 months even though there has been activity on other networks. LinkedIn is necessary to build business presence in a less social but more professional online network. The LinkedIn company name is different from others so finding the company page could be difficult for some.

**SlideShare - BridgeProjectSA**

BRIDGE has recently started to use SlideShare to distribute presentations. To date, they have 1 follower and have posted 3 presentations. The presentations have received a combined total of 141 views over the 3 weeks that they have been made available on the site.

Overall, BRIDGE has grown in terms of sharing effective practices through effective knowledge management techniques. More knowledge products are being generated internally and shared and the BRIDGE website has been revised to become more efficient and effective, especially as a repository for information, resources, tools, videos and other knowledge management products.

What knowledge management models can be used to expand BRIDGE’s reach in the future?

BRIDGE’s knowledge management approach is grounded in their CoPs in that it captures what emerges from CoP meetings, and from members sharing and reflecting on resources, tools and best practice. BRIDGE prefers working with and sharing existing knowledge, working with practitioners, and gleaning knowledge from practice rather than conducting independent research. As articulated by a BRIDGE staff member:

“There’s always been certain products that have come out of these Communities of Practice, whether people bring to it and then share or whether it has been learnings that come out of the sessions. One of the things we are trying to do now is to formalise THAT process of what comes out of the CoPs... what can BRIDGE actually produce and develop...”

BRIDGE key informants agreed that KM can expand beyond the dissemination and sharing of knowledge from and within the CoPs. The case studied (above) provides evidence that BRIDGE has the capacity and capabilities to provide knowledge management services in addition to the dissemination of information emerging from the CoPs. Knowledge management and dissemination services also support the sustainability of BRIDGE, as providing these services allows BRIDGE to have a bigger footprint in the sector and build on their expertise. A BRIDGE representative describes how knowledge generation and management is currently being approached:

“...the capturing of what’s working in practice and then the disseminating of that to practitioners and stakeholders is key to the functioning of the system, BRIDGE has now developed significant expertise and competence in this field... building on that and actually having significant knowledge management activities, not limited to the work of the CoPs but working in a much more systemic way, I think that is going to be a key driver for BRIDGE going forward.”

She goes on to describe how BRIDGE is using knowledge management to reach beyond the CoPs through deliberate sharing mechanisms:

“We are always looking for mechanisms as to how we can link knowledge products to other provinces. In [the] ECD [CoP] we have done this in a very deliberate way... we have mapped the provincial forums and networks in ECD and started to communicate with those, sending them
knowledge products so that they can then send them to their local and municipal constituencies, so it’s not only about the knowledge products but also the knowledge flow. That’s something we need to do for the Maths and Science CoP as well; it is getting the knowledge flow of what’s happening in these communities and start sending it out to the provinces using virtual forums and networks...”

What new knowledge products is BRIDGE creating?

BRIDGE has been successful in generating a number of new knowledge products, both internally and externally. BRIDGE uses knowledge management as a process to capture, develop, distil and share knowledge that improves practice. Listed below are various products which BRIDGE uses to disseminate new and existing knowledge21:

- **What’s Trending Updates**: Key issues and debates in the BRIDGE Focus Areas that receive a lot of attention.
- **Working Practice Profiles**: School profiles, stories or case studies that illustrate working practice in an area of education.
- **Impact Stories**: Brief narratives from community members on major learnings they have taken from an interaction.
- **Fact Sheets**: Summarised elements of new policies, directions or events in education.
- **Meeting Highlights**: Overviews and highlights of CoP or other meetings, including any ‘hot topics’ for debate.
- **Presentations**: PowerPoint presentations from CoP or other meetings.
- **Tools and Resources**: Tools, templates, and guidelines that help in the practical application of classroom or school-based strategies.
- **Maps**: Databases of systemic information, such as a map of provision in a specific sector with provider details. These maps help to keep the sector informed and promote collaboration by making information visible.
- **Videos**: Short videos of key presentations or debates in a CoP or other meetings.

BRIDGE makes a deliberate effort to share and link their CoPs through these products and services. The “What’s trending” update, introduced in 2014, includes information from all BRIDGE’s CoPs according to common themes and areas of concern among the CoPs.

**Sustainability**

Sustainability, in this context, refers to the ability of BRIDGE Communities of Practice to “strike a balance between stability and change”. In this report, Khulisa has investigated the importance of the stability of the Maths and Science COP, specifically the Tertiary Access Group within the COP. Khulisa

has examined how best BRIDGE can improve the potential for sustainability, and has also investigated potential funding models for the continuation of BRIDGE activities in the future. A subset of questions identified during the course of the evaluation that fit within the sustainability theme include the following:

According to BRIDGE and selected donors/members, how important is the stability of the Maths and Science COP, specifically the Tertiary Access Group, in relation to the larger BRIDGE community?

Respondents felt that BRIDGE as a whole is a stable organisation, but that the CoPs themselves will naturally shift and develop over time. A few respondents suggested that some of the focus groups, such as the Tertiary Access Focus Group or the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Group, no longer belong as a “sub-group” to the Maths and Science Learner Support COP but rather have evolved into communities in their own right. There was positive feedback and interest on the cross-COP trends documentation and sharing.

Is there evidence for the feasibility of BRIDGE to operate as a service provider in the sector?

All respondents interviewed were comfortable with BRIDGE as a service provider. The only caveat was the concern that some clients may be uncomfortable with BRIDGE’s open education resource (OER) ethos (in other words may prefer to keep the BRIDGE products private). In fact, BRIDGE has been operating as a service provider since inception, but the percentage of income earned as a result of selling services has hovered around 15% annually. Overall, BRIDGE’s revenue from 2011 to 2015 (including projections to June 30, 2015) is R20 757 829, of which R3 078 515 was earned through service provision, as diagrammed below:

![BRIDGE FUNDING SOURCES](image-url)
Is there an example of how BRIDGE resources are being optimised to promote sustainability?

BRIDGE does not monetise its in-kind contributions from supportive community members (although it did do this with the South African Extraordinary Schools Coalition/SAESC by noting the travel and hosting costs of member schools). If these contributions were monetised, it would add an additional 3 to 5% to BRIDGE’s overall budget. Donors like to know that organisations are receiving in-kind donations. Types of in-kind support received by BRIDGE include venue and catering. For example:

Figure 4: BRIDGE Contributions and In-Kind Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Champion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zenex</td>
<td>Major funder for Maths and Science CoP and its focus groups, Post School Access, M&amp;E, Teacher Development and Knowledge Management</td>
<td>Funds, attends and promotes BRIDGE, engages actively with Tertiary Access Group and contributes time and energy in the work of the focus group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rand Merchant Bank (RMB)</td>
<td>Venue and catering for Maths and Science Learner Support main community meetings, funder</td>
<td>Attends and promotes BRIDGE membership among grantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barloworld</td>
<td>Venue and catering for COPs, funder</td>
<td>Funds, attends and promotes BRIDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshikululu Social Investments</td>
<td>Venue for CoPs, funder</td>
<td>Funds, attends and promotes BRIDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasol Inzalo</td>
<td>Venue and catering for Tertiary Access Focus Group</td>
<td>Attends and engages actively with Tertiary Access Group. Contributes time and energy in the work of the focus group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAESC member schools</td>
<td>Venue and food provided by each school as they rotate meetings. Members pay their own travel and accommodation costs. Members actively run their own COP sharing experiences, promoting good practice and peer review processes.</td>
<td>Attends and promotes BRIDGE and is active in various BRIDGE CoPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wits University’s school of education, University of Johannesburg’s education faculty</td>
<td>Hosts and provides one of the speakers for each of the Teacher Upfront dialogues.</td>
<td>Promotes BRIDGE to their constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail &amp; Guardian</td>
<td>Publishes article(s) on each Teachers Upfront session.</td>
<td>Provides public coverage of BRIDGE activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities for optimising BRIDGE resources to promote sustainability include the following:

- The Sasol Inzalo Foundation needs to hand over after its statutory dissolution. The teacher leadership and knowledge management activities and records need to be handed over to an organisation. The cost of hosting future activities could be negotiated.
- RMB is moving towards “systemic” education interventions, which require significant sharing and KM requirements. RMB is also interested in setting up CoPs for other sectors, such as arts and culture.

What funding models could be considered that may contribute to BRIDGE sustainability?

There are several possible funding models each of which are considered with comments from respondents about their feasibility, below:

Figure 5: Possible Funding Models for BRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Funding</th>
<th>Appropriateness for BRIDGE</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service provision contracts</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>As noted above, service provision is already bringing in about 15% of BRIDGE’s revenue. This is a potentially bigger market, particularly as BRIDGE builds its relationship with the NECT and the Gauteng Education Development Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Investment</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>BRIDGE is already receiving both in-kind and funding from many CSI initiatives through Tshikululu and other donors, it should continue to be a prime focus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Champion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SciBono</td>
<td>Venue for COPs, venue for Teachers Upfront</td>
<td>Attends and promotes BRIDGE. Strong participation in Teacher Development COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIBS</td>
<td>Venue for ECD COP, venue for Teacher Development focus group of Maths and Science CoP</td>
<td>Attends and promotes BRIDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JET Education Services</td>
<td>Venue for M&amp;E Focus Group of Maths &amp; Science CoP twice a year</td>
<td>Attends and promotes BRIDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Funding</td>
<td>Appropriateness for BRIDGE</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>The Zenex Foundation is a very strong partner. The Michael and Susan Dell Foundation have funded BRIDGE in the past. Typically, foundations prefer to partner, often originating an idea with the implementing partner. Identifying and building these relationships can be challenging but offer large potential benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations from users/members</td>
<td>Strong potential</td>
<td>Under the old website, the “donate to BRIDGE” button was on the contact page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One individual member has consistently given annually to BRIDGE and a few members have made individual contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On BRIDGE’s new website, the donate button is now more prominent, but could be even stronger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE uses the GivenGain website and should upgrade the page in line with its new website identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Funds campaign</td>
<td>Small Potential</td>
<td>Identify donors who are willing to match any funds raised. Requires a very skilled fundraising team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowd-funding particularly from the South African diaspora</td>
<td>Small potential</td>
<td>Many international NGOs are targeting the diaspora to provide funding. For example, CARE has targeted Malawian diaspora to support their flood relief activities in Malawi. BRIDGE could target (perhaps in partnership with other NGOs) the South African diaspora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-lateral or Multi-lateral donors</td>
<td>Small potential</td>
<td>These projects are competed through complex tenders requiring knowledge of each agency’s requirements. Projects tend to be large and inflexible, and often shrouded in secrecy. BRIDGE could work as a subcontractor to a knowledgeable organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Type of Funding | Appropriateness for BRIDGE | Explanation
--- | --- | ---
Major gifts from philanthropists | Small potential | Worldwide 75% of all philanthropic giving comes from individuals or families. These include inclusion in wills or once off giving. Universities and health-related NGOs are particularly successful at this approach and often offer tax deductions.
Membership fees | Unlikely | Respondents had very negative view of membership fees. Collecting fees is a major administrative challenge and there needs to be clearly perceived benefit. For example, the National Home Builders Registration Council (NHBRC) charges members a fee, without membership, banks will not fund building alterations.

Typically, when development projects are assessed, elements of sustainability are examined. Khulisa has identified a “Sustainability Framework” (see Annex 2), which identifies a small set of organisational and contextual domains that can help build the capacity for maintaining a program. Based on this framework, Khulisa has assessed BRIDGE according to each element of the framework. Capacity for sustainability is defined as the ability to maintain programming and its benefits over time. The table below indicates the extent to which the BRIDGE has been effective in addressing these sustainability factors. The ‘green tick’ indicates where the programme has been effective, the ‘green tick plus red cross’ indicate the programme has been somewhat effective and the ‘red cross’ indicates an area that the programme should aim to improve.

Figure 6: BRIDGE Sustainability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>Effective or Adequate</th>
<th>Balanced but could improve</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22 Adapted from [https://sustaintool.org/](https://sustaintool.org/) downloaded November 2014.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Factors</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Evaluator Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Support or Enabling Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE is operating in an environment fraught with uncertainty and, in some cases, panic about the future of the education system. At this point, BRIDGE has several champions which assist and promote BRIDGE membership and activities. These include several corporate social investment leaders, Gauteng provincial, district and parastatal leaders, and a number of individuals in the private and NGO sectors. However, there is need for more champions who will bring BRIDGE into the centre of government, link to neglected stakeholder groups (such as Teacher Unions) and initiatives such as the National Education Collaborative Trust (NECT).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding stability is one of BRIDGE’s greatest challenges. Twelve donors currently provide support to BRIDGE, but only the <a href="http://www.dsd.gov.za/npo/dmdocuments/Model%20Codes%20of%20Good%20Practice.pdf">Zenex Foundation</a> has provided 2 consecutive multi-year grant funding for BRIDGE, although the Oppenheimer Memorial Trust has given two consecutive two-year grants. Other funders typically support BRIDGE on an annual basis, although many have supported BRIDGE for more than three years to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE has a strong outward focus and has a strong capacity to build and maintain its partnerships. However, key partnerships need to be built. Often respondents cited the need to build greater partnerships with the DBE, DHET and DST and, in other cases, with Teacher Unions and cross-sectoral potential partners such as the South African Monitoring and Evaluation Association (SAMEA), AMESA, RASA, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>BRIDGE has strong organisational capacity, and over the two years of the evaluations has shown efficiency gains. Standard operating procedures are adhered to and employees and board members are highly committed. BRIDGE is compliant with South African government regulations and laws governing non-profit organisations in South Africa, including the Department of Social Development’s official “Code of Good Practice for NPOs”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Factors</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Evaluator Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Evaluation</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Rating" /> <img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>BRIDGE has strong engagement with evaluators (and this evaluation in particular) and actively engages with recommendations and using new analytics. Currently BRIDGE is building internal programme evaluation capacity through appointing a Strategic Information Officer in January to assist with M&amp;E tasks and analytics. BRIDGE sent a representative to a three day Outcome Mapping workshop and subsequently Khulisa and BRIDGE representatives held an outcome mapping engagement session to discuss potential uses of this evaluation methodology. The first Tertiary Access Focus Group meeting will be deciding on their “progress markers”: an element of the Outcome Mapping methodology, while the M&amp;E group will be looking at common indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Adaptation</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>BRIDGE is flexible, adapts rapidly to changing conditions, and has mechanisms built in for quality improvement. BRIDGE is using its member feedback from communities of practice for reflection and action. Khulisa has worked with BRIDGE to build analytical tools (to measure social media such as Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/15" alt="Rating" /></td>
<td>BRIDGE is constantly seeking feedback and refining its communications strategies and platforms. The new website (launched in 2015) is already a huge improvement, allowing greater access to BRIDGE knowledge outputs. New formats (including trends and infographics) are more accessible for busy readers. However, communications are largely one-way from BRIDGE to followers, even on the BRIDGE online community. On the other hand, much of the one-way communication is the result of an “interactivity gap” that exists in the South African context. There are exceptions. For example, CoP members have collaborated on a suite of School Peer Review Instruments. The challenge is how to create a vibrant two-way online dialogue. It is worth noting that BRIDGE has:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reviewed its stakeholder analysis and charted a stakeholder journey that now informs our communication protocol with stakeholders via the different social network platforms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BRIDGE EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability Factors</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Evaluator Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Created a social media strategy that our newly appointed Strategic Information Officer heads with support of the various project managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intensified focus on knowledge management as a team, undertaking knowledge management activities weekly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategic Planning | ✔️ | BRIDGE has implemented routine strategic planning with staff and board members and, in April 2014, held a BRIDGE Review Day at GIBS with donors and key stakeholders. These sessions have been used to contribute to the strategic planning process. Out of the review day came a new commitment to knowledge management and a growing focus on M&E. The strategic plan aligns with the South African governments National Development Plan. |

Finally, partnership sustainability\textsuperscript{24} is another key element of sustainability that is relevant in the BRIDGE context. The more “stakes” that BRIDGE community members have, the more likely that the partnership between BRIDGE and the organisation will be sustained. Khulisa has conducted an analysis of the various “stakes” that a selection of stakeholders have in BRIDGE (Annex 3). It is important to note that this “stake analysis” is an experimental analysis carried out by Khulisa for this report. Therefore, the analysis was circumscribed by what was available in the existing database. Khulisa acknowledges that a qualitative exploration would yield better results at this point. However, the analysis could be used as a potential tool to assist BRIDGE in monitoring partnership sustainability going forward.

\textsuperscript{24} Boyle, M.E., Ross, L., and Stephen, J.C. Who has a stake? How stakeholder processes influence partnership sustainability.
5. OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

BRIDGE Model and Methodology

A. Previous Recommendations

In the BRIDGE Evaluation Interim Report, Khulisa made the following recommendations regarding the BRIDGE Model and Methodology:

As CoPs move through different phases in the lifecycle, ensure that facilitation methodology reflects the phase it is in. This can be done by analysing the database for participation trends by focus group. This can also be assessed through the check in at the beginning of the session. More mature members tend to prefer sharing that leads to action and momentum, while new members benefit from discovery and coalescing activities.

Revisit and reaffirm the ‘BRIDGE Way’ and its Theory of Change on a yearly basis to ensure that it is adapting to the emerging needs and changing environment of individual members, their organisations and the larger education sector. It may be appropriate at this juncture to invite a select number of representatives of mature CoPs or other core members in this process.

Over the past year, BRIDGE has implemented both of these recommendations. Check-in sessions are consciously considered with respect to the relevant CoP lifecycle phase, although the addition of new members and the exit of longer-standing members can make it difficult for BRIDGE to pinpoint the relevant stage. BRIDGE staff and facilitators recognise that the CoP and focus groups consequently move in and out of phases and the process is not linear. As a first step towards enhancing their facilitation methodology, BRIDGE has ensured that all facilitators are briefed on the lifecycle model. BRIDGE facilitators also participated in an evaluation workshop that Khulisa held in February 2014, which resulted in BRIDGE implementing some changes in their CoP facilitation approach.

The ‘BRIDGE Way’ is currently in its eleventh iteration and BRIDGE has engaged in the process of updating their methodology annually, based on learning. For example, BRIDGE is currently redefining CoP activity with respect to the “intensity of collaboration” within the CoP. BRIDGE aims to incorporate this model of intensity into the ‘BRIDGE way’, focusing on its implications for facilitation methodology. As another major adaptation to the ‘BRIDGE way’, BRIDGE has increased its involvement at a provincial level with the establishment of five Western Cape CoPs – specifically innovative in its approach is BRIDGE’s identifying of champion partner organisations, who drive the CoP in the WC. BRIDGE hopes to replicate this in other provinces. BRIDGE is testing and refining its model with a provincial audience to deepen and scale its work in its focus areas. BRIDGE has also started to experiment with radio and television broadcasts.
A third adaption to the “BRIDGE way” involves the concept that there are a variety of cross-cutting themes, such as teacher development and the use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs), that feature across CoPs and across focus areas. As a result, BRIDGE has made two changes to accommodate this concept: (1) BRIDGE has started to develop knowledge products on these cross-cutting themes that can be used and shared between CoPs and, (2) BRIDGE now facilitates feedback sessions in larger CoP meetings so that focus group members can share their work and knowledge in these thematic areas with the larger community.

B. Current Recommendations

Going forward, the evaluation findings suggest that BRIDGE could continue to play a role in actively facilitating innovation by creating deliberate, targeted, strategies. BRIDGE could also develop more specific strategies for gathering and distributing about innovations that have occurred. The evaluation team recommends that the following actions could be undertaken by the BRIDGE team:

1. **Continue to document and share innovation.** One of the evaluation’s recommendations is that BRIDGE consider labelling and defining innovative processes and products in such a way that they become more easily recognisable and searchable. This includes taking into account the difference between process and product innovations and documenting each of these in relevant ways. In addition, the evaluation team recommends that BRIDGE consider actively sharing stories of innovations across communities. This would help spread best practices and potentially motivate other stakeholders to innovate.

2. **Continue to facilitate innovation.** Another recommendation is that BRIDGE facilitators continue to provide support to CoPs in uncovering common challenges; identifying and mentoring change champions; and fostering the development of trust by encouraging sharing of successes and failures.

BRIDGE’s methodology with regards to **practice and policy**, defined in “The BRIDGE Way”, is to utilise “the communities for effective practice to create a link between practice on the ground and provincial and national policy creation and implementation” through (1) Sharing the work of a community for effective practice at a provincial and national level and with other provinces, (2) Learning from each other to create more effective processes to co-create policy and collaboratively implement and plan, and (3) Creating collective power around what is working in order to ensure adoption of what is working. The evaluation findings suggest that BRIDGE could continue to play a role in facilitating the vertical integration of practice and policy using this approach, but that it could also continue to develop its emerging strategy for actively linking knowledge, policy and practice. The evaluation team recommends that the following action could be undertaken by the BRIDGE team going forward:
BRIDGE has made great strides in improving its knowledge generation and management function. The evaluation recommends that the following action could further enhance BRIDGE’s knowledge management strategy:

3. **Develop a formal strategy for BRIDGE’s role in facilitating a link between knowledge, policy and practice.** The evaluation’s findings suggest that although BRIDGE has started to develop and implement targeted strategies for integrating knowledge, policy, and practice, a formal strategy and methodology could be considered to ensure that BRIDGE systematically takes advantage of the opportunities available.

5. **Further enhance attendance data and record keeping.** The evaluation team recommends that BRIDGE consider introducing drop-down lists for organisation names and session types, making sure that everyone signs the register at CoP meetings, and accounting for when people switch or leave organisations.

4. **Develop a formal strategy for BRIDGE’s role in facilitating a link between knowledge, policy and practice.** The evaluation’s findings suggest that although BRIDGE has started to develop and implement targeted strategies for integrating knowledge, policy, and practice, a formal strategy and methodology could be considered to ensure that BRIDGE systematically takes advantage of the opportunities available.

The evaluation presents a few options for BRIDGE to improve its sustainability. Recommendations include:

6. **Optimise social media strategy.** Specific recommendations include developing more easily searchable names for each social media group and actively improving BRIDGE’s LinkedIn network.

7. **Increase stakes in BRIDGE.** The evaluation recommends that BRIDGE consider actively aiming to increase participant’s stakes in BRIDGE by inviting them to participate in meetings, present at meetings, engage via social media, and via other targeted strategies. Increased stakes can increase partnership sustainability.

8. **Consider various funding models.** The evaluation presents several possible funding models for BRIDGE, each of which are considered with comments. BRIDGE could consider each of these funding models in relation to potentially increasing BRIDGE’s financial sustainability.
Maths and Science Learner Support

A. Previous Recommendations

In the BRIDGE Evaluation Interim Report, Khulisa made the following recommendations regarding the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP:

More structure. Clearer agenda. Explicitly define the role of this CoP within the Learner Support Focus Area, and how it should relate to its focus groups.

Know your audience and differentiate certain activities (such as breakaway sessions) accordingly. Update membership profiles for the database of the main community, further disaggregating by self-reported sector, seniority levels, types of participation and age (i.e. break out the 20-30 range from the 30-40 range).

Over the past year, BRIDGE has implemented both of these recommendations fairly well. BRIDGE has defined and implemented a much more overt link between what is happening in the major CoP communities, how this filters down to CoP subgroups, and vice versa. BRIDGE has also made a good effort to better ‘know their audience’.

B. Current Recommendations

The evaluation recommends that the following action could further improve BRIDGE’s Maths and Science Learner Support CoP:

Hearn and White (2009) note that CoPs are not uniform, and often have very different sizes, composition, level of formality, and focus, among other differences. They argue that the size and composition affects the purpose and functions of different CoPs. In the case of BRIDGE, it is evident that different CoPs, and even different focus groups, are not comprised the same way and therefore cannot be expected to evolve in the same way or even have the same purpose or function. For example, the Ekurhuleni North Principal’s Community of Practice is made up of a homogenous group of school principals from the same geographic location, whereas the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP is made up of a heterogeneous group of individuals from many different sectors and geographic locations. These differences naturally create variances in levels of trust, common purpose, values and motivation. The evaluation recommends that BRIDGE consider exploring the role of the National Maths and Science Learner Support CoP, taking these differences into account:
Tertiary Access Focus Group

A. Previous Recommendations

In the BRIDGE Evaluation Interim Report, Khulisa made the following recommendations regarding the Maths and Science Learner Support CoP:

Over the past year, BRIDGE has fully implemented this recommendation. Different focus groups report back to one another at larger meetings. For example, subgroups provide feedback on the content and outcomes of their sessions to the larger CoP meetings. This feedback is then reciprocated – the outcomes of larger CoP meetings are shared with sub-group members. These are often recorded and shared in meeting highlights (documented on the website’s knowledge hub) and on YouTube.

B. Current Recommendations

The Policy and Practice case study revealed that government and donors are not on the same page in the Tertiary Access Group. While one donor representative felt that government did not participate and that the value of the group was unclear, a government representative reported that the focus group is developing trust and having a positive impact on practice and policy. These widely divergent views suggest that more work could be done to bring participants together to a common understanding.

In addition, it is not clear what the role of the donor is within the focus group. Hearn and White (2009) suggest a number of ways in which CoPs can be better supported by organisations and donors including getting donors and organisations to (a) foster rather than control the objectives and goals of the CoP; (b) focus on facilitation of the emerging needs of the group; (c) clarify the needs and capacities of the group’s members; (d) understand the lifecycle of CoPs. These, among other things, can improve relations within a CoP and among its members.
With these findings and suggestions in mind, the evaluation recommends that BRIDGE consider undertaking the following activity with the Tertiary Access Focus Group going forward:

11. **Improve understanding of how the focus group can be better supported by organisations and donors.** The evaluation recommends that BRIDGE consider facilitating a session whereby focus group members align their expectations and roles.

### 6. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, BRIDGE has fully implemented almost all of the recommendations from the Interim Evaluation and has made significant progress towards achieving its objectives. BRIDGE is an agile and committed organisation that has embraced the developmental nature of this evaluation; often taking recommendations beyond what was initially expected. The organisation is not static, but rather is committed to iterative learning and improvement. They are flexible in method but inflexible in goal; remaining strongly committed to their vision but constantly reflecting on, and changing, their own practice.

### 7. ANNEXES

- Annex 1 Case Studies
- Annex 2 Sustainability Framework
- Annex 3 Key Informant Interview Tools
- Annex 4 “Stakes“ Analysis
BRIDGE CASE STUDY: INNOVATION

This study investigates one of the key innovations that has evolved out of BRIDGE’s Principals and School Leadership Community of Practice (CoP) and aims to understand how this innovation evolved. The case being studied involves the implementation of a Maths diagnostic test at a number of primary schools in Ekurhuleni North district in Gauteng and an innovative course of action taken by the Ekurhuleni North Principals’ CoP in response to the test results.

The key findings are (i) when CoPs have a common purpose and members begin to trust one another and share resources, innovation can take place; (ii) When a CoP has a “compelling goal or challenge that can be met only through innovation”, innovation is more likely to occur; (iii) although the CoP may come up with the innovative idea together, it is necessary for the CoP to have at least one “champion” to drive the innovation forward and; (iv) good facilitation of the COP could be a key factor for igniting the innovative idea and supporting the CoP in planning to take it forward. These factors drive the process of innovation.

This case study represents two types: (1) program effects and (2) critical instance. It captures an innovation that would not have taken place in the absence of the program, demonstrating program effects. It also examines a unique event, or critical instance, that provides an insight into how innovation has occurred in the BRIDGE context.

Data for this study was collected through a variety of sources including key informant interviews with a member of the COP, two representatives from BRIDGE, and the COP facilitator, and a review of relevant documents and records. Primary and secondary data underwent qualitative analysis to support findings and conclusions through a process of triangulation.

Introduction

The case being studied involves the implementation of a maths diagnostic test at a number of primary schools in Ekurhuleni North district in Gauteng and an innovative course of action taken by the CoP in response to the test results. This case was selected as a result of participatory engagement with BRIDGE, whereby the particular case was identified as the best example of a critical instance of innovation in BRIDGE that that also demonstrates the program’s effects.

Background

Ekurhuleni North Principals’ Community of Practice (CoP) was initiated by BRIDGE in 2011, with the support of the Ekurhuleni District Office. Importantly, the district was involved in the selection of schools for the CoP, as explained by a key BRIDGE staff member involved in the project:

“...the schools were originally chosen by [the] district so there has been support from the beginning”
The CoP is comprised of volunteer primary school principals and is facilitated by an experienced BRIDGE facilitator. The CoP sets its own agenda and meets formally once a quarter to discuss different types of issues; some that affect all schools in the area and others that relate to providing support and advice within and between the CoP member schools. The needs of the CoP emerge from the contexts within which the school principals work.

At the point of initiation in 2011, the CoP was not warmly received by the principals in the area. According to a principal in the CoP, who has been a part of the community since its inception;

“Initially there was a bit of scepticism, a bit of fear, because you don’t know who you’re dealing with.”

Over the past three years, the CoP developed into an engaging community where principals share their experiences and support one another. In the words of the principal:

“... I think now we’ve developed a form of camaraderie. I think there’s trust. We trust each other. I think also when we go to principal’s forums... we identify with each other, we socialise... So I think the spinoff has been far greater than us just being in that meeting and talking... there’s somehow that pull factor where we just pull together, and I think that is the difference.”

The CoP’s facilitator echoes this sentiment in the following comment:

“... [There is] real trust...they now share stuff. What I have a real problem with is picking up what they do which they see as normal which I think is impact of the CoP.”

The main activities that the CoP engages in include:

1. Sharing resources – both physical and intellectual
2. Solving problems together
3. Providing advice and support to one another (peer support)
4. Modelling behaviour
5. Coaching and mentoring

The CoP has changed over time from a collection of disconnected and isolated school leaders to a group of co-contributors who interact with one another in a symbiotic relationship. In relation to the lifecycle of CoPs, the Ekurhuleni North Principals CoP is in the “maturing” stage. The group is now building on knowledge sharing and co-consulting activities toward collaboration on innovative projects. The following comment, provided by the school principal interviewed for this study, summarises the evolution of the CoP over the past three years:

“...we’re basically not in competition but rather inter-dependent, and that makes a big difference... Before that we were all independent... our schools [were] in competition with each other... I think
once you get to know principals on a different level then that type of superficiality falls away, because then it lies in a community. You’re not selfishly alone in your school. And I think, to me, that’s absolutely important... to develop that view that the community is important and not just the learners in your school.”

Outside of the formal meetings, principals in the CoP are now meeting on an informal level. Some principals get together and discuss issues that face other schools in the area and that also affect them. Principals within the CoP have indicated that it is important that the CoP continue to operate, as it is an important source of support to the schools in the area.

The Innovation

The principals within the Community of Practice came up with an idea to administer a district-wide mathematics (maths) test so that they could gain insight into the gaps within maths learning and teaching both within their own schools and within the community as a whole. As the CoP was primarily made up of primary school principals, the group decided to meet with secondary school principals in the area and gain their buy-in to administer the test within their own schools. BRIDGE facilitated the administration of the maths diagnostic test at the schools within the district covered by the CoP. The primary and secondary school teachers met to mark the tests together which, according to a key BRIDGE staff member, was “the first time that they had really interacted”.

BRIDGE analysed the results and fed the results of this test back to the CoP through the CoP’s facilitator. The principals in the CoP subsequently recognised that there were common challenges across all the schools, both primary and high. They saw that there was a problem with Grade 7 maths in their schools and that, specifically, there was a problem with the quality of maths teaching at this level. In response, they decided to engage in a workshop to support the professional development of teachers in their schools. According to the school principal interviewed for this case:

“From the data we picked up [that] while the percentages varied, the problem areas were the same... there was a problem in terms of teaching. So what came up from our meeting ... was that teachers probably knew their work but the presentation, the didactics, was a problem in terms of how to transfer that knowledge to the learners. So, based on that, we then called up a meeting with all the HODs and the teachers teaching Grade 7. And again I think that because of that position of trust, I think probably about 90% of the teachers responded. We called the teachers together and my question to them was ‘where are the problem areas, or what do you find difficult teaching?’ , and they opened up.”

A few members of the CoP championed this course of action, and rallied the other members to participate. Together, the principals worked with the teachers in their schools to come up with a schedule of topics that would be covered in an eight-week workshop. The workshop was held just prior to the end of the second school term in 2014. Each week, a different person from a different school covered a workshop topic. The maths series taught teachers how to teach problem topics...
using the in-class resources available. The teachers engaged in positive criticism, encouraging peer learning and support.

Twelve out of thirteen schools in the CoP were represented in the workshop. Teachers were not forced to attend, but were invited to attend the series twice a week after school hours. No external funding was provided but, rather, each school volunteered to host a session. The schools that participated included a mix of section 21 and section 20 schools.

Importantly, while the facilitator of the CoP initiated the discussion, it was the members of the CoP who instigated and carried through with the innovative action in response to the feedback. BRIDGE played an administrative role through this process, not driving it but rather coordinating it. In the words of the CoP facilitator, who was not present during the time that the innovation was being carried out,

“...it was me initiating from their debate, which then they took up and which they then did something else with which was informing teaching and learning and which has now established a process which can continue.”

A key BRIDGE staff member involved in the CoP echoes this statement with the following:

“...there was a lot of self-evaluation by teachers, introspection in terms of the teaching...”

The response of the teachers to the workshop was highly positive. According to the interviewed principal,

“...one of the reasons this was a success, and this is probably just my opinion, is that teachers know there is a problem. They just can’t say it. This was an opportunity. There was a forum for them to come up with the things that were frustrating them. And I think that is why they bought into it”.

The CoP facilitator noted that “...there is action when you have a common factor, like with all school teachers”. Action, in this case, was facilitated through a shared perspective.

In terms of deepening, recombining, and scaling the innovation, the school principal interviewed in this study cited two examples of how the innovative course of action taken on by the CoP went on to affect more than just the Grade 7 teachers and HODs involved in the course, spurring on further innovative action. In the first example, the teachers across the different schools who were involved in the workshop formed their own group and began to share resources among one another (although the principal is unsure whether this community has continued to present). The innovation had, in this respect, a knock-on effect on a different group of practitioners within the school network and was
therefore inadvertently scaled. This instance was confirmed by a key BRIDGE staff member who reported;

“They’ve just been doing... internal professional development things within their own schools... they’re like mini Communities of Practice between maths teachers within the schools.”

In the second example, the principal cited a critical instance from his own school, where the teachers at the school decided not to only look at and support Grade 7 maths teaching, but rather to investigate and support the build-up of maths teaching practices from Grade 4 to 6. They realised that teachers of Grade 4 maths had to understand what was expected of students in the higher grades and that the higher grades needed to, in turn, understand how (and what) their students had been taught previously. In this sense, the innovation was deepened from simply strengthening Grade 7 maths teaching to changing the way teachers teach from earlier grades all the way up. In the words of the principal,

“In our school, we ran workshops on these topics. A teacher had to choose a topic and look at it from so that the Grade 7 teachers knew what was happening at the bottom, and the teachers at the bottom knew what was expected up top.”

Upon query around whether the innovation would likely have taken place in the absence of the CoP, the school principal reported, “It wouldn’t have happened on its own.” The principal went on to state,

“...you’ll find that if people don’t understand how a community of practice works, there’s a lot of mistrust. They think things are judgemental. It’s only after 6 months or so that you realise... you’re all sitting with the same problems here... and that’s when people start trusting each other and start opening up and start talking. And that all of a sudden the problem at your school isn’t just with you. You are able to talk about it. People are able to give their input”

Discussion

The case presented above provides a number of interesting insights into the concept of innovation in BRIDGE. Firstly, all of the informants interviewed for the case study note the fact that significant trust has been built among the CoP members, as portrayed the principal’s comment, “… I think now we’ve developed a form of camaraderie. I think there’s trust. We trust each other”, and in the facilitator’s comment, “… [There is] real trust...they now share stuff...resources.” According to Community Intelligence Ltd26, one of the key enablers of innovation within CoPs is a knowledge strategy that recognises the importance of trustful relationships among CoP members and builds on these relationships to facilitate collaborative learning. This, in turn, facilitates innovation. BRIDGE’s style of facilitating the Ekurhuleni North Principals CoP is consistent with this type of strategy. The fact that trust has been built among members of the community could be a key driver of the innovative course of action undertaken by the CoP in this case.

Another point raised during the interviews is the fact that members of the CoP identified an important challenge that affected the CoP as a whole. Not only was the challenge identified within the CoP, but it was understood as a challenge among the teachers involved in the innovation, as represented in the following comment: “...one of the reasons this was a success, and this is probably just my opinion, is that teachers know there is a problem. They just can’t say it.” Community Intelligence Ltd\(^{27}\) argues that a “compelling goal or challenge that can be met only through innovation” is another key driver of innovation within CoPs. The fact that the CoP identified a common challenge that required radical action is likely one of the main factors that drove the innovation in this context. This is reflected in the CoP facilitator’s comment, “...there is action when you have a common factor, like with all school teachers”.

Coakes and Smith (2007) contend that “innovation is facilitated and supported by innovation champions, who have most influence outside traditional organisational structures when they are members of a close-knit community”\(^{28}\). The fact that the innovation was taken up and driven by a few members of the CoP is consistent with the concept that change champions can spur on innovation in CoPs. The following comment captures how a few individuals within the CoP decided to take the innovation forward on their own; “They didn’t want BRIDGE involved in this. They said ‘We’ve got this. We can do this’ so there was a lot of buy-in and ownership.” Not only did the champions drive the innovation within the CoP, but they engaged other schools from outside of the CoP to participate in the innovative exercise, thereby scaling and deepening the intervention.

There is evidence to support the fact that facilitation was an important part of initiating, but not carrying forward, the innovation, as demonstrated in the comment of the CoP’s facilitator; “...it was me initiating from their debate, which then they took up and which then they then did something else with.” The role of the facilitator is interesting in the context of CoPs that are in the process of innovating. These individuals hold a unique place in the CoP structure. They are “part” of the CoP yet they stand at a distance, and they often play a role in multiple CoPs at the same time. These individuals have a “birds’ eye view” of the CoP. Community of Practice members with this kind of perspective are cross-functional individuals that can potentially play an important role in identifying opportunities for innovation:

> “Cross-functional individuals belong to multiple communities of practice, and it is the multi-membership that gives them the boundary-spanning multi-perspective, from which they can see radical innovation opportunities where others may see an opportunity only for gradual improvement or nothing.”\(^{29}\)

\(^{27}\) Community Intelligence Ltd (2003), p. 12.


\(^{29}\) Community Intelligence Ltd (2003), p. 11.
In this case, the CoP’s facilitator supported the group in identifying the opportunity for innovation. Although she was not involved in carrying it out, the fact that she helped the CoP to come to the point of decision to take it forward is likely one of the factors that spurred on the innovation in this context.

Findings

The key findings of this case study are summarised as follows:

(i) When CoPs have a common purpose and members begin to trust one another, innovation can take place;
(ii) When a CoP has a “compelling goal or challenge that can be met only through innovation”, innovation is more likely to occur;
(iii) Although the CoP may come up with the innovative idea together, it is necessary for the CoP to have at least one “champion” to drive the innovation forward and;
(iv) Good facilitation of the CoP could be a key factor for igniting the innovative idea and supporting the CoP in planning to take it forward.

Conclusion

The findings of this case study suggest factors such as synergy and trust among members, a common challenge, the presence of “champions” and good facilitation, are important in supporting an enabling environment for innovation to take place.

 Due to the limited amount of data available for this study, the findings may not be wholly generalizable.
BRIDGE EVALUATION

BRIDGE CASE STUDY: POLICY AND PRACTICE

This case study investigates the concept of “practice and policy change” in the Tertiary Access sub-group of BRIDGE’s Maths and Science Learner Support Community of Practice (CoP). The study follows up on a previous interview with a member of the Tertiary Access Focus Group who explains the link between policy and practice within the sub-group and how it has evolved over time. The case also incorporates the perspectives of other stakeholders, including various donors and BRIDGE.

The key findings are (i) BRIDGE has an important role to play as an “honest broker” that brings government, donors and the NGO sector together in a first step towards effecting policy and practice change (ii) actively involving policy makers in the process of generating knowledge can facilitate their engagement and strengthen the link between policy and practice; and (iii) practice and policy change is ideally bi-directional, with practice influencing policy and vice versa.

This is an illustrative case study. It is descriptive in nature and intends to provide insight into the link between policy and practice in the BRIDGE context. Data for this study was collected through a variety of sources including key informant interviews with a representative from SAQA/DHET, a representative from the Sasol Inzalo Foundation, a representative from BRIDGE, and a review of relevant documents and records.

Introduction

In an interim evaluation of BRIDGE and its perceived role in linking practice and policy, respondents acknowledged that;

“Influencing policy is a complex and long term endeavour and... policy is influenced in many ways. It’s influenced in terms of implementation, relationship building with government through joint projects; stakeholder groups that feed back to government as well as by hosting government participants at BRIDGE meetings”\(^{31}\).

The role of BRIDGE in achieving this kind of influence has gradually evolved from an opportunistic approach towards a strategic plan to enable the vertical integration of policy and practice. As articulated by a BRIDGE staff member interviewed for this case study,

“It’s a deliberate strategy on our part. We’re looking at what’s happening... in the policy environment. We’re looking at what’s happening at national government. We’re engaging. We’re making sure we make the linkages...”

\(^{31}\) Interim Evaluation, Khulisa Management Services, January 2014.
Policy is often considered in the literal sense of ‘public policy’. However, in the context of Communities of Practice (CoPs), Hearn and White\textsuperscript{32} argue that policy:

‘… refers to more than just public policy to mean ‘a purposive course of action followed by an actor or a set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern’ (Anderson, 1975). This definition includes the policies of international institutions, bilateral agencies and NGOs.”

From this perspective, influencing policy is about facilitating deliberate action at multiple levels, not just government.

\textbf{Background}

The Tertiary Access Focus Group (tertiary access group) is a sub-group of BRIDGE’s main Maths and Science Learner Support Community of Practice (CoP). Established in 2010, the main CoP runs quarterly main-community and sub-group meetings. The tertiary access group held its first meeting in 2011 and consists of a group of individuals from within the larger CoP who are specifically interested in post-school issues such as opportunities and pathways to tertiary education. The main activities that the tertiary access group engages in include:

1. Sharing resources – both physical and intellectual
2. Coordinating activities
3. Sharing best practice

Early on, BRIDGE invited the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) to join the sub-group as a parastatal government representative organisation responsible for tertiary access projects and programs in the country. More recently, the tertiary access directorate moved from SAQA to the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) and government representation at the sub-group changed accordingly. However, although government participation is represented at the tertiary access group, a representative from the Sasol Inzalo Foundation (in-kind funders of the sub-group) points out that;

“These things are sort of person-dependent. I can’t say that it’s systematic or that the organisations are committed or that they participate”

In other words, it is individual people from government that participate rather than government itself in an organisational sense. In addition, the participation of these individuals is not yet systematic.

On the other hand, according to a government representative who was interviewed for this case, participation in the CoP, particularly in the tertiary access group, allows government be in the same room as NGOs and funding organisations operating in this space;

When we saw BRIDGE… it provided a place where both a number of NGOs as well as funding organisations came together. Not that they coordinated or that they collaborate, they’re just together… in one room but at least sharing best practice and some of that rubs off.”

According to the government participant, BRIDGE is a forum whereby government can participate and gain insight into what civil society thinks about maths & science and how it relates to learners’ tertiary career choices. Even one representative is able to take back what is learned to the larger organisation.

Different stakeholders within the tertiary access group have divergent opinions regarding the current status of the group. According to the government representative interviewed for the case, the tertiary access group has begun to develop into its own community;

“I think over time the need for some kind of coordination, some kind of sharing of information, sharing of best practice, well that’s what Communities of Practice are all about and it’s beginning to be expressed with a stronger voice by the participants”

According to this informant, the tertiary access group has begun to build trust and collaboration among its members, evolving from a collection of individuals towards a maturing and active community as articulated in the following comment:

“I see… trust developing because people can now say, ‘look, I don’t know anything about this. I’m just here to learn’… to be able to say that in a group, there must be some element of trust that you feel okay to say it… and that’s beginning to be noticed. At least, I notice that more clearly nowadays.”

The statements above reflect a big departure from an interview one year earlier with the same government representative. At that time, the representative felt that, “There is a bit of mutual distrust, both from government and from NGO sides”. Later in the current interview, the government representative articulates how the tertiary access group is now beginning to share practices and lessons, building a more trustful community:

“It’s in all of those groups that this exchange of ideas and saying ‘look, sorry, I don’t know anything about this’… and then also the anecdotal stuff, some of it is personal experiences… of what happened in this school and that school. So to share that - both the successes and those things that have not been that successful – is crucial. So people are saying ‘I got stuck here and I didn’t know what to do. Is there anybody here that can say how I get out of this’… Those are what Communities of Practice are about – sharing best practices, getting different views of the problems we face and the solutions. So, ja, it’s beginning to work”

On the other hand, the representative from the Sasol Inzalo Foundation feels that because the same people are not participating in the tertiary access group regularly, it signals that the people attending do not get value out of participation in the group, as described in the comment below;
“If people were really getting value out of it wouldn’t they keep coming back? The fact that we have such a turnover... there is continuity in the work, but I can’t help wonder... why people don’t come back”

Different stakeholders in the group seem to feel differently about their participation, and about the overall value of the Tertiary Access Focus Group.

Practice and Policy Change

According to the government representative interviewed for this case study, the Maths and Science CoP has built a strong relationship with the Gauteng Department of Education as voiced below;

“...the maths [and science community of practice] and a bit of the tertiary access [group] have had a strong partnership or relationship with the GDE [Gauteng Department of Education] and so there is already a kind of ‘working with government’ with those providers ... and I think that’s the strongest thing that’s happening in the Province. There is some work being done by organisations in Limpopo, in the Eastern Cape, but you don’t get the sense that the department in those provinces are as strongly involved as they are in GDE.”

This perspective has changed over time as, in an interview one year prior, the same representative did not feel that BRIDGE had actively built sufficient ties with government. A BRIDGE representative interviewed for this study acknowledges that links between policy and practice are finally beginning to become evident. One of the most interesting examples of this is the fact that the tertiary access focus group members are working together on the tertiary access chain and this collaborative work is beginning to have an impact on policy. In the words of the BRIDGE representative;

“I think we’ve seen some interesting instances where policy has been influenced by practice, out of BRIDGE. So, you know, the famous example of the tertiary access chain...my understanding is that it has had a direct link into what DHET’s doing around policy to do with career advice and preparation for tertiary and post-tertiary and that the tertiary access chain has become a kind of a developmental pathway that they’ve used to inform their thinking. So, I think that’s really exciting that it’s being taken into a government department like that.”

The government representative echoes this statement with the following;

“Following through from the last interview... the project that used to be with SAQA is now with the Department of Higher Education and Training [DHET] so that’s where it’s located. So the chances of facilitating a national footprint are increased. So, we’re busy setting up an initial meeting with... BRIDGE... and the department... because the ideas that have come from the Community of Practice are really percolating in the policy development team”

The government representative goes on to say that this exchange of ideas and sharing of best practice has led to action within the department:
“The ideas that are coming from the Community of Practice are finding their way into the drafts of the policy, the national policy for careers development.”

Regarding the role that BRIDGE could play in facilitating this link between knowledge, policy and practice, the government represented noted that,

“I think that’s a key role – a kind of ‘honest broker’ role – that is accepted by both sides as having, really, the interest of the kids in the system at heart and is not... motivated by other things. So clearly that’s a role they can play. The other thing, and this is why we have a sustained relationship with BRIDGE, is that when, as this policy is developing and consultations have to occur (and consultations is written in the policy…)... the NGO sector is not organised. So, if we want to speak to an NGO then we have to contact all of them... and BRIDGE is the closest thing to such a ‘working together on a voluntary basis’ through NGOs mainly involved in education.”

From this perspective, BRIDGE plays two important roles in linking policy and practice: (1) brokering relationships between government, donors and civil society and (2) actively bringing different groups together in a neutral space.

The government representative explains that the policy-practice link is not uni-directional. Although practice certainly can have an effect on policy, policy can affect, and has affected, practice too. This kind of bi-directional effect is reflected in the comment, below:

“One of the outflows is that the Tertiary Access Group is now speaking of the ‘post-school system’, not just tertiary entrance. Now that’s a direct linkage to the white paper, because the white paper speaks of a post-school system. And so even the language is being taken up... and now somebody [might] say ‘Ag, come on. Semantics’. But it’s not. It’s quite a big shift when you move from the one to the other because... it also has elements of ideological shifts”

In a previous interview, the government representative interviewed for this case purported that although BRIDGE had the potential to play a role in supporting a link between practice and policy, they had no clear strategy to do so. In the current interview, 12 months later, the representative noted:

“The fact that BRIDGE is now saying, ‘Let’s have a meeting, and we’re busy arranging the meeting. It’s going to happen in November’… is saying... there’s the beginnings of a strategy.”

From BRIDGE’s perspective, they are in the process of implementing a deliberate strategy to strengthen the link between practice and policy on the basis of prior recommendations, as noted by the BRIDGE representative interviewed for this study:
“It’s a deliberate strategy on our part. We’re looking at what’s happening... in the policy environment. We’re looking at what’s happening at national government. We’re engaging. We’re making sure we make the linkages... We’re trying to keep the knowledge flow going between government and the community of practice. And then when a policy comes out actually taking it to the community and saying ‘do you have a response on it?’... and I think it makes people feel quite empowered”

Discussion

The case presented above provides a number of interesting insights into the link between policy and practice in BRIDGE. Firstly, the government representative pointed out the fact that BRIDGE has an important role to play in linking government and CoP members and practitioners as they are seen as an “‘honest broker’” in the system. By playing this role, BRIDGE provides a conducive environment where trust is built and practice and policy change can occur.

Another point raised during the interviews is the fact that BRIDGE actively brought government and the NGO sector together in a focus group to facilitate the vertical integration of policy and practice. In this case, it was important for government not only to be a passive bystander but rather to be an active participant in the focus group. Government representation and participation in the focus group had a direct effect on government’s career development services project, which supports the progress of career development policies in South Africa as reflected in the statement “The ideas that are coming from the Community of Practice are finding their way into the drafts of the policy, the national policy for careers development.”

The government representative interviewed for this case made the important point that it is not only policy that was affected through the tertiary access focus group, but that practitioners have, in turn, changed the way they think about policy as reflected in the statement, “the Tertiary Access Group is now speaking of the ‘post-school system’, not just tertiary entrance. Now that’s a direct linkage to the white paper, because the white paper speaks of a post-school system.” In this sense, policy was able to influence practice, and practice changed policy.

Findings

The key findings\(^{33}\) of this case study are summarised as follows:

1. BRIDGE has an important role to play as an “honest broker” that brings government, donors and the NGO sector together in a first step towards effecting policy and practice change
2. Actively involving policy makers in the process of generating knowledge can facilitate their engagement and strengthen the link between policy and practice; and
3. Practice and policy change is ideally bi-directional, with practice influencing policy and vice versa.

\(^{33}\) Due to the limited amount of data available for this study, the findings may not be wholly generalizable.
Conclusion

Linking practice and policy is a two-way endeavour. Although the focus is on using best practice to influence policy, it is evident that policy, in turn, should then influence practice. In this win-win scenario both government and civil society affect, and are affected by, one another, sharing best practice and learning from one another. The case reveals, however, that there is still work to be done in bringing the tertiary access group members together towards a common perspective.
BRIDGE CASE STUDY: KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

This short case example explores the requests for Knowledge Management services that BRIDGE has received from the Gauteng Education Development Trust (GEDT). The case being studied involved the revision of 36 evaluations and documentation of the lessons that emerged from these evaluations as part of BRIDGE’s role in providing knowledge management services to the GEDT.

The GEDT requested a meta-evaluation of a set of their projects over 20 years. BRIDGE examined and filtered through 36 evaluation reports related to 7 GEDT projects. The purpose of this meta-evaluation was to extract and categorise overall key learnings as well as key learnings from each of the projects. BRIDGE provided a summary of the evaluations as well as key learnings categorised into themes extracted from the evaluation reports. The idea behind this exercise was to extract and disseminate information and present it in a more accessible way. The outcome of the meta-evaluation was a user-friendly repository that provided targeted findings to stakeholders.

This study provides a single example of what is happening with knowledge generation and management in the BRIDGE context. Data for this study was collected through a variety of sources including key informant interviews with two representatives from BRIDGE, and a BRIDGE facilitator.

Introduction

The following definition of knowledge management highlights its role in creating strategic value for an organisation:

“Knowledge management is the systematic management of an organisation’s knowledge assets for the purpose of creating value and meeting tactical & strategic requirements; it consists of the initiatives, processes, strategies, and systems that sustain and enhance the storage, assessment, sharing, refinement, and creation of knowledge.”

This case study explores a specific instance where BRIDGE was commissioned to conduct a meta-analysis for the Gauteng Education Development Trust (GEDT) of 36 of its evaluations and distil and distribute the learnings from these evaluations. It highlights BRIDGE’s increasing role as the go-to organisation for knowledge generation, management and dissemination in the sector.

Background

Knowledge generation and management is a central activity in successful communities of practice. According to a BRIDGE staff member,
“There’s always been certain products that have come out of these Communities of Practice, whether people bring to it and then share or whether it has been learnings that come out of the sessions, one of the things we are trying to do now is to formalise THAT process of what comes out of the CoPs... what can BRIDGE actually produce and develop...”

BRIDGE’s knowledge management role is grounded in the work of the CoPs. It includes the packaging and dissemination of information generated by, or brought to, the CoPs. It also refers to sharing that information with community members and in the wider education sector. Thus far, BRIDGE has been successful in effectively sharing resources from CoP meetings to community members and the public.

BRIDGE recently released a new knowledge product; a “What’s trending” update that documents what is learned in CoP meetings and also links knowledge across CoPs and focus areas. Cross-cutting themes and common areas of interest are identified and documented for this resource. These updates are actively shared within and outside of BRIDGE’s network via email, social media, and BRIDGE’s new website.

BRIDGE is currently in the process of making knowledge more easily accessible, open source, appealing and user-friendly. According to BRIDGE representatives interviewed for this case, BRIDGE is actively pursuing opportunities to provide services and contribute to the generation of high-quality knowledge. BRIDGE has taken its knowledge management role one step further to provide knowledge management services to the education sector. Service provision not only supports the scalability of information within the education sector but also provides BRIDGE but with a potential income stream.

**BRIDGE Knowledge Management Services to the Gauteng Education Development Trust (GEDT)**

In 2014, the GEDT commissioned BRIDGE to conduct a macro-level evaluation of all of their evaluation reports and extract key learnings. BRIDGE examined and filtered through 36 evaluation reports related to 7 GEDT projects. They provided a summary of the evaluations as well as key learnings categorised into prominent themes extracted from the evaluation reports.

The GEDT did not want a long report and so asked BRIDGE to distil and disseminate these learnings in a different way. BRIDGE developed a key learning framework for easy dissemination. The outcome of the meta-evaluation was a user-friendly repository that provided targeted findings to stakeholders. The key learning repository that BRIDGE developed contained a landing page with hyperlinks to subcategories of important learnings. It also contained visual information, resource materials and tools to facilitate easy access to the information contained therein.
BRIDGE’s involvement in the GEDT project resulted in the creation of a valuable product that can be shared. However, it also increased BRIDGE’s own knowledge management capacity. As voiced by a BRIDGE staff member:

“It was exciting for BRIDGE to do that piece of work [for the GEDT] and it strengthened our understanding of the sector, [the GEDT] are happy for us to share it on our platforms through our knowledge repository”

Not only did the GEDT project provide BRIDGE with revenue but it also ensured that BRIDGE was aware of all of the information and lessons that came out of the 36 evaluations under review. BRIDGE was able to then take that knowledge and learning back to its community:

“…besides the fact it would be an income stream, it also keeps one in the loop within the education sector.”

Discussion

This case provides an example of the potential role BRIDGE can play in providing knowledge management services to the education sector, not only through the sharing of existing resources and tools but as a service provider, generating and packaging new knowledge. Providing these services is core to BRIDGE’s goals to (1) maximising sharing of resources and (2) reducing duplication.

This kind of collaborative project also strengthens relationships among BRIDGE and other key players within the education sector, increasing BRIDGE’s footprint in the education community. As articulated by a BRIDGE staff member,

“...the capturing of what’s working in practice and then the disseminating of that to practitioners and stakeholders is key to the functioning of the system, BRIDGE has now developed significant expertise and competence in this field... building on that and actually having significant knowledge management activities, not limited to the work of the CoPs but working in a much more systemic way, I think that is going to be a key driver for BRIDGE going forward.”

The provision of knowledge management services also expands the range of possibilities for BRIDGE’s financial and institutional sustainability. A BRIDGE staff member articulates this as follows:

“...there is a range of possibilities for a more sustainable approach for BRIDGE, one being a commitment to a knowledge management role in education, that’s an area where there is a key potential for sustainability...”

According to a BRIDGE key informant, new opportunities for potential partnerships and systemic learning are being actively pursued.
ANNEX 2: SUSTAINABILITY FRAMEWORK

The Sustainability Framework identifies a small set of organisational and contextual domains that can help build the capacity for maintaining a program. Capacity for sustainability is defined as the ability to maintain programming and its benefits over time. The eight key domains that can influence a program’s capacity for sustainability are described below:

**Environmental Support**

**We define Environmental Support as:**
Having a supportive internal and external climate for your program.

**Why does Environmental Support matter?**
No matter the level at which your program operates, the overall economic and political climate will affect your ability to get things done. State-level programs are significantly influenced by the governor, appointed agency leaders, the structure and traditions of public agencies, and the legislature. Community-level programs are more influenced by local councils and boards. Programs are also influenced by internal organisational politics and leadership.

You can’t necessarily handpick who is in the Director’s chair or in political office, but they can have a big impact on your program. Whether they support your cause or support your opposition, decision makers deserve your attention. Work to get people of influence on your side, both within and outside of your organisation. Often these decision makers control the money, and if you want some for your program, you will need them to know and like your program. In addition, champions can get policies passed that benefit your target population and help achieve your program goals.

**Funding Stability**

**We define Funding Stability as:**
Establishing a consistent financial base for your program.

**Why does Funding Stability matter?**
Planning for the sustainability of funding should be a strategic process that addresses the long-term needs of your program and adjusts to changing trends in economic and political cycles. Having a defined plan with an adaptive timeframe that maintains critical infrastructure is essential. Funding highs and lows put stress on programs and make it difficult to provide consistent quality services. Valuable staff may leave or have to be laid off if funding shortfalls are anticipated. Meanwhile, programs that rely on a single funding source are more vulnerable to funding cuts. For all these reasons, cultivating a stable and diverse funding base is essential for ongoing sustainability.

**Partnerships**

---
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We define Partnerships as:
Cultivating connections between your program and its stakeholders.

Why do Partnerships matter?
Partners play an important role in sustainability in several ways:
- partners can be connectors to greater resources or expertise;
- partners can take over providing services if your program has to cut back; or
- partners can advocate on behalf of your cause.

Partners can also help rally the community around your program and its goals. They can range from business leaders and media representatives to organisations addressing similar issues and community members. When your program is threatened either politically or financially, your partners can be some of your greatest champions. Building awareness and capacity for sustainability requires a strategic approach and partnerships across sectors, including alliances between private and public organisations.

Organisational Capacity
We define Organisational Capacity as:
Having the internal support and resources needed to effectively manage your program.

Why does Organisational Capacity matter?
Organisational capacity encompasses a wide range of capabilities, knowledge, and resources. For example, having enough staff and strong leadership can make a big difference in accomplishing your program goals. Cultivating and strengthening your program’s internal support can also increase your program’s likelihood of long-term success.

Program Evaluation
We define Program Evaluation as:
Assessing your program to inform planning and document results.

Why does Program Evaluation matter?
Evaluating your program on an ongoing basis builds sustainability capacity in two key ways. First, evaluation helps keep your program on track with its goals and outcomes. If evaluation data shows that an activity or strategy isn’t working, you can correct your program’s course to become more effective. Your evaluation or performance improvement measures can also influence strategic planning. Second, collecting data about your program’s successes and impact is a powerful tool for gaining support and funding. If your evaluation data shows that your program is making an important (or irreplaceable) impact, you can make a strong case for why your program needs to continue. Even in times of decreased funding, evaluation and monitoring data are key for the pursuit of new funding sources.

Program Adaptation
We define Program Adaptation as:
Taking actions that adapt your program to ensure its ongoing effectiveness.

Why does Program Adaptation matter?
Circumstances change and sometimes your program needs to also. The goal is not necessarily to sustain all of a program’s components over time, but rather to sustain the most effective components and their benefits to your target group. This requires flexibility, adaptation to changing conditions, and mechanisms for quality improvement within your program. By using your evaluation data and the most current evidence-base, you can ensure that your program effectively uses resources and continues having an impact. As you adapt your program, make sure to keep up-to-date on best practices.

Communications
We define Communications as:
Strategic communication with stakeholders and the public about your program.

Why do Communications matter?
People need to know what your program does and why it’s important. Communicating externally about your program’s effectiveness helps the program gain greater visibility and builds support from stakeholders. Internally, evidence that a program works builds staff buy-in and support from organisational leaders. The more people know and care about your program and mission, the more likely they are to support your efforts to continue providing services in the long term.

Strategic Planning
We define Strategic Planning as:
Using processes that guide your program’s directions, goals, and strategies.

Why does Strategic Planning matter?
Strategic planning is the glue that holds sustainability efforts together. Without a strategic direction and long-term goals, programs find themselves only reacting to day-to-day demands. Strategic planning combines elements of all of the sustainability domains into an outcome-oriented plan. Planning also ensures that the program is well aligned with the larger external and organisational environment.
ANNEX 3: “STAKES ANALYSIS”

Khulisa has conducted an analysis of the various “stakes” that BRIDGE community members have. The more “stakes”, the more likely that the partnership between BRIDGE and the organisation will be sustained. This analysis is presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khulisa Management Services</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tshikululu Social Investments</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moshal Scholarship Programme</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci-Bono</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindset Network</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Convent School</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rethink Education</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Foundation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasol Pty Ltd</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figure shows a selection of organisations that have three or more stakes in BRIDGE’s Maths and Science Learner Support CoP. These organisations participate through BRIDGE through attending CoP meetings, presenting at BRIDGE meetings, connecting to BRIDGE through social media platforms, funding BRIDGE, or providing services to BRIDGE.

It is important to note that this “Stake Analysis” is an experimental analysis carried out by Khulisa for this report. Therefore, the analysis was circumscribed by what was available in the existing database. However, Khulisa acknowledges that a qualitative exploration would yield better results at this point.
As part of the final phase of the BRIDGE evaluation, Khulisa Management Services will conduct a case study to capture a unique innovation that transpired as a result of the Principals and School Leadership Community of Practice. The case being studied involves the implementation of a maths diagnostic test at a number of primary schools in Ekurhuleni North district in Gauteng and an innovative course of action taken by members of the COP (school principals) in response to the results of the test. We would like to gain a number of perspectives on this case – the principals involved and BRIDGE representatives.

The questions below simply serve as a guide to ensure that none of the important points are left out. You may use your own language. You may find that the interviewee answers multiple questions at once and that it is not necessary to ask each question separately. Probes to be used as necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Follow-up Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think this would have happened if the COP did not exist? If yes or no, why?</td>
<td>Probe to find out if the COP was the catalyst for this event. It may be the case that this event would have been carried out even without the COP. Challenge the popular theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other similar activities that the COP has decided to carry out together? If so, examples?</td>
<td>Probe to find out if there are any other innovations that arose out of the COP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Check whether the interviewee has any other comments or questions and thank them for their time.
CASE STUDY INTERVIEW GUIDE:  
PRACTICE AND POLICY  

PURPOSE

As part of the final phase of the BRIDGE evaluation, Khulisa will conduct a case study to follow up on the linkage between BRIDGE (specifically, the Tertiary Access Group) activities/outputs/innovations and government/policy. The case being studied involves SAQA and Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET) representation/involvement in the Maths and Science Community of Practice (COP), specifically the Tertiary Access Group (TAG) and the effects that the COP/TAG has had (if any) on policy and practice. Specifically, on getting government and civil society to work together or reach common understanding. We would like to gain a number of perspectives on this case – a representative from the DHET, a member of the Tertiary Access Chain (SASOL), and BRIDGE.

INTRODUCTION

- Thank interviewee for participating and check whether they are still happy to participate
- Remind the interviewee that their responses will remain anonymous and confidential
- Record the interviewee’s name and date of the interview, and administer informed consent.

THE INTERVIEW

The questions below simply serve as a guide to ensure that none of the important points are left out. You may use your own language. You may find that the interviewee answers multiple questions at once and that it is not necessary to ask each question separately. Probes to be used as necessary

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONs</th>
<th>PROBES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell me a bit about how you are involved in the BRIDGE Maths and Science COP, specifically the Tertiary Access Group</td>
<td>When did the interviewee join the COP? (not applicable to BRIDGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why did they join the COP? (Not applicable to BRIDGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways, if any, are BRIDGE members collaborating around issues of policy? Examples?</td>
<td>Who is involved? Only NGOs and civil society or is government also involved?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Does BRIDGE have a strategy in place for facilitating the link between practice and policy? | Probe to find out if the following recommendations have been implemented:  
1. Lobby for relationships to be built between civil society and govt. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>probes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Speak to people who are influential in making policy</td>
<td>What has happened, if anything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Track government policy documents</td>
<td>Who was involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identify structures (such as forums) where people can participate,</td>
<td>When did this take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while facilitating a balanced view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me a bit about what has happened</td>
<td>probe to find out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with regard to the link between practice and policy in relation</td>
<td>1. If there are any other examples of BRIDGE’s impact on policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Tertiary Access Group (from your perspective) since January?</td>
<td>2. Whether this occurred as part of a deliberate strategy or whether it was inadvertent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there any other instances that you know of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where BRIDGE/ the TAG has had an influence on policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your/ BRIDGE’s thoughts for the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in terms of BRIDGE’s role in linking practice and policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION**

Check whether the interviewee has any other comments or questions and thank them for their time.
CASE STUDY INTERVIEW GUIDE:
KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

PURPOSE

As part of the final phase of the BRIDGE evaluation, Khulisa will conduct a case study to investigate the requests for Knowledge Management services that BRIDGE is receiving from the Gauteng Education Development Trust (GEDT). The case being studied involves the revision of 36 evaluations and documentation of the lessons that emerge from these evaluations as part of BRIDGE’s role in providing knowledge management services to the GEDT. The case will also look at BRIDGE’s role in the documentation of best practice as part of social innovations in Maths and Science over the past 20 years. We would like to gain perspectives from the GEDT and BRIDGE on this case.

INTRODUCTION

- Thank interviewee for participating and check whether they are still happy to participate
- Remind the interviewee that their responses will remain anonymous and confidential
- Record the interviewee’s name and date of the interview, and administer informed consent.

THE INTERVIEW

The questions below simply serve as a guide to ensure that none of the important points are left out. You may use your own language. You may find that the interviewee answers multiple questions at once and that it is not necessary to ask each question separately. Probes to be used as necessary

GENERAL QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROBES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How, if at all, are you involved in/with BRIDGE, specifically the Maths and Science COP and the Tertiary Access Group? | When did the interviewee get involved with BRIDGE? (not applicable to BRIDGE representatives)  
Why did they get involved with BRIDGE? (Not applicable to BRIDGE representatives) |
| Can you tell me a bit about how BRIDGE and the GEDT have collaborated around the issue of knowledge management? | What has happened, if anything?  
Who was involved?  
When did this take place?  
Probe specifically for the following examples: |
| What are your/ BRIDGE’s thoughts for the future in terms of BRIDGE’s role in knowledge generation and management? | BRIDGE’s revision of 36 evaluations and documentation of the lessons that emerge from these evaluations
BRIDGE’s documentation of best practice as part of social innovations in Maths and Science over the past 20 years |
| Probe to find out if BRIDGE could/should play a service provision role within knowledge management in the sector |

**CONCLUSION**

Check whether the interviewee has any other comments or questions and thank them for their time.
CASE STUDY INTERVIEW GUIDE: SUSTAINABILITY

PURPOSE

As part of the final phase of the BRIDGE evaluation, Khulisa will conduct a series of interviews to investigate the importance of the stability of the Maths and Science COP, specifically the Tertiary Access Group within the larger BRIDGE community. Khulisa will also examine how best BRIDGE can improve the potential for sustainability, and will investigate potential funding models for the continuation of BRIDGE activities in the future.

INTRODUCTION

- Thank interviewee for participating and check whether they are still happy to participate
- Remind the interviewee that their responses will remain anonymous and confidential
- Record the interviewee’s name and date of the interview, and administer informed consent.

THE INTERVIEW

The questions below simply serve as a guide to ensure that none of the important points are left out. You may use your own language. You may find that the interviewee answers multiple questions at once and that it is not necessary to ask each question separately. Probes to be used as necessary

GENERAL QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>PROBES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are you involved in BRIDGE, specifically the Maths and Science COP,</td>
<td>When did the interviewee get involved? (not applicable to BRIDGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the Tertiary Access Group?</td>
<td>Why did they get involved? (Not applicable to BRIDGE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your opinion, how important is the stability of the Maths and Science</td>
<td>What role does the Maths and Science COP, particularly the Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP, specifically the Tertiary Access Group, in relation to the larger</td>
<td>Access Group, play in BRIDGE as a whole?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGE community?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think BRIDGE could or should offer paid services to the sector?</td>
<td>Give examples if necessary – e.g. knowledge management services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, in what kinds of services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think BRIDGE could sustain itself without becoming a service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provider? Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What funding models do you think could be considered that may contribute to the sustainability of BRIDGE?

| Can BRIDGE exist without ongoing donor funding? |
| How can BRIDGE sustain its operations otherwise? |

Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for BRIDGE in relation to sustainability?

| What actions can BRIDGE take to improve its prospects for sustainability? |

CONCLUSION

Check whether the interviewee has any other comments or questions and thank them for their time.