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Executive Summary

The United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) was launched in 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar, with the goal of contributing to the achievement of the Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for gender equality and girls’ education. UNGEI is a movement that advocates for girl-friendly education policies and programmes through strong partnerships between stakeholders at global, regional, national and sub-national levels so that every girl and boy completes primary schooling.

To mark 10 years of the initiative, a formative evaluation of UNGEI was undertaken globally as well as in four countries (Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda) and one region (East Asia and the Pacific). The evaluation took place between January and July 2011 with specific objectives to: (1) define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls’ education; (2) validate outcomes to be achieved in Nepal in order to advance the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education; (3) collect empirical baseline data in Nepal against which progress in future evaluative work can be measured; and (4) map the status of UNGEI partnerships in Nepal.

The evaluation mainly focused on three outcomes, assessing the extent to which: (1) girls’ education has been mainstreamed into national education plans; (2) good practices aimed at increasing access to education of marginalized children, and especially girls, have been institutionalized; and (3) UNGEI brought together partners to reach consensus on the national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality. These outcomes were adapted to the Nepal context from the global outcomes, and mapped using both primary and secondary information, which can serve as the baseline for future studies.

Findings
The overarching finding of this study is that UNGEI has modestly contributed to the efforts of the Government of Nepal in achieving gender parity in primary education by:

- Bringing United Nations agencies together to share their strategy for supporting education policies and plans, including by helping the government to: (1) review education policies through the sector-wide approach; and (2) formulate the Girls’ Education Strategy Paper;
- Mobilizing critical masses such as women parliamentarians and Young Champions to advocate for girls’ education and gender equality; and
- Building the capacity of UNGEI focal persons who have been playing critical roles in supporting the agenda for girls’ education and gender equality.

However, the evaluation finds that the UNGEI partnership in Nepal has not been effective to the desired level in supporting the government to institutionalize good practices and develop context-specific strategies to bring all hard-to-reach children to school and retain them, or to improve quality education or strengthen partnerships. Specific findings are outlined below.
Mainstreaming girls’ education in the national plan
In Nepal, girls’ education and gender equality have been mainstreamed into national plans since the early 1970s with the express purpose of increasing girls’ participation in school. Subsequent plans have aimed to increase girls’ access to school and reduce gender disparity in primary schooling. During the first decade of this century, a Gender Audit in Education was conducted and a Girls’ Education Strategy Paper and School Sector Reform Plan were formulated, which have been important in informing girls’ education and gender equality policies and practices.

The specific contribution of UNGEI to this outcome was providing training for gender focal persons on gender mainstreaming in education in different countries, facilitating United Nations agencies for identifying relevant areas of support to the Government of Nepal, and supporting women parliamentarians to unite for girls’ education by informing them of issues of equity and marginalization, getting their involvement in influencing the education act and helping to make the constitution more gender-friendly. The approach taken by UNGEI to work through the existing mechanism was found relevant, as it did not disturb the structure that had already mainstreamed girls’ education and gender equality into the system. However, the role of UNGEI in policy advocacy in the broader partnership context was largely limited.

Institutionalization of good practices
Four areas of good practice were identified where UNGEI has been involved. These include the Welcome to School campaign, the Young Champions for Education movement, the Women Parliamentarians Networking Group for Girls’ Education and the support for quality education of girl students by providing families with cooking oil. These interventions contributed significantly to reducing gender disparity in primary schooling. However, the role of UNGEI in the institutionalization of these good practices was not visible.

- The ‘Welcome to School’ campaign was initiated in 2004 by UNICEF in 11 districts and mainstreamed as a strategy by the Government of Nepal in 2005 to meet the EFA goals and related MDGs by mobilizing all stakeholders, especially at the time of admission at the beginning of the school year. UNGEI participated in the central-level Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Network (GE Network), where campaign strategies were discussed and where the Young Champion movement was encouraged to strongly support the campaign.

- ‘Young Champions for Education’ is a strategy to mobilize community youth to address multiple issues related to girls’ education and gender equality and to help school management create a girl-friendly environment. UNGEI provided training to young champions and encouraged UNICEF to support them in implementing their action plans.

- The Women Parliamentarians Networking Group for Girls’ Education is an innovation of the GE Network in Nepal. It has been a powerful force for advocating gender-sensitive policies. The process of mobilizing women parliamentarians in education has been taken up in other countries in the region through the UNGEI Regional Office.

- Supporting the families of girl students with cooking oil for quality education is a partnership between the World Food Programme (WFP) and UNICEF under the UNGEI
By providing cooking oil to families who enrol girls and guarantee that they stay in school, this programme has contributed to the achievement of gender parity in five terai (plain region) districts where gender disparity was high. It has not yet been institutionalized.

**UNGEI partnership**

Building on a loose network established in 2002, UNGEI was officially launched in Nepal in 2008. Currently, the UNGEI network exists at national and district levels under the name ‘Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Network’, commonly called the ‘GE Network’. Structures in place to support the central and district-level networks and girl-friendly policy-making include: (1) Girls’ Education Theme Group within the United Nations system; and (2) Women Parliamentarians’ Networking Group for Girls’ Education. The GE Network, which was initially practiced in seven districts, has recently been expanded to all 75 districts as part of a government institutionalization process.

The partnership had shortcomings, which include attrition trained persons, a lack of a common action plan, no set schedule for meetings, and the fact that the partnership agenda was not articulated clearly enough to attract commitment from partners. This affected, in particular, the participation of partners outside the United Nations system, including international non-governmental organizations and donors.

**Relationship of UNGEI Nepal with the regional and global partnerships**

The evaluation found the relationship of UNGEI Nepal with the regional-level partnership to be strong, with good communication between the two. UNGEI Nepal received both technical and financial support, including for the training of Young Champions, so that women parliamentarians could visit Bangladesh. UNGEI Nepal also received global-level support in the form of guidelines and toolkits.

**Shortcomings of the UNGEI partnership**

The evaluation finds that the UNGEI partnership in Nepal does not have strong partnership features and structures. Although it exists in multiple stages at the national and district level, and has a common goal and vision and an element of inclusiveness, the partnership has been unable to keep its partners motivated. Additionally, the pooling of resources is weak, as is joint governance and decision-making. Other concerns include a lack of proper record-keeping, the capacity of the district-level gender focal person to manage the network/partnership due to the transfer of previously trained persons, and the lack of effective coordination among partners.

**Recommendations**

**Record-keeping:** Since the UNGEI partnership exists at multiple levels, it would be better if the respective member secretary of the UNGEI partnership/network keeps records of relevant activities and results disaggregated by sex, social class, ethnicity, religion, poverty and location of activities and achievements as they relate to girls’ education and gender equality. UNICEF is advised to make an arrangement for supporting the UNGEI focal person in this regard.
Preparing the UNGEI partnership workplan: The UNGEI partnership should have its own workplan prepared jointly by all partners, which should be monitored annually. UNGEI Nepal should seek to keep its partners and others abreast of its work and progress.

Partnership/network management: United Nations agencies, through the Girls’ Education Theme Group, should support the Department of Education in building capacity on partnership/network management.

Institutionalization of good practices: UNGEI should advocate for the institutionalization of good practices, specifically the Women Parliamentarians Networking for Girls’ Education and Young Champions for Education.

Advocacy: UNGEI should focus its advocacy on the following: quality education and gender equality; strategic programming for hard-to-reach children; reducing gender disparities in lower secondary education; introducing an engendered curriculum; creating joint monitoring tools; conducting a joint study on location-specific and gender-responsive education; promoting action against sexual harassment.

Capacity enhancement: The UNGEI partnership should advocate with partner agencies for providing financial and technical support to conduct activities for enhancing the capacity of gender focal persons, school management committees, and Young Champion groups in terms of micro-level planning from a gender perspective.

The regional partnership should advocate more strongly for UNGEI Nepal to prepare workplans and keep detailed records of its activities, processes and results.

The global UNGEI partnership should work with global partners to ensure their representatives in Nepal join the UNGEI Nepal partnership.
1. Introduction

1.1 Background and purpose of the evaluation

Research on female education in many countries has shown that educating girls and women is critical to economic development. Female education creates powerful poverty-reducing synergies and yields several intergenerational gains. For developing countries, where women represent an untapped source of human capital for development, policies to reduce gender gaps in access to education can yield economic and social benefits that accrue to individuals, families and society at large. Education is also important because it can help to eradicate poverty and hunger. Given the benefits of female education, it is important to promote equal access to education for girls and boys.

The United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) was launched in April 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar by then United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. Member States of the United Nations were challenged to adopt the initiative at the country level. In response, UNICEF and a number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) introduced the idea of UNGEI to Nepal in 2002, forming a informal network to promote girls’ education. UNGEI in Nepal was officially launched in 2008.

At present the UNGEI partnership/network exists at two levels:

(1) At the central level it consists of a Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Network (GEGEN), coordinated by the Gender Equity Development Section of the Department of Education (DoE), with more than 70 members from organizations belonging to the public, private and NGO sectors;

(2) At district level there is a GEGEN, coordinated by gender focal persons in the District Education Offices (DEOs) and with members from public, private and civil society organizations, including NGOs and Young Champions (YCs), as well as teachers and school management committees (SMCs) where parliamentarians representing the district are observers. These networks are commonly called GE Networks.

In addition, there are two working groups: (1) the Women Parliamentarians Networking Group for Girls’ Education, which consists of 197 women parliamentarians and an 11-member advisory committee; and (2) the United Nations Girls’ Education Theme Group (UNGETG), which has five United Nations agencies as members and is coordinated by the UNGEI focal person in Nepal. These working groups meet with their constituents and make decisions to support the Government of Nepal regarding girls’ education and gender equality through GEGEN and/or directly.

1.2 Aims and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of this formative evaluation of UNGEI is to establish the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, as well as the extent to which global and regional efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the partnership. The evaluation is anchored on a common Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework, which highlights the following key outcome areas of UNGEI:

Policies that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized; and
UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

The overall evaluation of UNGEI covers engagement by UNGEI at global, regional and country levels. Four countries were selected for detailed case studies: Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda (a fifth country, Côte d’Ivoire, had to withdraw from the evaluation because of security concerns). At the regional level, the evaluation focused on East Asia and the Pacific. The evaluation also included a comprehensive mapping of the UNGEI partnership in all participating countries, as well as data collection and interviews with global stakeholders. This report reflects the findings of the Nepal country study only. A separate overall evaluation report pulls together the findings from the evaluation as a whole.

It is anticipated that the formative evaluation will help UNGEI:
- Define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls’ education;
- Validate outcomes to be achieved in each country in order to advance the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education;
- Collect empirical baseline data in the countries and regions participating in the evaluation, against which progress in future evaluative works can be measured;
- Map the status of UNGEI partnerships in all countries and regions; and
- Map the governance structure and administrative components of the UNGEI partnership at the country/regional and global levels.

1.3 Scope of the evaluation at country level
The Nepal country evaluation documents how the Girls’ Education Initiative has interacted with and contributed to Nepal education processes, and how this has impacted, or is expected to impact, girls’ education and gender equality in education. Thus, the country evaluation will:

- Document what key changes have taken place in girls’ education and gender equality over time in the three outcome areas of UNGEI.
- Identify where and in what ways UNGEI has made a specific contribution or enhanced the contribution of others.
- Provide evidence of the outputs and outcomes of these interventions.
- Finally, assess the relevance, effectiveness and outcomes of UNGEI interventions, as well as their sustainability.

The evaluation also maps the UNGEI partnership, its governance and administrative structure, operational mechanism, and its contributions to gender-responsive changes in the education sector in Nepal. The evaluation focused on answering the following questions:

- Does the country coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?
What key changes have taken place in Nepal with respect to girls’ education and gender equality since UNGEI was formed, with focus on the three outcome areas of UNGEI?

In what ways did UNGEI contribute to these changes or enhance the contribution of others?

What achievements were made possible as a result of the partnership?

How relevant were UNGEI interventions to the context and gender issues in the education sector?

How effective have UNGEI interventions been in promoting changes?

Were these results achieved in an economical manner (efficiency in the use of resources – human, financial, etc.)?

What have been the impacts/likely impacts of these changes?

Are these changes sustainable over time?

The evaluation determined if UNGEI had added value to country-level results in girls’ education. Since it is always difficult to attribute results to only one source of inputs, actions or actors, to the extent possible, the evaluation attempted to outline the contribution of UNGEI to overall results through a contribution analysis. Contribution analysis focuses on identifying changes that took place, and how different inputs contributed to those changes. The logical steps to determining the contribution of UNGEI are as follows:

- What was the context like before UNGEI – what was happening at level ‘zero’ (before UNGEI)?
- What changed in the context over time (from before UNGEI until today)?
- What did UNGEI do (taking into account inputs from the global/regional/country levels)?
- What inputs (training, workshops, policy, evaluations, etc.) were provided by others?
- What were the outcomes?
- What was the added value of UNGEI to the changes that took place in terms of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs (for country, regional and global levels)?
- How sustainable are the changes that were brought about?

Thus, as emphasized in the Evaluation Guide, the following key steps were involved:

- Comprehensively mapping the situation at level ‘zero’;
- Examining what changed in the environment;
- Documenting inputs by stakeholders;
- Documenting changes; and
- Determining the distinctive contribution of UNGEI.

It should be noted that the last step is crucial and requires undertaking a contribution analysis. Rather than examining what changes took place and assuming that because changes took place and UNGEI was present, UNGEI must have contributed to the changes, contribution analysis goes further to construct a plausible story of influence, examining to what extent and in what ways UNGEI contributed. Because this is a formative evaluation it is important that this assessment not only looks at outcomes but also at processes and structures that have been put in place and how these influence or may influence future outcomes.

As stated in the Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR), the self-evaluation examined only activities/results that have been undertaken or achieved through collaborative efforts by the formal partnership (UNGEI). Activities related to only one or two partners and those that take place outside the UNGEI partnership
arrangement (e.g., an international organization funding an activity implemented by the Ministry of Education or a local NGO) were excluded from the evaluation.

1.4 Structure of this report
This report is divided into nine chapters. Chapter 1 deals with the background, purpose, aims, objective and scope of the evaluation at the country level. The chapter focuses on methodology and discusses the various phases of the evaluation, the activities that took place and the role of the Logic Model in the evaluation process. Chapter 2 deals with the evaluation process and methodology. This chapter focuses on the Logic Model, evaluation framework, data collection methods, samples, field work, data analysis, consultants’ workshops, Reference Group, quality assurance and limitations of the methodology. Chapter 3 focuses on context with reference to the country background, and the education sector and girls’ education in Nepal. Chapter 4 covers the UNGEI process in Nepal, including the establishment of UNGEI in Nepal, the structure and membership of UNGEI, and key strategies and activities. Chapter 5 presents findings with respect to three UNGEI outcomes, while chapter 6 assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the UNGEI partnership. Chapter 7 presents conclusions, while chapter 8 draws lessons learned and chapter 9 provides recommendations.
2. Evaluation process and methodology

This chapter outlines the evaluation process and methodology. It discusses the various activities that took place, the role of the Logic Model in the evaluation process, the sampling frame, data collection and analysis methods, and quality assurance.

The formative evaluation of the UNGEI partnership included several activities, including: an initial meeting in Cairo to agree on the evaluation process and methodology, an extensive document review, a preparatory meeting in Nepal with the UNGETG, the formation of and meeting with an evaluation reference group, the preparation of a country inception report, interviews with credible persons at the central level and focus group discussions with district-level and school-level stakeholders, a visit to Nepal by the evaluation's international lead evaluator, preparation of an evaluation framework and draft report, sharing the framework and the draft report, a meeting in Montreal of the evaluation consultants to reflect on overall findings, the preparation of a second draft report and sharing with the reference group, and the preparation and submission of the final report.

As guided by the ToR (see Annex 1), the evaluation used contribution analysis to identify the contribution of UNGEI. The process of contribution analysis included the context before the introduction of UNGEI in Nepal, the context after UNGEI was introduced, the inputs provided by UNGEI to the changed context, the relevance of UNGEI inputs, the effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs to bring about the changes, sustainability of changes and risks to sustainability. The evaluation examines the period beginning in 2002 with the initiation of UNGEI as a loose network in Nepal and ending in 2010.

2.1 The Logic Model

A key tool for the evaluation was the Nepal Logic Model, which is a modification of the UNGEI Logic Model provided in the Evaluation Guide. This evaluation is guided by the Logic Model of UNGEI, which includes the UNGEI vision, goals, global outcomes, Nepal outcomes, outputs and inputs (Annex 2). The analysis is based on how UNGEI inputs have contributed to the outputs as well as to the outcomes, the goal and the vision.

2.2 Validation of outcomes

There are three national outcomes for UNGEI in Nepal representing policy, good practices and their institutionalization, and partnership enhancement. These are derived from the country context and global framework, and from the Logic Model of the UNGEI partnership, which was put together retrospectively by the evaluation and validated by the reference group so as to make it possible to assess what outcomes UNGEI sought to achieve.

2.3 Evaluation framework

The evaluation methodology included the preparation of an evaluation framework on the basis of the information collected through document reviews, interviews, focus group discussions and observations. The evaluation framework systematically reflected on the context at the start of the UNGEI partnership in Nepal as well as the context in 2010/11, and identified UNGEI inputs to the changed context, and the relevance of the UNGEI inputs. It also records the evaluation’s effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and risk to sustainability (see Annex 3).
2.4 **Data collection methods**

Data collection entailed examining UNGEI partners’ involvement in the partnership activities. In order to interactively maximize knowledge and experience sharing with stakeholders, the study collected information through: (1) document review, (2) interviews (3) field visits and focus group discussions, and (4) direct observations.

**Document review:** The documents related to policies, plans and implementation achievements as they relate to girls’ education and gender equality in Nepal were reviewed. The document review informed the preparation of the evaluation inception report and guided the evaluator in designing the data collection process and instruments through primary sources. Documents helpful to describing and analysing the context at the time of the start of UNGEI in 2002 and the context at the time of evaluation were reviewed. The review also included UNGEI-related documents. The documents reviewed are included separately in Annex 4.

**Interviews:** Face-to-face interviews with key informants provided a unique opportunity probe deeper and get clarifications on the lead aspects of UNGEI Nepal, including its design, programming, ToR, evolutionary path, workplans, achievements and challenges to date (see Annex 5.3.1 through 5.3.8 for questionnaires).

**Focus group discussions:** These were held with UNGEI district and SMC members, pupils and teachers. Focus group discussions afforded the consultant the chance to listen to the voices of the beneficiaries of UNGEI regarding their candid assessments of the relevance, strengths and shortcomings of the UNGEI process.

**Direct observations:** This included observations of activities of beneficiaries (for example, female students in their classrooms, school buildings, separate toilets for girl students, teachers’ behaviour in classrooms).

2.5 **Sampling frame and sample size**

UNGEI is a partnership of organizations from the United Nations family, governments, civil society and the private sector, as well as communities and families. Thus the primary stakeholders from whom data was collected included: members of the United Nations family, government agencies, civil society organizations, media, beneficiaries of the programme, policy/lawmakers and network members. A purposive sampling method was used to select the persons for interaction from each category given above. In total, 126 persons were contacted, of which 27 were central-level respondents, 51 were district and school-level non-student respondents, and the remaining 48 were students with whom focus group discussions were held (see Annex 4 for a list of interviewees).

2.6 **Data collection instruments**

The UNGEI Evaluation Framework was used to obtain detailed information from partnership members – UNGEI focal persons at country and regional levels, UNGETG and GEGEN at national and district levels. In addition, interview and focus group discussion schedules were developed, with questions derived from the main framework. The questionnaires were to identify partners’ contributions to girls’ education in general and to the partnership in particular, as well as their perceptions about the impacts and effectiveness of the partnership, and the challenges to the partnership. (*See Annex 5 for questionnaire and checklist.*)
2.7 Fieldwork
A weeklong field visit was carried out to understand the field-level partnership in girls’ education and gender equality. Two of the adjacent districts visited had a World Food Programme (WFP)-UNICEF partnership and general girls’ education programme. One school in each district was visited. Focus group discussions were held with two district-level GEGENs, two YC groups, two SMCs and four students’ groups (two groups each of boys and girls).

In addition, the international lead evaluator, Dr. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, visited Nepal from 16 May to 20 May 2011, and the Nepal consultant worked together with her to conduct interviews with some people in the MoE, European Commission (EC) and NGOs, and held meetings with UNGEI Focal Persons at country and Regional Office for South Asia (ROSA) levels, and with the UNICEF Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser. They developed a draft evaluation framework based on the information collected, and came to a consensus on the further work to be conducted to finalize the evaluation.

2.8 Data analysis
A content analysis technique was used where data were coded according to the themes relevant to the research questions. A ‘key message’ was drawn for each question from each interviewee, which was then grouped under positive, negative or neutral categories. A frequency count technique was applied, which was complemented by other sources of information to assess the level of UNGEI involvement in generating the results (outputs) that had been identified by the evaluation. The cumulative results of related outputs were used to determine the outcome.

2.9 Consultant workshops
Two workshops were held for the team of evaluation consultants working in different countries. The first workshop was held in Cairo and aimed at reaching a common understanding on the objectives of the UNGEI Formative Evaluation, the evaluation framework, methodology, evaluation tools, product and outline of the country, and regional and global reports. The meeting reached a common consensus on the key objectives and steps of the UNGEI evaluation process, the purpose of the evaluation framework, the importance of contribution analysis, data sources, data availability and data triangulation, selection of evaluation instruments, and the approach to develop a sampling framework. The second workshop was organized in Montreal six months later to share the findings, identify gaps, and discuss reporting.

2.10 Reference Group
An evaluation reference group, led by the DoE Director, was formed by involving persons from different organizations with the aim of making the group more inclusive. The group reviewed and provided feedback for the inception report and draft report of the evaluation. (See Annex 6 for a list of members of the reference group).

2.11 Quality assurance
Quality assurance was achieved by triangulation of information from various sources as well as frequent sharing with concerned officials, including those working in the M&E Unit of UNICEF, members of the evaluation reference group, and M&E officials of the DoE. A reiterative process was used to further examine the facts on conflicting messages, which helped to moderate the data collection process and ensure quality reporting.
2.12 Methodology limitations

The study encountered a number of limitations to complete this evaluation. First, UNGEI Nepal had kept limited records of the UNGEI process, activities and achievement in a systematic way. This constrained the evaluation and made it difficult to triangulate the information. This also limited the establishment of a chain of linkage with processes such as who was involved, to what level, at what context, and with what inputs to get what outputs and what outcome.

The second limitation was finding an adequate number of key informants who were involved in the early period of the UNGEI loose network. Recalling the process and events was equally difficult for respondents, especially of the early period. This created difficulties in gathering information on the early part of the evaluation period. Similarly, there were some UNGEI activities outside the formal partnership that had also contributed to the UNGEI outcomes. The contribution of such activities was excluded as per the scope of this evaluation.
3. **Context: Country background, education sector**

This chapter provides brief background information on the country, as well as a succinct overview of the education sector and the progress towards girls’ education and gender equality. Key issues affecting girls’ education and gender equality are highlighted.

### 3.1. Country background

Situated between India to the south, east and west, and China to the north, Nepal is a country of climatic, geographical, biological, ethnic and cultural diversity. Barring oceanic climates, all other types of climates are found in the country’s mountains, hills and the plains known as terai. Eight of the world’s 10 highest mountain peaks are in Nepal, including Mount Everest. The country has abundant fresh water reserves and high potential for producing hydroelectricity. The population of about 29 million people belong to more than 60 ethnic groups and speak more than 90 languages.

Nepal is a new republic, formed after overthrowing 240 years of monarchy in 2008. Despite being rich in natural and cultural heritage, Nepal is among the least economically developed countries in the world. More than a decade of a war that took place between the mid-1990s to mid-2000s devastated the already sluggish economy.

However, Nepal is one of the ‘Top 10 Movers’ when measured from a non-income human development index (UNDP, 2010). There is less gender disparity in political, development and education sectors. Women now make up almost one-third of parliamentarians, and women’s participation in development and education is increasing, with near gender parity in the enrolment for primary education. Under-5 mortality has been reduced to 50 per 1,000 live births and maternal mortality has reduced to 229 per 100,000 live births, which is a reduction of nearly half over 10 years. Nepal has also succeeded in halting the spread of HIV and AIDS (UNDP, 2010).

Politically, Nepal experienced feudal rule by Rana families for about 104 years (until 1951), followed by the direct rule of a king from 1951 to 1989 and then a constitutional monarchy from 1990 to 2008. Under Rana rule, development and education were limited to Rana families and external relations were limited. Under direct rule of the king, political parties were banned and development and education were largely under state control, although they were progressing. With the constitutional monarchy, a government of elected representatives ruled Nepal, and a liberal economy and privatization were promoted in economy and education. The republican state has made social and gender inclusion an important part of the political, education and development agenda.

### 3.2. The education sector in Nepal

Education has been a priority area of the Government of Nepal since 1951. Basic education is a legal right of every citizen, as stated in the 1990 Constitution of the Kingdom of Nepal. The Interim Constitution (2006) of the Federal Republic of Nepal acknowledges the right to free education for all up to the secondary level, and recognizes the key role of education in poverty reduction. However, both constitutions mentioned above have not firmly ensured education as a fundamental right (UNICEF, 2009).

With the approval of the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) in 2009, the education system was modified to establish two levels of education: basic, covering Grades 1–8 (for children aged 5-12) and secondary,
covering Grades 9–12 (for children aged 13-16) [MoE, 2009]. The objective of the SSRP is to “increase access to and improve quality of school education, particularly basic education (Grades 1–8), especially for children from marginalized groups”.

Around the country, there are community (public) schools and institutional (private) schools. In the academic year 2009/10, community schools made up approximately 80 per cent of the country’s 32,865 basic schools, covering 86 per cent of the 6,651,883 students at the basic level (Grades 1–8), as reported in the Flash I Report 2010–11 (DoE, 2010). There were also 766 religious schools (Madrassa, Gumba/Vihar and Ashram/Gurukul) for Muslim, Buddhist and Hindu children (DoE, 2010). The table below shows that there are more boys in institutional schools and more girls in community schools, thereby indicating parental biases for sending boys to institutional schools, which require greater payments.

**Table 1: Type of school and distribution of students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Community (Public)</th>
<th>Institutional (Private)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>32,865</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students (Grades 1–8)</td>
<td>6,651,883</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DoE, 2010.*

Education is also now more equal from a social point of view. There is less disparity among social classes in terms of school enrolment. The population of indigenous people, known as Janajatis, is estimated at about 40 per cent of the total population; enrolment of Janajati children at primary level is 38.2 per cent in 2010. This shows slightly less proportion of students of this group in primary school. Likewise, the share of Dalits (low-caste) in the population is reported at 12 per cent, whereas student enrolment at the primary level from this group is 21.5 per cent, as per the DoE Flash Report for 2010. There were more girls than boys who were enrolled in primary school in 2010 from both Dalit and Janajati groups. Some reports are skeptical of this level of achievement and doubt the over-inflated figure, as school enrolment of girls and children of Dalit and other marginalized groups is associated with scholarships.

### 3.3. Girls’ education in Nepal

There are three important education plans related to girls’ education and gender equality. These are: (1) The National Education System Plan (1971–1976), which has given greater emphasis to girls’ education; (2) The Basic and Primary Education Master Plan (1991–2001), which provided greater impetus to increase girls’ and women’s participation in education; and (3) the SSRP (2009–2015), which is currently in the implementation stage, and has a main purpose of fulfilling the objectives of Education for All (EFA) by 2015, where every boy and girl receives basic education.

EFA sets the net enrolment rate (NER) target for children in primary (5–9 years old) school at 99 per cent and for basic education (5–12 years old) at 85 per cent. The SSRP is comprehensive, strategic and more
inclusive, where 50 per cent of girl students and all students from disadvantaged groups are provided with scholarships. It has programmes to restructure school education and improve the quality of education and institutionalization of performance accountability. The plan emphasizes access for out-of-school populations and has ensured the provision for all children to learn with effective and efficient delivery of services (MoES, 2009).

Various efforts have ensured that the situation in 2010 has greatly changed since 2001. Not only has gender parity nearly been achieved, but the transition rate from one cohort to another has also improved (see Table 3). However, about 6 per cent of children are still out of school, and bringing these children to school requires different approaches and incentive packages, as they are from vulnerable and disadvantaged families.

Table 2: Changes in gender parity in primary and lower secondary education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Lower secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NER of boys</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER of girls</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender parity index in NER</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate from primary to lower secondary and lower secondary to secondary of boys</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate from primary to lower secondary and lower secondary to secondary of girls</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher trained per cent of total</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female teacher per cent of total teachers</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Female teacher trained per cent of total female teachers | 12.2 | 22.6 | 79.9 | 63.9

**Source:** DoE, 2001 and DoE, 2010.

There has been improvement in quality between 2001 and 2010, thereby improving the internal efficiency rate. The promotion rate increased for all grades (1–5) at primary level and very significantly in Grade 1 for both boys and girls. The repetition rates and the drop-out rates reduced for all cases. The survival rate to Grade 5 went up significantly for girls within the same period. The almost equal survival rate for boys and girls indicates that there is no discrimination between boys and girls. What is still shocking, however, is that almost one-fifth of students leaves school without completing primary-level education (DoE 2001 and DoE 2010).

**Table 3: Change in internal efficiency in primary education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survival rate (1-5)</td>
<td>Promotion rate</td>
<td>Repetition rate</td>
<td>Dropout rate</td>
<td>Survival rate (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** DoE, 2001 and DoE, 2010.

The data above suggests that there had been significant achievements regarding gender parity in primary education, especially in terms of net enrolment, promotion from one grade to another, and transfer from one cohort to another. Changes are also significant in the ratio between male and female teachers; however, gender disparity is still high between them.
4. Establishment and evolution of UNGEI at the country level

This chapter provides an overview of the establishment and evolution of UNGEI in Nepal. It outlines the objectives and structures that make UNGEI function, describes the various levels of operation, and outlines key strategies and activities. A fuller assessment of UNGEI achievements and challenges will follow in chapters 5 and 6, which deal with the evaluation findings.

4.1. Establishment of UNGEI in Nepal

The origin of UNGEI Nepal is traced back to an informal network established in 2002. Efforts from NGOs and United Nations agencies were important in the formation of this network. At a meeting convened by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) meeting in Paris in 2001, participants from Nepal discussed the need for starting a networking group in Nepal that focused on girls’ education. Upon their return to Nepal, and with support from UNICEF, a workshop focusing on girls’ education was held involving NGOs (national and international) and United Nations agencies, with presentations about UNGEI. About 60 persons from government and non-government sectors participated.

The start-up of UNGEI reportedly suffered from not having proper guidance from headquarters (HQ) and the regional office (ROSA). Although the issues relating to girls’ education and gender equality were known, UNICEF Nepal was not clear about how to get UNGEI moving. With new UNGEI leadership in HQ and ROSA in 2006, UNICEF Nepal was provided with clearer guidelines for the UNGEI movement. The UNGEI Global Advisory Committee (GAC)\(^1\) Asia-Pacific Technical Meeting of UNGEI was held in Nepal in 2008, which triggered Nepal to establish a formal partnership of UNGEI at country level that same year. UNGEI was then given the GEGEN designation, and the Director General of the Department of Education (DoE) was nominated as chair of GEGEN, while the Gender Equity Development Section (GEDS) of the DoE was nominated as member secretary and UNICEF was nominated as co-chair.

4.2. Structure and membership of UNGEI

4.2.1. UNGEI at the national level

The GEGEN is now in place at both central and district levels. To support the UNGEI partnership, there is a United Nations Girls’ Education Theme Group (UNGETG) – called the ‘UNGEI Group’ within the United Nations system – which is coordinated by the UNGEI focal person. There is also a Women Parliamentarians Networking Group for Girls’ Education. The relationship between these networks is shown in diagram 1, and details are provided in Annex 8.

---

\(^1\) The GAC is the decision-making organ of UNGEI at the global level.
Before the official launch of the UNGEI partnership in Nepal, activities related to girls’ education and gender equality were carried out by an informal network without the UNGEI logo. After the official launch, the UNGEI logo was associated with those activities where there is a strong UNGEI presence/involvement. The official launching is credited with having sensitized people to the existence of UNGEI. In addition, UNICEF ROSA is doing more in terms of documentation of UNGEI’s work and processes.

At the central level, GEGEN convenes a formal meeting each quarter to review progress. It also holds an annual meeting to develop strategies for the Welcome to School (WTS) campaign. Likewise, district-level GEGEN meetings are also organized accordingly. In addition, the district GEGEN organizes special meetings when women parliamentarians and/or central-level GEGEN members visit the district.

United Nations partners in UNGEI meet formally twice each year – one meeting is for sharing the individual annual workplan and is generally held in April, while the other is for reviewing progress towards the end of the year. After sharing the workplan, United Nations agencies carry out the activities through their respective channels.
In most cases, UNGEI partnerships do not have common workplans. As girls’ education and gender equality is a common agenda for all, the member agencies work independently to promote girls’ education in many cases. However, in some cases, the members forge a partnership and work collaboratively. The partnership between UNICEF and WFP in the five terai districts is one example of a collaborative partnership. In partnership efforts of this kind, partners agree on their individual and collective roles and responsibilities, and share activities and progress more frequently. Costs are shared for some activities, reviews are done jointly and partners keep more systematic records of activities. However, the UNGEI partnership does not systematically keep meeting records and detailed progress reports, and it is difficult to get insight into the priority-setting and processes that were put in place. Though ROSA keeps the annual records of many activities, UNGEI Nepal rarely prepares or keeps records regarding the UNGEI partnership.

It is therefore sometimes difficult to distinguish what is an UNGEI activity and what is not. Specifically, it is hard to distinguish between UNICEF and UNGEI activities. Because of the integrated approach that has been taken, it was difficult even for the UNGEI focal person to distinguish the activities that she did on behalf of UNICEF from those that were done on behalf of UNGEI. This was also true for the Education Adviser and the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser of UNICEF. For many other agencies, UNGEI meant girls’ education and the gender equality programme of UNICEF. This might have been because UNICEF initiated and continuously provided strong support to UNGEI.

### 4.3. Key strategies and activities

The priorities of the UNGEI agenda are closely aligned with those that have been mainstreamed into Nepal’s education system, as the Government of Nepal also promotes girls’ education and gender equality to achieve the EFA and MDG targets related to girls’ education and gender equality. Therefore, UNGEI in Nepal is not considered a separate programme, but a framework that helps the government implement the strategies in a focused way.

UNGEI in Nepal works mainly at the policy level by advocating, lobbying and stimulating policymakers for gender-sensitive policy in education. It plays a facilitating role by encouraging partners/network members to make girls’ education and gender equality their priority areas.
5. Findings with respect to UNGEI outcomes

This chapter presents the substantive findings of the evaluation for the three outcome areas of UNGEI. In discussing each of these outcome areas, the evaluation follows a contribution analysis approach by consecutively: (i) outlining the situation with respect to the outcome area before UNGEI, (ii) describing the situation today, and (iii) identifying the inputs and contribution of UNGEI to the area.

5.1. Outcome 1 – Mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality in the National Education Plan

5.1.1. Before UNGEI

Nepal initiated mainstreaming of girls’ issues into education in the early 1970s, with the formulation of the National Education System Plan (1971–1976), which had a policy of at least one female teacher per primary school to promote a girl-friendly environment. Thereafter, subsequent periodic plans have progressively incorporated issues and concerns related to girls’ education and gender equality. A summary of important policies related to girls’ education and gender equality in education that existed in 2001 is provided below.

As already indicated, the Ninth Five-Year Plan made provisions for gender justice by adopting gender equality and empowerment as strategies for equal access to primary education (National Planning Commission, 1997). A gender audit was initiated in 2001 and completed in 2002, identifying 10 actions to integrate and mainstream gender in education. At the time, the government decided to place a gender focal person in each ministry, including the then Ministry of Education and Culture. The policy of recruiting at least one female teacher in each school was continued, given that almost 43 per cent of schools continued to be without a female teacher despite the introduction of a policy in this respect in the early 1970s. Other policies that existed at that time included distributing free textbooks up to Grade 3 in general and Grade 5 in 18 remote districts, opening 10,000 early childhood education centres, and ensuring that a primary school existed within walking distance of each village. At the time, 15.6 per cent of government expenses were dedicated to the education sector (DoE, 2001).

5.1.2. Situation in 2011/changes since UNGEI

A number of significant events have taken place between 2001 and 2010/11, the most significant of which was the introduction of a republican state. This brought many associated modifications in the structure of institutions that have had a great bearing on education and girls’ education, as referred to in chapter 3. Other relevant policy developments include:

**EFA National Plan of Action (2001–2015):** Includes gender equality in planning and programme implementation, and activities targeted to girls and women to eliminate gender disparity.

**Secondary Education Support Programme (2003–2004):** Focused on raising girls’ participation from 40 per cent to 50 per cent in lower secondary and secondary education.

**Tenth Five-Year Plan (2002–2007):** Included a focus on quality education, decentralizing education services, ensuring gender equality in education, and providing equal access to education to females and students with special needs.
Development of an education plan through the sector-wide approach (SWAp): The SSRP was developed in a holistic way as a framework for inclusive education as well as a funding mechanism. It takes into account the issues of girls’ education and the education of children of marginalized communities.

Greater participation from women lawmakers in education: Women parliamentarians are actively involved in education through a network to understand issues related to girls’ education and provide feedback to policymakers and also create pressure to put the girls’ agenda into law and policies.

Gender Responsive Budget (2010): The Finance Ministry uses five indicators to analyze budget allocations from a gender perspective. According to the International Labour Organization, each indicator is assigned an equal weight of 20 per cent. The indicators include: Women's capacity development; Women's participation in programme formulation and implementation; Benefit incidence of public expenditures on women; Support to women's employment and income generation; Positive impact on women’s time use and care work. Programmes scoring 50 per cent or more are classified as directly supportive of women, those scoring 20 to 50 per cent are classified as indirectly supportive, and those scoring less than 20 per cent are classified as neutral.

Draft Education Act: Includes provisions for a more engendered law, securing 33 to 50 per cent seats for women in management committees ranging from school level to policymaking. The act is expected to be approved under pressure from women lawmakers, who are in contact with partners of the UNGEI partnership.

Since 2001, policies have become more focused on gender equality and receive support from more development partners. Education services have also been decentralized, with a greater emphasis on community participation and on improving the access of marginalized communities to education.

5.1.3. UNGEI inputs

Five output areas were identified as influencing policy in favour of girls’ education and gender equality in education. The output areas were identified by conducting in-depth discussions among the Nepali members during the Cairo meeting, as well as further discussions with UNGETG and the Director General of the DoE. The output areas were approved by the reference group at the beginning of the evaluation. The areas include: a) girls’ education policies reviewed through the SWAp mechanism; b) gender-disaggregated data available; c) girls’ education strategy paper developed; d) gender audit on education policy conducted; and e) M&E systems of Girls’ Education Initiative (GEI) partners strengthened.

a) Girls’ education policies reviewed through the SWAp mechanism

To assess the involvement of the UNGEI partnership in the preparation of the SSRP, specifically in reviewing the education policies through the SWAp mechanism, the evaluation conducted interviews with persons who were involved in the educational policy review process through the SWAp mechanism. Out of the nine persons who responded, five did not know of UNGEI's role in reviewing girls’ education and the gender equality policy through the SWAp mechanism. There were familiar with the roles of UNICEF, WFP and UNESCO, but the role of UNGEI was not known to them. Two respondents said that UNGEI’s role was to encourage partners to put the girls’ agenda
into education policy. The remaining two respondents were not clear whether UNGEI or UNICEF were involved.

When this issue was discussed with the UNGEI focal person, the evaluator was told that an UNGETG meeting was held that discussed relevant areas for gender-based issues to be incorporated in the SSRP. Issues to be addressed by individual United Nations agencies were identified, and individual workplans were developed. Agencies such as UNICEF, UNESCO, WFP and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) decided to provide financial and/or technical support to the review of education policies through the SWAp mechanism.

In view of these somewhat conflicting findings, the evaluation concludes that UNGEI's role was existent within the United Nations system in placing the girls’ agenda into the respective plan to help the MoE in reviewing education policies through the SWAp mechanism in order to form the SSRP, which was invisible outside the United Nations system.

b) **Gender-disaggregated data availability**: Gender-disaggregated data are available for students by grade, and for teachers. The data by specific ethnic and Dalit groups are not available. The evaluation tried to assess the involvement of UNGEI in making the gender-disaggregated data available. Here again, there is no document that shows UNGEI involvement in this respect. The claim of the UNGEI focal person was that gender-disaggregated data was demanded from DOA for comment, individual annual workplans were developed by United Nations agencies and technical support was provided for making gender-disaggregated data available. This claim, however, was supported by none of the eight persons who responded to this issue, not even the single United Nations agency that the evaluation interacted with. What is known with respect to this issue is that UNESCO developed the format and UNICEF provided consultant support for Education Management Information System data analysis and district-level data collection training. There might have been some inputs from the UNGEI focal person, but they were not identified or noticed by others. It was not made clear by the UNGEI focal person whether the inputs in the form of comments on the gender-disaggregated data were on behalf of the UNGEI partnership or UNICEF.

c) **The Girls' Education Strategy Paper (GESP)**: This paper was developed during 2005–2006 and published in 2007, and is based on the gender audit in education. UNGEI involvement in developing the GESP was partially supported by the credible respondents of this evaluation. Out of seven who responded to this question, two respondents were from United Nations agencies. They reported that there was an UNGEI role in developing the GESP. However, those in the DoE and MoE involved in developing the paper indicated that they were not aware of an UNGEI role. Others mentioned that UNGEI had a role in advocating for the implementation of part of the paper’s agenda, rather than developing the paper per se. Two prominent members of the Association of Non-Governmental Organizations in Nepal (AIN) also kept silent regarding UNGEI’s involvement in the development of the paper. The paper itself acknowledges a contribution by UNICEF, but does not mention UNGEI. However, a DoE respondent in the GEDS section told the evaluation that UNGEI provided technical support to the paper’s development. The evaluation concludes that here again, UNGEI played an internal role in motivating United Nations partners, and that, in most of the cases, this role was not known to partners outside the United Nations system.
**d) Gender audit on education policy:** Initiated in 2001, the work was completed in 2002. The audit has put forward 10 actions to integrate and mainstream gender in education. UNGEI's involvement in the gender audit was, according to the UNGEI focal person, to support the discussion on how to address gender issues in policy to support the UNGEI agenda. However, the UNGEI focal person's claim was supported by only one out of the seven people who responded. Only one person who represented a United Nations agency told the evaluation that there was UNGEI involvement in conducting a gender audit in education. Others responded that they did not know UNGEI's role, but stated that there was a UNICEF role. One person representing the MoE – who was also involved in facilitating the gender audit – clearly rejected the involvement of UNGEI. Another person who coordinated the gender audit also could not recall UNGEI's involvement. As the process of the gender audit was initiated before the loose network of UNGEI was formed in Nepal in 2002, the gender focal point’s claim to have UNGEI involvement in this process does not seem relevant, although it is plausible that the current UNGEI focal person who was working as an Education Specialist in UNICEF might have gone to the process on behalf of UNICEF and discussed the gender issues in the education policy.

**e) Strengthening of M&E systems of GEI partners:** Although UNGEI did not play a role in strengthening partner capacity in the M&E system, the UNGEI focal person has been participating in the planning and review meetings of partner agencies, including the DoE and Educational Pages. Eight people were asked about UNGEI’s involvement. Of these, six respondents highlighted that UNGEI participated in the review meetings. The UNGEI focal person called review meetings of related United Nations agencies, where they discussed the overall educational programme, including girls’ education and gender equality.

In addition, it was known that UNGEI was involved in the process of building the capacity of gender focal persons through training on mainstreaming gender issues in education planning. Some of the people who participated in the training were involved in reviewing education policies through the SWAp mechanism. In addition, it was known that UNGEI involvement was found visible in creating space for women parliamentarians and their capacity building, which later played a critical role in providing feedback to the Education Act to make it more gender sensitive and inclusive.

### 5.1.4. **Contribution by UNGEI**

Contributions included:

- Creating space for uniting women parliamentarians and building their capacity, which contributed to 12 gender-related common points to be included into the Education Act, currently at the stage of being approved. If approved, the Act will be more gender sensitive.
- Lobbying for the implementation of GESP, which has provided a framework for implementation of gender strategies, such as ensuring the participation of women in SMCs and District Education Committees (DECs), as well as ensuring scholarships for girls, with a specific focus on marginalized communities.
- Coordinating United Nations agencies through meetings of UNGETG to provide support for developing GESP.
• Providing training to MoE gender focal persons, which contributed to building the capacity to understand gender issues and played a key role in formulating the GESP and other policies (including SSRP). Such policies are now more gender-sensitive.

• Discussing among United Nations agencies the relevant areas for gender-based issues to be incorporated in the SSRP, where issues to be addressed by individual United Nations agencies were identified and individual workplans were developed. On the basis of the discussion, UNICEF, UNESCO and UNFPA provided technical and/or financial support for the review of educational policies through the SWAp mechanism to help the formulation of the SSRP.

This analysis indicates that girls’ education and gender equality have been mainstreamed in the national education plan for years, even before the start of the UNGEI loose network. Girls’ education and gender equality have become more engendered and inclusive following the establishment of the republican state in 2008. The contribution of UNGEI to the process of mainstreaming girls’ education in the national education plan was most evident within the United Nations agencies as it focused advocacy and lobbying activities mainly to United Nations agencies through Girls’ Education Theme Group (GETG) meetings where the agencies shared the annual workplan, reviewed progress and assisted in formulating educational plans and policies. Therefore, the evaluation found evidence of only a very modest UNGEI contribution to mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality into the national plan.

5.2. Outcome 2: Good practices aimed at increasing access to education of marginalized children and especially girls, institutionalized at the national level

The next section of this report examines the evaluation’s findings with respect to the second outcome area of UNGEI, namely, the identification and dissemination of good practices. As was the case for the first outcome area, this section will examine what the situation was like before UNGEI and what changed, and will seek to establish in what way UNGEI contributed.

5.2.1. Before UNGEI

Despite the fact that the state had recognized school education as one of its prime responsibilities in a number of plans, policies and legal documents, the results were not highly satisfactory, and the gender gap was wide. In 2001, there was a high level of gender disparity in education, including a NER of 12 per cent at the primary level and 11 per cent at the secondary level. While the gender gap was distinct at the national level, it was more pronounced in rural areas, geographically remote areas, in southern parts of the country, in the mid-west, and among marginalized groups of people. With respect to out-of-school children, 63 per cent of the 590,000 children out of school were girls. This again shows very high gender discrimination. Out of 98,000 total teachers, about 25 per cent were female. Of the total number of teachers, about 15 per cent were trained and 12 per cent were female and trained.

Some of the good practices at the time included the recruitment of female teachers in each school, feeder hostels, the conducting of a gender audit, and girls’ scholarships. These are briefly discussed below:

Female teachers act as role models for girl students to go to school. With female teachers in school, the enrolment of girls increased, repetition rates decreased and retention rates increased, because
girls felt secure and confident when female teachers were around. Parents were also more confident in sending their daughters to school (Bista, 2004).

**Feeder hostels** were provided for girls who were training to become teachers. A feeder hostel programme was launched to train female teachers in 18 districts where finding such teachers was difficult due to low qualifications. The students were selected from the rural areas where they would teach after completing the School Leaving Certificate programme and teacher training. Many of the students went back to their communities to teach after completing the course.

**Gender audit:** In 2001–2002, the MoE undertook a ‘gender audit’ that recommended the development of a ministerial gender policy. Recommendations included the integration of gender perspectives in all training and statistics and increasing the number of women leaders at all levels to 30 per cent within five years. Further actions include the presentation of gender-sensitive role models and educational materials without gender stereotypes. The audit has proven to be an important instrument to achieve gender equality in the education sector.

**Girls’ scholarships:** Such scholarships were introduced in the 1990s under a basic and primary education programme, which was expanded thereafter and is currently institutionalized.

Though good practices were not documented appropriately, they were identified by some studies, and those involved in programme design and interventions incorporated them by reviewing documentation on the previous studies. Improvements were made in terms of the number of female teachers and feeder hostels, and the scholarship programme was expanded to all 75 districts in the country by incorporating lessons learned. Likewise, many gender-related policy decisions are made in education based on the provisions in the gender audit, which are implemented gradually to achieve gender parity.

5.2.2. **Context in 2010/11**

Gender disparity at primary and secondary levels decreased by 18.5 and 34.8 percentage points, respectively, during the past decade. In 2010 the gender disparity for NER was 1.7 per cent at the primary level and 1.5 per cent at the lower secondary level. The actual NER of girls is 93.6 per cent at the primary level and 68.5 per cent at the lower secondary level. Likewise, on average, the promotion rate of girls (Grades 1–5) has gone up by 8.62 per cent, repetition rates decreased by 7.44 per cent, drop-out rates fell by 1.22 per cent and survival rates increased by 13.4 per cent, with an overall NER level of 81.2 per cent compared with the 2001 level of 67.8 per cent. The number of out-of-school children has decreased from 590,000 to 196,000.

Some good practices emerged during the period between 2001 and 2011. After discussions with UNGEI focal persons at the country and regional levels, as well as in the UNGETG and the reference group formed for this study, the following UNGEI-supported good practices in girls’ education and gender equality were identified: the Welcome to School campaign, mobilization of Young Champions, mobilization of women parliamentarians in education, and partnership between WFP and UNICEF on cooking oil support and quality education. These are briefly discussed below.

**The Welcome to School (WTS) campaign,** launched in Nepal in 2004, is an initiative to increase the access of girls and vulnerable children to school. The objective is to bring out-of-school children
to school and retain them there. The campaign involves a combination of multiple strategies to encourage school enrolment and retention, including policy development, strong advocacy, civil society monitoring, micro-planning, partnership facilitation, community mapping, and the establishment of child clubs to identify out-of-school children. It mobilizes all stakeholders, including the local government, SMCs, children’s clubs, NGOs, community-based organizations and the media at various levels, especially at the community level. A month-long campaign, the first two weeks are devoted to admission and the second two weeks are used to identify and motivate those households that have not enrolled children in school during the admission period. The school then sends invitation cards to the children with, in many instances, a notebook and pencil as encouragement. Other incentive packages are also used in areas where the number of out-of-school children is particularly high and in areas that have above-average gender disparity. The campaign has been very effective, with the number of out-of-school children decreasing to 160,000 in 2010 from 590,000 in 2004. The effective and committed support of implementation partners played a key role in this success.

The Young Champions (YC) programme involves volunteers from communities who are dedicated to the promotion of girls’ education. A YC is an advocate and a change agent who is committed to making quality education available to girls and boys. To help increase the access to quality education by every child, YCs facilitate stakeholders to identify out-of-school children, why they are out of school, and how they can be brought to and retained in school. The YC programme is a specific UNGEI South Asia model for actively involving young people in education. The YC process involves training of trainers, preparing an action plan, implementing the action plan prepared during the training, and training other youths. In Nepal, YCs are involved in the WTS campaign to enrol out-of-school children, forming YC groups at the school level, creating youth clubs, disseminating information, education and communication materials, mobilizing the media at district and local levels, monitoring students’ attendance, networking with other community-based organizations and child clubs, integrating religious madrassas into formal education, coordinating and following up on girls’ education activities with district partners, and participating in district-level GEGEN and awareness-raising campaigns on issues such as early child marriage, child labour and child trafficking. YCs are also involved in leading classes when teachers are absent and working as watchdogs. They are the UNGEI focal point at the school level.

YCs and youth group members, together with other activists in the community, work towards convincing parents to send their children to school in support of the WTS campaign. They keep household records, especially vital records, and know the number of children and their ages for each house. This helps to prepare an evidence-based campaign. They also keep a record of the children who have not regularly gone to the school. In such a case, the youth group and YC identify the cause of a child not regularly going to school and try to resolve it, bringing the issues to the appropriate entity. YCs also monitor schools in terms of records of student attendance, teacher attendance, school opening and closing days, etc.

There are 477 YCs in six terai districts, of which one-third are women. There are also 1,420 members of youth groups and about 29 per cent of them are women.
Table 4: Young Champions and youth group members in six terai districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Young Champions</th>
<th>Youth group members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanusha</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahottari</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarlahi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rautahat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bara</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsa</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNICEF field office, Bharatpur.

Economic support was also provided to the families of girl students, including by distributing two litres of cooking oil per month per girl studying in Grades 2–5 with at least 80 per cent attendance during school days.

WFP-UNICEF partnership for food for education

UNGEI partners WFP and UNICEF forged a partnership to support the Government of Nepal’s efforts in promoting girls’ education in about 100 schools in five terai districts where gender disparity in education was more than 15 per cent. They defined the roles of different stakeholders and jointly selected schools. The DOE monitored and supervised the DEO, and coordinated with related sections in the DOE and DEO. The DEO regularly monitored the project. WFP ensured the distribution of a monthly take-home ration of 2 litres of vegetable oil to the mothers of about 10,000 girls with a minimum monthly attendance of 80 per cent in schools. The Food Management Committee organized the transport of oil from distribution centres to schools. UNICEF supported the DEO and partner NGOs to create child-friendly schools by supporting teacher training in child-friendly teaching methods, and wall printing. UNICEF also strengthened school management, provided child-friendly educational materials, helped to improve the classroom environment and provided furniture. This partnership was forged under the UNGEI banner, as it significantly contributed to stimulating partners to forge the partnership. The project has been credited with bringing out-of-school children to school and retaining their attendance. YCs played an active role in disseminating the information and monitoring the attendance of students.

There was a higher girls’ enrolment in those schools where families were provided with oil than in schools not providing such support. In Nepal Rastriya Primary School in Bara, where the family support programme was not in place, it was reported that there were about 100 out-of-school children within the school’s command area, with more girls than boys out of school. In Shree
Primary School in Rautahat, where families were provided with two litres of cooking oil per girl per month, the reported number of out-of-school children was about 20, with fewer girls than boys.

The involvement of women parliamentarians and members of the constituent assembly in girls’ education helped to improve parliamentarians’ understanding of issues related to girls’ education and gender equality in education, and also advocated for gender-friendly policies and acts. Women have made up about one-third of the parliament in Nepal since the Constituent Assembly election of 2008, and there are 197 women out of 601 Constituent Assembly members/parliamentarians. Educational Pages – one of the active members in the GE Network – initiated a dialogue with women leaders of major political parties on issues related to girls’ education. Educational Pages put the agenda in the GE Network meeting, and the meeting welcomed the idea and requested that political parties send their representatives to discuss the issues. They participated in a series of meetings and formed a Girls’ Education Networking Group of Women CA Members. To facilitate the process, they also formed a Women Parliamentarians Advisory Group for Girls’ Education. The groups organized workshops and identified barriers to girls’ education.

Based on the identified barriers, they made a 15-point commitment regarding girls’ education and gender equality in education and launched it in a special ceremony by including the signatures of all 197 women parliamentarians. This was held under the UNGEI banner. The groups also went to districts to understand girls’ educational issues in depth, as well as visited schools, participated in review meetings, brought the issues to the centre of discussions, discussed the issues at a centre-level workshop, and provided a 12-point list of suggestions to include into the Education Act, which was in the process of being discussed. In their first visit to the district, they encouraged district stakeholders to form the district-level GE Network with DEO, District Development Committee, the Women Development Office, the Teachers’ Union of Nepal (TUN), NGOs, school representatives, YCs as members, gender focal persons as member secretaries and parliamentarians as observers.

Other good practices identified during the process of interviews included consistent and progressive policies in gender equality in education and the introduction of girl-friendly toilets.

The continuous government insistence on gender parity in education, with incentive packages including scholarships, day meals, free textbooks, free tuition and female teachers cumulatively contributed to access and retention. The role of female teachers is thought to have been the most influential factor for girls’ education and enrolment.

Girl-friendly toilets: The gender audit had strongly recommended the introduction of girl-friendly toilets. Accordingly, the Government of Nepal has allocated funds and in 2010, the government planned to construct girl-friendly toilets in 5,500 schools.

5.2.3. UNGEI inputs
UNGEI conducted coordination meetings and provided technical and financial support to mark occasions such as International Women’s Day, International Literacy Day and International Children’s Day. Training was provided to gender focal persons in the MoE/DoE for mainstreaming the girls’ agenda in education. While preparing the WTS campaign, UNGEI encouraged UNICEF to study girls’ issues more deeply, including the barriers to education, and to address the issues through UNICEF programmes. Regarding the
YC initiative, ROSA provided training for youths selected by UNICEF Nepal. In the case of involving women parliamentarians in girls’ education, the UNGEI partnership/network discussed the idea, conducted informal discussions with some women parliamentarians, wrote invitation letters to major political parties to send representatives to discuss the girls’ educational agenda, supported conducting the workshop where they identified barriers to girls’ education, supported the launching of the 15-point commitments, sent some women parliamentarians to Bangladesh to share their experiences (ROSA), supported publicity (ROSA) and provided the UNGEI banner for publicity purposes. Regarding the WFP-UNICEF partnership, the discussion was held in UNGETG, which made a decision to forge the partnership under the UNGEI banner. The UNGEI focal person was actively involved in developing the memorandum of understanding between the partners. She also participated in the field visit and progress review meetings, and stimulated both partners to share costs for training and evaluation.

Inputs of UNGEI global and regional partnership to the identification and dissemination of good practices

The WTS concept was shared in the 2008 GAC meeting held in Kathmandu. Another event was that Nepal’s report was selected for the UNGEI 2009 regional meeting where the WFP-UNICEF partnership was included in the global advocacy agenda. Similarly, UNGEI’s regional partner, UNICEF ROSA, provided training for YCs, sent women parliamentarians to Bangladesh for sharing experiences, took forward the involvement of parliamentarians in education to other countries in the region, and included Nepal in the regional studies for good practices, such as the progress review of YCs for education.

5.2.4. UNGEI contribution

UNGEI’s contribution was of an enabling nature. As a global movement, its major role was sensitizing, convincing and encouraging central-level stakeholders in terms of prioritizing girls’ education and gender equality in their agendas. Training provided by UNGEI ROSA to four young Nepalis in 2008 has now reached to 477 YCs in six districts. These young people have formed and mobilized youth groups/YC groups with 1,420 members who are actively involved in supporting the Government of Nepal’s WTS campaign and school monitoring, which has been credited with significantly lowering the number of out-of-school children.

The GEDS at the DoE, the focal point of UNGEI at the DoE, coordinates the WTS campaign. A decision was made in the DoE to use all stakeholders in the campaign, including YCs who were promoted by the UNGEI partnership. The YCs and members of the youth groups contributed substantially to bringing out-of-school children to school and retaining them there through the home-visit campaign, as well as by monitoring the attendance of students and teachers and providing other necessary support that further contributed to the provision of quality education.

UNGEI also stimulated UNICEF and WFP in the GETG meeting and through informal discussions to forge a partnership to provide quality education through economic support to the families of girl students. This has helped bring girls to school and has strengthened retention in school, as the partnership included activities for cooking oil distribution to mothers of 10,000 girl students in Grade 2–5 with at least 80 per cent attendance on school days.
UNGEI and its partners, under the UNGEI banner, provided technical and financial support to build the capacity of women parliamentarians on issues related to girls’ education and gender equality. This led them to develop a 15-point common agreement and 12-point agenda for the Education Act, and to the revising of four major clauses in the draft Education Act, making the Act more gender sensitive.

5.2.5. Achievement of outputs
The evaluation concludes that UNGEI has contributed to promoting a number of good practices, which were identified above. To assess whether the good practices were institutionalized, the evaluation examined the following four related outputs (results): a) good practices known to UNGEI partners and communities; b) good practices institutionalized by the government; c) tools developed jointly by UNGEI partners; and d) critical mass mobilized. Each of these is briefly discussed below.

a) Good practices known to UNGEI partners and communities
All of the above good practices were known to UNGEI partners and school communities. Not only are the practices known to the communities, but the communities are implementing them. In fact, school communities are participating in the WTS campaign, YC activities, and cooking oil distribution for quality education. YCs are helping school communities to bring out-of-school children from communities to school, and helping to retain them in school. Out of five people who responded, four pointed out the involvement of YCs in the process of bringing girls to school and retaining them in school. Their involvement in the WTS campaign was further reported by teachers, SMCs, NGOs, YCs themselves and district-level GEGEN. Despite coming from communities, YCs are known as central-level authorities of the DoE/MoE.

The communities are also enjoying the benefits of the WFP-UNICEF partnership on cooking oil for quality education. The women parliamentarians’ involvement in education is also well known to school communities and district stakeholders, as they have visited schools, interacted with school stakeholders and participated in review meetings of the district GEGEN, among other activities. UNGEI activities included the participation of the UNGEI focal person in district visits together with other central GEGEN members and women parliamentarians, and encouraging YCs to actively support the application of good practices. Although there is a certain role that UNGEI plays, the major role is played by the DoE, which mobilizes the entire education system and stakeholders in the WTS campaign. For the other three good practices, it is UNICEF that took the lead role to disseminate good practices to communities, mainly through NGOs and area offices. This shows that good practices are being disseminated to communities even with little UNGEI input.

b) Joint development and use of GEI tools by partners
The Gender in Education Network in Asia-Pacific (GENIA) toolkit on Promoting Gender Equality in Education was developed by UNESCO in collaboration with UNDP, UNICEF and NGO partners for the Nepal context. The toolkit was reprinted by UNICEF and distributed to partners. UNGEI partners participated in the pilot testing of the initial draft of the tools that are part of the toolkit (UNESCO, 2009). The WFP-UNICEF partnership has developed a common instrument to evaluate the partnership. Likewise, measuring gender equality in education policies and the Gender Responsive Budget were developed jointly by UNESCO, UNICEF and the Government of Nepal. Other tools developed jointly were not known to the evaluation. There exists much scope where partners can
share their strengths in developing tools of common interest jointly and minimize the costs. It is now clear that only a small portion of the large scope is used in the joint development and use of UNGEI tools.

c) Mobilization of critical mass
YCs, women parliamentarians, the media and United Nations agencies have been mobilized by the UNGEI network/partnership, together with GEDS of the DoE, in favour of girls’ education (see box under 5.2.2 for details), especially to support the WTS campaign.

d) Institutionalization of good practices
The government has institutionalized WTS as a regular programme. Other good practices, such as YCs and women parliamentarians’ involvement in education have not been institutionalized as yet, but are likely to be institutionalized as interest of government agencies was found to be positive in this survey. The partnership between WFP and UNICEF can also be institutionalized within the United Nations system in areas/districts where both agencies are present. The bottleneck is that the government does not have adequate funding even if the good practices are institutionalized, indicating the need for external support for effective implementation. This evaluation, however, could not find the UNGEI role in the process of institutionalization of good practices.

5.2.6. Achievement of outcome
It is therefore concluded that the ‘Good practices aimed at increasing access to education of marginalized children and especially girls, institutionalized at the national level’ outcome has been partly achieved, as WTS is already institutionalized and the involvement of YCs and women parliamentarians in education are likely to be institutionalized, whereas the oil for quality education partnership between UNICEF and WFP could be institutionalized within the United Nations system, but is less likely at the national level. However, UNGEI’s role in the institutionalization process was not made clear to the evaluation team.

The evaluation confirms that UNGEI contributed substantially to promoting the good practices, but UNGEI’s role in the process of institutionalization of the good practices was not found explicitly or implicitly. Since three good practices have not been institutionalized, UNGEI could have lobbied the government through its networks to institutionalize them.

5.3. UNGEI brought together partners (government, United Nations, non-governmental organizations, media, women parliamentarians) to reach consensus on national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality
The final section of this chapter examines the extent to which UNGEI contributed to strengthening partnerships around girls’ education and gender equality in Nepal. As was the case for the previous sections, we will first consider the context in 2001, then examine the changes that took place, and finally reflect on the contribution of UNGEI to these changes.

5.3.1. Context in 2001
Coordination efforts around girls’ education
The Government of Nepal started a formal partnership with the private sector in 1985 when a law allowing the operation of educational institutions with private investment was enacted. The Ninth Five-Year Plan (1997–2001) proposed several policy strategies to seek community and private participation in education.
However, evidence of girl-specific partnerships that impacted on girls’ education could not be found (Shrestha, 2010). Girls’ education was viewed as part of the total education system by the government. Therefore, separate coordination mechanisms for girls’ education were not developed. The Basic and Primary Education Programme (BPEP) II had a programme of coordination and integration among government, NGO and INGO activities in early childhood development, but not specific to girls’ education and gender equality.

### 5.3.2. Context in 2010

The three-year interim plan (2007–2009) is very explicit in foreseeing policies for public-private partnership (PPP) in technical and vocational education, cost sharing in higher education, and partnership in secondary education.

The SSRP (2008) proposes different forms of PPPs in education, including: community management for basic education, cost sharing for higher education, cooperative schools, management contract and school choice.

GEGEN have been put in place at central and district levels involving members from different sectors. Gender focal persons have been put in place in all 75 districts and five development regions.

A partnership between and among United Nations agencies has been put in place to support girls’ education and gender equality.

### 5.3.3. UNGEI inputs

UNGEI inputs regarding the evolution of the coordination and partnership around girls’ education and gender equality and UNGEI inputs are given in chapter 4 of this report, and therefore are not repeated here.

### 5.3.4. UNGEI contribution

Inspired by the UNGEI vision and goal, the UNICEF education specialist took the initiative of forming (1) the UNGEI network involving INGOs and United Nations agencies, which was later expanded to the government system where girls’ education and gender equality initiatives are shared, and (2) UNGETG as an internal forum to share girls’ education and gender equality in education within United Nations systems. The training provided by UNICEF in UNGEI initiation contributed to enhancing the capacity of gender focal persons in the education system at ministerial, departmental and district levels, which later formed the district-level GEGEN.

Likewise, inter-agency meetings called by the UNGEI focal person for sharing the annual workplan and progress enhanced coordination among members of the UNGETG, to some extent. Further, discussion in the meeting of the UNGETG about the partnership between UNICEF and WFP contributed to forging the partnership between the agencies to support the families of girl students with cooking oil incentives, which has increased the retention of 10,000 girls in about 100 schools in five terai districts that had high gender disparities in education. Also the decision made in the meeting at central-level GEGEN contributed to forming GEGEN in seven terai districts where gender disparity in education was high.
5.3.5. **Achievement of outputs**

The evaluation assessed the promotion of partnership through two outputs, namely, (1) strengthened capacity of UNGEI partners on gender mainstreaming and (2) enhanced coordination among UNGEI partners.

1) **Capacity strengthening of UNGEI partners**: It was found that the capacity of UNGEI partners, especially the MoE, DoE and DEO, has been strengthened on gender mainstreaming to some extent through the participation of gender focal persons in the UNGEI-supported training programme and continuous interaction about gender issues in education in GEGEN and other forums. However, their capacity was not adequately developed, as evidenced by their inability to retain prominent earlier partners in the UNGEI partnership. An equally important observation was that the institutional capacity was not properly used due to the frequent transfer of trained personnel. At the district level, GEGEN members were not as actively involved in other activities related to quality education as they were in the WTS campaign, which reflects their inadequate attention to quality education. The evaluation also found limited capacity of SMCs and YCs, especially in planning school activities and record-keeping. Despite the large number of YCs, they were not federated to district and national levels. The evaluation also noticed that, in many cases, partners had limited knowledge and skills for understanding and managing partnership.

2) **Enhancing coordination among GEI partners**: Similarly, coordination among GEI partners has been enhanced to some extent among United Nations and government agencies as they jointly participated in several activities, as spelled out in the contribution section under the partnership outcome. However, the coordination is not to the level of satisfaction, as they have not yet developed common workplans, in many cases, to promote partnership.

5.3.6. **Achievement of Outcome 3**

UNGEI brought together partners (donors, NGOs, media, United Nations, Government of Nepal, women parliamentarians) to reach consensus on the national strategy on girls' education and gender equality to some extent through the formation and meetings of GEGEN at national and district levels. However, active participation on the part of some of the prominent partners could not be retained due to inadequate management of the partnership and insufficient coordination.

Drawing information from this section and chapter 4 of this report, the evaluation found the following key elements necessary for strengthened partnership in Nepal:

- Mainstreaming UNGEI agenda into the government plan;
- Working through existing structures rather than creating a new one;
- Common vision and goal of all partners;
- Inclusiveness;
- Frequent communication/meeting/sharing information/review;
- Support from regional and global partnership;
- Joint governance; and
- Record-keeping of UNGEI activities, processes and results.
6. Overall assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership

A working definition of a partnership is “a collaborative relationship between entities to work toward shared objectives through a mutually agreed division of labour” (World Bank, 1998, cited in Axelrod, 2001). Given this definition, this chapter will examine how effective and efficient the UNGEI partnership has been. This analysis is done by identifying the strengths and weaknesses, as well as the opportunities and threats facing the UNGEI partnership.

6.1. Relevance

UNGEI inputs, including the support of the global and regional partnership to the country partnership, were relevant to the efforts of the Government of Nepal, as the support was in line with the government policy of building the gender capacity in the MoE, DoE and DEO. The support was also appropriate as it was provided based on the demand of the government. The good practices where UNGEI support was visible were found supportive to attaining the national EFA goals and the related MDGs. However, focusing only on girls’ education seems less appropriate in a context where gender parity has now almost been achieved but where a large number of children – both boys and girls – remain out of school.

6.2. Effectiveness

UNGEI support for training gender focal persons under the MoE has been effective in formulating more gender-responsive education policies and plans, including the SSRP, and in overseeing the programmes, to some extent, from a gender perspective. Similarly, support to women parliamentarian groups for girls’ education and gender equality in education has been effective in providing gender-responsive feedback and exerting pressure to make the Education Act\(^2\) engendered.

The effectiveness of UNGEI was noticed also in terms of mobilizing critical masses such as YCs and women parliamentarians for bringing out-of-school children to school and improving the quality of the education in the seven districts where a special girls’ education programme was implemented.

The district-level GEGENs, which were piloted in seven districts with support from the UNGEI partnership, have been expanded to all 75 districts by the government, with broad ToRs developed in support of the central-level GEGEN.

However, UNGEI has not been effective in keeping records of activities, outputs and processes, or in enhancing coordination among the partners/network members. UNGEI support has also not helped in retaining the important NGO partners that were active in the initial stage of girls’ education, nor has it been effective in identifying strategies for disseminating and institutionalizing good practices. The evaluation concludes that UNGEI training and other support have been effective in formulating gender-responsive policies, promoting good practices and expanding girls’ education networks to some extent, but not effective in keeping records of activities, outputs and processes, nor in identifying strategies for disseminating and institutionalizing good practices.

\(^2\) The Education Act is in the draft form. What is more important is that the women parliamentarians have been coming together for ensuring gender equality in education legally.
6.3. **Efficiency**

In terms of efficiency, the fact that UNGEI was hosted by UNICEF reduced costs that otherwise would have been incurred to establish a separate office. Similarly, UNGEI agendas are put forward through existing government mechanisms. This has avoided the creation of separate mechanisms and associated costs. The WFP-UNICEF partnership carried out orientation and evaluation jointly, thereby reducing the cost for duplication. However, the support could have been more efficient if civil society organizations were on board together with the public sector and more activities were done jointly. Similarly, activities were delayed against the workplan in some cases, including the WFP-UNICEF partnership.\(^3\) In addition, the capacity at the grassroots level was not developed well to manage the partnership efficiently and transparently. Against this background, this evaluation concludes that while UNGEI has been able to make a modest contribution even with low/no funds, it lacks the capacity to manage the partnership efficiently and transparently.

6.4. **Sustainability**

The GEGEN is now owned by the Government of Nepal, which allocates funds for managing it both at central and district levels. Likewise, the process of conducting the WTS campaign by mobilizing the critical mass is owned and institutionalized by the government. These two areas are likely to be sustained. Other good practices, though not institutionalized, have shown signs of being continued to certain periods of time in some locations, with certain inputs for capacity building and linkages. In the case of the YC movement, support for generating funds for conducting some activities and capacity building will be required for their survival. The network of women parliamentarians is likely to continue, though it may require some catalytic agency to push them forward. Even after the retirement of the women parliamentarians, with continued approach by the GEGEN, their support can be ensured. The economic support to the families of girl students through cooking oil may continue as long as the WFP programme is in place. The inadequate national resources could be a major challenge to continue and replicate the good practices, even with the government’s good intention. The frequent transfer of the trained gender focal points would affect the programme planning, implementation and record-keeping. This suggests that some institutionalized good practices have a higher potential of being sustained; other good practices are at risk of becoming discontinued due to a shortage of government resources to support them.

---

\(^3\) It is expected that a partnership forms slowly in the beginning as time is needed to understand each participant’s working style and to build trust and consensus. This understanding is necessary to prepare workplans with timelines.
7. **Conclusions and lessons learned**

This concluding chapter assesses the partnership’s achievements.

7.1. **Overarching conclusion**

The overall conclusion of this study is that gender parity in basic education could be achieved with just a little contribution from UNGEI. The main reason for this was that the UNGEI agenda was already a priority area of concern within the education sector of Nepal. As a result, UNGEI would not have to do much separately to achieve its stated objectives. Therefore, without coming out explicitly beyond the United Nations system, the UNGEI agenda was mainstreamed into the government priorities and system. In such a positive environment, the strategy taken by UNGEI not to disturb the government framework and to support it was correct. The major role played by UNGEI to improve the coordination was encouraging for network members to give priority to girls’ education and gender equality. UNGEI did this mainly through meetings, discussion, dialogues, advocacy and lobbying.

7.2. **UNGEI contribution to stated outcomes**

As already mentioned, there are three stated outcomes of UNGEI Nepal, and this section provides conclusions for UNGEI’s contribution to each outcome.

7.2.1 The contribution of UNGEI to the process of **mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality in the national education plan** was found within the United Nations agencies, as it focused on advocacy and lobbying activities mainly with United Nations agencies through GETG meetings, where the agencies shared individual annual workplans, reviewed progress and assisted in formulating educational plans and policies. Therefore, the evaluation found evidence of only a very modest UNGEI contribution to mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality into the national plan. Specific contributions by UNGEI as they relate to mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality in the national plan and policies include:

- Gender mainstreaming training for gender focal persons. The training was provided with UNGEI support to MoE gender focal persons, and contributed to building their capacity in understanding gender issues. The participants were involved directly or indirectly in the process of formulating the GESP and other policies (including SSRP) that are now more gender-sensitive.
- Facilitating United Nations agencies. UNGEI brought United Nations agencies on board for UNGETG and facilitated the discussion on identifying relevant areas for United Nations support to address gender-based issues to be incorporated in the SSRP. Based on the discussions, individual workplans were developed and UNICEF, UNESCO and UNFPA provided technical and/or financial support for the review of educational policies through the SWAp mechanism to help the formulation of the SSRP.
- Support to women parliamentarians. Another area of UNGEI contribution was found in creating space for uniting women parliamentarians and building their capacity in mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality through workshops, field visits and cross-country sharing. Advocacy and lobbying. UNGEI participated in lobbying and advocacy for the implementation of GESP, which has provided a framework for implementation of gender strategies such as ensuring
the participation of women in SMCs, DECs and scholarships for girls, with a specific focus on marginalized communities. In addition, UNGEI coordinated United Nations agencies through meetings of UNGETG to provide support for developing GESP.

UNGEI support to policies was relevant in terms of objectives and capacity building, including the support of global and regional partnerships to the country partnership. The approach taken by UNGEI to work through the existing mechanism was found particularly relevant, as it did not disturb the system that had already mainstreamed girls’ education and gender equality.

7.2.2 Regarding the institutionalization of good practices, the WTS was institutionalized but the other three good practices are yet to be institutionalized. The evaluation found that UNGEI had contributed to some extent to make these good practices known to partners and school communities, where the programmes were implemented and the critical mass was mobilized for girls’ education and gender equality. However, UNGEI’s contribution was not found to be significant in terms of jointly developing toolkits and other materials, as well as terms of the institutionalization of good practices. Though UNGEI had contributed to promoting the good practices, record-keeping of the activities and achievements was not systematic. The good practices that have been identified in this evaluation were not identified explicitly as good practices, despite the fact that some studies were done on WTS and YCs for education. It was also found that there was inadequate gender parity and capacity among YCs to effectively mobilize communities within the frame of local resources. The evaluation, therefore, concludes that UNGEI support had been effective in promoting good practices to some extent, but not effective in keeping the records of UNGEI activities, outputs and processes.

7.2.3 Regarding promoting the UNGEI partnership, UNGEI contributed to bringing together partners (NGOs, media, United Nations, Government, women parliamentarians) to reach consensus on the national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality to some extent through support for the formation and meetings of GEGEN at national and district levels. GEGENs were found to include members from a wide range of stakeholders. GEGEN is now owned by the Government of Nepal, and the DoE has allocated funds for managing GEGEN at both central and district levels. The continued effectiveness of GEGEN, however, is challenged by inconsistent government staff transfer practices. In addition, active participation of some of the prominent partners could not be retained due to UNGEI’s inadequate understanding on how to manage the partnership and enhance coordination. In addition, the UNGEI partnership has not kept the records of its activities and achievements including the meeting minutes. There was also no joint planning of activities, and the separate progress report of UNGEI was not prepared or sent to the regional partnership.

7.3. Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI
UNGEI inputs, including the support of the global and regional partnership to the country partnership, were relevant to the efforts of the Government of Nepal, as the support was in line with the government policy of building gender capacity in education. The training for the gender focal persons added value by making the GESP and SSRP more gender-responsive, as the focal persons were involved in the process of preparing these documents. Another area of their effectiveness was observed in the expansion of the GEGEN from seven districts to all 75 districts. Though UNGEI operated at low costs, the support could have been more
efficient if more civil society organizations were on board together with the public sector, and if more activities were conducted jointly.

7.4. Relationship of UNGEI Nepal with the regional partnership

The evaluation found a strong relation between the regional and country partnerships. There was good communication between the two partnerships. UNGEI’s regional partner, UNICEF ROSA, provided training for YCs, sent women parliamentarians to Bangladesh for sharing experiences, took forward the involvement of parliamentarians in education to other countries in the region, and included Nepal in regional studies of good practices, such as the progress review of Young Champions for Education. However, the advocacy from UNGEI ROSA to UNGEI Nepal was not strong enough to influence the latter in preparing an annual workplan and annual progress report.

7.5. Relationship of UNGEI Nepal with the global partnership

UNGEI global support to the country partnership has been in the form of guidelines and toolkits, which are often provided through the ROSA regional partnership. Other support included organizing the 2008 GAC meeting in Kathmandu and selecting the Nepal report for the UNGEI 2009 regional meeting, as well as including Nepal’s WFP-UNICEF partnership in the global advocacy agenda. The global partnership, however, has not provided direct support to the country-level initiative. Similarly, the evaluation did not find the global partnership asking the global partners available in Nepal to join the country partnership.

In summary, the overarching finding of this study is that UNGEI has contributed to the efforts of the Government of Nepal in achieving gender parity in primary education by:

- Bringing United Nations agencies together to share their plans for supporting education policies and plans, such as by helping the government to (1) review education policies through the SWAp mechanism, and (2) form the GESP;
- Mobilizing critical masses such as women parliamentarians and YCs; and
- Building the capacity of UNGEI focal persons, who have been playing critical roles in supporting the agenda for girls’ education and gender equality.

The UNGEI partnership in Nepal, however, has not been effective in supporting the Government of Nepal in institutionalizing good practices and developing context-specific strategies to bring all hard-to-reach children to school and to retain them in school, as well as to improve the quality of education and strengthen partnerships.

7.6 Lessons learned

This chapter deals with lessons about the working strategy of UNGEI Nepal, as well as with partnership/network management and good practices.

7.6.1 Lessons about working strategy and policy

Working through the government framework works well if the government framework has space to integrate innovative ideas. Such an approach increases receptivity and ownership on the part of the
government, with an increased likelihood of being sustained through government resources even after the funding supports of external development partners have ceased. Recognizing that the Government of Nepal had space to integrate the UNGEI agenda into the existing framework, UNGEI did not create a separate structure for providing support, but rather worked through the existing framework.

Policymakers are limited to secondary information in most cases. Their level of understanding deepens while interacting directly with concerned people and observing activities firsthand. They can make more realistic plans and policies with greater understanding from the field. This was observed with the women parliamentarians, who at first had little information about issues related to girls’ education. When they went to the field and interacted with stakeholders in schools and districts, their level of understanding about barriers to girls’ education and gender equality increased. With this enhanced understanding, they developed the 12-point feedback to the Education Act, which was in the draft stage, and provided evidence-based advocacy.

7.6.2 Lessons about partnership/network management

When a network cannot provide a strong agenda that is of interest to its members, the members drop out or become inactive. NGOs that were active at the beginning of UNGEI became inactive later, as they did not find a strong agenda within the network that was of interest to them.

Partnership or network management requires specific knowledge and skills that are different from regular programme management. A lack of specific knowledge, information and skills led to decreased interest on the part of members/partners, which contributed to making the network/partnership ineffective. This happened in the management of the UNGEI network in Nepal, as many members, specifically those representing the NGO sector, discontinued participation in the network. Proper orientation to the concerned staff and the system as a whole is necessary to launch and continue an innovation. UNICEF Nepal did not have proper orientation from headquarters and the UNICEF regional office at the start of the UNGEI loose network in 2002. This was one of the reasons why it could not bring a strong UNGEI agenda with a clear vision and mission. This might have contributed to the NGO partners’ response. After the change in the UNGEI leadership in headquarters and at the regional office, UNICEF Nepal started getting clearer directions and instructions. This encouraged UNGEI Nepal to become more active. This is also a matter of leadership, as things start to move properly with committed leadership. However, many challenges still exist.

Despite the fact that results are achieved at lower costs due to complementarity and reduced duplication, working through partnerships takes a relatively long time in early stages as all partners come to a common consensus regarding the working pattern of the partnership, which is generally different from the working style of partner institutions. This was observed in the WFP-UNICEF partnership on improving education through oil distribution to families of girl students. The actual start took a relatively long time after the signing of the memorandum of understanding.

Contribution analysis of partnerships requires that information regarding both the process and achievements be properly recorded. The absence of this reduces the opportunity to triangulate the information for validity on the one hand, and, on the other, establishes a chain of linkage with the process, such as whom was involved, to what level, at what context, and with what inputs to get what outputs and
what outcome. It was noted in the process of this evaluation that UNGEI Nepal did not have data and that data on UNGEI activities were not systematically kept.

7.6.3 Lessons about good practices
Sharing good practices developed in one country with other countries benefits both the place of origin and the country of destination. The establishment of the Women Parliamentarians Networking Group and its involvement in policy advocacy based on evidence gathered from the field was shared by UNICEF ROSA under the UNGEI banner with other countries in the region. This worked as an incentive for women parliamentarians of Nepal, as they were reflected as role models to parliamentarians in other countries. This encouraged them to give more inputs from their side into their efforts. For the country of destination, the women parliamentarians benefited from the success story of Nepal and started doing something similar under their context, especially in Bangladesh. This also helped to link the UNGEI country-level partnership to the regional and global partnership.
8  Recommendations

This chapter provides recommendations for country, regional and global partnerships.

8.1  Recommendations for country-level partnership

The study showed that the governance of the UNGEI partnership was not properly managed, there was a limited understanding of the management of the partnership and inadequate capacity of partners at the grassroots level to prepare, plan and monitor activities and to use the information to improve the plan. Based on these findings, conclusions and lessons, the study makes the following recommendations for improving the UNGEI partnership in Nepal:

8.1.1  Record-keeping of UNGEI partnership

Since the UNGEI partnership exists at multiple levels, the respective member secretary/coordinate of the UNGEI partnership/network should keep updated information disaggregated by sex, social classes, ethnicity, religion, poverty, and location of activities and achievements as they relate to girls’ education. As such:

- The GEDS should keep updated information on both central- and district-level GEGEN. It should collect information from respective partners at the central level and compile the data received from the district-level GEGEN.
- The gender focal point in the DEO should ensure that district-level GEGEN data are properly collected, compiled, synthesized and stored on the DEO database. The data should contain both results and processes, as both are important in partnership management.
- The UNGEI focal person should collect information from United Nations agencies, as well as compile, synthesize and keep the records of such agencies. The UNGEI focal person should also send a copy of the compiled information to the central-level GEGEN. In this regard, the UNGEI focal person either should be released with some non-UNGEI activities or supported by a junior staff, as the evaluation found that the UNGEI focal person was overloaded with other activities of UNICEF Nepal.

Updated information is necessary, as it serves as a means for accountability and transparency and also helps to build trust between network members/partners, in addition to their importance in programme planning and policy formulation.

8.1.2  Preparing the UNGEI partnership plan

UNGEI should have its own plan of work to influence other agencies. In this connection:

- The member secretary of the district-level GEGEN should ensure that GEGEN activities are reflected in the overall DEO annual plan. The secretary should also ensure that individual agency plans are adequately engendered.
- The member secretary of the central-level GEGEN should, likewise, ensure reflection of GEGEN activities in the overall DOE annual plan while ensuring that partners’ educational activities are sufficiently gender-sensitive.
- As partners need to own the planning process and know the strengths and weaknesses of other partners, it is important that a series of discussions are held to prepare the annual plan of work. For
this, both central-level and district-level member secretaries of GEGEN should call meetings of partners at respective levels and bring them into the discussion process to prepare respective annual workplans. Likewise, the UNGEI focal person should call meetings of UNGETG for preparing the partnership annual workplan as well as for ensuring that United Nations partners’ plans for supporting the Government of Nepal and NGOs are adequately gender-sensitive.

8.1.3 Partnership/network management
United Nations agencies, through GETG, should support the DoE in building capacity on partnership/network management of the member secretary and chairperson of the GEGEN working at central and district level, as well as M&E officials at respective levels through short trainings, workshops/seminars, trips to successful partnership areas and more, as specific knowledge and skills are required to manage the partnership/network. The importance of capacity building in partnership/network management has further grown with the expansion of GEGEN to all 75 districts. Alternatively, partnership/network management could be integrated into other training curricula and provided to the above-mentioned participants when they undergo other training programmes. Capacity building in this area will take care of the expanding network, providing a strong agenda to bind the partners continuously together, involving all agencies of the global UNGEI partnership in the country partnership, if they are present in Nepal, and so on.

8.1.4 Institutionalization of good practices
Good practices such as women parliamentarians in education and YCs for education have shown impressive results in reducing gender disparity in education through policy advocacy and community mobilization, respectively. These need to be institutionalized. It is therefore recommended that UNGEI advocates strongly to the Government of Nepal for their institutionalization.

8.1.5 Advocacy
UNGEI should focus its advocacy on the following agenda: Quality education, donor support, strategic programme for hard-to-reach children, reducing gender disparity in lower secondary education (Grades 6 to 8), development of engendered curricula, creating joint monitoring tools, joint study on location-specific gender responsive education, action against sexual harassment, girls’ education and gender equality for dignified life.

8.1.6 Capacity building
UNGEI should bring agencies together to build the capacity of central-level and local-level stakeholders. In addition to developing the capacity of GEDS of the DoE, gender focal points in districts and M&E officials of DoE, external development partners should support the DoE in building the capacity of network members at the school level, especially the SMC, YCs/Youth Groups in micro-planning, community mobilization and network building and managing, post-conflict management, inclusive development, etc. Capacity building is a continuous process, especially in Nepal, where retaining trained persons for a long period with specific responsibility is difficult due to frequent transfers. Therefore, support for capacity building should be a common area of priority of external development partners, United Nations agencies and the MoE/DoE.

8.2 Recommendations for the regional partnership
UNICEF ROSA should advocate and facilitate the Nepal partnership more strongly to prepare strategic as well as annual workplans of the UNGEI Nepal partnership. The regional office should also provide support
technically and financially through the country partnership to form a network of YCs at the district and national level and explore the possibility of expanding the network regionally and globally.

8.3 **Recommendations for the global partnership**

The global partnership should:

- Have policy and strategies to ensure that each partnership at regional and country level has strategic and annual workplans;
- Advocate that each partner at the global level is also the partner in the UNGEI Nepal partnership, if present in Nepal, and that they support the country-level proposals; and
- Provide direct support to country-level initiatives in Nepal based on the demands of the UNGEI Nepal partnership.
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ANNEXES

Annex 1: **FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GIRLS’ EDUCATION INITIATIVE (UNGEI)**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs) FOR THE NATIONAL CONSULTANT**

**BACKGROUND**

The United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) is a partnership of organizations committed to gender equality in and through education by narrowing the gender gap in primary and secondary education. It also seeks to ensure that, by 2015, all children complete primary schooling, with girls and boys having equal access to free, quality education. UNGEI was launched in 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, by then United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan in response to a troubling reality: Of the millions of children worldwide who were not in school, more than half were girls – a reality that continues today. Understanding that a special focus on girls would require a concerted effort by all partners, UNGEI became the EFA flagship for girls’ education.

UNGEI is a partnership that includes organizations from the United Nations family, governments, civil society and the private sector, as well as communities and families. The initiative works at global, regional and country levels to ensure that girls receive a quality education that prepares them to be full and active participants in their societies.

An important tool for the advancement of gender parity and equality in education, UNGEI works primarily at policy and technical levels and uses three main strategies: technical outputs and capacity development, policy dialogue and advocacy, and coordination and alignment with current aid architecture.

**A. OBJECTIVES OF THE BASELINE EVALUATION**

As UNGEI evolved over a period of years from a loose advocacy network to a more formal global partnership using more defined strategies, a baseline was not established in 2000. Therefore, this self-evaluation will be formative in nature and will serve as a baseline against which future evaluative work can be done.

The evaluation’s objectives are to explore the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership. The evaluation will be anchored on the proposed monitoring and evaluation framework, which highlights the following outcomes:

1. policies that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
2. best practices, such as Constituent Assembly members’ initiation and Young Champions’ role in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality, are known and institutionalized; and,

---

4 One of the objectives of this evaluation is to validate the outcomes. Hence the understanding is that they will remain in draft form until they are finalized at the conclusion of the evaluation.
3. UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

The formative evaluation will help the UNGEI Nepal chapter to:

- define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls’ education;
- validate outcomes to be achieved in Nepal in order to move forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education;
- collect empirical baseline data in Nepal against which progress in future evaluative work can be measured; and
- map the status of UNGEI partnerships in Nepal.

B. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This exercise is a self-evaluation to be executed in up to six countries (including at least one French-speaking country) spanning four regions, one regional partnership and the global partnership. The evaluation will cover how effective the institutional engagement of key UNGEI partners has been in Nepal.

Activities included and excluded from analysis. The self-evaluation study will examine only activities/results that have been undertaken or achieved through collaborative effort by the formal partnership. Activities related to one or two partners only and take place outside the UNGEI partnership arrangement, e.g., an international organization funding an activity implemented by the Ministry of Education or a local NGO, will be excluded from the evaluation.

Attribution and contribution. While the evaluation will seek to determine if UNGEI has added value to country-level results in girls’ education, it is often difficult to attribute results to only one source of inputs, actions or actors in a field where there are multiple actors and inputs. Therefore, to the extent possible, the evaluation will seek to outline UNGEI’s contribution to overall results through a contribution analysis.

C. METHODOLOGY

Sample: The evaluation will collect data from a sample of all stakeholders, hence a sampling framework that reflects a range of activities will be developed for each country.

Design and data collection methods: The evaluation study will mainly be a mixed-method study that seeks to describe the baseline for UNGEI work and judge it against evaluation criteria. Data will be collected from multiple sources: a formal desk review, interviews of key/elite informants, interviews and/or focus groups of important groups of beneficiaries, self-administered surveys, and direct observations of activities with beneficiaries wherever possible. Where opportunity occurs, the evaluation methodology should also examine the possibility of doing a comparison to organizations working in gender in the education sector but not participating in the partnership, and/or interview them to determine their perceptions. The evaluation will also conduct a secondary analysis of existing data.

The national consultant will be responsible for the professional conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the ToR, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation and the UNEG Code of

---

5 This is an evaluation that it is intended for the purpose of learning, rather than accountability. Secondly, the evaluation management arrangements do not aim for a high level of independence at the country level. Ideally, the M&E Officer will be the primary manager, but the situation in the country may be such that the programme officer (Education) is the only person available to manage the consultant.

Conduct for Evaluation. S/he will be working closely with an Education Specialist in the UNICEF Office to perform the following tasks:

- assist in setting up a reference group for stakeholders in consultation with UNGEI focal points and/or UNICEF education officers;
- customize, review and validate data collection tools, (questionnaires, interview questions and protocols);
- supervise data collection and data processing;
- design and facilitate consultative workshops and meetings;
- prepare country reports – draft and final reports – and develop PowerPoint presentations; and,
- ensure that the evaluation manager is regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation and possible causes of delays and issues to resolve.

This being a multi-country and multi-layer study, the national consultant will be responsible for supporting UNGEI evaluation-related activities at the regional as well as global levels.

**Desired competencies for evaluation consultants:** Evaluation consultants must each offer the following demonstrated experience, knowledge and competencies:

1. Significant knowledge and experience of evaluation concepts and approaches;
2. Good knowledge in gender in the Education Sector, and experience with evaluations conducted from a gender-based perspective;
3. Good knowledge of national programmes, INGOs and NGOs, and partnership principles;
4. Facilitation skills, particularly design of stakeholder consultation exercises;
5. Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection skills;
6. Strong quantitative and qualitative data analysis skills;
7. Excellent language and communication skills in English;
8. Demonstrated report writing skills, in English; and
9. Computer literacy in Word, Excel and PowerPoint;

**Duration of consultancy:** 43 person days

**PROPOSED WORK PLAN AND TIMELINE**

**Tentative Schedule:** A tentative schedule for major evaluation activities and expected timeline is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalizing contracts for all consultants</td>
<td>15 December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for consultation workshop</td>
<td>10 January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening consultation workshop</td>
<td>16–20 January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit/present inception reports to UNICEF</td>
<td>14 March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection, analysis and other field activities</td>
<td>29 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit first draft of country reports</td>
<td>13 May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit first draft of synthesis report</td>
<td>30 May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit final country reports</td>
<td>15 June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit final report</td>
<td>30 June 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Annex 2: Logic Model for UNGEI**

**Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality**

**Context in 2001:** What was the situation at level zero? What was happening before the UNGEI partnership was put in place?

**Vision:** All girls and boys are empowered through quality education to realize their full potential and contribute to transforming societies where gender equality becomes a reality.

**Goal:** UNGEI contributes to the achievement of the Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDG) for gender equality and girls’ education through a strong partnership.

---

**Global Outcome 1:**
Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

**Global Outcome 2:**
Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized

**Global Outcome 3:**
UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

**Nepal Outcome 1:**
Girls’ education mainstreamed in national education plan (SSRP); e.g., 50% of enrolled girls benefit from education scholarships

**Nepal Outcome 2:**
Good practices aimed at increasing access to education of marginalized children and especially girls, institutionalized at the national level

**Nepal Outcome 3:**
UNGEI brought together partners (donors, NGOs, media, United Nations, government, political parties) to reach consensus on national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality

---

**Outputs**

1. Gender audit on education policy conducted
2. Gender disaggregated data available
3. Girl’s education strategy paper developed
4. M&E systems of GEI partners strengthened
5. Good practices known to GEI partners and communities

**Inputs**

- Inputs from global and regional UNGEI partnership
- Inputs from national government
- Inputs from communities
- Inputs from multilateral partners
- Inputs from bilateral agencies
- Inputs from NGOs, private sector etc.

---

**Outputs**

1. GE policies reviewed through SWAp mechanism
2. Capacity of GEI partners strengthened on gender mainstreaming
3. Critical mass mobilized
4. GEI tools developed jointly by partners

---

**Outputs**

1. Gender equality mainstreamed in national education plan (SSRP)
2. 50% of enrolled girls benefit from education scholarships
3. Good practices institutionalized at the national level
4. Consensus reached on national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality
5. Coordination among GEI partners enhanced
### Annex 3: Evaluation Framework – Nepal

#### Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

**Context in 2001: What was the situation at level zero? What was happening before the UNGEI partnership was put in place?**

What policies to promote girls’ education and gender equality were in place?
- The Ninth Five-Year Plan (1997–2001/02) included: Adoption of mainstreaming, gender equality and empowerment as strategies for equal access to primary education move towards gender justice. Programmes focused on expansion of educational facilities and improvement in quality.
- Gender audit: Conducted in 2002, has identified 10 actions to integrate and mainstream gender in education.
- Gender focal persons existed in all ministries.
- Percentage of government expenses in education sector was 15.6%.
- A policy of one female teacher per school was in existence since 1975, but in 2001 10,900 schools (43.3 per cent) were still without female teachers.
- Free textbooks offered up to Grade 3 (and up to Grade 5 in 18 remote districts).
- 10,000 early childhood education centres in existence.
- Ensuring primary school is within walking distance from each village.

Capacity with respect to policy change and decision-making in girls’ education and gender equality issues
- Education Act (Amended in 2001) has provisions: (1) A woman in District Education Committee, a woman in Village Education Committee, a woman in SMC; and (2) special support for girl children and students from the dalit and under-represented ethnic groups below poverty level.
- Lack of gender monitoring mechanism.
- Lack of internalization of gender strategies in education objectives.
- Policymakers
- Limited number of women policymakers, who do not have adequate voice to influence policy.
- Education system did not have sufficient to respond to the conflict situation.

What knowledge and information were available about girls’ education and gender equality? To what extent was this sufficient for decision-making?
- Information available by sex on school enrolment and retention.
- Info was not available by specific ethnic group.
- Info was not adequate to make inclusive education policy/decisions.

Were monitoring systems being used to inform decision-making around education policies, and around girls’ education and gender equality specifically?
- Good lessons of the project were not utilized to improve policymaking.
- The linkage between data collection and informed decision-making was not sound.
- Data quality and reliability were of questionable nature.

**Context 2010: What is the situation like at present? What overall policy changes have taken place in the education sector since the UNGEI partnership was established? What evidence is there that these are girl and gender sensitive?**
Introduction of Republic: After 240 years, the monarchy was abolished on May 28, 2008 and a republican state was established as per Clause 159 of the Interim Constitution. The Interim Constitution was formed after the Peace Accord between the Maoist party, which waged a people's war for a decade against social and economic inequalities, and seven major political parties. Sub-article 2 of article 17 of the Interim Constitution – which still exists – guarantees the rights of participation of people from different walks of life, including marginalized groups and women, in all areas of human concern, including education. The Constitution also set aside a quota system of 33 per cent for women in all areas of development and administration, which is also applicable to education (Nepal Sub-article 2 of article 17 of the Interim Constitution).

SWAp system institutionalized (2009): The SWAp system embodies a per capita funding scheme, scholarships to girls and other marginalized children with one umbrella funding mechanism of the Government of Nepal and 13 external development partners, including the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank, UNICEF, the European Commission, Denmark, the United Kingdom's Department for International Development, the Australian Agency for International Development, Finland, Norway, France and others. The SWAp system has been institutionalized.

Tenth Five-Year Plan: This aims to ensure: gender equality by making education opportunities available to each and every caste and ethnicity; active community participation; special programmes for women's and dalits’ access to education opportunities; and scholarships to girls and other disadvantaged children.

Three-Year Interim Plan (2007–2010): The Plan was formulated right after the Janandolan II (People's Movement II). Therefore, it is more inclusive from gender and social perspectives, including education. The 'one school, one village' concept was introduced.

Girls’ Education Strategy Paper (GESP): There are 16 strategies, including coordination and partnership, information management, motivation and support, improvement in school physical environment, improvement in pedagogy, parent empowerment, special programmes, gender mainstreaming in education, community mobilization, increase in female teachers, capacity development and employment, counselling services, girls’ participation, extension, monitoring, and financial arrangement.

Draft Education Act: Allows provision for more engendered law, securing 33 per cent to 50 per cent of seats for women in management committees ranging from school level to policymaking.

Greater participation from women lawmakers in education: Women Parliamentarians are actively involved in the education system through a network to understand issues related to girls’ education and provide feedback to policymakers, as well as create pressure at times to put the girls’ agenda into law and policies.

Gender Responsive Budgeting (2007): As for the current guidelines, each programme proposed in the 13 sectors where Gender Responsive Budgeting is made applicable has to be scored as per the indicators developed by the gender responsive budgeting committee, in which different aspects of gender sensitivity have each been allocated 20 potential marks each. Programmes scoring 50 per cent or more are classified as directly supportive of women, those scoring 20 to 50 per cent are classified as indirectly supportive and those estimated to score less than 20 per cent are classified as neutral.

Percentage of government expenses in education sector is now 17.9% (2009/10 actual [non-audited]) and 3.7% of the gross national product.

Availability of gender-disaggregated data: Gender-disaggregated data are available and are used for making plans. The data, however, are not disaggregated by ethnic group.

Gender audit: Initiated in 2001, the work was completed in 2002. Has put forward 10 actions to integrate and mainstream gender in education. Further interventions in education are in line with these 10 actions in many cases.
The origin of UNGEI Nepal is traced back to a loose network since 2002, which developed into a formal partnership launched in 2008. From 2002 to 2008, there was active NGO involvement. UNICEF later decided to go through the government, which discouraged NGOs to participate according to informants. After the official launching in 2008, coordination meetings were held, and joint activities coordinated on International Women’s Day, International Literacy Day and International Children’s Day with a national focus. Support was also provided for the GAC meeting in Kathmandu and to train gender focal points of the DOE on gender-sensitive planning and monitoring to ensure the educational rights of girls.

Who are the partners?
In the beginning the partners were Tribhivan University and some NGOs, including World Education, Ama Milan Kendra, Didi Bahini, Child Workers in Nepal (CWIN) and others. Currently the UNGEI network members include United Nations agencies such as UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO, WFP, UNESCO, as well as the DoE.

How do they function?
They discuss girls’ education-related issues/agenda in the United Nations internal group, GETG. The meetings, however, are not regularly held. Individual United Nations agencies share their annual plans at the meeting called by UNGEI focal person in April every year. They also share progress of annual plans towards the end of the year.

Does the partnership have a ToR?
The partnership does have a ToR, which is in the process of being refined. Agencies forging partnership have memorandum of understandings in certain cases. UNGEI inspired UNICEF and WFP to forge a partnership in girls’ education with UNICEF providing teaching-learning materials, social mobilization and other support, UNGEI YCs to facilitate the process in the school and WFP providing with two litres of oil per month per girl in Grades 2 to 5. A memorandum of understanding between UNICEF and the WFP was developed, although not with others.

Does UNGEI have an annual workplan? How is it drafted? How is it disseminated? What are the priorities/areas of focus of the plan?
There is not a common annual workplan. Individual agencies have their workplans where the girls’ education agenda is reflected. The individual workplan is drafted by each individual agency. Dissemination of the workplan is done through each respective agency system. Priority is for gender and inclusive education for many agencies that support different dimensions of education, such as water and sanitation, separate toilet construction for girls, school room construction, etc. There is no joint planning or common plan.

How are partnership activities monitored?
In principle, the UNGEI focal person at UNICEF develops and monitors the gender responsive policy-related activities. The information is expected to go to the monitoring officer at UNICEF and data to be stored and managed for further planning. However, the data were not included in the UNICEF database for the year 2010. Activities and output data at the school level are prepared by school administrator, submitted to the DEO through the respective Resource Person. District-level data are then sent to the DOE. Monitoring at the school level is done by YCs and reported to UNICEF through related NGOs. Respective partners also monitor the activities. For example, WFP monitors the number of students at the time of examination, during which inflation is rarely made. In addition, Girls’ Education and Gender Development Networks (GEGDN) in the district also make joint visits to schools, sometimes with women Constituent Assembly members of the district. There is no documentation of UNGEI activities in UNICEF.

Does the partnership have a communication strategy?
Although there is no formal communication strategy that has been developed, partnerships share related information generally through electronic media. In addition, they share information through an annual planning session in April and review meeting organized at the end of the year. Sometimes, they call a special meeting to share information. For example, a meeting of the United Nations Gender Theme Group was called to share information about the UNGEI evaluation.
- Inputs of non-UNGEI partners
  Pool partners and non-pool partners providing financial support
- Specific studies used to rethink policy
- Government funds (per cent of gross national product in education): 3.7 per cent and 17.9 per cent of government expenses
- Government provided scholarship to all girls since 2010

- Are future policy changes in the making that will have an impact on girls' education and gender equality?
  Draft Education Act is in place, which is likely to be approved by Parliament in 2011/12. Percentage of women increased in policymaking, management, teaching; reservation of scholarship for marginalized groups in higher studies in place.

- What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at country level provide in the policy context?
  Girls' education issues raised strongly by UNGEI focal person in United Nations inter-agency meeting of Gender Theme Group
  Advocacy on girls' education directly to government as well as through GEGDN.
  Financial and technical support for women members by UNGEI partner UNICEF under UNGEI banner to host workshop
  Training for gender focal person in gender sensitive planning and monitoring to ensure that girls' educational rights are well protected
  Participation in GEGDN meeting/ coordinating meeting of United Nations agencies’ Girls' Education Theme Group (UNGETG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global and country partnership relevant? Was the design appropriate?</th>
<th>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.)</th>
<th>Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to making education-sector policies sensitive to girls’ education and gender equality?</th>
<th>Efficiency – How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the country partnership relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country?

UNGEI Nepal focuses on marginalized girls, and thus supports the government policy and addresses one of the UNGEI outcomes.

The UNGEI support was in line with the government policy in building the gender capacity in the MoE, DoE and DEO.

Support to Constituent Assembly women members in building their capacity to articulate the needs and concern of girls in policy, which contributed to forming pro-girl policies and supporting implementation.

Were the objectives of the UNGEI support from the global partnership appropriate to the work of the country partnership?

Support from the regional and global ROSA was on the basis of the demand of country partnership, which was in line with government priorities.

- Has education policy improved and become more strategic?
  Policy includes specific strategies (e.g., girls’ scholarship and incentive packages).
  The policies are more strategic, as they specifically focus on marginalized communities and on establishing gender targets in education, such as attaining gender parity in primary education.

- Has knowledge and information about girls’ education and gender equality in education increased?
  Disaggregated data of students by sex are available. However, the data are not sufficient to address the gender issues of specific ethnic groups.

- Are policies being informed by this knowledge and information?
  Gender policies in education are formed based on the sex-disaggregated data to a large extent, such as money allocation for scholarships for girls.

- Are national systems monitoring girls’ education and gender equality in education regularly resulting in evidence-based policymaking?
  There is a system of monitoring progress in school education twice a year and Flash reports are prepared, which include data on girls’ education and gender equality.

What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?

- Creating space for uniting women Constituent Assembly members and building their capacity contributed to 12 gender-related common points to be included into the Education Act, which is at the stage of being approved. If approved, the act is more gender sensitive.

- Formulation of GESP was discussed in the internal meeting of United Nations agencies, and UNGEI focal persons sent ToR for the preparation of the GESP to the agencies for review. The comments on the ToR were collected and refined, which contributed to the quality and ownership of the drafting process of the GESP.

- Lobbying for the implementation of GESP has provided a framework for implementation of gender strategies, such as ensuring the participation of women in SMCs, DEC, and scholarships for girls, with a specific focus on marginalized communities.

- The training provided with UNGEI support to MoE gender focal persons contributed to building the capacity in understanding gender issues, who played a key role in formulating the GESP and other policies (including SSRP), which are now more gender sensitive.

- Meeting of UNGETG discussed relevant areas for gender-based issues to be incorporated in the SSRP. Issues to be addressed by individual United Nations agencies were identified. The United Nations partners of UNGEI UNICEF, UNESCO and UNFPA prepared individual agency workplans to support the formation of the SSRP.

How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to improvements in the sector policies and knowledge and information?

UNGEI was hosted by UNICEF, which reduced costs that otherwise would have been incurred for establishing a separate office.

UNGEI agendas are put forward through existing government mechanisms. This avoids creation of a separate mechanism and associated costs.

The support could have been more efficient if civil society organizations were on board together with the public sector and activities were conducted jointly.
### Outcomes: What has been the effect on the participation of girls in education?

**What effect has UNGEI had on:**

- **Financial incentives targeted at reducing barriers to girls’ education?** UNGEI does not directly deal with the community on financial issues, as it is working through the government. UNGEI supported five districts where WFP provides cooking oil to girls’ families; UNICEF-teacher training, classroom improvement; and the government distributes and monitors the cooking oil provided by WFP.

- **Measures promoting safety for girls at school and travelling to school?** Not directly, UNGEI and UNICEF supported the development of a national framework on child-friendly schools, which was endorsed by the government; one of the indicators is girls’ safety in and on the way to school. Girls travel in groups to and from school and feel safe. Female teachers at school have made the school environment safer, as per the girl students.

- **Measures against sexual harassment and violence?** In 2008, the ‘Learning without Fear’ campaign was launched, which embodies the concept against sexual harassment and violence that helped the government form guidelines that are being rolled out.

- **Proportion of schools with separate toilets for boys and girls:** Advocacy and lobbying to the government resulted in the allocation of funding for separate toilets for girls.

- **Number and quality of gender-responsive learning materials, curriculum and teaching guides?** Calendar, hoarding board, chart, poster, gender education magazine, brochures were some of the awareness-raising materials developed with the message that boys and girls are equal. There was not direct involvement on the part of UNGEI, but issues were raised by UNGEI. This helped to increase awareness and sensitization on the part of parents.

- **Number of teachers and school managers trained in gender equality?** Gender focal points in each district received training and refresher training; as a result, GEGDN was developed in seven districts and has been expanded to 75 districts.

- **Publications promoting good practices in girls’ education and gender equality?** Not published and not prepared, but prepared by Educational Pages triggered by UNGEI advocacy.

- **Availability of primary education and movement towards the universal primary education completion target?** The WTS campaign was a movement towards completion of primary education, which resulted in greater enrolment and retention in school and increased completion of primary cycle.

- **Positive effects on access and equity and in addressing key cross-cutting issues?** With the launching of the WTS campaign, mostly girls came to school.

- **Positive effects on learning outcomes?** Not measured yet.

- **Sustainability of primary education provision and its quality?** The provision such as scholarships for girls’ education, free admission, textbooks and examinations are institutionalized by the government to ensure sustainability. The concern is about the quality education, which needs to be improved.

### Sustainability: Are the changes that took place in policy and planning, finance, capacity, M&E and aid-effectiveness interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?

- **How durable are the improvements?**
  
  The major support of UNGEI was on the policy advocacy for girl-friendly education and training for gender focal persons. There has been improvement in policies focusing on gender. Since UNGEI support was through the government, the supports such as training for gender focal persons and gender equality policies are institutionalized and therefore will be sustained, because UNGEI support was not largely based on providing money.

- **What are the main risks to sustainability?**
  
  Network members, development partners and the Government of Nepal may lose interest in girls’ education if they are not continuously reminded and inspired by a specific entity. UNGEI’s role, therefore, would have to be there to energize the stakeholders.
Context: 2001 What was the situation at level zero? What was happening before the UNGEI partnership was put in place?

- What was known about girls’ education and gender prior to the UNGEI partnership? What were the good practices at the time?

Despite the fact that the state had recognized school education as one of its prime responsibilities through number of plans, policies and legal documents, the results were not highly satisfactory, as the gender gap was wide. In 2001, there was a high level of gender disparity in education, including a 12 per cent NER at primary level and 11 per cent in lower secondary education. While the gender gap was distinct at national level, it was more pronounced in rural than urban areas, in geographically remote areas than relatively accessible areas, in southern parts of the country than in central and mountain regions, in the mid-west than in other development regions, and for marginalized groups of people than others. As regards out-of-school children, 63 per cent were girls out of 590,000 children. This again shows very high gender discrimination. In the teacher force, out of 98,000 total teachers, female teachers were about 25 per cent. Trained teachers were about 15 per cent of total teachers, whereas female trained teachers were 12 per cent. Good practices are as follows: **Female teachers** worked as role models to school for girl students. With female teachers in schools, girls’ enrolment increased, repetition decreased and retention rates went up, because girls felt secure and confident when female teachers were around. Parents were also more confident to send their daughters to school (Bista, 2004).

**Feeder hostels** were provided for girl students who would become female teachers. The feeder hostel programme was launched in 18 districts with a concept of developing female teachers in the districts where finding female teachers was difficult due to low qualification of women to become teachers. The students were selected from the rural areas where they would go for teaching after they complete the School Leaving Certificate programme and teacher training. Many of the students after the completion of the course went back to their community to teach there.

**Gender audit**: In 2001-2002, the MoE undertook a ‘gender audit’ that recommended the development of a ministerial gender policy. Recommendations included integration of gender perspectives in all training and statistics and increased number of women leaders at all levels to 30 per cent within five years. Further actions include presentation of gender-sensitive role models and educational materials without gender stereotypes. The audit has proven an important instrument to achieve gender equality in the education sector.

**Girls’ scholarship**: It was introduced in the 1990s under the basic and primary education programme, which has been expanding there after and is institutionalized.

- Were best practices being identified and documented? In what areas?
  The practices mentioned above were not found documented as best practices but some studies and key informants indicate them as good practices of the time.

- Were best practices being used to inform design of programmes and interventions?
  Although they were not documented appropriately, they were identified by some studies and those involved in programme design and interventions incorporated them by reviewing documents of the previous studies. Improvements were made in female teacher and feeder hostel and the scholarship programme is expanded to all 75 districts of the country by incorporating lessons learned.

- Were best practices being used to inform decision-making around policies?
  Some practices were used to make decisions around policies, such as piloting of scholarship studies and policies made to expand nationwide.

Context 2010: What is the situation in 2010? What has happened between 2002 and 2010/11?
Outcome 2: Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality known and institutionalized

- What is known about girls’ education and gender between 2002 and 2010/11 during the UNGEI partnership? What are the good practices?

  Gender disparity at primary level and secondary level has decreased by 18.5 and 34.8 percentage points, respectively, during the past decade. Now the gender disparity for NER is 1.7 per cent at primary and 1.5 per cent at lower secondary level, by reaching the actual NER of girls of 93.6 per cent at primary level and 68.5 per cent at lower secondary level. Likewise, in an average, the promotion rate of girls (Grades 1–5) has gone up by 8.62 per cent, repetition rates have decreased by 7.44 per cent, drop-out rates have gone down by 1.22 per cent, and survival rates have increased by 13.4 per cent, reaching the level of 81.2 per cent from the 2001 level of 67.8 per cent. There has also been a reduction in the number of out-of-school children, from 590,000 to 196,000.

  Welcome to School (WTS) campaign (2004–) was been reported to have been instrumental for greater achievement in school enrolment, as the focus of the WTS has been to improve the access to quality education and retain children in school by bringing out-of-school children to school. This is a month-long campaign that happens annually during the time of students’ admission in school. The education system from central to school level is mobilized to bring the out-of-school children to school by using motivational and educational activities. The first two weeks are devoted to general admission of the students who come for admission. The remaining two weeks are devoted to bringing those children to school who have not come for admission.

  Young Champions (YC) and youth group members, together with other activists in the community, work towards convincing parents to send the children to school to support WTS. They keep the household records, especially vital records, and know the number of children and their age for each house. This helps to prepare the evidence-based WTS campaign. They also keep records of children who have not regularly gone to school. In such a case, the youth group and YC identify the causes of not regularly going to school and try to resolve them, bringing the issues to appropriate entities. YCs also monitor schools regarding the records of students’ attendance, teacher attendance, days school open and close, etc.

  Economic support of families of girl students, including two litres of cooking oil per month, per girl student studying in Grades 2–5 with at least 80 per cent attendance on school days. There was higher girls’ enrolment in schools where the family support with oil was provided than in schools not providing such facilities. In Nepal Rastriya Primary School in Bara district, where the family support programme was not in place, the out-of-school children within the command area of the school were reported to be about 100, with more girls than boys. In Shree Primary School in Rautahat district, where the family support with cooking oil support was provided, the number of out-of-school children was reported to be about 20, with fewer girls than boys.

  Women Constituent Assembly Members’ involvement in girls’ education helped Constituent Assembly members have a greater understanding of issues related to girls’ education and gender equality in education, and are able to advocate for gender-friendly policies and acts.

  The continuous insistence of the government in gender parity in education with several incentive packages including scholarships, day meals, free textbooks, free tuition, and female teachers cumulatively contributed to access and retention. The role of female teachers has been the most influencing factor for girls’ education and enrolment. But the policy of employing at a minimum one female teacher in each primary school has not been implemented properly. Girl-friendly toilets: The gender audit had strongly recommended for girl-friendly toilets. Accordingly, the Government of Nepal has allocated funds to construct girl-friendly toilets. This fiscal year it plans to construct girl-friendly toilets in 5,500 schools.

Inputs: What did the UNGEI partnership do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What other inputs and processes took place throughout the same period?
What inputs were provided?

- What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, technical support, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at country level provide in facilitating best practices?
  
  UNGEI contribution is of an enabling nature. It provided a global agenda to integrate with the local agenda, especially to give priority to girls' education. Its major role was convincing and encouraging central-level stakeholders in terms of prioritizing girls' education in their agendas. It conducted coordination meetings and provided technical and financial support to mark international days, thereby raising awareness at a national level. It also provided training to gender focal persons in the MoE/DoE for mainstreaming the girls' agenda in education.
  
  While preparing the WTS, UNGEI encouraged UNICEF to study girls' issues more deeply, including their barriers to education, and to address the issues through programmes.
  
  Regarding the YC programme, the UNGEI regional office provided training for four selected youths by UNICEF from terai districts, among other country YCs. Two YCs of the central region who received the YC training organized by the regional office expanded the idea to another seven districts and created their own network from district to school level by forming the YC Group/Youth Group. Refresher training funding was provided by UNICEF, as per the decision of the UNGETG meeting. YCs are directly linked to UNGEI.
  
  The role of UNGEI in involving parliamentarians in education was significant, but it should not be understood that it would not happen if UNGEI were not involved. Moreover, the role of UNGEI was seen as helping to forge partnership between UNICEF and WFP to support education and also as addressing household economic issues in five districts.

- What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to the identification and dissemination of best practices? How widely are these known?
  
  YCs who were provided training by UNGEI ROSA are working as education activists and volunteers in communities. The good practices in the community are disseminated by them, together with other stakeholders of school systems, and are known to communities.

- What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were ongoing? How did these influence the policy decisions and priority setting?
  
  The good practices are disseminated through a government system (MoE/DoE/DEO/Resource Centre/School), NGOs working in the districts with financial support of development partners, and other stakeholders – including the media and political parties – were also there supporting WTS.

What changed?

- What key best practices in girls' education and gender equality are in evidence today in the country (e.g., financial incentives, measures promoting safety in schools, gender responsive learning materials, etc.)?
  
  Oil distribution to families has increased the retention in school as the oil is provided only to the family of the girl who has at least 80 per cent attendance on school days.
  
  The WTS campaign has increased the access of girls to school, thereby contributing to the reduction of out-of-school children to 196,000 from 590,000.

- What progress has been made in documenting and disseminating best practices in girls' education and gender equality? Which audiences are being targeted?
  
  The YC best practice has been well documented, but documentation on other good practices is not adequate. Evidence of the documents being disseminated could not be found in the short visit to a few districts.
  
  The target group includes primary schoolchildren and children who have dropped out and who are not regular children in school. YCs talk with parents and bring them to school.

- To what extent are best practices being used to inform decision-making around policies and programming? What specific best practices have been most influential in informing policies/priority setting?
  
  Women Constituent Assembly members’ involvement in promoting girls’ education has been influential in making policies and laws more favourable to girls. Case studies and investigative reporting by education journalists has helped policymakers use the data in decision-making.

Outcomes: What has been the effect on decision-making and priority setting? Do these reflect knowledge and understanding of best practices?
Outcome 2: Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality known and institutionalized

Are policies and programmes being informed by knowledge and information on best practices, such as those related to:

- Financial incentives targeted at reducing barriers to girls’ education: Financial incentives such as scholarships and family support with cooking oil are evaluated and recommended for better use of them. UNGEI does not directly deal with the community on financial issues, as it is working through the government. In the UNGEI-supported districts where WFP provides cooking oil to girl students’ families, UNICEF teacher training and classroom improvement; and the government distributes and monitors the cooking oil provided by WFP.

- Measures promoting safety for girls at school and travelling to school: UNGEI partners such as UNICEF supported for development of national framework on child-friendly schools and endorsed by the government: one of indicators is girls’ safely in and on the way to school. The schools have developed location-specific strategies to protect girls while going and coming to school, as well as studying in school. Moving in groups is one of the strategies that many schools have brought into practice.

- Measures against sexual harassment and violence: Not found.

- Separate toilets for boys and girls: The government provides NRP 200,000 per school to construct girl-friendly toilets. The target for this fiscal year is 5,500 schools.

- Use of gender-responsive learning materials curriculum and teaching guides: Curricula were revised with content about gender-responsive learning materials. They were, however, not sufficiently gender sensitive, as pictures of boys dominate the materials. The female teachers were not adequately satisfied adequately with teaching guides in our interaction with them.

- Training of teachers and school managers in gender equality? In the course of teacher training, gender issues are incorporated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global, regional and country partnership relevant? Was the design appropriate?</th>
<th>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes and intermediate outcomes refer to changes in the use of best practices.)</th>
<th>Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to the dissemination and institutionalization of best practices in girls’ education and gender equality?</th>
<th>Efficiency – How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Outcome 2: Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality known and institutionalized**

- **Was the overall direction and nature of support relevant to the priorities of the sector and country?**
  
  The support was provided through the demand of the Government to the area prioritized by the Government. It was therefore relevant to the priority of the country.

- **Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the country, regional and global partnership appropriate to the priorities of the sector and of the country?**
  
  Education for all has been the priority area of Nepal since 1990. To get education for all materialized, special attention to girls’ education was a good strategy. Since UNGEI support has been in stimulating stakeholders to forward the girls’ agenda in education mainly through the building of capacity of stakeholders, they were appropriate.

- **Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the global and regional partnerships appropriate to the work/priorities of the country partnership?**
  
  Knowledge sharing through publication: Global report; gender review, equity, gender, guidance and toolkits were the global UNGEI support to the Nepal UNGEI partnership. Similarly, the ROSA UNGEI partnership provided contextualized support on gender theme to the Nepal partnership. Respondents informed these supports appropriate.

- **Are best practices being identified?**
  
  Welcome to School, economic support to family to improve nutrition through cooking oil, mobilizing critical masses such as YCs, women Constituent Assembly members, media and female teachers are some of the good practices identified.

- **Are good practices being documented and disseminated? Are they known to UNGEI partners and communities?**
  
  These practices are documented and disseminated to some extent but not to the desired level. The UNGEI focal person does not have records of these, nor does UNICEF have it. Similarly, the DoE also does not have the records of UNGEI activities to a large extent. Attention to documentation and dissemination is not adequately given. Documentation of YCs is well done in ROSA, but UNGEI Nepal has not done it. Similarly, the process of Constituent Assembly women’s involvement in education is done by Educational Pages and by ROSA to some extent. UNGEI Nepal has also not done any documentation of it. The good practices are disseminated by partners through their networks in the district and school. In addition, YCs are also actively involved in making the good practices known to communities.

- **Has knowledge and information about best practices in girls’ education and gender equality in education increased?**
  
  Sex-disaggregated data are available, and aggregated data are also available of total ethnic groups, but they are not disaggregated by different ethnic groups and *dahits*. There are some tools developed by United Nations partners jointly. The tools developed by one agency are used by other agencies. The GENIA tool developed by UNESCO is disseminated by various United Nations agencies and INGOs.

- **What was UNGEI’s contribution at country, regional and global levels to each of the above?**
  
  Training provided by ROSA UNGEI to four young Nepalis in 2008 has now reached to 477 YCs in six districts, who have formed and mobilized youth groups/YCs groups, with membership at 1,420, who are actively involved in supporting activities for girls’ education, including the WTS campaign.

  The Girls’ Education Development Section at the DoE is the focal point of UNGEI at the DoE that coordinates the WTS campaign. The decision was made at the meeting of the DoE to use all stakeholders in the campaign, including YCs. Supporting the WTS campaign through the YC and youths in bringing out-of-school children to school through home visit campaigns, monitoring the school attendance of students and teachers and providing other necessary support. Stimulating UNICEF and WFP in Girls’ Education Theme Group meeting and informal discussion to forge partnership to provide quality education through economic support to family of girl students, which has helped both bringing girls to school and retention in school.

  The then UNGEI Network (Now GEGDN) meeting approved the proposal by Educational Pages to involve women Constituent Assembly members in education. This was discussed in the inter-agency meeting of Girls’ Education Theme Group of United Nations agencies called by the UNGEI focal person, who is also UNICEF education specialist. The focal person convinced UNICEF to provide financial support for activities to involve and mobilize them. The women Constituent Assembly members participated in meetings supported by UNGEI and formed Girls’ Education Network of Parliamentarians, and GE Advisory Group at the central level to work more closely with GEGDN. The Group drafted a common agreement paper and made a 15-point commitment to promote girls education by putting signature of all 197 women Constituent Assembly members.

  In the similar spirit, central GEGDN decided to form district-level GEGDN under the chair of DEO involving a wide range stakeholders including teacher union, resource persons, NGOs, government agencies, young champions as members, parliamentarians as observers, gender focal point as member secretary so as to advocate for girls education and monitor school and DEO activities. GEGDN in 7 districts were formed. After the positive response of this mechanism, other districts are gradually moving toward establishing the district level GEGDN.

- **How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of the use of best practices in policy and programming?**
  
  UNGEI inputs are meagre in terms of time and transactions costs. In many cases UNGEI funds come from UNICEF. UNICEF allocation for UNGEI activities was US$35,000 for 2008 and US$60,000 for 2010. Even with small funds UNGEI has contributed to the mobilization of YCs in support of the WTS campaign and other activities, supported Educational Pages in mobilizing women Constituent Assembly members under the UNGEI banner and encouraged UNICEF and the WFP to forge partnership for quality education with economic support to girl students’ families.
### Outcome 2: Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality known and institutionalized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability: Are the changes that took in terms of knowledge and institutionalization of best practices likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How durable are the improvements?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WTS campaign is institutionalized, and it is the part of the government system. YC is a new concept and capacity building would have to go on for both YCs and members of Youth Groups/YC Groups. The YCs do not have their own networks at district and national levels. Establishing networks at these levels would be helpful for their greater role and sustainability. Some mechanisms to generate funds for conducting some activities will be required for their survival. The involvement of women Constituent Assembly members/parliamentarians is likely to continue, but this may require some catalytic agency to push them forward. Even after their retirement in the Constituent Assembly, they are likely to be active at district level and in the community. GEGDN at district level need to continue to be active to get their support devising proper mechanisms. Economic support to the families of girl students through cooking oil may continue until the WFP programme is there. But what happens after this is not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What are the main risks to sustainability?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District level:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A trend is that young people from the community migrate temporarily to city areas or other countries for employment. This may happen also with the trained YCs. Therefore, a training programme for new YCs as well as Youth Groups/YC Groups is needed to fill the vacancies of earlier groups on organization development, network management and community mobilization, to make them resilient to the risk of survival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- After the termination of the Constituent Assembly, the women Constituent Assembly members may not get re-elected for parliament. New women parliamentarians would be on board. Orientation programmes for the new women parliamentarians would be required to support the agenda for girls’ education and gender equality in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cooking oil to the families of girl students may not continue after the current project in the same districts if WFP cannot raise funds for this. However, this kind of support could be provided jointly in other districts where both UNICEF and WFP are in operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Frequent transfer of the trained gender focal points at district as well as central level would affect programme planning, implementation and record-keeping. Capacity building, therefore, needs to be made a continuous process for both basic and advanced knowledge of both new and continuing gender focal persons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome 3: UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

**Context: 2001 What was the situation at level zero? What was happening before the UNGEI partnership was put in place?**

- Were there coordination efforts around girls’ education and gender equality at country level? How did this function? How effective was it?
  The Government of Nepal started a formal partnership with the private sector in 1985 by enacting a law to permit to open educational institutions with private investment. The Ninth Plan (1997–2001) proposed several policy strategies to seek community and private participation in education. However, this study could not find girl-specific partnerships that impacted on girls’ education.

- Was coordination around girls’ education and gender equality at country level taking place in the context of other more general education groups? How did this function? How effective was it?
  Girls’ education was viewed as a part of the total system by the government. Therefore, a separate coordination mechanism for girls’ education was not developed. The BPEP II had a programme of coordinating and integrating government, NGO and INGO activities in early childhood development, but was not specific to girls’ education.

- What were the main capacity constraints with respect to girls’ education and gender equality? Were there any systems/efforts in place to address these?
  Finding female teachers for rural areas was a main obstacle to promote girls’ education, although a policy was made to have at least one female teacher in every primary school in 1975. There were more than 10,000 schools that did not have even a single female teacher in 2001.

**Context: 2010 What is the situation in 2010? What has happening after the UNGEI partnership was put in place in 2002?**

- The Three-Year Plan (2007–2009) was very explicit in provisioning policies of public-private partnership in technical and vocational education, cost sharing in higher education and partnership in secondary education.
- The SSRP (2009–2015) proposes different forms of public-private partnerships in education: community management for basic education, cost sharing for higher education, cooperative schools, management contract and school choice.
- The role of local communities and parents in school management has contributed significantly to improve the enrolment of children from *dalit* and other marginalized community in primary schools.
- GEGDN at central and district level formed.
- Gender focal persons established in all 75 districts and 5 Development Regions.
- Partnership between and among United Nations agencies formed to support girls’ education.

**Inputs: What did the UNGEI partnership do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What other inputs and processes took place throughout the same period?**
Outcome 3: UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

- How has coordination and partnership around girls’ education and gender equality evolved?
  The Action Group for Girls’ Education was established in 2002 as a loose network of university, NGO, government and United Nations agencies. The United Nations Girls’ Education Theme Group, established in 2003, brought the ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP together by encouraging them to make girls’ education a priority area in their agendas. Gender focal persons were trained on the mainstreaming of girls’ education into the overall education system. Advocacy and lobbying took place for forging partnership between UNICEF and WFP for improving girls’ access to and retention in school by supporting families of girl students with cooking oil and gender-sensitive teaching and learning materials, and building capacity of teachers and SMCs. Formation of district-level GEN in seven districts.

- Who has been involved?
  DoE/MoE/DEO, UNICEF, WFP, ILO, UNESCO, Save the Children Alliance, World Education Nepal, Sahabagi

- Have clear priorities been established?
  The SSRP gives priority to disadvantaged populations for the early childhood education and development programme; to increase access to and participation in, promote equity and social inclusion in, and improve quality and relevance of basic and secondary education; to recruiting female teachers and teachers from dalit and other disadvantaged groups, gender parity in education with high enrolment to achieve the EFA goal of primary education completion by 2015.
  Girls’ education and gender equality in education is one of the priority areas of partners, but forging strong partnership between and among them is still to be seen.

- Has an agreed-upon action plan been developed to guide the collective and individual work on girls’ education and gender equality?
  There is no combined workplan, but the workplan of each partner is shared in the meetings at the time of the annual workplan and progress is also shared at the end of the year among the United Nations agencies. The goal of UNGEI is to contribute to the achievement of the EFA and MDG targets for gender equality and girls’ education through a strong partnership. But strong partnership has not been realized in Nepal, as there is no common workplan.

- How effective have coordination and partnership efforts been?
  The coordination and partnership efforts are not effective, as expressed by persons that we interacted with. Even within the United Nations, agencies’ activities are not well coordinated and the current partnership between UNICEF and WFP has issues related to effectiveness and efficiency, and works are delayed against the workplan in some cases.

- In what key areas, if any, has capacity been strengthened?
  Training provided to gender focal persons in gender mainstreaming in planning, monitoring and evaluation.

- What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, technical support, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at country level provide to strengthen partnerships and coordination?
  The key inputs that UNGEI provided in relation to enhancing partnership was providing technical guidelines to form GEGDN in seven districts.

- What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to strengthen partnerships and coordination? How widely are these known?
  Holding a GAC meeting in Nepal in 2008, selection of Nepal report to include into the global advocacy by the GAC meeting 2009, knowledge sharing through publications such as the global report, gender review, equity, guidance and toolkits; providing travel support to women Constituent Assemblies to Bangladesh to share the Nepal experience on parliamentarians’ support to girls’ education, technical support for forming partnership based on regional knowledge.

- What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were ongoing? How did these influence partnerships and coordination efforts? In what way were they complementary to work by UNGEI?
  Pooling and direct partner for supporting SSRP funding.
  INGO supports to access and retention of girls in education and gender equality in education.
  Support of bilateral and multilateral agencies through NGOs.
### Outcome 3: UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes: What has been the effect on the quality of partnerships?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What effect has UNGEI had on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The number of member organizations that are engaged in UNGEI’s activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are about 80 agencies involved in GEGDN at central level, including United Nations agencies, Educational Pages, DoE, divisions of education, NGOs and civil societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The degree of satisfaction of member organizations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was no complaint reported by the partners that were interviewed. They suggested, however, a more active role of UNGEI.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global and country partnership relevant? Was the design appropriate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, and intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to building a more effective partnership for girls’ education at country level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency – How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome 3: UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the country partnership appropriate to the priorities of the sector and of the country?</td>
<td>Girls’ education has been one of the priority areas of the education sector in Nepal. The objective of UNGEI support is to facilitate an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality. The UNGEI objective thus is appropriate, as it is supportive of the national priority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the objectives of the UNGEI support from the global partnership appropriate to the work of the country partnership?</td>
<td>The global support, which was mostly in the form of information sharing and providing guidance and tools, was appropriate to the Nepal partnership. However, the approach that the Nepal partnership has taken for girls’ education is oriented towards mainstreaming gender parity in education in all sectors, not only the girls’ education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the size and dynamic of partnership arrangements for girls’ education and gender equality evolved?</td>
<td>The partnership size has grown moderately with network membership of DoE, Educational Pages, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNESCO, ILO, WFP, SCA, CECI Italy, ActionAid, NORAD, TUN and others NGOs. About 80 institutions are members at the central-level GEGDN, though they are not equally effective. The earlier active members of NGOs have decreased interest in the UNGEI network as, according to them, UNGEI does not bring a strong agenda. The district-level GEGDN has expanded from 7 to 75 districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there more and better opportunities for capacity building? Are these being used by partners?</td>
<td>UNGEI partners have various sources that are willing to build the capacity of partners. These are yet not adequate, as the demand for capacity building is wide. School-level planning, monitoring and community empowerment are other areas for capacity building. Likewise, the expansion of GEGDN to all 75 districts requires training for gender focal persons and M&amp;E personnel of DEO on mainstreaming gender in school and district-level education plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence of better joint planning and priority setting at country level? Is there a clear joint agenda?</td>
<td>There is no evidence of better joint planning and priority setting at country level. What an informed source said was that it was only Nepal that did not have joint planning in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was UNGEI’s contribution from country, regional and global levels to each of the above?</td>
<td>Country-level contribution: Inspired by the UNGEI vision and goal, a UNICEF education specialist took the initiative of forming the UNGEI Network, involving INGOs and United Nations agencies, which was later expanded to the government system where girls’ education initiatives are shared. Inspired by the UNGEI vision and goal, a UNICEF education specialist took the initiative of forming UNGETG as an internal forum to share girls’ education and gender equality in education within United Nations systems. UNGEI providing training to the staff of MoE/DoE/DEO on gender mainstreaming in education, which was funded by UNICEF. This contributed to the capacity enhancement of gender focal persons in the education system at ministerial, departmental and district levels, which later formed the district-level GEGDN. Inter-agency meeting called by UNGEI focal person for sharing the annual workplan in April and review of progress towards the end of every year enhanced the coordination among members of the UNGETG. Discussion in the inter-agency meeting of the UNGETG about the partnership between UNICEF and WFP contributed to forge the partnership between the agencies on supporting families of girl students with cooking oil incentives, which has increased the retention of girls in about 100 schools in five terai districts that had high gender disparity in education. Decision made in the meeting at central level GEGDN contributed forming GEGDN in seven terai districts where gender disparity in education was high, by involving various stakeholders including young champions, NGOs, GOs under the chair of DEO and gender focal person in DEO as member secretary. This concept is now in the process of expansion to other districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of stronger partnerships and improved capacity?</td>
<td>With a small amount of funds and little time, UNGEI has been able to influence partnership. There has been some level of capacity built by the Government. It is, however, due to the cumulative efforts of different UNGEI and non-UNGEI partners. It encouraged UNICEF and WFP to forge partnership for quality education with economic support to girl students’ families. The capacity at the grass-roots level needs to be developed for organizational management under volatile stage – post-conflict, where politicization and corruption are common phenomena. Capacity of school administration not only on teaching but also on keeping records, planning and monitoring involving YCs and SMC needs to be developed. UNICEF has taken lot of load off of UNGEI. This has to be shared by other partners. They may hold meeting in different partner agencies. Time commitment of partners need to be in a more balanced manner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The global work of the country partnership is appropriate to the UNGEI vision and goal, which was mostly in the form of information sharing and providing guidance and tools, was appropriate to the Nepal partnership. However, the approach that the Nepal partnership has taken for girls’ education is oriented towards mainstreaming gender parity in education in all sectors, not only the girls’ education.
### Outcome 3: UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

**Sustainability:** Are the changes that took in terms of knowledge and institutionalization of best practices likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?

- How durable are the improvements?
- The improvements in enhancing the partnership were identified as forging partnership between WFP and UNICEF, forming central-level and district-level GEGDNs and expansion of the networks to all 75 districts, mobilizing local resources such as YC to locate the students out of school, explore the reason for their being out of school, and search ways to address the issues.
  
  UNGEI partnerships can sustain as they operate in low cost/no cost. The GEGDN is in the process of further expansion to other districts. Therefore, it is likely to be sustained. UNGETG may continue either as a separate group or merged with the Gender Theme Group of the United Nations coordinated by UNESCO.

- What are the main risks to sustainability?
  
  As UNGEI does not have funds to influence partners, low attention to UNGEI calls from partner agencies cannot be ruled out, in spite of the fact that girls’ education is the agenda of the moment recognized by partners. Time commitment from partners for the partnership is also a risk, as every partner is busy with its own activities.
Annex 3: Questionnaires

Annex 5.1

Specific questionnaire for DoE (Gender section and M&E)

1. Name of Girls’ Education Districts at present.
2. What specific strategies were there to bring girls to school before the WTS campaign was launched in 2004?
3. What youth groups were involved in education at the school level in 2001 or before YCs in 2008?
4. Who are pool partners and who are non-pool partners in the SSRP?
5. What were the specific activities that UNGEI did to achieve the following outputs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Specific UNGEI activity</th>
<th>UNICEF activity</th>
<th>Activity of other agencies (Asian Development Bank, World Bank, etc.)</th>
<th>What did others do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy changes concerning girls’ education and gender equality in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing girls’ education policies through SWAp mechanism (SSRP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making gender-disaggregated data available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing girls’ education strategy paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducting gender audit on education policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthening M&amp;E system of GEI partners (Regular review of progress and good practices)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Champions mobilization in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Constituent Assembly member mobilization in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTS campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF-WFP partnership in education in five terai districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making the above good practices known to GEI partners and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutionalizing the above good practices by the Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Developing GEI tools jointly by partners
- Mobilizing critical mass

**Strengthening of the partnership process** What was the contribution of UNGEI in bringing stakeholders (donors, NGOs, media, United Nations, government, political parties and others) together to reach consensus on girls’ education and gender equality

- Capacity building of Girls’ Education Network/gender focal point in DoE on gender mainstreaming (gender-sensitive planning and monitoring to ensure girls’ educational rights and female and *dalit* representation in SMC)
- Coordination among Girls’ Education Initiative partners enhanced
- Form and mobilize Girls’ Education Network in district
- Training for gender focal person at central level (DoE/MoE)
- Training for gender focal persons at district level
- Publications promoting good practices in girls’ education and gender equality
- Proportion of schools with separate toilets for boys and girls
- Scholarships to 50 per cent of girls
- Scholarships to all girls

What were good practices in girls’ education in 2001?

1. 
2. 
3. 

What are good practices in girls’ education in 2011?

1. 
2. 
3. 
Annex 3.2

Questionnaire for UNGEI focal persons

1. When was the UNGEI partnership established in Nepal?
2. Who are the partners?
3. What roles do different members play?
4. Does the partnership have a ToR?
5. Does it have an annual workplan?
6. How is it disseminated?
7. What are the priorities/areas of focus of the plan?
8. Who monitors the UNGEI partnership activities?
9. How frequently is UNGEI database updated?
10. How are UNGEI data used for management improvement?
11. What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at country level provide in the policy context?
12. What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to the policy dialogue/reforms?
13. To what extent were the UNGEI supports appropriate to the priority of the Government of Nepal in the education sector?
14. What were the Global supports of UNGEI to Nepal UNGEI educational priority of Nepal?
15. To what extent were the UNGEI global supports appropriate to work with the Nepal UNGEI partnership?
16. How was the UNGEI global support provided to Nepal UNGEI?
17. How appropriate was it?
18. In what way has UNGEI contributed to each of the above?
19. What effect has UNGEI had on:
   20. Financial incentives targeted at reducing barriers to girls’ education
   21. Measures promoting safety for girls at school and travelling to school
   22. Measures against sexual harassment and violence
   23. Proportion of schools with separate toilets for boys and girls
   24. Number and quality of gender-responsive learning materials curriculum and teaching guides
   25. Number of teachers and school managers trained in gender equality
   26. Programs supporting girls’ re-entry to school after pregnancy
   27. Publications promoting good practices in girls’ education and gender equality
   28. Availability of primary education and movement towards the UPC target
   29. Positive effects on access and equity and in addressing key cross-cutting issues
   30. Positive effects on learning outcomes
   31. What are key good practices in girls’ education and gender equality are currently in evidence in Nepal in terms of financial incentive?
   32. What are key good practices in girls’ education and gender equality are currently in evidence in Nepal in terms of safety in school?
   33. What are key good practices in girls’ education and gender equality are currently in evidence in Nepal in terms of gender responsive learning materials?
   34. What are key good practices in girls’ education and gender equality are currently in evidence in Nepal in terms of mobilising critical masses in education?
   35. What progress has been made in documenting and disseminating good practices in girls’ education and gender equality?
   36. Which audiences are being targeted?
   37. To what extent are good practices being used to inform decision making around policies and programming?
   38. What specific good practices have been most influential in informing policies/priority setting?
   39. What were the key inputs provided by UNGEI partnership in facilitating the good practices?
40. What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were on-going in the key good practices such as "Welcome to School Campaign"?
41. How did the non-UNGEI supports influence the policy decisions and priority setting?
42. How appropriate were the UNGEI supports to the education sector?
43. How appropriate were the global UNGEI supports to the work of UNGEI Nepal partnership?
44. Are good practices being identified?
45. Are good practices being documented and disseminated?
46. Has knowledge and information about good practices in girls’ education and gender equality in education increased?
47. What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?
48. How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of the use of good practices in policy and programming?
49. Financial incentives targeted at reducing barriers to girls’ education
50. Measures promoting safety for girls at school and travelling to school
51. Measures against sexual harassment and violence
52. Separate toilets for boys and girls
53. Use of gender-responsive learning materials curriculum and teaching guides
54. Training of teachers and school managers in gender equality
55. How durable are the improvements in terms of institutionalization of good practices?
56. What are the main risks to sustainability of good practices from the financial and capacity perspectives?
57. What were the main capacity constraints with respect to girls’ education and gender equality?
58. Were there any systems/efforts in place to address these?
59. How has partnership/coordination around the girls’ education and gender equality evolved?
60. Who has been involved?
61. How clear are the partnership priorities in girls’ education and gender equality?
62. Is there collaborative action plan developed in girls’ education and gender equality among partners?
63. How effective are the coordination efforts?
64. What are the key areas of strengthened capacity of partnership?
65. What are the key areas of strengthened capacity of partners?
66. What key inputs were provided by UNGEI to strengthen the capacity of partnership?
67. What key inputs were provided by UNGEI to strengthen the capacity of partners?
68. What were the key inputs provided by global UNGEI partnership to strengthen UNGEI Nepal partnership?
69. What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were on-going to strengthen capacity of GEI partners on gender mainstreaming?
70. In what way were they complementary to work by UNGEI?
71. How appropriate were the objectives of global UNGEI support to the work of Nepal partnership?
72. What is the size and dynamic of partnership arrangements for girls’ education and gender equality evolved?
73. Are there more and better opportunities for capacity building? Are these being used by partners?
74. Is there evidence of better joint planning and priority setting at country level? Is there a clear joint agenda?
75. What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?
76. How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of stronger partnerships and improved capacity?
77. The degree of satisfaction of member organizations?
78. How durable are the improvements institutionalization of GEI partnership?
79. What are the main risks to sustainability of the coordination among GEI partnership?
### Annex 3.3

**Questionnaire for key informants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were the key capacity issues of the system with respect to policy change and decision-making at the start of UNGEI?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent was there awareness at policy level of girls’ education and gender equality issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What knowledge and information was available about girls’ education and gender equality? To what extent was this sufficient for decision-making?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were monitoring systems being used to inform decision-making around education policies, and around girls’ education and gender equality specifically?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there coordination efforts around girls’ education and gender equality in Nepal at the beginning of this century?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did the coordination mechanism function?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective was the coordination mechanism?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was coordination around girls’ education and gender equality taking place in the context of other more general education groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did this function?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effective was it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the main risks in sustaining change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was known about girls’ education and gender equality prior to the UNGEI partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the good practices at the time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were good practices being used to inform design of programmes and interventions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were good practices being identified and documented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How were good practices being used to inform decision-making around policies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Questionnaire for partners

1. What key good practices in girls' education and gender equality are currently in evidence in Nepal in terms of safety in school?
2. What key good practices in girls' education and gender equality are currently in evidence in Nepal in terms of mobilizing critical masses in education?
3. Has knowledge and information about good practices in girls’ education and gender equality in education increased?
4. Is there collaborative action plan developed in girls’ education and gender equality among partners?
5. How effective are the coordination efforts?
6. What are the key areas of strengthened capacity of partnership?
7. What are the key areas of strengthened capacity of partners?
8. What key inputs were provided by UNGEI to strengthen the capacity of partnership?
9. What key inputs were provided by UNGEI to strengthen the capacity of partners?
10. What were the key inputs provided by global UNGEI partnership to strengthen the UNGEI Nepal partnership?
11. What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were ongoing to strengthen capacity of GEI partners on gender mainstreaming?
12. In what way were they complementary to work by UNGEI?
13. How appropriate were the objectives of global UNGEI support to the work of the Nepal partnership?
14. What is the size and dynamic of partnership arrangements for girls’ education and gender equality evolved?
15. Are there more and better opportunities for capacity building? Are these being used by partners?
16. Is there evidence of better joint planning and priority setting at country level? Is there a clear joint agenda?
17. What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?
18. How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of stronger partnerships and improved capacity?
19. The degree of satisfaction of member organizations?
20. How durable are the improvements institutionalisation of GEI partnership?
21. What are the main risks to sustainability of the coordination among GEI partnership?
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Questionnaire for Education Adviser and M&E Adviser, UNICEF

1. How do you differentiate UNGEI activities from the UNICEF activities?

2. How are UNGEI activities reflected in the UNICEF workplan?

3. How are UNGEI activities monitored and database managed?

4. When you raise any issue/agenda and/or provide any support related to girls’ education and gender equality, how would people understand whether the agenda/issue/support was on behalf of UNGEI or UNICEF?

5. As UNICEF is very strong in girls’ education and gender equality, what is the added value of UNGEI to UNICEF?

6. As an experienced person involved in different partnerships at regional and global levels, how do you find the UNGEI partnership compared with other partnerships (horizontal and vertical linkages at and between local, regional and global levels; resource management; and roles and responsibilities of partners at different levels)?

7. What should be changed to make UNGEI more effective?
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Specific questionnaire for regional focal person

Regional support and linkages between the regional focal person and country level

For regional focal person:

1. What is your role as a regional focal person? How does this work link to country level?

2. To what extent are you part of the process of planning with the countries and with country reporting?

3. What type of support do you provide to countries? (e.g., capacity building, financial resources)

4. How do you facilitate the sharing of good practices or other collaborations between and among countries in the region? (Give examples)

5. What percentage of your time overall is spent on UNGEI-related activities? Of that what percentage of your time is spent on country-level activities?

6. What is happening at the global level (based on your participation in the GAC) that is directly linked to country level? How is that communicated? Give examples.

7. Is there anything else you would like to add?
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Specific questionnaire for UNGEI focal person

8.3.1.1.1.1. When were you designated as the UNGEI focal person

2. What are the activities that you do for UNICEF and UNGEI?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities that you do for UNICEF</th>
<th>Activities that you do for UNGEI</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What were the specific activities that UNGEI did to achieve the following outputs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>UNGEI activity</th>
<th>UNICEF activity</th>
<th>Who were others?</th>
<th>What did others do?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy changes concerning girls’ education and gender equality in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing girls’ education policies through SWAp-mechanism (SSRP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making gender disaggregated data available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing girls’ education strategy paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducting gender audit on education policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthening M&amp;E system of GEI partners (regular review of progress and good practices)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YCs mobilization in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women Constituent Assembly member mobilization in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTS campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF-WFP partnership in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Making the above good practices known to GEI partners and communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutionalizing the above good practices by the Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing GEI tools jointly by partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mobilizing Critical mass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengthening of the partnership process for the furtherance of girls’ education where UNGEI contribution to bring UNGEI stakeholders (donors, NGOs, media, United Nations, government, political parties and others) together to reach consensus on girls’ education and gender equality

- Capacity of GEI partners strengthened on gender mainstreaming
- Coordination among GEI partners enhanced
- Form and mobilize Girls’ Education Network in district
- Training for gender focal person at central level
- Training for gender focal person at district level
Annex 3.8

School Youth Group

ljBfno o'jf ;d'x

- :yfkgf aif{ (Year of establishment)
- u7g k|lqmof (Process used to organize the youth group (YG))
- o'jf ;d'x u7g ug{ s:n] pTk ['/0ff u ¥of} < (Who motivated to organize the YG?)
- o'jf ;d'xsf lqmofsnfkk? (Activities of the YG)
- ljBfnol; t o'jf ;d'xsf] ;DaGw (Relations of YG to the school)
- ljBfyL[x?l; t o'jf ;d'xsf] ;DaGw (Relations of YG to the students)
- cljefjsl; t o'jf ;d'xsf] ;DaGw (Relations of YG to the guardians)
- of] RoflDkogl; t o'jf ;d'xsf] ;DaGw (Relations of YG to the Young Champions)
- ljBfno gcfPsf afnaRrfnf0{ ljBfno Nofpg o'jf ;d'xsf ;b:ox?n] s] u5{g\ < (What activities are conducted by YGs to bring the out-of-school children to school?)
- ljBfnodf ljBfyL[sf pkl:ylt a9fpg o'jf ;d'xsf ;b:ox?n] s] u5{g\ < (What activities are conducted by YG to increase the attendance of students in school?)
- plgx?sfl qmofsnflxx? slQsf] k|efjsf/L 5g\ < (To what extent are their activities effective?)
- s;f] u/]sf] eP tL qmofsnfkk? cem a9L k|efjsf/L x'g] lyP < (How would the YG activities be more effective?)
- tkfO[x?sfl ufp“df ljBfnodf egf{ gePsf slt s]6Lx? 5g\ < slt s]6fx? 5g\ < (How many girls and boys of school going age are in your village who have not gone to school?)
- ltgLx? ljBfnodf egf{ lsg gePsf xf]nfg\ < (Why have they not gone to school?)
- o'jf ;d'x gePsf] eP, jflnsf lz[ffsf] cj:yf s:tf] x 'GYof] xflnf < (How would the situation of girls’ education in your village have been different if there was no YG?)
- o'jf ;d'x afro/fVg{ s] ug{ ' knf{ < (What has to be done to sustain the YG?)
- o'jf ;d'x ;' wf/ ug{ s] u5{g\ < (What needs to be done to improve the YG?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Janardan Nepal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Joint Secretary, MoE</td>
<td>MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Neera Shakya</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GFP, and Under-Secretary, MoE</td>
<td>MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mahashram Sharma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Joint Secretary, MoE</td>
<td>MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lava Dev Awasthi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director General, DoE</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Hari Khanal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M&amp;E Officer, DoE</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kamala Gyawali</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GEDS, DoE</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Rajan Sharma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Rajdhani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Laba Raj Oli</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Journalist</td>
<td>Education Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Mohamadi Sadiqi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CA Member</td>
<td>Muslim Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sushan Acharya</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ram Pyari</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Previous GFP</td>
<td>MoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Sumon Tuladhar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>UNGEI CFP</td>
<td>UNICEF, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Eva Ahlen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Education Adviser</td>
<td>UNICEF, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Misaki Akasaka Ueda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M&amp;E Adviser</td>
<td>UNICEF, Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Raka Rashid,</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>UNGEI Focal Person, ROSA</td>
<td>UNICEF, ROSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Tapa Raj Pant</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>National Programme Officer</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Pramila Ghimire</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CP Coordinator</td>
<td>WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sudha Pant</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Program Officer</td>
<td>UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Tirtha Khaniya</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ex-Member (Education)</td>
<td>NPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Louise Banham</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Education Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Frank Jensen</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CTA Edu Sector Adviser Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Radha Gyanwali</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CA Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Suprabha Ghimire</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CA Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Amrita Thapa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CA Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Deergha Shrestha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Coordinator, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chij Kumar Shrestha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Solani Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. District and school-level persons (non-student) contacted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rabindra Mishra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resource Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Manzur Alam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>School Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Shambhu Sah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEO-Partner NGO and GEN member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Haiya ram Yadav</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Devendra Giri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Muni Lal Baitha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Filed Coordinator (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sunil Yadav</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Manju Dahal</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lalita Devi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PTA member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kantli Devi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SMC member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Babanti Devi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PTA member, Dalit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Sarita Devi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District and school-level persons (non-student):

- Rabindra Mishra, M, Resource Person, DEO, Bara
- Manzur Alam, M, School Inspector, DEO, Bara
- Shambhu Sah, M, DEO-Partner NGO and GEN member, HUDEC, Bara
- Haiya ram Yadav, M, Chairperson, JJYC, Bara
- Devendra Giri, M, Chairperson, TUN, Bara
- Muni Lal Baitha, M, Filed Coordinator (Education), UNICEF
- Sunil Yadav, M, GEGDN member, RDC, Bara
- Manju Dahal, F, GEGDN member, TUN, Bara
- Lalita Devi, F, PTA member, NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara
- Kantli Devi, F, SMC member, NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara
- Babanti Devi, F, PTA member, Dalit, NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara
- Sarita Devi, F, Teacher, NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kanti Karna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Women teacher</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Meena Devi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Child Support Teacher</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Janga B. Ram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Youth Group (YG) member</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Munna R. Kurmi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>PCS Teacher</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Arun K. Thakur</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>VDC-supported Teacher</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Jaya Prakash Lal Das</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Jaya Narayan Prasad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Shri Kishor Baitha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>YG member</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Firoz Ansari</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>YG</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Jaya B Ram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>YG</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Sagira Khatun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>YG</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Meena Devi Sahni</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>YG</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fulmati Devi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>YG</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Babita Sharma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>YG</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Sindhu Kumari Gupta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Young Champion</td>
<td>NR Primary School, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Krishna Subedi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEO and Chair, GEN</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sushil K Jha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resource person, GEN member</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Tabrez Ahmad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>RDC-NEPAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Bipin Adhikari</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resource person, GEN member</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ram Bachan Yadav</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resource person, GEN member</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Meena Yadav</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>Women Union, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Sabitri Sharma</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>Teacher, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Title/Role</td>
<td>Organization/Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Sarbar Shahi Faiz</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>Young Champion, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Madhu Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>Young Champion, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Pramod Yadav</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>ASMAN-Nepal, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Kameshwar Yadav</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>TUN-Madheshi Forum, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Om Prakash Mahato</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>Teacher, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rekha Jha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>TUN, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Mani Shankar Lal Nidhi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GEGDN member</td>
<td>TUN, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Radjeshyam Prasad Gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resource Person, GEN member</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Mukunda Puri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Resource Person, GEN member</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Nanda Kishore Gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Gender Focal Person and GEN Member-Secretary</td>
<td>District Education Office, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Om Prakash Mahato</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Head Teacher</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Ram Charitra Sahni</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Surya Narayan Mishra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ranu Shrivastava</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Teacher, Female</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Kamali Devi Raut</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SMC member</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mustakima Khatun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Kamal Deo Paswan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SMC member</td>
<td>Shree Primary School, Hazminia, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Student participants in focus-group discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade/Role</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Ganiya Kumari</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 4 Student</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Krishna Kumari</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 6 Student</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Kiran Kumari Patel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 6 Student</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Raju Kumari sahni</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Tara Kumari Patel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Ayu Kumari yadav</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Muskan Kumari Gupta</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Sarita Kumar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Brihaspati Kumar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Tetar Kumari</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Jagi Kumari</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Lalmati Kumar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Kiran Kumar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Reshma Khatun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Puja Kumar</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Sarbar Alam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Deep Kumar Gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Dhirendra Prasad Gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Naga Ram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Asar Quresh Ansari</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Mohammad Sarif Ansari</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Mahesh Gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Sunil Kumar Paswan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Radhe Chandra gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Pintu Kumar gupta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>School Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Raj Mangal Pandit</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>N. R. Primary School, Laxmipur, Kotwali, Bara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Suman Kumari Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Punam Kumiari Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Rakesh Ram</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Bikash Pandit</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Dharmendra Tahkur</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rahul Mishra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Shiv Kumar Mishra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kishan Kumar Mishra</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Saurabh Singh</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Gutam Bir hahi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Rohit Patel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Nabab Saheb</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Anjali Kumari Mishara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Samjhana Kumari Jha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Roshani Kumari Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rubi Kumari Paswan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Kabita Kumari Paswan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Puja Kumari Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Shiva Kanti Kumari Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Puja Kumari Sah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Shivani Kumari Singh</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Kanchan Kumari Jha</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>Shri Primary School, Hazminia, Patahi, Rautahat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Reference Group Members

Members of reference group:

1. Khaga Raj Baral, Director/DoE          Coordinator
2. Neera Shakya, Under Secretary/GFP, MoE Member
3. Hari Prasad, Under Secretary/DoE      Member
4. Kamala Gyawali, Section Officer, GEDS, DoE Member
5. M&E Officer, UNICEF                   Member
6. Representative of the Teachers’ Union Member
7. Representative of the Dalit Commission Member
8. Sumon Tuladhar, UNGEI Focal Person, Nepal, Invitee member
9. Pramila Ghimire, Coordinator, WFP, Invitee member

Members of reference group who participated in sharing of inception report on 25 March 2011:

1. Khaga Raj Baral, Director/DoE          Coordinator
2. Neera Shakya, Under Secretary/MoE      Member
3. Hari Prasad, Under Secretary/DoE      Member
4. Kamala Gyawali, Section Officer, DoE   Member
5. Sumon Tuladhar, UNGEI Focal Person, Nepal
6. Pramila Ghimire, Coordinator, WFP
7. Dagny Fosen, UNICEF ROSA

Members of reference group who participated in sharing of final report on 25 July 2011:

1. Khaga Raj Baral, Director/DoE          Coordinator
2. Neera Shakya, Under Secretary/MoE      Member
3. Hari Prasad, Under Secretary/DoE      Member
4. Kamala Gyawali, Section Officer, DoE   Member
5. Ashok Vaidya, M&E, UNICEF
6. Rakesh Shrestha, Education Section, UNICEF
7. Sumon Tuladhar, UNGEI Focal Person, Nepal
8. Pramila Ghimire, Coordinator, World Food Programme
Annex 6: List of GEGEN members at central level

(As revised on 12 July 2011)

A. Ministries
   1. Ministry of Education (MoE)
   2. Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare
   3. Ministry of Local Development
   4. Ministry of Health

B. Entities within the MoE
   1. Gender Focal Point, MoE
   2. Department of Education (DoE)
   3. Gender Equity Section, DoE
   4. Gender Focal Point, Non-formal Education Centre
   5. Gender Focal Point, Curriculum Development Centre
   6. Gender Focal Point, Higher Secondary Education Board
   7. Gender Focal Point, Education Human Resource Development Centre
   8. Gender Focal Point, Examination Controller's Office
   9. Gender Focal Point, Teacher Service Council
  10. Gender Focal Point, Teachers' Record Section
  11. Gender Focal Point, Food for Education Programme
  12. Gender Focal Point, Council for Technical Education and Vocational Training
  13. Gender Focal Point, Regional Education Directorate, Central Development Region
  14. Research Centre for Educational Research and Innovation Development

C. United Nations agency
   1. UNICEF/UNGEI
   2. WFP
   3. ILO
   4. UNFPA
   5. UN Women
   6. UNESCO

D. INGOs
   1. Save the Children
   2. Plan International
   3. ActionAid
   4. World Education
   5. World Vision
   6. Room to Read
   7. Mercy Crops
   8. Restless Development
   9. CMC Nepal
  10. VSO Nepal

E. NGOs
   1. Beyond Beijing
   2. AASAMAN Nepal
3. Maitee Nepal
4. CWIN
5. NCE Nepal
6. Global Action
7. Concern Nepal
8. Shakti Samuha
9. WOREC Nepal
10. Seto Gurans
11. IFCD

F. Professional educational organizations
1. Women Department, Teachers’ Union
2. Women Department, Nepal National Teachers’ Union
3. Women Department, Nepal Teachers’ Organisation
4. Women Department, Education Republican Forum
5. Women Department, All Nepal Teachers’ Union
6. Women Department, Republican Teachers’ Union
7. Women Department, Madheshi Teachers’ Union
8. Women Education Society
9. Women Department, ISTU (Institutional Schools’ Teacher Union)
10. Women Department, PISTU (Private and Institutional Schools’ Teacher Union)

G. Guardians’ organizations
1. Guardians’ Organisation Nepal
2. National Guardians’ Organisation Nepal

H. Private school organizations
1. Private and Boarding Schools’ Organisation, Nepal
2. National Private and Boarding Schools’ Organisation, Nepal

I. Media
1. Federation of Journalists
2. Educational Pages
3. Educational Journalist Group
4. Educational Journalists’ Network
5. Iqbal XC
6. Madhurima Nepal
7. Sancharika Samuh (Invitee)

J. Commissions/invitees
1. National Human Rights Commission
2. National Women Rights Commission
3. National Dalit Commission
4. Women Caucus
5. Women Parliamentarians’ Advisory committee for Girls’ Education
6. Inter party Women’s Network
7. Women’s Security Pressure Group
8. National Planning Commission
9. Office of Council of Minister (Prime Ministers’ Office)
10. Central Children Welfare Committee
11. Nepal children’s organizations

Task group

1. DoE – Chair
2. MoE – Gender focal person
3. Educational Pages
4. Room to Read
5. Teacher’s Union of Nepal
6. NCE Nepal
7. National Human Right Commission  – Observer Member
### Nepal – Progress towards the MDGs and targets

#### Goals and targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</th>
<th>Current status, against 2015 target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than $1 a day.</td>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population below $1 per day (PPP value)</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty gap ratio at $1.25 a day (PPP) (%)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</th>
<th>Current status, against 2015 target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.A: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.</td>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 and reaching Grade 5 (%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy rate of people 15–24 years old (%)</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</th>
<th>Current status, against 2015 target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of girls to boys at primary level</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of girls to boys at secondary level</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of women to men at tertiary level</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of women in wage employment in the Non-agricultural sector (%)</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of seats held by women in Parliament (%)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</th>
<th>Current status, against 2015 target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 4.A: Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-5 mortality rate.</td>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-5 mortality rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 1-year-old children immunized against measles</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 5: Improve maternal health

Target 5.A: Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.

Target 5.B: Achieve, By 2015, universal access to reproductive health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>Latest</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal mortality ratio (per 100,000 live births)</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>229 (2009)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of births attended by skilled birth attendant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.8 (2009)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases

Target 6.A: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Target 6.C: Have halted by 2015, and begun to reverse, the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.

### Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability

Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs and reverse the loss of environmental resources.

Target 7.B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss.

Target 7.C: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>Latest</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive prevalence rate (%)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45 (2010)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet need for family planning</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26.3 (2010)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive prevalence rate (%)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45 (2010)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV prevalence among people 15–49 years old (%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.5 (2009)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence rate associated with malaria (number of cases per 1000 of the population)</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.16 (2009)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence associated with tuberculosis</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>280 (2005)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2 emissions (tons per capita)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>0.2 (200)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Indicators for which data are not available are not reported in the table.
## Annex 8 – Timeline of key events globally in girls’ education and gender equality, as well as key UNGEI events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General developments in international arena in development aid and education</th>
<th>Gender events</th>
<th>UNGEI-specific events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>March 1990 <strong>World Conference on Education for All, in Jomtien, Thailand</strong>, adopts the World Declaration on Education for All, which states that all have a right to education. The conference recognizes the setbacks experienced in the 1980s by many South nations and makes a commitment to meeting the basic learning needs of every citizen.</td>
<td>African Girls’ Education Initiative established with substantial funding from Norway, expanded to 34 countries over the course of the decade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><strong>Education For All (EFA) Assessment 1999–2000</strong>, involving six regional conferences, reveals that the EFA agenda has been neglected.</td>
<td>Basic and Primary Education Programme II (1999-2004) implemented to increase access to education in Nepal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td><strong>United Nations Millennium Summit in 2000</strong>: 189 world leaders sign up to try to end poverty by 2015 when they agree to meet the MDGs. The MDGs recognize the centrality of gender equality as a goal in itself (Goal 3), as well as the importance of the gender dimensions of each of the other goals. <strong>World Education Forum</strong>: 164 governments adopt the Dakar Framework for Action, in which they promise to commit the necessary resources and effort to create a comprehensive and inclusive education system for all.</td>
<td><strong>United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325</strong> is the first resolution specifically addressing the impacts of conflict on women and girls. It calls upon all parties to armed conflict to respect provisions in international law as it applies to women and girls, to respect the civilian and humanitarian charter of refugee camps, and to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence and other forms of violence. It calls upon States to put an end to impunity for those responsible for committing sexual violence against women and girls and to integrate the particular needs of women and girls into the design of refugee camps.</td>
<td><strong>UNGEI is launched in Dakar, Senegal</strong>, by the UN Secretary-General Kofi Anan. The mandate of UNGEI is to narrow the gender gap in primary and secondary education by 2005 and to ensure that, by 2015, all children were able to complete primary schooling, with equal access to all levels of education for girls and boys. <strong>Establishment of the UNGEI Secretariat</strong> with UNICEF Senior Advisers at HQ covering UNGEI in addition to other assignments (advisers included Mary Joy Pigozzi, Elaine Furniss and Ellen van Kalmthout).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><strong>UNGASS issues a Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS</strong> that includes important language on addressing the gender dimensions of the pandemic (&quot;Stressing that gender equality and the empowerment of women are fundamental elements in the</td>
<td><strong>The Girls’ Education Movement</strong> is launched in Kampala, Uganda, in August 2001.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments in international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>reduction of the vulnerability of women and girls to HIV/AIDS”).</td>
<td>Two optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child – ratified by 120 states – enter into force in 2002. The first restricts the involvement of children in military conflicts, and the second prohibits the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. Both of these protocols are extremely important for advancing the protection of girls from exploitation and abuse.</td>
<td>The regional UNGEI partnership for East Asia and the Pacific is launched in May 2002. UNGEI loose network formed in Nepal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>G8 Washington, D.C., United States, approves the EFA Action Plan and the Fast Track Initiative amid overwhelming support from the international community.</td>
<td>Gender Audit in Education conducted in Nepal, which provides 10 action points regarding gender equality in education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Education for All (EFA), Amsterdam, Netherlands. April 2002: Developing countries and their external partners agree at a Dutch-World Bank-sponsored conference on broad principles for scaling up EFA efforts; the Netherlands commits 135 million euros to set the process in motion.</td>
<td>Education Act and Education Regulations amended in Nepal with provision for at least one women representative in various educational committees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>G8 Kananaskis, Canada. June 2002: Agreement to significantly increase bilateral assistance for the achievement of EFA and to work with bilateral and multilateral agencies to ensure implementation of the Fast-Track Initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>EFA Global Monitoring Report established to monitor progress towards the six EFA goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>International Conference on Financing for Development (Monetary, Mexico) – the first major attempt by the United Nations and the international community to integrate trade, monetary and financial matters into a consolidated framework for achieving development results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments in international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><strong>February 2003. Rome Declaration on the harmonization of aid.</strong> The development community commits to work towards aligning its assistance around country development priorities and to harmonize donor policies and priorities around country systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action Group for Girls’ Education formed with UNICEF initiative involving United Nations agencies, NGOs and government officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><strong>FTI Donors Meeting – Paris, March 2003:</strong> Donors agree on modus operandi for the Fast-Track Initiative that is country driven, secure funding for the seven countries and agree on an operating framework for the Initiative. The Fast-Track Initiative Catalytic Fund is established. It aims to provide transitional grants over a maximum of 2–3 years to enable countries lacking resources at country level, but with Initiative-endorsed education sector plans to scale up the implementation of their plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><strong>The Education Programme Development Fund was established in November 2004</strong> as a funding window under the Fast-Track Initiative to support low-income countries improve the quality and sustainability of their education sector planning and programme development.</td>
<td><strong>Welcome to School campaign started in Nepal to reduce the number of out-of-school children.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The UNGEI Global Advisory Committee (GAC) is established.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The policy framework for EFA (2004–2009) developed.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNGEI formally adopts a two-pronged strategy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expanding its network at the global and regional levels by opening membership to a wider range of organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Making concerted efforts for more formal platforms at the national level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |  |  | **Regional focal points are put in place in four UNICEF regional offices** (West and Central Africa,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General developments in international arena in development aid and education</th>
<th>Gender events</th>
<th>UNGEI-specific events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa, South Asia and East Asia and the Pacific). An informal arrangement was put in place with the Middle East and North Africa regional office, which opted not to establish a regional focal person post, but rather to have the Regional Education Adviser cover UNGEI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI undertakes a study on gender and the EFA Fast-Track Initiative, entitled 'Integrating Gender into Education for All Fast Track Initiative Processes and National Education Plans'. The study assessed the gender responsiveness of Fast-Track Initiative processes and education sector plans to formulate recommendations to strengthen processes, tools and partnership mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March 2005, Paris Declaration endorsed</strong> by more than 100 Ministers, Heads of Agencies and other senior officials who commit their countries and organizations to continue to increase efforts in the harmonization, alignment and management of aid for results with a set of actions and indicators that can be monitored.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI undertakes a study on gender and the EFA Fast-Track Initiative, entitled 'Integrating Gender into Education for All Fast Track Initiative Processes and National Education Plans'. The study assessed the gender responsiveness of Fast-Track Initiative processes and education sector plans to formulate recommendations to strengthen processes, tools and partnership mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>United Nations World Summit, New York, September 2005:</strong> delegates accused of producing a 'watered-down' outcome document, which merely reiterates existing pledges. However, it referred to the centrality of gender equality to human security and human development, and affirmed that achieving gender equality goals depends on the full implementation of the Beijing Platform and its five-year review. It led to the adoption of additional targets and indicators under the MDGs – including reproductive health and rights and sex-disaggregated data on informal employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI undertakes a study on gender and the EFA Fast-Track Initiative, entitled 'Integrating Gender into Education for All Fast Track Initiative Processes and National Education Plans'. The study assessed the gender responsiveness of Fast-Track Initiative processes and education sector plans to formulate recommendations to strengthen processes, tools and partnership mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td>UN Action established as the coordination body that unites the work of 12 United Nations entities in the goal of ending sexual violence in conflict.</td>
<td>In April 2006 UNGEI is established in West and Central Africa at the regional level. UNGEI Secretariat gets a full-time Head (Sabah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments in international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child (45th Session). Keeping our Promises on Education, takes place in May 2007, Brussels, organized by the European Commission, the United Kingdom and the World Bank. The meeting seeks concrete proposals and commitments for action to deliver on the promise to give all the world's children a full primary education by 2015.</td>
<td>The United Nations General Assembly adopts resolution 61/143, calling upon Member States and the United Nations system to intensify their efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women.</td>
<td>UNGEI is formally launched in Nigeria. UNGEI organizes a Regional UNGEI Gender in Education Roundtable in July 2007 in Bangkok. Cheryl Gregory Faye is appointed Head of the UNGEI Secretariat, replacing Sabah Knani.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>September 2008, Accra summit on aid effectiveness: donor countries agree to end the fragmentation of aid. Donors agree to donate half of aid directly to governments of low-income countries, rather than to individual projects. Donors also agree to coordinate aid better.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI GAC, the main policymaking body, formally adopts a Vision and Mission Statement to clarify its purpose and goals. UNGEI organizes its first regional meeting in Khatmandu, Nepal. UNGEI is formally launched in Nepal, although activities had been ongoing since 2002. Women Parliamentarians’ Networking Group for Girls’ Education formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>School Sector Reform Plan (2009–2015) formed using SWAp mechanism. This Plan has developed the education system of Nepal along the international line and is more focused towards gender equality in education by Her Majesty Queen Rania Al-Abdullah of Jordan, becomes Honorary Global Chair of UNGEI.</td>
<td></td>
<td>District-level UNGEI network with the name...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments in international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2010 | Providing incentive packages to girls and marginalized communities.            | Establishment of New UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), which is mandated to:  
• Support intergovernmental bodies in their formulation of policies, global standards and norms.  
• Help countries implement these standards, providing technical and financial support to those countries that request it, and to forge effective partnerships with civil society.  
• Hold the United Nations system accountable for its own commitments on gender equality, including regular monitoring of system-wide progress. | Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Network (GEGEN) established in seven districts  
UNGEI holds a global conference on ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality’ (E4) in Dakar, Senegal.  
The first private sector member – CISCO – joins the GAC. |

2011 |                                                                      | GEGEN expanded to all 75 districts of the country. |
Annex 9: Gender Audit 2002

Ten actions to integrate and mainstream gender in education:

1. Develop, agree on and disseminate a gender policy for MoES/DoE.

2. Redefine the women's remit in line with the recommended shift in the DoE from implementation to planning, policy and evaluation, moving from a women's education section to a gender unit or gender focal point.

3. Integrate gender into all departments, divisions and sections, and educational implementation agencies.

4. Set specific gender-focused goals, objectives and targets, and ensure that monitoring and performance indicators are gender specific.

5. Gender disaggregate all statistics.

6. Implement the policy on female teachers.

7. Increase the number of female managers at all levels to achieve 30 per cent in five years.

8. Revise civil service regulations to make them ‘family friendly’ to benefit spouses and parents.

9. Present gender-equitable role models and ensure that all teaching materials are free from gender bias.

10. Incorporate gender issues into all training.