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Executive Summary

This evaluation of UNGEI in the East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) region is part of a larger formative evaluation of UNGEI. The objectives of the evaluation are to explore the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, as well as the extent to which global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership.

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. The evaluation also includes a comprehensive mapping of the UNGEI partnership in all participating countries, as well as data collection and interviews with global stakeholders. At the regional level, the evaluation focused on East Asia and the Pacific. This report reflects the findings of that regional study only, and examines three outcome areas of the regional partnership, including:

- Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
- Institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence; and
- UNGEI facilitates effective partnerships for girls’ education and gender equality.

Framing the study

The study takes a ‘before UNGEI’ and ‘after UNGEI’ approach, and in so doing looks at questions such as:

- Does the regional coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?
- What key changes have taken place 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 partnerships?
- 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 effects/likely effects of these changes?
- Are these changes sustainable over time?
Methodologies and fieldwork

The ‘on the ground’ fieldwork for the EAP regional evaluation study took place in March 2011. In total, individual and group interviews were carried out with 25 informants. A core aspect of the work of UNGEI EAP is knowledge generation through conducting studies on girls’ education and gender equality and through the production of various documents for use in the region. The partnership has produced a number of advocacy briefs, case studies and related learning materials since 2006. These documents were used in the UNGEI EAP evaluation in a variety of ways: first, to help to map out the scope of the work in the region, and then to corroborate and study further some of the issues raised during interviews. A third component of document analysis aimed to look at utilization: i.e., who uses the documents? The methodology for tracking policy involved the development of an online tracking tool.

Conclusions

Contribution of UNGEI to changes around girls’ education and gender equality:

It seems clear that UNGEI EAP is contributing to policy dialogue in relation to girls’ education and gender equality, and that it is contributing to influencing institutional frameworks both at the level of the regional partners themselves and in some countries within the region. The Evidence-Based Advocacy Workshop that first took place at the regional level, but which has been replicated in several countries, is a good example of how the work of a regional partnership can also reach the country level. Building on this success, UNGEI might wish to initiate some additional work that examines the extent to which participating countries are working with evidence-based advocacy following their participation in such workshops.

Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI:

The issues being addressed by UNGEI respond to the priorities of the region. As evident throughout the evaluation, however, the sheer size and diversity of the region, the perception on the part of some countries that gender issues do not exist, and the emergence of new agendas, including ‘what about the boys?’, contribute to challenges in relation to determining which issues UNGEI should focus on and how it can maintain relevance among competing agendas. Overall, however, UNGEI is effective in its objective of establishing and maintaining a strong and growing partnership.

At the level of working with regional partners and within regional structures, UNGEI is effective in promoting policy dialogue on girls’ education and gender equality and in ensuring that institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence. At the level of being effective in relation to countries in the region, there is a need for further study. The strength of the partnership and its mechanisms suggests an efficient use of human resources (especially in relation to coordination). However, the absence of procedures and structures for studying the utilization of the various outputs of the partnership within the region points to the importance of further attention to the efficiency (funds, expertise, time) of the partnership.
Relationship with the country level of UNGEI:

One of the greatest challenges to UNGEI EAP and its work is to see how policy dialogues are being fostered and institutional frameworks influenced at the level of the countries in the region. At present there is only one country being considered as a partner (Papua New Guinea). As noted in chapter 4, the regional partnership is in an excellent position to refine and further develop its communication strategies and tools in ways that could be responsive to countries in the region.

Relationship with the global level of UNGEI:

UNGEI EAP participates in the regular meetings of the Global Advisory Committee (GAC). This involves reporting to the GAC on activities in the region, as well as reporting back to the region (and country level) from the Committee. Perhaps the greatest contribution of the regional UNGEI to the Committee is advising on improving regional structures elsewhere.

Lessons learned for UNGEI partnership at the regional level

Champions of girls’ education and gender equality:

The regional partnership thrives through the work of its ‘champions’. It seems clear that unless there are champions of girls’ education and gender equality, the overall effectiveness of the work is likely to be compromised. The strength of UNGEI EAP from the beginning has rested on passion and commitment, and this remains very evident.

Coordination:

An effective partnership involving a substantial number of organizations, each with its own institutional demands, requires strong leadership and coordination. UNGEI EAP has that, although it is important to explore how coordination is linked to influencing policy dialogue and institutional frameworks at as high a level as possible within the various United Nations organizations as well as other regional structures.

Communication:

UNGEI EAP has a strong communication strategy. Good communication systems are critical, with prompt follow-up in relation to minutes of meetings, newsletters and so on. In a region that has strong technological resources and social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook and Google, online banner ads have played an important role in the communication strategy.

Lessons for UNGEI globally

Investing in regional partnerships:

The overall success of the UNGEI EAP partnership in providing a platform for promoting policy dialogue and developing various tools and methods for influencing institutional frameworks offers a model in terms of the structures that need to be put in place. The Regional Focal Point structure of
other regions could benefit from the success of UNGEI EAP. At the same time, the realities of country successes in other parts of the world could influence the working relationship of the EAP regional partnership at country level.

**Investing in communication structures:**

The successes and challenges of communication in the EAP region suggest that leadership could be offered at the global level to deepen an understanding of the most effective ways of using online network tools for improving social practices within organizations (Castells, 2010; Turkle, 2004, 2011). Although various global networks for disseminating information are being used, the question of ‘how?’ and ‘with what effect?’ remains under-examined. The focus of the UNGEI EAP partnership in producing high-quality documents makes it a perfect ‘testing ground’ for how best to study and refine the use of new technologies.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendation 1: Intensify efforts to make UNGEI EAP 'louder' and ‘more strategic’**

While there is widespread agreement that the policy dialogues and documents being produced are excellent, they need to feed more directly into higher-level policy talks within the United Nations structures and in concert with other agencies such as the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women).

**Recommendation 2: Aim to have UNGEI EAP coordinated at as high a level as possible and in as neutral a way as possible**

This recommendation follows from Recommendation 1 and speaks to the importance of strategic placement of UNGEI coordination. It needs to be at a level that will allow the coordinating structures to influence high-level coordinating structures of various institutions and to be seen as neutral as possible (i.e., perhaps not so clearly attached to UNICEF).

**Recommendation 3: Study and improve the use of social media in the region as a whole for disseminating partner productions**

UNGEI employs online network technologies to share knowledge, launch campaigns and dialogue with partners. However, there is a need for a clearer strategy (and resources) across the partnership regarding online technology and what is actually being used in terms of social media networks, online dissemination of texts, and monitoring how these texts are being used.

**Recommendation 4: Conduct evaluation studies of how UNGEI EAP documents are being used**

Notwithstanding the debates about whether a regional initiative should be reaching ‘into the region’ or should be reaching international players at the regional level (a debate that many regional partners said they struggle with, and therefore not unique to UNGEI), it would be worth carrying out an in-depth study of policy dialogue utilization (which would involve the various
partner organizations engaging in their own study of how they are benefiting in their own work and in their own policy work).

**Recommendation 5: Use partner structures to improve possibilities for policy dialogue at the level of countries in the region**

Informants whose experience has been more at the country level recently (as well as partners working outside of Bangkok) spoke about the ways in which they had not been aware of UNGEI, but now that they are working at the regional level they see the value UNGEI could have at the country level, together with universities, local and international NGOs, civil society and the private sector. There is a need to study and mine these country-based perspectives as a way to develop a strategy and initiatives for dissemination.

**Recommendation 6: Make budgets and workplans more transparent and ‘public’ within the partnership as a component of addressing efficiency**

Most international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the region, including those that are UNGEI partners, have specific guidelines from their organizations for their own workplans and budgets. Some of these may preclude financial participation. This is an area that requires greater clarity when it comes to UNGEI workplans.

**Recommendation 7: Consider formalizing an UNGEI partnership with one or several countries in the region**

As noted in chapters 3 and 4, a limitation to the overall success of the regional partnership is the relative absence of reach to the country level. While this can be improved through the structures of the individual partners, having a formalized partnership with one or two countries expands the learning possibilities for the organization of UNGEI as a whole.

**Recommendation 8: Conduct a regional ‘re-visioning of UNGEI’ exercise**

The adage, ‘If it isn’t broken, why fix it?’ might apply to UNGEI EAP. The strengths of the partnership and the overall satisfaction of the partners with the mechanisms of UNGEI all point to a successful partnership. The well-developed communication structures, coordination mechanisms and verbal ‘buy-in’ from senior directors of international NGOs in the region are all strengths. Underlying some of what was said, though, is a sense of being able to do even more. UNGEI might wish to initiate some follow-up work that examines (a) the extent to which countries in the region are drawing on knowledge and evidence produced through the regional studies and documents; and (b) the extent to which policy dialogues and evidence and knowledge are feeding into high-level initiatives. A partnership re-visioning exercise could contribute to developing a strategy for doing this.
1. Introduction

This evaluation of UNGEI in the East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) region is part of a larger formative evaluation of UNGEI. The objectives are to explore the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country and regional levels, and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the partnership.

This report is specific to the evaluation of the EAP region, and as such includes references to the specific task of considering the potential for partnership in selected EAP countries (see also Annex A). It is based on fieldwork carried out in March 2011 in Bangkok and involving individual and group interviews with members of the partnerships, senior management from several key international NGOs and representatives of various Education for All (EFA) Thematic Working Groups, as well as on a review of UNGEI EAP documents (reports, policy briefs, advocacy briefs, learning materials and meeting minutes).

The report maps out the evaluative process and methodology, offers a context for the work of UNGEI in the EAP region, provides a brief profile of UNGEI in the region, summarizes the key findings in relation to the three outcome areas, and ends with conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

1.1 Aims and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of the formative evaluation of UNGEI is to establish the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, and the extent to which the global and regional efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI 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.

As noted above, 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 EAP. 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 regional study. A separate overall evaluation report pulls together the findings from the evaluation as a whole.

It is anticipated that, ultimately, 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 move forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education;

Collect empirical baseline data in the countries and regional partnerships 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.

1.2 Scope of the evaluation at the regional level

The EAP evaluation documents how the girls’ education initiative has interacted with and contributed to EAP processes and how this has had an effect on girls’ education and gender equality in education. Thus, the regional evaluation is meant to do the following:

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; and

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 EAP education sector. The evaluation focused on answering the following questions:

Does the regional coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?

What key changes have taken place with respect to girls’ education and gender equality since UNGEI was formed, with a 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 partnerships?

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 effects/likely effects of these changes?
• Are these changes sustainable over time?

The evaluation will seek to determine if UNGEI has added value to regional-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 will try 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 the changes. The logical steps to determine the contribution of UNGEI are as follows:

• What was the context like before UNGEI – what was happening at level zero?
• 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’s inputs for the regional level?
• How sustainable are the changes that were brought about?

The following key steps were involved:

• Comprehensively mapping the situation at level ‘zero’ (before UNGEI);
• 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 examines outcomes but also the processes and structures that have been put in place and how these influence or may influence future outcomes.

1.3 Structure of this report

This report is divided into six chapters. The first chapter serves to map out the overall framework for the formative evaluation (at global, regional and country levels). Chapter 2 addresses the evaluation process and methodology, refers to the Logic Model, and offers the context for girls’ education and gender inequality in the EAP region. It ends with a brief snapshot of the regional level, providing a history of UNGEI in the region. Chapter 3 offers the findings of the evaluation, organized according to the three outcome areas for UNGEI in the region. Chapter 4 is addresses the partnership’s overall effectiveness across all of the outcome areas. Chapter 5 provides the conclusions to the study and chapter 6 highlights lessons learned from the partnership, while chapter 7 offers recommendations.
2. Evaluation process, methodology, context and a brief ‘snapshot’ of UNGEI at the regional level

In keeping with the overall approach to the UNGEI evaluation organized across global, regional and country levels, the study uses mixed methods, based on interviews and document analysis.

2.1 Interviews

The ‘on the ground’ fieldwork for the study took place 14-18 March 2011 (see Annex 4). In total, individual (face-to-face and Skype) and group interviews were carried out with 25 informants. An interview plan (and logistical information) was developed and organized by the UNGEI focal person and her team. The interview questions, reviewed by the reference group and lead consultant, referred to the three key outcome areas: (1) policy dialogue; (2) institutional frameworks, evidence and knowledge; and (3) the effectiveness of the partnership (see Annex 7). Most individual interviews lasted for approximately 40–45 minutes. Group interviews lasted slightly longer.

Not all questions from the interview schedule were used in any one meeting, depending on whether the interviewee was a member of a partner organization or not, the position of the person (a director working at senior management level vs. someone working more directly with programmes), and the length of time that the person had been involved with UNGEI. In the case of several people who had been around and involved in 2002–2004, the focus was much more on getting at the history of UNGEI. In the case of relatively new participants, some of whom had only attended a few meetings, the focus was more on what the partnership looked like in relation to the two key outcome areas (policy dialogue and institutional frameworks), and what it was like to be a new member of the partnership. In the case of people who had once been involved in UNGEI, but less so now, it was important to determine what had changed for them.

This purposive sampling and purposive interviewing allowed for greater flexibility in following up on certain issues, although it also had its disadvantages in terms of consistent data. Early on in the process a question came up that seemed particularly generative: ‘What would happen if UNGEI ceased to exist? What would happen to girls’ education in the region?’ This question was added to many of the interviews, although it was absent from the first day’s meetings. Several email conversations also took place following the fieldwork, both in relation to people who were identified as having the historical background (and who were not in-country at the time of the interviews), and in relation to details of the various communication documents and strategies.

2.2 Document analysis

A core aspect of the work of UNGEI EAP is knowledge generation through the production of documents on girls’ education and gender equality. It has produced a number of advocacy briefs, case studies and related learning materials since 2006. These documents were used in the UNGEI EAP evaluation in a variety of ways: first, to help to map out the scope of the work in the region, and then to corroborate and further study some of the issues raised during interviews. A third component of document analysis in the study was to try to get at utilization.
The methodology for tracking documents involved the development of an online tracking tool that was designed to respond to the concerns and questions raised during the interviews about the use of the various documents that are produced. The approach was to submit the documents to a cyber scholarship ‘netnography’ exercise (Kozinets, 2009; Castells, 2010; Cummings et al., 2006; Turkle, 2011; Wenger et al., 2009) for studying the distribution and accessing of the various documents produced by UNGEI EAP. This examined where the document goes and who accesses it. To address these questions, a system was set up to pursue Internet-based research on selected documents listed on the UNGEI website in the section of resources listed under the EAP region. Two questions guided the tracking of each document: 1) Where has it been distributed/displayed on the Internet?; and 2) How has it has been shared/used? An online tracking method was designed to assess the online dissemination and online utility of the documents listed under the section, ‘Resources for the East Asia and Pacific region’ on UNGEI’s website (<www.ungei.org/resources/index_535.html>). The exercise generated further questions that were followed up through email and telephone interviews with UNGEI representatives at both global and regional levels (see Annex 3).

2.3 Preparation phase

The evaluation began with a preparatory phase, of which the main output was the production of the Inception Report, providing a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and approach, and highlighting issues emerging from the preliminary desk review.

The preparation phase for the EAP regional evaluation started with the participation of the EAP Regional Evaluation Team at the Orientation and Planning Workshop for the Formative Evaluation of UNGEI in Cairo, from 23–27 January 2011. The workshop brought together members of the UNGEI evaluation team, including: national, regional and international consultants, UNGEI focal points, evaluation managers at country and regional levels, as well as UNICEF staff from headquarters and members of the UNGEI M&E working group (see Annex 3). The purpose of the workshop was to ensure a common understanding of the objectives of the UNGEI Formative Evaluation, and to ensure familiarity by the evaluation team with the proposed methodology, evaluation framework, evaluation tools and products. It was at this stage that the EAP evaluation workshop team refined the wording of the outcomes at the regional level to reflect the nature of the work, as follows:

- Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
- Institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence;
- UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

The preparatory work in the region commenced shortly after the Orientation Workshop for Evaluation Consultants in Cairo.

A reference group guided the evaluation at the regional level (see Annex 4 for a list of group members). The regional inception report was circulated to the reference group in early March. This
allowed for inputs from regional (reference group and Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist) and global stakeholders (international consultant).

The focus during this stage was on documentation review and fine-tuning of the evaluation methodology and drafting of field instruments. The key activities undertaken during this phase were:

- Study of the overall Evaluation Guide;
- Familiarization with the literature on girl’s education in EAP;
- Reading of various documents on UNGEI;
- Identification of information gaps and key issues that require review and/or verification during fieldwork;
- Finalization of sampling frame and list of respondents (stakeholder map);
- Identification of activities to be reviewed;
- Preparation of data collection instruments – finalization of UNGEI EAP Evaluation Framework and Logic Model, drafting of interview schedules and focus group discussion guides;
- Finalization of activity plan and timelines;
- Meeting regional reference group/technical working group to discuss evaluation methodology, examine field instruments and discuss arrangements for the fieldwork; and
- Preparation of the Inception Report.

2.4 The Logic Model

A key tool for the evaluation was the EAP Regional Logic Model, which is a modification of the UNGEI Logic Model provided in the Evaluation Guide. The model explains how the partnership expects to work, as well as the theory and underlying assumptions. It links outcomes (short- and long-term) to activities (the results chain) and to the vision and goals of the partnership. It is important because it explains how UNGEI expects to reach its goals. An important part of the evaluation is to assess to what extent the expected outcomes are being achieved.

Outcome 1: Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence.

Sample indicators
- Number, type and scope of policy dialogues at the regional level on girls’ education and gender equality;
• Number and type of regional initiatives (e.g., participation in awareness activities such as those linked to International Women's Day);
• Revision of policy documents in the countries in the region in relation to gender and girls' education;
• Publications on girls’ education and gender equality circulating in the countries in the region;
• Policy dialogues influencing the girls’ education and gender equality agendas of international NGOs in the region.

Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence.

Sample indicators
• Number and type of knowledge- and evidence-based practices documented and disseminated;
• Number and type of critical issues identified in relation to institutional frameworks;
• Nature of UNGEI contributions to knowledge and evidence-based practices;
• Durability of contributions over time.

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

Sample indicators
• Degree of satisfaction of partners;
• Number of member organizations actively engaging in UNGEI activities.

2.5 The context for girls’ education and gender equality in the EAP region

This section is meant to offer a consideration of the region itself, particularly in relation to gender in education activities. The region is geographically and demographically very large; home to more than 2 billion people, the EAP region is made up of close to 60 per cent of the world’s population. The region is economically, socially, religiously and culturally diverse. It is worth noting that, according to World Bank figures, approximately 70 per cent of the world's natural disasters take place in the EAP region.

The broad question of ‘what does gender have to do with it?’ highlights the significance of a range of critical gender issues: girls’ attendance and achievement in school; boys’ attendance and achievement in school; and primary school and secondary school data: transitions of male and females to the work place or university education; the participation of male and female teachers (who teaches what and where?), school leadership, issues of safety and security in and around school, non-discriminatory school policies (can a pregnant girl stay in school?). It should not be surprising that there is no ‘one size fits all’ set of issues (or solutions) in relation to the critical issues related to girls’ education and gender equality, and that ‘disadvantage’ in relation to girls may be quite different from ‘disadvantage’ when it comes to boys. In some cases neither boys nor

1 World Bank, East Asia and Pacific Regional Brief <http://go.worldbank.org/9INZDJIXA0>
girls have the opportunity to go school. In others, schools may seem to ‘fail boys’ so that they choose not to go to school.

It is also important to note that the discourses around gender and schools signal a shifting landscape, such that the issues have changed over time. According to the UNGEI 2009 ‘Snapshot: Gender Equality in Education Report: East Asia and Pacific’, most countries in the region had achieved gender parity in primary education by 2005. However, as that report notes, aggregated figures mask some disparities that have continued. For example, girls in certain parts of Cambodia and Indonesia remain as disadvantaged when it comes to school attendance, while at the same time the rates of attendance of boys in schools in Myanmar and Mongolia is less than that of girls.

When it comes to secondary education, the status of countries in relation to achieving gender parity varies a great deal. Thailand, for example, has far fewer boys than girls attending secondary school, while fewer girls attend secondary school in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Cambodia. In 2009, Viet Nam was close to achieving parity but, again, sections of the country have high rates of girls out of school. Another UNGEI report, ‘Towards Gender Equality in Education: Progress and challenges in Asia-Pacific region’, indicates that some countries in the region have particularly dismal results when it comes to girls’ attendance at secondary school. In the following countries in the EAP region, girls’ participation is less than 20 per cent: Cambodia, Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands, with participation of girls at 40 per cent in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Myanmar. What the ‘Snapshot’ report makes clear is that ‘digging into the data’ is critical because regardless of the national figures, there continues to be serious gender gaps in various provinces. In Viet Nam, for example, there are significant disparities in North East province, with more girls than boys out of school. In the South East and Central Highlands region of Viet Nam, there are more boys out of school.

Targeted initiatives are clearly necessary, particularly in the context of understanding the impact of such issues as poverty in various areas. In Mongolia, for example, boys may drop out of school in order to tend livestock and contribute to family income. However, as the ‘Snapshot’ report highlights, poverty is not the only contextual factor. In Thailand, there are wider gaps in the attendance of boys from middle-class families compared with girls. Such data sometimes more closely resemble some of the data on boys from middle-class families in North America, Australia and the United Kingdom. While there has been a spate of literature in Western contexts on the reasons why boys are not performing as well as girls (the feminization of the primary school system, irrelevance of the curriculum, lack of physical activity, maturity of girls, and so on), the results are far from conclusive, and the data on boys in Western contexts may mask some of the contextual factors in middle-class families in Thailand.

In the context of a greater focus on achievement and learning outcomes, what are some of the trends in the EAP region in relation to gender and location? The ‘Progress Note: Gender equality in education, East Asia Pacific EFA mid-decade assessment’ reveals some interesting attainment profiles. In the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, for example, there are significant differences in the attainment of children and young people in rural and urban areas, with a much larger proportion of the population – both boys and girls – attaining education, and with few differences
between boys and girls. In rural area of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, more boys attain education. The Progress Note also reveals some declines over time, so that in the Philippines and Malaysia, disparities regarding the disadvantage of boys have worsened. In Cambodia and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, girls’ enrolment is still less than boys, but it improved between 1999 and 2005.

Alongside issues of gender, location and educational attainment, several reports have also considered a number of critical features that might account for gaps between the participation of girls and boys in school, or that might shed further light on the situation: survival rate, gender and leadership (who heads up the school, men or women?); proportion of female teachers to male teachers; levels of literacy, gender-responsive budgeting, gender polices and birth registration; language of instruction; and separate toilets, transition rates from primary to school, access to pre-primary school and so on.

What cuts across the analysis of much of the findings in the EAP region is the need for greater disaggregation of data and a ‘fine-tuning’ of focus, ranging from the development of more nuanced tools of analysis for understanding gender gaps, and for a greater appreciation of sub-national differences in such a vast region. The EAP region appears to be on track in terms of achieving universal primary education by 2015; broadly speaking, there remain many sub-national variations. Clearly, as well, there needs to be greater attention to educational outcomes. A good example of this is work on educational outcomes, which asks, ‘what happens if girls and boys are educated’, and, ‘are there differences in relation to decent employment’. As the UNGEI EAP (2008) study, ‘Making Education Work: The gender dimension of the school to work transition’, asks: What are the existing gender disparities in the labour market? The study draws on secondary data from three countries – Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines – and notes that parity in education and more access to education do not always translate into more and better opportunities for young women, and that there remains gender discrimination in terms of salaries and the types of job available to women.

Finally, there is a need to consider the consequences of inequalities when it comes to schooling. What are the consequences to girls and boys who do not attend school or whose education does not extend beyond primary school? Are there re-entry points and, if so, for whom?

### 2.6 A brief ‘snapshot’ of UNGEI EAP at the regional level

This section offers a brief profile of the regional partnership. It is based largely on a review of a) the minutes of UNGEI meetings and b) public documents, along with checking back with various informants to fill in some of the details that were not written down.

UNGEI at the level of the EAP region comes out of UNGEI, which was launched in April 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar. The initiative as a whole was meant to respond to the call of then United Nations Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, to address girls’ education. Following the launch of UNGEI at the global level, various UNGEI partnerships began to take shape at the country level, and one at the regional level, in the EAP region. UNGEI was launched in May 2002. While there no doubt
are many reasons for the selection of EAP as the first regional initiative, some key points include the fact that 60 per cent of the world’s population lives in this region, and in 2000 there were very large gender imbalances. As one informant also pointed out, the region itself was very strong, and there was a keen interest and commitment on the part of UNICEF and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) staff (as champions) to support such an initiative.

As per the global structures of UNGEI, UNICEF took the lead in initiating discussion with potential partners. As noted by an informant, “The need was to muster enough partners interested to form a critical mass.” UNICEF was there from the beginning, but it was critical to get the participation of UNESCO. Other early partners included the Baha’i International Community, Education Development Centre (EDC), the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), the International Labour Organization (ILO), Plan Asia, Save the Children, Sweden, and the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) Secretariat. It is worth noting that in the minutes of an UNGEI EAP meeting held in May 2005, in conjunction with the UNICEF Education Project Officer meeting, there are references to organizations that could be potential regional UNGEI partners since they are already involved with girls’ education at the country level (e.g., CARE in Cambodia, AusAID in Papua New Guinea and UN-Women).

Organizationally, UNGEI EAP (housed in the UNICEF regional office) is led by the UNGEI Focal Person under the direction of the Senior UNICEF Education Adviser, and includes as team members a Communications Officer, whose position with UNGEI EAP is half-time, and a Research Assistant. The activities of the partnership are made public through the UNGEI-EAP website and an e-newsletter published several times a year. The website maps out the main areas of focus for the year; for example, 2011 identifies: 1) advocacy for gender in education; 2) knowledge generation; 3) knowledge management; and 4) capacity building.

As of 2011, UNGEI EAP is made up of the following partners: Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE), Baha’i, CARE, CISCO, the Commonwealth Secretariat, EDC, Plan, ILO (since 2004) Room to Read, Save the Children, Oxfam, UNESCO (since 2002), UNICEF (since 2002), UNAIDS, UNESCAP, Right to Play, SEAMEO, USAID and World Vision of Thailand. UNGEI EAP also includes a number of independent consultants and individuals. CISCO, which joined in 2010, is the first private-sector organization involved. At present there are no university partners. There do not seem to be any clear reference points about which organizations can join outside of an interest and involvement in some aspects of gender and education in the EAP region. Some respondents in the interviews commented on the need to expand the partnership: “There are activists already working in the area. I think we don’t do enough for the external community... I think independent consultants, for example, could do a lot in building the grass-roots support.” At the same time, others spoke of making membership in the partnership more formal, with the idea that perhaps there should be more explicit criteria for belonging.

UNGEI meets bimonthly, although not all partners participate equally in terms of being present at meetings. Email communication is an important part of the partnership’s structure. Moreover, as was made clear in a number of the interviews, one of the features of UNGEI EAP is its flexibility in relation to membership: “It is informal and flexible, but to a certain degree that informality and
flexibility has worked to the benefit of the group – even though members have changed and the make-up of the people in the room is constantly changing.”

Over time, UNGEI EAP has become more structured, both in terms of taking and circulating minutes, and in terms of developing an annual workplan (which is presented at the first meeting of the year). The final meeting of the year is meant to be more of a celebration/summing up of the year’s activities. Minutes are only available from 2005 onwards. These minutes are circulated immediately to all members after meetings and are very detailed in terms of action plans and annexes. There are also regular newsletters (which began in 2009) and these too have become more structured.

The newsletter is coordinated through the UNGEI EAP Communication Officer. In 2009, there were 150 direct subscribers and another 3,000 that received the newsletter through the EFA newsletter. In 2011, there were more than 350 people on the mailing list who receive the newsletter. This includes regional partners, experts, practitioners and students. Some have subscribed directly through the UNGEI EAP dedicated page for newsletters and other names have been received through contacts. The newsletter is also posted on the UNGEI global Twitter page (<www.twitter.com/UNGEI>). The themes are voted on by members during the bimonthly meetings. Topics may link to other events that are happening at the same time, such as the December 2010 issue, which drew on the papers presented at the International Conference on Language, Gender and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), held in November 2010. UNGEI EAP is currently investigating other ways to harness social media and has plans to investigate greater use of technology for outreach through widgets/e-cards and online lesson plans.

Several regular UNGEI EAP initiatives take place during the year. One of these is the production of an annual calendar based on a regional gender-themed visual image contest. Coordinated by the UNESCO team participating in UNGEI, the project involves the partners in several ways. The partners identify a theme, some sit on the jury for judging the visual images (photographs or drawings, as in the contest for 2012), and partners contribute funds according to the number of calendars they intend to circulate to their various constituents. In 2011, UNGEI EAP also participated in the Global Action Week of activities that used ‘The Big Story’ lesson plan and drawing contest to focus on the theme of educating women and girls. These activities have a high profile in terms of public relations and help get the word out about UNGEI and its mission. They also provide some unity to the group as a whole.

Another regular feature of the UNGEI EAP year is the formal participation of the partnership in special United Nations and other commemorative events, such as International Women’s Day and World Day Against Child Labour. These are events where UNGEI may also team up with other organizations, such as UN-Women, and where it might participate in issuing a joint statement.

However, at the centre of the work of UNGEI EAP are the various research initiatives. These range from initiatives that feed into structures within the region (e.g., Education for All Mid-Decade Assessment, Gender Equality in Education Snapshot and Progress Note: East Asia Pacific Education for All End-Decade Review), to studies and initiatives that are proposed by the partners. As is
evident in the minutes of the meetings, these are not just ‘one-off’ activities in terms of planning. Thus, preparing an advocacy brief might typically be represented across several meetings (planning, fine-tuning, getting partner-sponsor buy-in, and then reflecting on the process itself). In the instance of the case studies series (e.g., the ‘Making Education Work’ study), which was published in 2008, the minutes show the type of lead-up discussion that began in 2007, and from 2010 reveal that a follow-up study using both primary interview data as well as secondary data would take place and involve more countries. During several meetings, planning, discussion and project updates are provided so that, although led by ILO, other partners around the table have an opportunity for input.
3. **Findings with respect to UNGEI outcomes**

This chapter presents the substantive findings of the evaluation for the three outcome areas of UNGEI. The findings of the study are organized around three broad outcome areas of UNGEI, fine-tuned to the EAP regional context:

**Outcome 1:** Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;

**Outcome 2:** Institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence; and

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

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 current situation;

iii) assessing the nature of the changes that took place;

iv) identifying the inputs and contribution of UNGEI to the area; and

v) making an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI’s involvement.

3.1 **Outcome 1: Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence**

3.1.1 **Before UNGEI**

Because of the nature of policy (and who uses policy), UNGEI at the regional level is not directly involved in policymaking, but rather is dedicated to promoting policy dialogue related to girls’ education and gender equality among regional stakeholders. There is little evidence of any coordinated policy dialogue at the regional level prior to the establishment of UNGEI in 2002, although there were a number of country initiatives in the region in the mid to late 1990s and beyond. As one person put it: "There were things happening in already existing forums, like SEAMEO, and various girls’ projects or a theme, but to actually have a forum – that was something else." It took some time for UNGEI to take off following its launch in 2002. As one informant commented, "That was one of the challenges, what on earth do you do? It was opened up to a lot of regional bodies – who can come to the party? In those first meetings, it was all, ‘let’s share, let’s talk’, rotating location, two times in each place – but what to do? ‘Let’s do some advocacy work. Should we come up with the idea of sticker campaigns or posters?’ But what would be the messages?"

3.1.2 **Since the formation of UNGEI**

Promoting policy dialogue has been a key feature of UNGEI EAP. Indeed, the same informant who talks above about the early days of UNGEI EAP goes on to discuss what has become an important
feature of UNGEI EAP’s work, which is to commission studies, produce advocacy briefs and joint statements, participate (and sometimes organize) regional roundtables and conferences, and contribute to overall ‘knowledge management’ in relation to girls’ education and gender equality. According to the informant, “Then we focused on coming up with products. If you come up with products with various groups’ names on it and you don’t have to pay for it all, well that works.” UNGEI has funded several multi-country case studies, such as the ‘Towards Equal Opportunities for All: Empowering girls through partnerships in education’ study (Cambodia, China [Yuman], Indonesia, Philippines, China [Gansu], China [Guangxi]), and the ‘Making Education Work: The gender dimension of the school to work transition’ (Indonesia, Philippines, Viet Nam) study. The documents produced are attractive and are based on commissioned research in various countries in the region. A follow-up study to the ‘Making Education Work’ study is currently being replicated in five countries in the region, using qualitative as well as quantitative approaches.

A number of policy briefs and advocacy documents began to appear in 2006. Since that time there have been policy briefs on a variety of topics, including ‘Getting Girls Out of Work and into School’, and others on such issues as female teachers and single-sex classrooms.

As revealed in the interviews and documents, the actual agenda of girls’ education has changed over time, from one of awareness at the beginning of the century to one of strategy and evidence. UNGEI seems to have played a key role in this, as is evident in the types of documents produced and how and where they are cited. The agenda, however, is also shifting, with various members and countries calling for more focus on boys as part of gender equality and in response to a concern that in some parts of the region it is boys who are disadvantaged. In addressing these tensions – girls’ education vs. ‘what about the boys?’ and gender equality more broadly – UNGEI is in a good position to provide leadership in managing the debates and ensuring knowledge production through evidence-based research.

Having a clear strategy of where it wants to go on emerging agendas is critical for UNGEI. For example, as the various UNGEI EAP studies highlight (Snapshot, Progress Note, Progress and Challenge in Asia-Pacific Region), there remain important sub-national issues related to rural-urban differences, for example, and the situation for girls who are marginalized because of ethnicity.

The question of how a particular policy issue gets on the agenda of UNGEI EAP in the first place is one that speaks to the nature of the partnership itself. The findings of the studies and those that call for further research are one aspect of this. In the case of the ‘Making Education Work’ study, the research was based entirely on secondary data. Given the call for ‘digging into data’ in order to deepen an understanding of the issues, and given the success of the ‘Evidence-based Advocacy’ work, it is an obvious next step to remark upon a new study that includes both primary interview study data along with secondary data. ILO had headed up the first study and was interested in embarking upon this follow-up study.

Although financial issues are, of course, critical it is not always clear how the partnership proceeds and how funds are mobilized in the case of a large study. The minutes of the meetings reveal some of the backstory of various initiatives that have taken place. A good example of an emerging issue is
the role of social media as a communication strategy, and although it is also taken up below (under ‘Overall effectiveness of the partnership’) and has been heightened perhaps through the new partnership with CISCO (whose community outreach work is with girls’ leadership through information communication technologies [ICTs]), it is possible that it could become a policy dialogue concern in relation to girls’ education. At the same time, the issue of girls and disability and the need to incorporate disability into programming has appeared a couple of times in minutes and came up in interviews, but has not managed to get on the agenda.

The ‘how’ of policy dialogue through UNGEI was addressed by a number of informants as they reflected on what it means to promote dialogue around policy (vs. policy itself). As one person commented: “I think that UNGEI has a lot of leverage in terms of providing the right recommendations and they can sometimes influence policymakers, or it can sometimes comfort policymakers or project implementers that they are doing the right thing, or that perhaps they could consider something else, such as looking at the more marginalized or the issue of skilled work.” In this way, UNGEI helps to refocus some of the gender analysis.

3.1.3 The influence of the changes

A challenge that exists for most organizations in the region, with the UNGEI partnership as no exception, is studying the utilization of the various advocacy briefs, reports and studies, and investment costs of the various partners. How widely are they circulated? Who is using them? How do the various organizations (even the partners) use these documents? This is not easy to study, although in the interviews, various informants made reference to particular studies. Organizations such as UN-Women, for example, report being able to use the data from the Progress and Snapshot documents to inform their own work.

The sheer size and diversity of the region speaks, perhaps, to the need for different strategies. One informant suggested sub-dividing the region in order to be more strategic vis-à-vis the needs related to girls’ education and the issue of boys out of school: “Policy dialogue is important but it is not making much impact yet. A mechanism to communicate policy dialogue should really be established. UNGEI in Asia Pacific is huge and the situation, the politics, the needs and the demography are all so different so one approach might be to break the Asia Pacific into smaller groups so we can serve specific geographic groups.”

Another concern relates more to dissemination itself, although, again, it speaks to the questions of ‘how’ and ‘how many’ when it comes to dissemination: “I think it is one of the big challenges because it seems very obvious and natural that this is what should happen, but in practice I don’t know how easy it is because it’s very much linked to funding (which is another issue) and ownership – who is going to be the owner on the ground for specific studies and in terms of distributing them, expanding awareness and the awareness of the conclusions, because the last thing you want is a report that finishes up on the floor.”

One suggestion for addressing dissemination was to develop more effective partnerships for the purpose of dissemination, such as through the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, to
address scale at a national level. For example, sending 1,000 copies of a document to Indonesia would be just a ‘drop in the bucket’, and there remain issues of translation. How can UNGEI use its resources to muster further resources for dissemination?

Others noted that while some issues being raised may be influencing policy and policy dialogue, these are not enough. How can UNGEI help countries actually work with the policies? As one person noted: “It gets into policy, but the level of support that is needed to help countries to move beyond policy is an issue. Something strikes a chord with almost every country and they take that into policy and then you say, ‘What have you done with it?’ They have not understood that it needs to get into the nitty-gritty, the strategies, the programmes, and link that to budgets so that it is one of the issues.”

Several informants spoke about the potential for UNGEI to feed its outcomes more directly into the United Nations system, both in relation to gender parity but also in relation to the MDGs on poverty reduction. One said: “The experiences would be useful if we were to hold an intergovernmental meeting on gender. UN-Women will be meeting in a year or so. Some of the experiences that have implications in terms of policy actions for governments could feed into that process. UNGEI is now well established, and it could have a higher profile.” Some also noted that perhaps the fact that the partnership started off more loosely may have held UNGEI back – but also commented that it has the potential “to be strengthened and institutionalized.”

3.1.4 Contribution of UNGEI itself to changes in relation to policy dialogues

It was not easy to determine the contribution of UNGEI and what might be happening if UNGEI did not exist. Compounding the issues is the profile of UNGEI. Not all of the informants who were interviewed had a clear sense of what UNGEI EAP actually is or what it does, although there was a universal association with the yearly photo calendar. Informants knew the current Focal Person through the various responsibilities she has and knew that the partnership of course has something to do with gender. If various groups in the region that are working on gender or on issues of youth do not know very much about UNGEI, this speaks to the need for a higher profile for the partnership, or for representation at a higher level in relation to policy dialogue in the region.

3.1.5 Assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs into policy dialogue

The relevance of the policy dialogues seems to be high according to most people interviewed, and the fact that there is room for an emerging agenda that recognizes new issues, such as the ‘what about the boys?’ question, is a strength of UNGEI. A 2006 policy brief, ‘Getting Girls out of Work and into School’, responds to child labour conventions as relevant in the region. A 2007 document, ‘Towards Equal Opportunities for All’, addresses girls’ exploitation (trafficking and domestic labour) and reaching marginalized girls (through vocational education and learning systems for out-of-school youth). These case studies respond to the MDGs as well as specific labour conventions. At the same time, a critical issue pertains to how to advance new issues without losing sight of the situation for girls, particularly in some rural areas in the region and in relation to ethnicity. There is also a question of quality control in research, as well as concern that information that is being
disseminated may be misleading. An example of this is in the newsletters. In ‘What are boys doing poorly?’, one of the country studies highlights what seems to be a ‘boy’s nature’ perspective that flies in the face of social constructs of gender (see In Focus Newsletter: ‘Why boys do poorly in school’, Issue no. 8, May 2011).

In relation to the overall effectiveness of addressing Outcome 1, there have been a number of different policy dialogue issues addressed through policy briefs, case studies, newsletters and other reports. There have also been a number of regional initiatives that have helped keep girls’ education and gender equality on the agenda. The 2011 International Women’s Day joint statement and regionally-based sessions with girls clearly helped raise the visibility of girls’ education; these events were mentioned in a number of the interviews. Where it was more difficult to evaluate effectiveness was on the indicators that related to the country level (e.g., revision of policy documents in countries in the region and publications circulating at the country level). Various participants at the regional level, however, spoke about how policy dialogues were influencing international NGOs.

Several of those interviewed questioned the efficiency of UNGEI and spoke about the challenges of funding and ownership, and what might be described as ‘value for money’. Thus, while the discussion on efficiency pertains to the efficiency of promoting policy dialogue more broadly, the discussion of very specific outputs speaks to some of the challenges within the partnership.

One person, speaking specifically about the yearly calendar based on the photo contest, commented that the value of the calendar, “has to be measured against the time spent, the cost, and so on... How many thousand copies of the calendar are spread around ... anything under 50,000 would be a waste of time. If we are going to do it, we should do it big! There is no question that it is high-quality stuff, but it is very work- and resource-intensive in terms of the man and women hours spent on producing something, and then if we calculate back on the salary cost of involved people, that is much higher than the printing costs of the calendars, because you have high-level P4s and P5s engaging in it, from so many, so I think that one of the things that the UNGEI group really needs to do is to try to find ways of becoming more effective and efficient in their working together.” This same person goes on to argue that if something is going to be done, it should be done on a bigger scale “... let’s go all out, ‘okay if we are going to do a calendar, everyone needs to invest $15,000 in that.’” Another person mentions this ‘going all out’ in relation to the actual case studies: “I think that in terms of contributing to the systematizing of knowledge in the region regarding how to deal with ensuring access to girls’ education and quality, especially thinking about minority groups, it’s very much relevant, and not only relevant but crucial to inform policies.”

3.2 Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence

Outcome 2 is based on knowledge generation and knowledge management, and the extent to which these areas inform the institutional frameworks of the EAP regional partners and the various regional stakeholders in relation to girls’ education and gender equality. As noted in the previous section on facilitating policy dialogue (vs. policymaking directly), the UNGEI regional mandate
places limitations on directly influencing institutional frameworks at the country level. As one informant commented, it is necessary to do this somewhat indirectly and respectful of the position and knowledge of stakeholders at the country level: “I know what the issues are more than someone from the outside.” As he went on to say, “Preaching may not be a good approach. Rather, you come up with compelling cases, practice cases with strategic information. You just share them with the countries and it’s their job to determine what to do. We mustn’t preach as though we have one solution.”

3.2.1 Before UNGEI

As in section 1.1 on policy dialogues before the establishment of UNGEI in the region, there is no real way of establishing how institutional frameworks might have been informed by knowledge. At the country level in various countries in the region, and even at the level of ‘good practices’ across several countries, there was some circulation of information prior to UNGEI. This was in evidence at the ‘Girls’ Education: A Development Imperative’ conference held in Washington in May 1998. SEAMEO as a regional structure also played a role in facilitating inter-country sharing of good practices. However, there is no clear sense that there was any key mechanism for dissemination.

3.2.2 Since the formation of UNGEI

A number of events and resulting documents have contributed to providing knowledge and evidence, with the regional workshop on evidence-based advocacy in September 2010 involving nine countries and resulting in the development of a learning guide, ‘Evidence-based Advocacy for Gender and Education’. This guide serves as an example of what can be accomplished through the partnership. This work has clearly reached the country level through the involvement of the nine countries that attended the workshop in Bangkok and, at the same time, it has contributed to capacity building of various partner organizations that were involved as resource persons and to the partnership of UNGEI as a whole.

Various informants spoke positively about the significance of this initiative. As one person said: “My sense is that a lot of UNGEI’s activities are about sharing, pooling together, sharing ideas, looking for opportunities for the partnership across agencies. For instance, there is advocacy, evidence-based advocacy, which has a really positive turnout. Everyone was very engaged and representatives were from governments in East Asia. They came to this workshop to learn tools that they could use – evidence to be used in policy advocacy back in their countries… you know people are engaged when they ignore breaks. They kept working on these tools. What emerged out of that meeting was an advocacy guide, which I think people regard as the UNGEI ambassador.” This same workshop has now been ‘rolled out’ to the country level in Papua New Guinea, with the regional team having conducted a training session there in early May 2011 that lasted a week and a half.

Several informants spoke about the ways in which UNGEI EAP is keeping gender on the agenda of various governments. One informant, for example, highlighted the ways that UNGEI has helped to expand the idea of what counts as gender in the region: “… at a regional level, we see that UNGEI is quite active in publications and focusing on gender issues, and because in South East Asia there is
already the growing disadvantage of boys instead of girls, UNGEI brings this issue more into the region... When I started in 2005 with [...], most ministries would say, ‘well we have equal numbers of boys and girls (in school), there are no more problems’, but this boys issue, they didn’t see it as a gender issue, but I think UNGEI is doing quite good work in that sense, advocating on the issue.”

UNGEI EAP has commissioned three case studies (in Malaysia, Mongolia and Thailand) on ‘Why boys are doing poorly in school?’, with preliminary findings from these studies written up in the May 2011 issue of the newsletter. As with other case studies in the EAP region, they will be disseminated throughout the region.

Several informants spoke of the importance of the work of mainstreaming to their own organization, which, while keen to mainstream gender into various frameworks they had found quite challenging. As one notes: “There is a demand and a realization that these types of studies are necessary, because in a way everybody knows of the absolute importance to capitalize on more gender-sensitive projects and programmes and there are many gender specialists, gender experts, but it is still not something easy to mainstream throughout the programmes, and so what is hoped by everyone is that the actions of UNGEI help mainstream gender in such a way that we often discuss it in terms of aggregate value of actual dollars and cents because of employment.” Another person spoke about the statistics that are available in the various reports: “I think that the statistics are regularly updated and presented systematically, and there is an easy way to search for information on the website... good in terms of the way it is packaged.”

3.2.3 The influences of the changes

To what extent are various organizations in the region incorporating the work on evidence-based advocacy into their planning? Several informants noted that studying the outcomes of the partnership is an issue for many international organizations operating at the regional level. Given the diverse ways that issues of girls’ education and gender equality are being taken up in the region, it is perhaps one area where UNGEI could take a lead in relation to developing strategies for studying utilization, since it clearly follows from the work on various ‘knowledge and evidence' initiatives, such as the evidence-based advocacy workshops and materials. A member of the senior management of one of the international NGOs commented: “Countries in the region are very different – we have countries with Islamic traditions, other countries heavily influenced by Confucianism – UNGEI offers a type of convergence. Countries all recognize the importance and they want to try to incorporate this feature (gender) in their legal system. It’s going to take some time for some countries.”

New knowledge-management systems are currently under development by UNGEI EAP. An ‘in progress’ initiative on knowledge management is the Girls’ Education Mapping Exercise (GEME) tool that is being developed as a database/knowledge management tool. A presentation on how the tool could work and how the various ministries of education in the region as well as the regional partners and other stakeholders could use it was given at UNGEI EAP.
The policy-tracking exercise described under Document Analysis in the Methodology section of this report (see chapter 2 and also Annex 3), which drew on an Internet search, revealed that for the most part, where UNGEI was the publisher of a document, it had a substantially lower number of hits than its partners (i.e., UNICEF and the United Nations Development Programme [UNDP] in particular). However, there are a number of smaller NGOs and individuals (bloggers) showcasing UNGEI and partner published documentation, and it would be advantageous for UNGEI to track these particular websites to determine their interests and the purpose for doing so as a way of studying patterns of communication and reach, and as an important entry point to seeing how the various knowledge pieces can inform the work of stakeholders. As one informant commented: “In terms of contributing to systematiz[ing] the knowledge in the region regarding how to deal with access to girls’ education and quality, especially thinking about minority groups... the best practices component is good, but what I would like to see also is a much stronger linkage between the good practices and the rolling out of these on a larger scale.”

3.2.4 Contribution of UNGEI itself to changes in relation to institutional frameworks

UNGEI seems to be a key player in ensuring that institutional frameworks are influenced by knowledge and evidence. However, it is important to note that UNESCO and other organizations also continue to work on girls’ education initiatives on their own. The commissioned studies and evidence-based advocacy initiatives developed and promoted by UNGEI carry with them credibility based on the collaborative work of several partners all contributing to one product.

3.2.5 Assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs into influencing institutional frameworks

As with the discussion on policy dialogues, there seems to be a clear sense that the commissioning of the various studies and the implementation of the Evidence-based Advocacy workshop are highly relevant to what has been identified as a need in the region through EFA and the MDGs in relation to providing evidence. There has also been a key theme running through the region that there needs to be greater support for decision-making based on evidence. The fact that several countries identified that they would like to take part in the follow-up ‘Making Education Work’ study suggests that countries in the region see the relevance of the work.

Several indicators help to frame the overall assessment of the effectiveness of Outcome 2: the number and type of knowledge and evidence-based practices documented and disseminated; the number and type of critical issues identified in relation to institutional frameworks; the nature of UNGEI contributions to knowledge- and evidence-based practices; and the durability of contributions over time. The specific initiative on evidence-based practices, which has been based on workshops at the regional level and then in several countries in the region, is probably the best example of a practice that has contributed to the institutional agenda of partners and education ministries. This was highlighted in a workshop that was carried out in Papua New Guinea in May 2011. Durability is more difficult to assess because the initiative began recently.
It is difficult to assess the efficiency of the initiatives since it is difficult to know what else could have happened. What is critical, though, is that the various partners also report within their own structures. The fact that sometimes as many as 11 or more of the partners are all willing to collaborate on one study is significant. Additionally, even though the logos on the back of a report do not give an indication of the relative ‘balance’ of support, there seems to be a sense on the part of partners that this is an efficient way to operate. Various partners also spoke about the fact that there is greater coherence to the messages delivered on girls’ education and gender equality.

### 3.3 Outcome 3: UNGEI EAP facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality

#### 3.3.1 Before UNGEI

Prior to UNGEI, SEAMEO provided some leadership in relation to partnerships more generally. Indeed, a conference organized by SEAMEO (with UNESCO) in 2004 highlighted the significance of partnerships in education, and although there is little indication that this work pertained to girls’ education (rather it was linked to inclusive education), the role of SEAMEO highlights the importance of partnerships.

#### 3.3.2 Since the formation of UNGEI

Interviewees spoke extensively about the nature and benefits of the partnership. Key points related to its informality, flexibility and action orientation (e.g., presence of intense discussions, a shared vision, excellent communication through newsletter and regular minutes, and now a Facebook and Twitter presence). Clearly, the idea of coordination is critical to keeping girls’ education and gender equality on the agenda.

The partnership has increased in size over time, and its composition has also changed, with representatives of partner organizations coming and going. More formality and structure have also been introduced. For example, for the past several years there has been an agreed-upon workplan established at the first meeting of the year. References to the increased structure (and satisfaction with this) were also revealed in discussions about various outputs, such as the newsletter. As one person who has been part of the partnership for several years noted: “It is much more transparent now... And we know what is happening because there is also an editorial board now (for the newsletter), which they didn’t have before. It (editing of the newsletter) was just random; the Chair would just draft it and send back the comments, and then he or she would revise it again and officially send it out and disseminate it. But now we have an editorial board for the newsletter, so there is much more of [a] structure within the regional group...”

At the same time, some members of the partnership also used a discussion about the newsletter as an indication of concern over who does what in the partnership. As one person commented: “We are sometimes struggling to get articles... [...] is such a great coordinator; she shouldn’t have to struggle and spend time chasing people down to get articles for the newsletter ... it becomes artificial. This would go for most newsletters that are out there.”
Another person commented on some of the institutional barriers related to being a member of the partnership. Again, using the example of the newsletter, several people commented on the process of getting something published in the newsletter as revealing of a challenge within the partner organizations themselves. One person commented: “... it is tricky to get an article published if you also have to get clearance from your organization first.”

Distribution of documents such as the newsletter was another concern that some members raised regarding the value of their participation in the partnership: “How far have we reached? Are we reaching the universities or it amongst policy makers? Are they more on Facebook or on Twitter these days?: they don’t go on websites anymore.”

Finally, the value of capacity building that is built into the partnership by virtue of who participates is worth noting. As one informant commented: “It is an extremely successful partnership and very much based on the individuals of the network. Really incredibly strong individuals from the different organizations, and they are all very open to collaboration, they are open to the idea of sharing, and they believe in the whole notion of capacity building. It is interesting because we have some senior, experienced [United Nations] professionals that live and breathe the UN, and then you have very young people that are welcomed and are learning from them, and are given responsibility and they are truly empowered. It is really capacity building the second generation of development workers involved in the same issues and sharing some of their expertise and experiences.”

### 3.3.3 The influence of the changes

One perspective on the partnership is to look at what can be accomplished by groups of organizations rather than individual organizations alone. Several informants commented on the power of the collective work of the partnership: “I think with some of the publications that have come out, the fact that they have come out represents something. Five years ago we wouldn’t have had agreement or consensus around what we are saying. We wouldn’t have had evidence to present those cases so in the investments we made, the step-by-step approach, the links between region and the country – these weren’t just written by a consultant sitting in a room dreaming it up.”

This strength in numbers was also considered an expression of credibility: “Well, my take is that it’s an advantage; it’s a strength because it gives added credibility to see that there is a strong partnership already amongst the various institutions involved. Putting UNICEF and ILO together is something that other agencies (UNDP) and others see as good. We all want to have joint projects and on the ground it’s always one of the most difficult things to do because we have our respective agendas, and it’s not for bad will but it is difficult – so I think UNGEI has this immense strength that shows at least one way in which it is possible to develop such synergies.” On this point, another informant commented on the strength of the partnership in relation to the value added and overall efficacy of individuals: “You are not alone. You have a lot of people who are interested and have passion to get something done. So in that sense the value-added part is there.”

The question, ‘what would happen if UNGEI ceased to exist?’, elicited many comments about the ways that organizations would still be looking at girls’ education and gender equality (regardless of
UNGEI), but the responses also highlighted the significance of UNGEI in relation to coordination, avoidance of duplication and overlap, a singular voice through joint statements (in relation to International Women’s Day and other events), and the ways that UNGEI can serve a leveraging function (catalytic funding) in terms of EFA. Informants who are members of the partnership brought up several issues about the partnership: ‘Should membership be expanded and should there be a more formalized structure?’ Some were in favour of this while others said what they liked best is the informal nature of the partnership: “People put more energy into it.”

### 3.3.4 Contribution of UNGEI itself to partnerships

A critical point on the overall effectiveness of the partnership relates to attribution and contribution, and the factors that might determine the extent to which various partners participate. This is not an easy issue, since indirectly it tackles whether partners might ‘hold back’ and put more of their resources into girls’ education and gender equality initiatives for which they will receive full credit. Additionally it brings up potential tensions such as what logos go on various UNGEI productions. Even the look of a publication might make it more associated with one organization within the partnership. This is an area that needs to be explored further, and is also an issue that could be informed by the study of other partnerships, such as the sector-wide approaches that developed in the 1990s (Clarkeokah, 2004).

There are, however, several points to be highlighted. UNGEI has contributed to capacity building of partners over time in taking on gender issues. Various partners spoke about the contribution of this work to their organizations more broadly, noting that they might not have been as attuned to issues of gender equality if they had not been a member of UNGEI. Partners have collaborated on conducting workshops, participating in International Women’s Day events and contributing to joint statements to mark these special days. There is little evidence that this took place prior to the establishment of UNGEI. There is a power of the collective in bringing about change. UNGEI has brought greater credibility to addressing issues of girls’ education.

### 3.3.5 Assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs into facilitating an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender

The partnership is addressing critical issues in the region. In relation to its overall effectiveness, there are two main indicators: degree of satisfaction of the partners and the number of organizations actively engaging in UNGEI activities. Overall, the partners expressed high levels of satisfaction with the partnership, although as noted above, their discussion of various outputs – such as the newsletter or the calendar – revealed some concerns about efficiency (are the documents reaching audiences? what influence are the calendars having?). The overall efficiency, as noted in other sections, is difficult to measure, since it was not possible to consider financial contributions. However, based on a consideration of human resources and what the partnership is able to achieve through the collaboration of various partners, it would appear to be efficient in its operations. The partnership continues to grow in size, and although not all partners attend meetings, the use of the newsletter, timely circulation of minutes, and Skype and email, all contribute to keeping members informed and involved.
4. Looking at the UNGEI partnership overall

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). Within this context, this chapter will examine how effective and efficient the UNGEI partnership has been by identifying the strengths and weaknesses, as well as the opportunities and threats, it faces.

4.1 Strengths of the UNGEI partnership

Overall, there are many strengths of the UNGEI partnership at the regional level. These include the following: (1) there is a loose structure which is kept informal enough to allow room for new members; (2) increasingly, it is managed within a strong communication structure; this is critical for a partnership where people ‘come and go’; (3) it is open to an emerging agenda where new issues such as information technology or ‘what about the boys?’ can be incorporated into the workplan; (4) the sheer enthusiasm of many of the representatives of the various partners is key; and (5) the very democratic operation of the partnership was also noted as a key strength.

New participants spoke about how welcome they felt and how much they appreciated the low-risk environment for speaking about gender equality and girls’ education at a time when such issues may be more controversial within their own organization. The strength of leadership through the current Regional Focal Person was referred to many times and it is clear that coordinating a successful partnership requires a very special set of skills. Although many informants offered suggestions for improvement, and several responding to the question of ‘what if UNGEI ceased to exist’ by offering that girls’ education and gender equality work would still go on, there was only enthusiasm for the continuation of UNGEI.

4.2 Weaknesses of UNGEI partnership

It is perhaps more straightforward to study the overall effectiveness of the partnership as an outcome area, and more difficult to study it in relation to the other two outcome areas (policy dialogue, and knowledge and evidence in institutional frameworks). This could be because of the relatively short timespan for many of the initiatives. Current partners (both new and long-term) spoke enthusiastically about the work of UNGEI EAP and its relevance to the work of their organization. Former partners and others that are no longer involved or are only involved in a limited way are not so aware of what is going on with UNGEI. It would be unfair to over-determine the reasons for their lack of involvement (task overload, shifting agendas of the organizations, different personalities), but two areas where more engagement would be critical would be in relation to reaching countries in the region and keeping girls on the agenda.

It is worth noting that SEAMEO, a partner which seems to be less involved in UNGEI, is an obvious direct line to countries, and UN-Women, again less involved in UNGEI at present, offers a direct line to deepening an understanding of the issues pertinent to girls and women. Notwithstanding the significance of boys and their access to education, it would seem anomalous that there may be less
concern about girls at a time when the global machinery for addressing women’s issues is expanding. Finally, several informants commented on the resources of UNGEI, noting that there is a ‘grey area’ when it comes to budgeting.

4.3 Opportunities for UNGEI partnership

The documents that UNGEI EAP has produced and the initiatives it has embarked on received widespread endorsement by those interviewed. One concern raised related to whether there might be greater emphasis on how such documents are being used, both within the region and at the country level. These comments were not so much about the actual outputs themselves as about the mechanism for influencing policy dialogue and institutional frameworks. Some informants pointed out that the work of UNGEI does not reach high-level talks and, for that reason, is going to have limited influence on policy dialogue. Others pointed out that UNGEI could draw more on social media and video productions. Given that UNGEI at the regional level has a high capacity to carry out strong research studies, to produce very sophisticated documents, and has excellent access to technology, it could become the ‘flagship’ for championing (implementing and monitoring) communication through information technology, since the region as a whole has good access to technology. The UNGEI EAP partnership has the potential to be the ‘communication leader’ through its use of information technology in getting the message out and tracking and improving the reach of products. To date, although the technology exists, it could be used in more effective ways to reach and communicate with countries in the region.

4.4 Opportunities for establishing an UNGEI partnership at the country level in the EAP region

Currently, UNGEI EAP is a regional initiative, and while there are activities taking place at the country level (including the participation of various countries in the case studies), and activities that draw on the participation of representatives from various education ministries (nine countries participated, for example, in the Evidence-based Advocacy workshop in 2010), there are no official UNGEI partnerships at the country level in the region. Beyond a consideration of the overall effectiveness of the current partnership at the regional level, what is the potential for partnership in the EAP region with one or two selected EAP countries? This is a critical question because it speaks to concerns about the reach of UNGEI into the countries of the region more directly. It is also something that was considered important by many of the informants. As one person commented, “We are not as robust in terms of countries as other regions, and it is because of how we started, and the pressure from New York which was exerted by the donors themselves, to say we want to see more stuff happening at the local level. We thought if we tried to plant the UNGEI banner, it would backfire, it will be counter-productive, so there is actually quite a lot going on that we could lay claim to – but could we do things like form a collective of gender focal persons from the various ministries? That would help.”

While there may be a number of different entry points for considering an UNGEI partnership at the country level in the region, Papua New Guinea serves as an illustration of the social and political environment and structures that would make such a partnership feasible. It seems as though there
is already the dedication and energy of a number of ‘champions’ for girls’ education in the country. For example, through the support of the Commonwealth Secretariat (a member of the UNGEI Global Advisory Committee or GAC) and UNICEF, a three-member delegation of the Steering Committee of Accelerating Girls’ Education (AGE), a UNICEF-supported initiative in Papua New Guinea, attended the Dakar Conference in May 2010. Many of the issues that are central to the work of UNGEI in parts of Africa (e.g., gender-based violence, girls out of school, low status of girls) are greatly in evidence in the country, and so many of the mechanisms and activities of UNGEI at the regional level (evidence-based advocacy, support for the development of tools for gender audits), as well as issues such as gender-based violence within other United Nations organizations in the region, such as the Thematic Working Group on gender and UN-Women, are particularly relevant ‘on the ground’ in Papua New Guinea.

The country is also one of the few in the region that has a clear national policy on gender mainstreaming in education – the Gender Equity Strategy for the Education Sector – which was first developed in 2002, but which needs to be updated. Papua New Guinea is one of the five countries that have signed on to be part of the new ‘School to Work’ study (the replication and extension of the 2009 study). It is worth noting that a version of the Evidence-based Advocacy workshop, carried out in Bangkok in 2010, was held for the AGE Steering Committee members from the provinces on Evidence-based Advocacy for Gender Mainstreaming in Education (2–11 May 2011). There is evidence of commitment to systematizing work on girls’ education and gender. The Advisor for Gender and Education from the Commonwealth Secretariat also participated in this work. Clearly, a partnership requires partners, and the Commonwealth Secretariat, which is already part of UNGEI GAC, could be an important partner with UNICEF in Papua New Guinea. While there are very few education-focused donor agencies other than UNICEF and the Commonwealth Secretariat in Papua New Guinea (except for AusAID, which currently does not place much emphasis on girls’ education), emerging work (such as the proposed ‘Making Education Work’ study) and the presence of a university with a gender programme points to the potential for a country partnership. The Commonwealth Foundation (2008) study, ‘Girls’ Education: A foundation for development’, draws attention to other potential partners: World Vision, the Papua New Guinea Education Advocacy Network (PEAN) and ASPBAE, a PEAN ally.

4.5 Threats to UNGEI partnership

While there was strong endorsement on the part of the partners themselves to continue with the UNGEI partnership, it was not always clear that all informants were knowledgeable about the work of the partnership, even though they may themselves be working on issues of gender equality. This suggests that UNGEI should be working towards having a higher profile and having entry points at higher levels within the various regional bodies. As other girl-focused initiatives come into the region (e.g., the Adolescent Girls initiative of the World Bank and the United Kingdom Department for International Development’s Girls’ Education Challenge project), UNGEI EAP may need to re-establish priorities. Finding a path and staying on it (but not being too entrenched in one path) are also threats to the success of the partnership. The question, ‘what about the boys?’ is critical and very relevant to some sectors of some countries in the region. There is still, however, the need for
ensuring that governments do no leave out girls (again). Rural girls in many contexts and girls of particular ethnic groups remain to benefit from the work of UNGEI.
5. Conclusions

5.1 Contribution of UNGEI to changes around girls’ education and gender equality

It seems clear that UNGEI EAP is contributing to policy dialogue in relation to girls’ education and gender equality, and that it is also contributing to influencing institutional frameworks both for regional partners and for some countries within the region. The Evidence-Based Advocacy Workshop, which first took place at the regional level but which has been replicated in several countries, is a good example of how the work of a regional partnership can also reach the country level. Building on this success, UNGEI might wish to initiate some follow-up work that examines the extent to which participating countries are working with evidence-based advocacy following their participation in such workshops.

5.2 Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI

The issues being addressed by UNGEI respond to the priorities in the region, although as was evident throughout the evaluation, the sheer size and diversity of the region, coupled with the misperception on the part of some countries that there are no gender issues add to the challenges. New agendas, including ‘what about the boys?’, also contribute to the questions of ‘which issues?’ and ‘how does UNGEI maintain relevance among competing agendas?’

Overall, UNGEI is effective in its objective of establishing and maintaining a strong and growing partnership. At the level of working with regional partners and within regional structures, it is effective in promoting policy dialogue on girls’ education and gender equality and in ensuring that institutional frameworks and practices are informed by knowledge and evidence. At the level of being effective in relation to countries in the region, there is a need for further study. The strength of the partnership and its mechanisms suggests an efficient use of human resources (especially in relation to coordination). However, the absence of procedures and structures for studying the utilization of the various outputs of the partnership within the region points to the importance of further attention to the efficiency (funds, expertise, time) of the UNGEI EAP partnership.

5.3 Relationship with the country level of UNGEI

One of the greatest challenges to UNGEI EAP and its work is to see how policy dialogues are being fostered and institutional frameworks influenced at the level of the countries in the region. At present there is only one country that is being considered as a partner (Papua New Guinea). As noted in chapter 4, the regional partnership is in an excellent position to refine and further develop its communication strategies and tools in ways that could be responsive to countries in the region.

5.4 Relationship with the global level of UNGEI

UNGEI EAP participates in the regular meetings of the GAC. This involves reporting on the activities of the region and then reporting back to the region (and country level). Perhaps the greatest contribution of the regional UNGEI to the GAC is advising on the area of improving regional structures elsewhere.
6. Lessons learned

6.1 For UNGEI partnership at the regional level

6.1.1 Champions of girls’ education and gender equality

The regional partnership thrives through the work of its champions. It seems clear that unless there are ‘champions’ of girls’ education and gender equality, the overall effectiveness of the work is likely to be compromised. The strength of UNGEI EAP from the beginning has rested on passion and commitment, and this remains very evident.

6.1.2 Coordination

An effective partnership involving a substantial number of organizations, each with its own institutional demands, requires strong leadership and coordination. UNGEI EAP has that, although it would be important to explore how coordination is linked to influencing policy dialogue and institutional frameworks at as high a level as possible, within both the various United Nations sister organizations and other regional structures.

6.1.3 Communication

UNGEI EAP has a strong communication strategy. Good communication systems are critical, with prompt follow-up in relation to minutes of meetings, newsletters and so on. In a region that has strong technological resources, social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook and Google banners are important features of a communication strategy.

6.2 For UNGEI globally

6.2.1 Investing in regional partnerships

The overall success of the UNGEI EAP partnership in providing a platform for promoting policy dialogue and developing various tools and methods for influencing institutional frameworks offers a model in terms of the structures that need to be put in place. The Regional Focal Point structure of other regions could benefit from the success of UNGEI EAP. At the same time, the realities of country successes in other parts of the world could influence the working relationship of the EAP regional partnership at the country level.

6.2.2 Investing in communication structures

The successes and challenges of communication in the EAP region suggest that leadership could be offered at the global level to deepen an understanding of the most effective ways of using online network tools for improving social practices within organizations (Castells, 2010; Turkle, 2004, 2011). Although various global networks for disseminating information are being used, the question of ‘how’ and ‘with what effect’ remains under-examined. The focus of the UNGEI EAP partnership in producing high-quality documents makes it a perfect ‘testing ground’ for how best to study and refine the use of new technologies.
7. Recommendations

7.1 Recommendation 1: Intensify efforts to make UNGEI EAP ‘louder’ and ‘more strategic’

While there is widespread agreement that the policy dialogues and documents being produced are excellent, they need to feed more directly into higher-level policy talks within the United Nations structures and in concert with other agencies such as UN-Women.

7.2 Recommendation 2: Aim to have UNGEI EAP coordinated at as high a level as possible and in as neutral a way as possible

This recommendation follows from Recommendation 1 and speaks to the importance of strategic placement of UNGEI coordination. It needs to be at a level that will allow the coordinating structures to influence high-level coordinating structures of various institutions and to be seen as neutral as possible (i.e., perhaps not so clearly attached to UNICEF).

7.3 Recommendation 3: Study and improve the use of social media in the region as a whole for disseminating partner productions

UNGEI employs online network technologies to share knowledge, launch campaigns and dialogue with partners. However, there is a need for a clearer strategy (and resources) across the partnership regarding online technology and what is actually being used in terms of social media networks, online dissemination of texts, and monitoring how these texts are being used.

7.4 Recommendation 4: Conduct evaluation studies of how UNGEI EAP documents are being used

Notwithstanding the debates about whether a regional initiative should be reaching ‘into the region’ or should be reaching international players at the regional level (a debate that many regional partners said they struggle with, and therefore not unique to UNGEI), it would be worth carrying out an in-depth study of policy dialogue utilization (which would involve the various partner organizations engaging in their own study of how they are benefiting in their own work and in their own policy work).

7.5 Recommendation 5: Use partner structures to improve possibilities for policy dialogue at the level of countries in the region

Informants whose experience has been more at the country level recently (as well as partners working outside of Bangkok) spoke about the ways in which they had not been aware of UNGEI, but now that they are working at the regional level they see the value UNGEI could have at the country level, together with universities, local and international NGOs, civil society and the private sector. There is a need to study and mine these country-based perspectives as a way to develop a strategy and initiatives for dissemination.
7.6 **Recommendation 6: Make budgets and workplans more transparent and 'public' within the partnership as a component of addressing efficiency**

Most international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the region, including those that are UNGEI partners, have specific guidelines from their organizations for their own workplans and budgets. Some of these may preclude financial participation. This is an area that requires greater clarity when it comes to UNGEI workplans.

7.7 **Recommendation 7: Consider formalizing an UNGEI partnership with one or several countries in the region**

As noted in chapters 3 and 4, a limitation to the overall success of the regional partnership is the relative absence of reach to the country level. While this can be improved through the structures of the individual partners, having a formalized partnership with one or two countries expands the learning possibilities for the organization of UNGEI as a whole.

7.8 **Recommendation 8: Conduct a regional ‘re-visioning of UNGEI’ exercise**

The adage, ‘If it isn’t broken, why fix it?’ might apply to UNGEI EAP. The strengths of the partnership and the overall satisfaction of the partners with the mechanisms of UNGEI all point to a successful partnership. The well-developed communication structures, coordination mechanisms and verbal ‘buy-in’ from senior directors of international NGOs in the region are all strengths. Underlying some of what was said, though, is a sense of being able to do even more. UNGEI might wish to initiate some follow-up work that examines (a) the extent to which countries in the region are drawing on knowledge and evidence produced through the regional studies and documents; and (b) the extent to which policy dialogues and evidence and knowledge are feeding into high-level initiatives. A partnership re-visioning exercise could contribute to developing a strategy for doing this.
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF UNGEI

Under the supervision and guidance of the Education Specialist of UNICEF/EAPRO, the consultant will undertake the following specific tasks:

Participate in the global evaluation planning workshop in Cairo (23–27 January 2011) and the pre-workshop meeting (22 January 2011), and prepare for the regional evaluation in view of the global evaluation protocols;

Prepare an inception report following the guidance of the global lead evaluator;

Adapt, customize, review and validate data collection tools (questionnaires, interview questionnaires and protocols) to suit the regional-level evaluation of the UNGEI EAP partnership;

Undertake a desk review exercise, including a brief overview of gender in education activities in the EAP region and in countries with some form of partnership for gender and girls’ education;

Conduct the actual evaluation, which entails an in-depth assessment of the existing partnership at the regional level and the potential for partnership in one or two selected EAP countries;

Consult the regional reference group and regularly inform UNICEF regional evaluation adviser of the progress made; and

Submit the regional evaluation report with concrete findings, clear evidence-based conclusions and recommendations to UNICEF EAPRO for incorporation into the global evaluation report.
ANNEX 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY


Turkle, Sherry, *Alone Together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*, Basic Books, New York, 2011.


United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, ‘Regional Overview: East Asia and the Pacific’, UNESCO.


ANNEX 3: TRACKING POLICY: ONLINE TRACKING OF UNGEI DOCUMENTS

To address certain gaps identified as a result of interviews with UNGEI representatives and research of their administrative documentation, a method to track documents online was designed. A concern, for example, raised by the regional reference group in a consultative meeting during the fieldwork pertained to the extent to which the regional evaluation was an evaluation just of regional structures and outputs, or whether it could also capture something of the work of UNGEI in the countries of the region. While this is an issue that is not unique to international NGOs in the region, it is one that had particular resonance with people around the table in terms of advice on studying utilization and influence.

The online tracking method was used, therefore, to assess the online dissemination and online usefulness of the documents listed under the Resources section for the EAP region on UNGEI’s website (<www.ungei.org/resources/index_535.html>). Notwithstanding the limited time and resources available for conducting fieldwork for the evaluation, or the fact that at least in terms of policy, UNGEI at the regional level is about policy dialogue and not policy, this analysis raised some valuable questions:

1) What measures could be taken to try to track (or trace) specific UNGEI initiatives beyond the regional structures?

2) Where does a document go after it has been produced?

3) Who accesses it?

4) How is it used?

5) What was the purpose for using it?

These seemed to be particularly relevant questions underpinning the concerns about attribution and contribution that are often central to partnership studies.

Methodology

Phase one: One UNGEI document was identified throughout the interview process as the main resource, and was considered widely disseminated: ‘Making Education Work: The gender dimension of the school to work transition’. Originally, this document was selected as the main focus/impetus of the online tracking of the documents; however, it was considered to have very limited results. Therefore, all 17 documents listed in the Resources section for EAP on the UNGEI website were selected as primary resources for study.

A table was designed that listed each of the 17 documents, along with some key information about each one, including: title, type of document, and author/publisher.

Acknowledgement to Pamela Teitelbaum of McGill University, who piloted the methodology for tracking documents and who presented this to the global, regional, country evaluation team meeting, Montreal, Canada, June 27-29, 2011.
Criteria of the table design were established based on the needs identified. The first criterion established parameters for tracking these 17 documents. It set out to answer two key questions: 1) Where has it been distributed/displayed online (on the Internet); and 2) How it has been shared/used?

For the first question, the results are listed as online databases, news on websites, resource lists, or as references within a given document available online. For the results of the second question, regarding how documents were shared or being used, the focus was on where and how these documents were cited in documentation on a website or in scholarly work. The findings for both questions are listed in separate columns in order of results displayed as 'hits' on the Internet search engine.

A second criterion involved completing three separate searches for each document. The first search was on the main Google search engine <http://www.google.com>. The second and third searches were more targeted, and specifically related to searches using Google Scholar <http://scholar.google.com> and Google Blog Search <http://www.google.com/blogsearch>.

The third criterion for the online tracking tool ensured that each of the 17 documents was searched by title under each of these three engines separately. Each title was searched using a technical parameter that would limit the number of hits to each of the specific publications. Each title was searched in quotation marks with the date of publication in brackets to create limits to the search. In the table below, the number of hits for each document under each of the three search engines is listed under the title within the same column.

The last criterion was set to help address the time constraints for gathering data as well as to avoid redundancy. A maximum number of 10 search pages were searched regardless of the number of ‘hits’ that came up per document. Generally, any ‘hits’ after 10 pages provided redundant information.

**Phase two:** Interviews through email and Skype were also conducted with key UNGEI representatives working in the area of communication, as well as with several regional partners. The purpose of these interviews was to further explore critical issues related to UNGEI policy in relation to reaching various audiences.

Questions for those working most directly in the areas of communication and knowledge management included the following:

1. Which UNGEI documents have been most relevant to the work of your organization at the country level? Why?

2. How do you use the documents produced through UNGEI EAP? (e.g., who are the main users of these documents? Is there a difference regarding how you use hard copies and electronic copies? Do you access them through the website and download?)

3. Do you have any sense of how widely in use any of the UNGEI documents are within your organization at the country level?
4. What social media or other electronic channels do you use for communication in your organization? Are the UNGEI documents typically circulated through your organization's channels?

5. Are there any other thoughts you might have about how the UNGEI documents are circulated, or anything you would like to recommend?

**Results:** Some significant findings help to address some of the key questions identified earlier in this section.

**Online tracking**

First, for the most part, where UNGEI was the publisher of the document, it had a substantially lower number of hits than its partners (i.e., UNICEF and UNDP in particular). Second, it is unclear from this particular search what the intended audience is for most of these documents. Overall, there are consistently a handful of the same online databases that disseminate UNGEI documents through their websites. Some are partners of UNGEI (i.e., UNICEF, UNDP and UNESCO), while others are larger international organizations such as the World Bank, or online information-sharing networks with a thematic/global/regional focus, such as CRIN, or general knowledge-sharing sites such as ZUNIA and Pacific Archive of Digital Data for Learning and Education.

Third, UNGEI’s social media and Internet strategy for sharing documentation is unclear. There is no indication based on other evaluation documentation and the interviews conducted that these organizations are being strategically engaged by UNGEI for dissemination, other than their key partners.

Fourth, whether it is a question of institutional memory or resource allocation, the use of online technologies for dissemination of UNGEI documents does not seem to have a concrete focus, and therefore, it does not have as strong a presence as its United Nations counterparts. According to representatives from UNGEI, there is a definitive move towards strategic utility of these technologies, and a plan to develop a knowledge management strategy.

Finally, the results indicate that there are a number of smaller NGOs and/or individuals (bloggers) showcasing UNGEI and partner-published documentation; however, again, there does not seem to be any institutional knowledge about these particular players and how they would be beneficial to UNGEI policy work and knowledge-sharing strategies.

**Recommendations**

As noted by UNGEI representatives in the interviews, a Knowledge Management Working Group (KMWG) has been organized to address gaps and bottlenecks regarding the position of UNGEI as knowledge leader and influencer of policy regarding issues affecting girls’ education. KMWG is planning to develop a knowledge management strategy that will address a number of key areas related to dissemination of documentation, audience analysis and mechanisms that would capture knowledge sharing through the different activities taking place globally. The recommendations below are in response to the interviews and online tracking of documents, as well as an
understanding of what measures are currently being developed by UNGEI. They have been created to support and strengthen the existing work of the UNGEI Secretariat and its partners and to suggest some approaches to include in the new knowledge management strategy to assess and track how current technologies may benefit their work. Suggestions include the following:

- Given that UNGEI is planning to develop a new knowledge management strategy, it may prove useful for UNGEI to include an online technology strategy focused on social media initiatives that it is engaging with (i.e., the UNGEI Facebook page). Prior to doing so, it would be practical to incorporate an assessment of how social media is being used currently by UNGEI network members, as well as of its benefits and challenges and how it maintains, strengthens or grows the UNGEI global network.

- Set up an online database of documentation (i.e., reports, newsletters, policy briefs, minutes, etc.) requiring membership. It can include a tiered system in which the partners and collaborators have different access than general network member users (i.e., organizations, institutions, individuals). This closed, tiered system would also enable partners and collaborators to communicate through an intranet system, as well as share documents, meeting notes, ideas, etc. By creating this online database that requires tiered levels of membership and sign-in, UNGEI would create efficient opportunities to track not only ‘who’ and ‘what’, but also set up a system whereby it can track ‘how’ its documentation is being used. There is also potential to simplify ways of sending out information-gathering tools to its network members online for further evaluation of how documents are most useful, what members would find most interesting for their work, and what formats would be the most easily disseminated and accessible.

- It would be advantageous for UNGEI to organize an investigation that would include as participants these particular websites/individuals identified through the online tracking work, to determine their interests and purpose for disseminating and using the UNGEI resources. This can be achieved by tracking documents through the partners themselves via either another series of interviews or through online research and following up the positioning of a document on various websites reports and other types of documents.

- Given that UNGEI is planning to establish some more formal way of ensuring that its documentation is shared among partners and throughout the network, it would be beneficial to assess the advantages and limitations of the current partnership structure and to consider developing partnership policies that require the sharing of documentation online.

- Given the wealth of expertise and experience within each partner agency (i.e., UNICEF, UNDP, etc.) it would also be advantageous to put resources towards planning and implementing a consultation with various international organizations and United Nations branches on the effective use of technologies (i.e., to learn about how they are utilizing
technologies, what the benefits and costs are and how they are effective). This can be achieved through a series (two or three) of workshops or knowledge-sharing meetings.³

- Assess the socio-technical system⁴ of UNGEI and its network members to deepen the institutional memory of UNGEI and establish a more effective and efficient working environment. This would also strengthen its global network and help to identify and share best practices among all of the countries involved.

- If dissemination of documents, whether policy-based or knowledge-based, is a part of the main goal of UNEI, it would be worthwhile for its representatives to assess their programming strategy in order to review and possibly revise dissemination practices across the organization.

---

³ Whether it is called a meeting or a workshop, it should be a space where participants would work on related strategy from planning to implementation, and where knowledge experts participate in knowledge sharing and planning. A second meeting would discuss how UNGEI has developed a plan, and would feedback – a kind of brainstorming.

⁴ 'Socio-technical' is a term used to describe complex organizational interactions that acknowledge the relationship between technology and people within a specific context. The focus of examining a socio-technical system is on procedures and related knowledge, not specifically material technology (Kenyon, 1973).
ANNEX 4: UNGEI EAST ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REFERENCE GROUP

- David Clarke, Independent Consultant
- Silvia Cormaci, International Labour Organization, Timor-Leste
- Terry Durnnian, Save the Children
- Koto Kanno, Visiting Professor, Ochanomizu University (former Head of UNESCO, Kathmandu)
- Jon Kapp, DevInfo
- Ada Ocampo, Regional Evaluation Advisor, UNICEF Asia and Pacific Shared Services Centre
- Idit Shamir, UNESCO, Bangkok
### ANNEX 5: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SELECTED PARTICIPANTS AT FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS IN FIELDWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bang, Kristy</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boucher, Adrian</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catilio, Raquel</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Advocacy Campaigns ASPBAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coates, Anna</td>
<td>ESCAP, SDD Social Affairs Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognac, Matthieu</td>
<td>ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durnnian, Terry</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hakeem, Hameed</td>
<td>APPEAL Coordinator, UNESCO Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazleman, Malcolm</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ishikawa, Shoko</td>
<td>UN-Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kapur, Ashima</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, Gwang Jo</td>
<td>Director of Bangkok Office, UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krainiksh, Nanda</td>
<td>SDD, ESCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Krisensen, Sergio</td>
<td>Regional Director, Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanceta, Abigail</td>
<td>SEAMEO Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leotes, Helin</td>
<td>TWG-EFA Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lindberg, Johan</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mansukhani, Mika</td>
<td>UN-Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meyers, Cliff</td>
<td>UNICEF EAPRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miyazawa, Ichiro</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phongposob, Chanunda</td>
<td>Cisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phumtim, Goy</td>
<td>Communication Officer, UNGEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pizani, Moni</td>
<td>Regional Director, UN-Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Function/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raghavan, Chemba</td>
<td>Consultant, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rangsitpol, Ryratana</td>
<td>UN-Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santigul, Malisa</td>
<td>TWG-EFA Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singh, Anupama Rao</td>
<td>Regional Director, UNICEF EAPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soni, Tanushri</td>
<td>Regional Gender Specialist, PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, 14 March</td>
<td>Briefing: Maki Hayashikawa, Ada Ocampo, Goy Phumtim</td>
<td>UNGEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, 15 March</td>
<td>Malcolm Hazelman</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthieu Cognac</td>
<td>ILO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anapuma Rao Singh</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nanda Krainiksh, Anna Coates, Mikah Mansukhani</td>
<td>SDD, ESCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, 16 March</td>
<td>Cliff Meyers</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abigail Cuales Lanceta</td>
<td>SEAMEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemba Raghaven</td>
<td>Consultant, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chununada Phongposob</td>
<td>CISCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryrutana Rangitpol</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, 17 March</td>
<td>Ashima Kapur, Johan Lindberg, Adrien Boucher, Kristy Bang, Ichiro Miyazawa</td>
<td>UNESCO (APPEAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hameed Hakeem</td>
<td>UNESCO (APPEAL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwang Jo Kim</td>
<td>Director UNESCO Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helin Leotes and Malisa Santigul</td>
<td>TWG-EFA Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group meeting:</td>
<td>Reference Group meeting:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Cormaci</td>
<td>DEVInfo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Kapp</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Durnnian</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idit Shamira</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada Ocampo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| UNESCO meeting room     |                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friday, 18 March</th>
<th>Raquel Catilio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASPBAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sergio Kristensen       | Save the Children        |
| (Director)              |                          |
|                         | Save the Children office |

| Terry Durnnian          |                          |
|                         |                          |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanushri Soni</th>
<th>PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maki Hayashikawa</th>
<th>UNGEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Save the Children office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June</th>
<th>Sheldon Shaeffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Former Director of UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangkok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23 July 23</th>
<th>Maki Hayashikawa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 7: COMPLETED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

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 at global, regional and country levels

Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence

Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence

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

Monitoring criteria
Criteria for M&E of UNGEI goals:
- Number of girls and boys out of school
- Number of girls and boys completing primary education
- Girls’ and boys’ second level participation rates

Criteria for M&E outcome 1:1
- Number, type and scope of policy dialogues at regional level on girls’ education and gender equality
- Number and type of regional initiatives (e.g., participation in awareness activities)
- Revision of policy documents in the countries in the region in relation to gender and girls’ education
- Publications on girls’ education and gender equality circulating in the countries in the region
- Policy dialogues influenced the gender agenda of international NGOs in the region

Criteria for M&E Outcome 2:
Evidence of:
- Number and type of critical issues identified in relation to institutional frameworks
- Number and type of knowledge and evidence-based practices documented and disseminated
- Nature of UNGEI contributions to critical knowledge issues and knowledge and evidence-based practices
- Durability of contributions over time

Criteria for M&E Outcome 3:
- # of member organizations actively engaging in UNGEI

RESULT
IMPLEMENTATION

Participating in and systematically influencing regional EFA meetings; preparing technical materials; organizing conferences; engaging with other education sub-groups.

Inputs from national government
Research, seminars; database development
Bimonthly meetings; newsletters; website; dedicated communication officer; joint statements

Developing technical tools
Outputs from bilateral agencies

Input 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened

Output 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.1 Identifying and disseminating innovative practices
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened

Output 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.1 Identifying and disseminating innovative practices
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened

Input 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened

Input 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened

Input 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened

Input 1.1 National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
Output 2.2 Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks
Output 3.1 UNGEI partner capacity is strengthened
Output 3.2 Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced. GEI partner capacity is strengthened
# Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence

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

- What were the existing policies and policy dialogues to promote girl's education and gender equality?
- What were the key systemic issues with respect to policy change and decision-making?
- How much awareness existed at the policy level regarding girls’ education and gender-equality issues?
- What knowledge and information was available about girls’ education and gender equality? To what extent was this sufficient for decision-making?
- Were monitoring systems being used to inform decision-making around education policies, and around girls’ education and gender equality specifically?

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

**Outputs:**

### Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls' education and gender equality are in existence

1. What does the UNGEI regional-level partnership look like?
   
   a) When was it established? Who is part of the partnership? What roles do different members play?
   
   b) Does the partnership have terms of reference?
   
   c) Does it have an annual work plan? How is it drafted? How is it disseminated? What are the priorities/areas of focus of the plan? What are the key expected results?
   
   d) How are partnership activities monitored?
   
   e) Does the partnership have a communications strategy?
   
   f) Is the partnership part of other networks, broader regional institutional arrangements, etc.?

2. What types of policy dialogues were taking place and who were the key actors or players? Which issues where they addressing?

3. What were the contextual factors that enabled and constrained the setting up of the partnership and how did these contribute to the idea of policy dialogue as a key focus of the partnership?

4. What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at regional level provide in the policy context?

5. What would the story of a process and outcome policy dialogue look like? (Is it possible to trace or map the story of a typical policy dialogue?) How have the types of policy dialogues changed over time?

6. What overall policy changes have taken place in the various countries in the region in the education sector since the UNGEI partnership was established? What evidence is there that these are girl and gender sensitive? What examples are there of how UNGEI has influenced policymakers (from their perspective) and what examples are given by UNGEI partners of influence?

7. Has the partnership influenced the harmonization of institutional practices at the regional level and in the countries?

8. Are there new directions that should be taken up within policy dialogue around girls’ education and gender equality?

### Output 1.1

National and EFA progress reviews incorporate a gender analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls' education and gender equality are in existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global partnership relevant?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the design appropriate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the regional partnership relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the countries in the region?</td>
<td>Has knowledge and information about girls’ education and gender equality in education increased?</td>
<td>How does the volume of inputs by partners within UNGEI (time, transaction costs) relate to improvements in the sector policies and knowledge and information at the regional level, and how does this have an influence on the countries in the region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the global partnership appropriate to the work of the regional partnership?</td>
<td>Are policies and policy dialogues being informed by this knowledge and information?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?</td>
<td>Are national systems within the regional monitoring of girls’ education and gender equality in education regularly resulting in evidence-based policymaking?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What was UNGEI’s specific contribution to each of the above?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes:** What has been the effect of the regional partnership in addressing key issues around gender and the participation of girls in education, thereby advancing the agenda on girls’ education in the countries in the region?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What effect has UNGEI regional partnership had on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number, type and scope of policy dialogues at the regional level on girls’ education and gender equality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number and type of regional initiatives (e.g., participation in awareness activities)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revision of policy documents in the countries in the region in relation to gender and girls’ education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publications on girls’ education and gender equality circulating in the countries in the region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy dialogues that influenced the gender agenda of international NGOs in the region?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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?
- What are the main risks to sustainability?
### Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence

9. What does the UNGEI regional-level partnership look like?
   
   g) When was it established? Who is part of the partnership? What roles do different members play?
   
   h) Does the partnership have terms of reference?
   
   i) Does it have an annual work plan? How is it drafted? How is it disseminated? What are the priorities/areas of focus of the plan? What are the key expected results?
   
   j) How are partnership activities monitored?
   
   k) Does the partnership have a communications strategy?
   
   l) Is the partnership part of other networks, broader regional institutional arrangements, etc.?

10. What types of policy dialogues were taking place and who were the key actors or players? Which issues where they addressing?

11. What were the contextual factors that enabled and constrained the setting up of the partnership and how did these contribute to the idea of policy dialogue as a key focus of the partnership?

12. What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at the regional level provide in the policy context?

13. What would the story of a process and outcome policy dialogue look like? (Is it possible to trace or map the story of a typical policy dialogue?) How have the types of policy dialogues changed over time?

14. What overall policy changes have taken place in the various countries in the region in the education sector since the UNGEI partnership was established? What evidence is there that these are girl and gender sensitive? What examples are there of how UNGEI has influenced policymakers (from their perspective) and what examples are given by UNGEI partners of influence?

15. Has the partnership influenced the harmonization of institutional practices at the regional level and in the countries?

16. Are there new directions that should be taken up within policy dialogue around girls’ education and gender equality?

---
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### Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance:</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 sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness:</strong> To what extent did UNGEI contribute to placing gender equality and girls’ education on the agenda of ministries and international NGOs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Efficiency:</strong> How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls' education and gender equality are in existence

- Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the regional partnership relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the countries in the region?
- Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the global partnership appropriate to the work of the regional partnership?
- Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?
- Has knowledge and information about girls' education and gender equality in education increased?
- Are policies and policy dialogues being informed by this knowledge and information?
- Are national systems within the region monitoring girls' education and gender equality in education regularly resulting in evidence-based policymaking?
- What was UNGEI's specific contribution to each of the above?
- How does the volume of inputs by partners within UNGEI (time, transactions costs) relate to improvements in the sector policies and knowledge and information at the regional level, and how does this have an influence on the countries in the region?

### Outcomes: What has been the effect of the regional partnership in addressing key issues around gender and the participation of girls in education, thereby advancing the agenda on girls’ education in the countries in the region?
**Outcome 1.1 Policy dialogues that promote girls' education and gender equality are in existence**

What effect has UNGEI regional partnership had on:

- Number, type and scope of policy dialogues at regional level on girls' education and gender equality?
- Number and type of regional initiatives (e.g., participation in awareness activities)?
- Revision of policy documents in the countries in the region in relation to gender and girls’ education?
- Publications on girls' education and gender equality circulating in the countries in the region?
- Policy dialogues that influenced the gender agenda of international NGOs in the region?

**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?
- What are the main risks to sustainability?
## Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence

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

- What discussions were taking place at the regional level about girls’ education and gender prior to the UNGEI partnership?
- What institutional frameworks and practices were informed by gender equality? In what areas?
- Was knowledge and evidence being used to inform institutional practices and frameworks?

**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 institutional frameworks and practices have been informed by the work of UNGEI?
- How are these being documented? Who are the key audiences being targeted?
- To what extent are these institutional frameworks and practices contributing to decision-making around policies? What specific frameworks and practices have been most influential in informing policies/priority setting?
- What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, technical support, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at the country level provide in facilitating knowledge and evidence towards institutional frameworks and practices?
- What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to the identification and dissemination of best practices? How widely are these known?

**Outputs:**

- **Output 2.1**
  Identifying and disseminating innovative practices
- **Output 2.2**
  Emerging issues in gender in education identified and prioritized in institutional frameworks

**Relevance:** Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global partnership relevant? Was the design appropriate?

**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.)
**Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness:</th>
<th>Efficiency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did UNGEI contribute to knowledge-based and evidence-based institutional frameworks and practices?</td>
<td>How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the regional partnership appropriate to the priorities of the sector and of the country?
- Were the objectives of the UNGEI support from the global partnership appropriate to the work of the regional partnership?
- Are critical knowledge issues that could contribute to institutional frameworks identified?
- Are knowledge-based and evidence-based practices documented and disseminated?
- What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?
- How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transaction costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of the use of best practices in policy and programming?

**Outcomes:** What has been the effect on decision-making and priority setting? Do these reflect knowledge and understanding of best practices?

**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?
- What are the main risks to sustainability?

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

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero? What was happening before the UNGEI partnership was put in place?
### Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence

- Were there coordination efforts around girl’s education and gender equality at the country level? How did this function? How effective was it?

- Was coordination around girls’ education and gender equality at the country level taking place in the context of other more general education groups? How did this function? How effective was it?

- What were the main capacity constraints with respect to girls’ education and gender equality? Were there any systems/efforts in place to address these?

**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?

**Outputs:**
### Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence

- How has coordination and partnership around policy dialogue related to girls’ education and gender equality evolved?
- Who has been involved?
- Have clear priorities been established?
- Has an agreed-upon action plan been developed to guide the collective and individual work on girls’ education and gender equality?
- How effective have coordination and partnership efforts been?
- In what key areas, if any, has capacity been strengthened?
- What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, technical support, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at the country level provide to strengthen partnerships and coordination?
- What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to strengthen partnerships and coordination? How widely are these known?
- What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were ongoing? How did these influence partnerships and coordination efforts? In what way were they complementary to UNGEI’s work?

### Output 3.1

Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced.

<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, and intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness:</strong> To what extent did UNGEI contribute to building a more effective partnership for girls’ education at the country level?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency:</strong> How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the regional partnership appropriate to the priorities of the sector and of the country?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were the objectives of the UNGEI support from the global partnership appropriate to the work of the regional partnership?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has the size and dynamic of partnership arrangements for girls’ education and gender equality evolved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there more and better opportunities for capacity building? Are these being used by partners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is there evidence of better joint planning and priority setting at the country level? Is there a clear joint agenda?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transaction costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of stronger partnerships and improved capacity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes:** What has been the effect on the quality of partnerships?

What effect has UNGEI had on:

- The number of member organizations that are engaged in UNGEI’s activities?
- The degree of satisfaction of member organizations?

**Sustainability:** Are the changes that took place in terms of knowledge and institutionalization of best practices likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2: Institutional frameworks and practices informed by knowledge and evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How durable are the improvements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What are the main risks to sustainability?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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