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Executive summary

Background and purpose of the evaluation: The importance of girls’ education is no longer a subject for debate; research has clearly demonstrated the relationship between women’s education and the economic development, health and education of their children. Girls’ education has become an area of concern for international and national leaders, as evident in their commitments to Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Yet, many girls are still either out of school or fail to complete their schooling for a variety of reasons.

These persistent challenges led to the launch of the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) in April 2000 by then United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. In Uganda, UNGEI was launched in 2004 as an overarching multi-stakeholder response that would set forth a context-specific development road map for girls’ education in the country.

This report forms part of a broader study commissioned by the UNGEI Secretariat in New York to document UNGEI experiences in four countries – Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda – as well as capture the work done at regional and global levels.

The overall goal of this evaluation was to ascertain the contributions of UNGEI in:

- Promoting girls’ education, especially with regard to the gender-responsiveness of education policies;
- Establishing policies regarding the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school;
- Identifying, documenting, disseminating and institutionalizing ‘good practices’; and
- Promoting effective partnerships.

The findings will not only provide a baseline for benchmarking progress, but will also feed into future efforts to improve the design of UNGEI and strengthen its implementation in Uganda.

Evaluation process and methodology: A data collection strategy involving documentary review, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions was employed in a mutually supportive manner. Contribution analysis was then applied to gauge the contributions of UNGEI in the achievement of the outcomes.

Context: Despite the remarkable economic transformation seen in recent years, Uganda is still ranked 161 out of 187 countries on the 2011 Human Development Index prepared by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The country is characterized by low per capita incomes, high population growth rates (3.2 per cent) and poor service reach.

While Uganda has made commendable progress in providing access to schooling – as evident in the massive increase in enrolment after the introduction of universal primary education and universal secondary education – the quality of education remains inadequate. Moreover, considerable inequalities persist based on regional, social and gender divides.
Girls, particularly those living in rural areas, continue to lag behind their male counterparts in nearly all access, quality and efficiency indicators. For instance, although the net enrolment rate rose from 86 per cent (89 per cent for boys, 82 per cent for girls) in 2000 to 93 per cent (96 per cent for boys, 90 per cent for girls) in 2009, completion remained low. In 2000, the completion rate was 63 per cent (71 per cent for boys and 55 per cent girls), but this dropped to 52 per cent (55 per cent for boys and 48 per cent for girls) in 2009. In addition, girls constitute the largest proportion of out-of-school children and lag behind boys in performance on national examinations. The dwindling completion rate is attributed to class repetition, which is estimated at 11 per cent, and to school dropouts, estimated at 6.7 per cent.

**Status of UNGEI in Uganda:** UNGEI Uganda has a three-tier management structure spanning the national, district and sub-county/community levels. A Gender Task Force, District Advisory Committees and Camp Education Committees provide strategic guidance on girls’ education within their areas of jurisdiction. Despite being a fairly inclusive multi-stakeholder partnership, UNGEI Uganda largely remains a loose coalition of non-committal partners. It has no Secretariat or physical office space of its own, and a rather amorphous administrative structure that leaves room for divided loyalties and nearly non-existent coordination between national, district and community levels.

**Key findings:**

- **Contribution to gender-responsive policies:** The exclusive UNGEI focus on girls’ education has helped raise the level of policy dialogue between the Government of Uganda, providers of girls’ education and beneficiaries. It has also increased gender consciousness and the prominence of girls’ education in the education policy discourse. UNGEI has become a key player in Uganda girls’ education policy development. Although the government-led Universal Primary Education (UPE) policy has improved enrolment, UNGEI contributions are evident in attendance, retention and completion. For instance, in 2003, a year before the launch of UNGEI, 66 per cent of boys and 47 per cent of girls completed the first seven years of primary school; the following year there was an increase in the completion rate, to 72 per cent for boys and 54 per cent for girls.

- **Policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school:** Although there is still no policy to offer girls ‘another chance,’ the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES), in concert with UNGEI partners, is at advanced stages of resolving this policy gap. Even in the absence of a formal policy pronouncement, UNGEI and the MoES have put in place several initiatives, including radio talk shows, ‘school walks’ and school visitations to raise awareness on the importance of sending child mothers back to school. Such initiatives, together with circulars that MoES regularly sends to school administrators urging them not to expel pregnant girls from school, are starting to change the community mindset to embrace the rationale for re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers. UNGEI activities, however, have thus far been limited to the primary school level, sometimes to the disadvantage of girls at the secondary school level.

- **Good practices in girls’ education:** This is probably the area where the contribution of UNGEI is most noticeable. UNGEI is effectively providing a platform for broad stakeholder involvement in identifying good practices in girls’ education, sharing and advocating for their institutionalization, and for the pooling of resources for their scale-up. The key limitation UNGEI faces arises from a shortage of funds for scaling up and implementing good practices.

- **Strengthening partnerships:** As a pioneer partnership for girls’ education in Uganda, UNGEI significantly altered the dynamics for collaboration between participating partners, especially at
district and community levels. By avoiding parallel planning, programming and implementation structures, the UNGEI partnership is: (i) strengthening government systems and local capacities; (ii) enhancing government as well as local community ownership; and (iii) improving the quality and availability of gender-disaggregated data. The galvanization of a broad spectrum of partners, each with its own unique vantage point is, in itself, creating scope for synergy. Nevertheless, the low sense of ownership and collegiality, inadequate funding, differing policy and funding perspectives, disconnect between national and district levels, and non-regularization of UNGEI have undermined its visibility as a vibrant partnership.

Further, although the UNICEF regional office provided support and finances to map the partnership and conduct a gender audit during the initial stages of UNGEI Uganda, that support has declined over time. Linkages with the global level also appear to have waned.

In spite of these limitations, several factors have helped keep UNGEI Uganda afloat. These include: working to bringing the voices of various partners to a common planning table; using national Education for All (EFA) action plans and other planning/policy frameworks to ensure a policy fit; having clear terms of reference (TORs) and workplans; conducting advocacy and communication in a way that leads to a bottom-up social movement for girls’ education; engaging boys and men as strategic allies; and prioritizing girls’ education in all development activities.

Conclusions: Although UNGEI has contributed to the alignment of sector policy towards girls’ education and the consolidation of partnerships in girls’ education, its contributions to the outcomes are probably more discernible in terms of the identification, documentation, implementation and downstream institutionalization of good practices. However, the UNGEI concentration on the pre-primary and primary education sub-sectors exacerbates the ‘bottleneck effect’ at higher-level transition points.

Lessons learned: The most notable deductions that can be gleaned from the evidence gathered are that: (i) the limited resources of UNGEI seem to have a better catalytic effect when utilized at community and school levels rather than at national launches; (ii) behaviour change calls for participatory approaches and continual messages for reinforcement, with follow-up support and supervision, capacity building, increased resource inflows, intensified advocacy and social marketing to create receptivity – as well as monitoring and evaluation – backed by strong political will from the top; (iii) the engagement of children and youth in the partnership process is critical; and (iv) multi-sectoral interventions appear to have a higher chance for success in girls’ education, since many problems relating to girls’ learning lie both within and outside the education system.

Recommendations: Based on the conclusions above, UNGEI Uganda must: (i) revive its support and supervisory role over districts in order to strengthen the partnership at this level; (ii) organize meetings of different district UNGEI committees to enhance information sharing at that level; (iii) go beyond the narrow focus on pre-primary and primary education and pay more attention to the full delivery chain covering the entire education sector; (iv) include more partners/donors, including the private sector, in order to forge ahead with its scale-up agenda, which will in turn widen the UNGEI financial base; and (iv) revive its ties with UNGEI at regional and global levels.
1. Introduction

1.1 Background and purpose of the evaluation

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

Hence girls’ education, as a development issue, has been the concern of international and national leaders for several years. This is evident in the commitments made during the 1990 World Conference on Education for All (EFA) in Jomtien, Thailand, which were realigned at the Dakar World Education Forum of April 2000 and reaffirmed by the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In particular, MDGs 2 and 3 sought to ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, girls and boys alike, are able to complete a full cycle of primary education and that gender parity is achieved at all levels of schooling.

The relative but persistent ‘under-visibility’ and under-performance of girls in education prompted the launch of the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) in Uganda in December 2004, with the aim of correcting these disparities. UNGEI Uganda was launched in response to a call for Member States to adopt the initiative at the country level from United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan during the global launch of UNGEI in April 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar.

Statement of the problem: Since the creation of UNGEI in Uganda, the country has made improvements in narrowing the gender gap in primary and secondary school and is now on track in terms of achieving MDG 2 (see Annex 9). However, the findings of a 2008 UNICEF-commissioned evaluation of UNGEI revealed three disturbing trends in girls’ education in Uganda, namely:

- While there is near gender parity in access and attendance at basic levels of education, progress is uneven across regions and different levels of schooling;
- There is unequal treatment of boys and girls with regard to school processes, textbooks, subject choices, teachers’ attitudes and susceptibility to violence; and
- Girls’ and women’s education is more vulnerable to adverse circumstances such as poverty, conflict, natural disasters and economic downturns.

This could imply that the progress in girls’ enrolments in primary and secondary education has not been accompanied with gender-responsive policies. It could also mean that structural causes of gender inequalities that undermine female participation in education have not been adequately addressed. It may also signify failure to galvanize a critical minimum mass of partnership-based support required to advance the girls’ education agenda. These are the policy and practice gaps that UNGEI was initially
meant to bridge. The persistence of these gaps motivates an inquiry about relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of UNGEI.

1.2 Aims and objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of the formative evaluation of UNGEI is to establish the extent to which the UNGEI partnership in Uganda is achieving its intended outcomes, as well as the extent to which global and regional efforts are contributing to the partnership’s effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluation is anchored in a monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework, which highlights the following four outcome areas of UNGEI:

- Policies that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
- Policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers is in existence;
- Good practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized; and
- UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

The overall evaluation of UNGEI covers the engagement by UNGEI at global, regional and country levels. Four countries were selected for detailed case studies: Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda (a fifth country, Côte d’Ivoire, had to withdraw from the evaluation because of security concerns). At the regional level, the evaluation focused on East Asia and the Pacific. The evaluation 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 Uganda country study only. A separate overall evaluation report pulls together the findings from the evaluation as a whole.

It is anticipated that the formative evaluation will help UNGEI:

1. Map the status of the UNGEI partnership in Uganda;
2. Map the governance structure and administrative components of the UNGEI partnership in Uganda;
3. Validate outcomes to be achieved in order to move forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education;
4. Collect empirical baseline data against which progress in future evaluative works can be measured; and
5. Define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls’ education.
1.3 Scope of the evaluation

The current report documents how UNGEI has interacted with and contributed to education processes in Uganda, and how this has impacted – or is expected to impact – on girls’ education and gender equality in education. Thus, the Uganda evaluation will:

- Document what key changes have taken place in girls’ education and gender equality throughout time in the four outcome areas of UNGEI (gender responsiveness of education policies, policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls, good practices and effective partnership);
- 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
- 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, its operational mechanism, and its contributions to gender-responsive changes in the education sector. The evaluation focused on answering the following questions:

- What key changes have taken place in Uganda with respect to girls’ education and gender equality since UNGEI was formed, with a focus on the four 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 likely impacts of these changes?
- Are these changes sustainable over time?
- Does Uganda’s coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?

The evaluation will seek to determine if UNGEI has added value to results in girls’ education in Uganda. Since it is always difficult to attribute results to only one source of inputs, actions or actors, the evaluation will try, to the extent possible, to outline the contribution of UNGEI to overall results through a contribution analysis. This 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’ (before UNGEI)?
- What changed in the context over time (from before UNGEI until today)?
• What did UNGEI do (taking into account inputs from global/regional/country levels)?
• What inputs – (training, workshops, policy, evaluations, etc.) were provided by others?
• What were the outcomes?
• What were the contributions of UNGEI to the changes that took place in terms of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs?
• How sustainable are the changes that were brought about?

Thus, as emphasized in the Evaluation Guide, which was developed to ensure a consistent approach to the evaluation, the following key steps were involved:

1. Comprehensively mapping the situation at level zero;
2. Examining what changed in the environment;
3. Documenting inputs by stakeholders;
4. Documenting changes; and
5. 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 when 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, this assessment did not only examine outcomes, but also processes and structures that have been put in place, as well as how these influence or may influence future outcomes.

As stated in the evaluation TOR, the self-evaluation examined only activities/results that have been undertaken or achieved through collaborative efforts by the formal partnership (UNGEI). Activities that take place outside the UNGEI partnership arrangement – e.g., an international organization funding an activity implemented by the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) or a local non-governmental organization (NGO) – were excluded from the evaluation.

1.4 Structure of this report

This report is divided into nine sections. First is the Executive Summary, which is a synopsis of the entire report. The Introduction provides an overview of girls’ education globally and highlights some of the interventions made to improve girls’ education. The problem, purpose, objectives are then provided. The Evaluation process and methodology section shows the sample and data collection and analysis techniques. The fifth section is the Uganda context, which discusses the current demographic and governance status in Uganda. It also shows the education status, such as trends in enrolment, with a focus on girls’ education in Uganda, before highlighting the national response. A section follows this on the Establishment and evolution of UNGEI in Uganda, which describes the establishment and expansion of UNGEI in Uganda. It also shows the structure and management and includes an analysis of its vibrancy. The relationship between regional and global UNGEI is also presented in this section. The
seventh section presents the evaluation’s findings. This section shows the situation before the launch of UNGEI; the inputs and impact made by UNGEI; and, lastly, the contributions UNGEI is making with respect to the four outcomes. The section also highlights challenges hindering effective achievements of the outcomes. In the next section, Conclusions on the four outcome areas of UNGEI are provided. Lessons learned is a distillation of key issues arising from the study. Lastly, Recommendations for remedial action are provided. Relevant annexes have also been attached to facilitate cross-referencing.
2. Evaluation process and methodology

This chapter outlines the evaluation process and methodology. It discusses the various phases of the evaluation, the activities that took place, and the role of the Logic Model in the evaluation process.

2.1 The inception/preparation phase

The main output of the preparatory phase for the country evaluation was the production of the inception report, which provided a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and approach, and highlighted issues emerging from the preliminary desk review. The Uganda inception report was circulated on 25 February 2011. This ensured that the Evaluation Manager at the UNICEF office in Kampala and the specially established evaluation reference group had adequate time to provide feedback before fieldwork began.

The preparation phase for the UNGEI evaluation started with the consultant and the UNGEI chairperson in Uganda participating in the overall UNGEI Evaluation Orientation and Planning Workshop in Cairo from 23–27 January 2011. The purpose of the workshop was to ensure a common understanding of the objectives of the UNGEI Formative Evaluation, as well as to ensure familiarity by the evaluation team with the proposed methodology, evaluation framework, evaluation tools and products.

The number of people who participated in this preparatory workshop varied from country to country. Uganda was represented by two people, Nepal by three, Nigeria by four, and Egypt – the host country – by seven. These included national consultants, M&E specialists from UNICEF (evaluation managers), UNGEI focal persons and officials from the Ministry of Education (MoE). In addition, regional and international consultants, members of the UNGEI M&E working group, staff from the UNGEI Secretariat, and UNICEF staff from the East Asia and Pacific Regional Office, Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office and headquarters also attended the workshop.

2.2 Key activities undertaken during the preparation phase

The preparatory work for the Uganda evaluation commenced upon return from Cairo. The focus during this stage was on documentation review, fine-tuning the evaluation methodology and drafting field instruments. The key activities undertaken during this phase included:

- Study of the overall Evaluation Guide;
- Familiarization with the literature on girl’s education in Uganda;
- Reading of country documents on UNGEI;
- Identification of information gaps and key issues that required review and/or verification during fieldwork;
- Production of summary findings on UNGEI establishment, membership, structure, achievements and challenges;
• Finalization of sampling frame and list of respondents (stakeholder map);
• Preparation of data collection instruments – finalization of Uganda Evaluation Framework and logic model, drafting of interview schedules and focus group discussion guides; and
• Finalization of activity plan and timelines.

During the Cairo meeting, it was agreed that; a UNICEF staff member from headquarters would visit Uganda to provide support and brief the evaluation manager, who did not attend the Cairo meeting; and that data collection instruments would be piloted in Uganda.

**Visit by UNICEF staff:** This visit took place from 1–4 March 2011. The main purpose was to brief the evaluation managers and UNICEF on their roles in the evaluation. During this visit, several meetings, including three in which the consultant and author of this report participated, were held. These included:

• A meeting with UNICEF staff from the Education, and Social Policy and Evaluation sections (1 March 2011). During this meeting, the participants were briefed about the Cairo meeting, the roles of UNICEF, the Evaluation Manager and the Reference Group. The inception report was presented and feedback was received.
• A meeting with the Evaluation Manager (2 March 2011): During this meeting of three participants, the data collection instruments were discussed and adjustments were suggested. When the time came to pilot the instruments, they had therefore already been validated by the Evaluation Manager and UNICEF staff from headquarters and Uganda.
• A Gender Task Force (GTF) meeting (3 March 2011): There were 20 participants encompassing government ministries, donors and NGOs. During this meeting, participants were briefed about the UNGEI evaluation, the inception report was presented and feedback was provided. It was also during this meeting that the Reference Group was set up. A total of six people volunteered as members of the Reference Group.

The reference group provided guidance to the evaluation process. They reviewed and provided comments on the inception report, draft report and final report.

**Piloting data collection instruments:** This took place from 27 March to 1 April. From 27–29 March, the UNGEI international lead consultant accompanied the national consultant in undertaking the pilot. Thereafter, the national consultant and international consultant shared their experiences with the other consultants.

### 2.3 The logic model

A key tool for the evaluation was the Uganda Logic Model (see Annex 7), which was derived from the 2010—2014 UNGEI Uganda workplan. The model shows how UNGEI expects to reach its goals, linking outcomes (short- and long-term) to activities (the results chain) and to the vision and goals of the partnership. Since the evaluation aimed to assess the extent to which UNGEI outcomes have been achieved, the Logic Model provided guidance for this assessment process.
2.4 Validation of outcomes

Validation of the outcomes was undertaken during the planning workshop in Cairo. During this workshop, each participating country discussed and agreed on the outputs, outcomes and monitoring indicators (see Annex 7).

Further, the UNGEI Uganda workplan included a fourth outcome. This is an indication that the three global-level outcomes – namely: (i) ensuring that policies promote girls’ education and gender equality; (ii) regular review of progress and good practices; and (iii) strengthening partnership in promotion of Girl Child education – were found inadequate to move forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education in Uganda. If pregnancy among school girls continues to rise, it would affect the gains found in the other three outcome areas. Therefore, a fourth outcome – focusing on formulation of a policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers – was included.

2.5 Data collection methods

The UNGEI Evaluation Framework, modified for the Uganda context (see Annex 7), was used to obtain detailed information from members of the partnership.

Data collection involved critically examining the involvement of UNGEI partners and the operational efficiency in the partnership activities. The study adopted interactive stakeholder engagement approaches to data collection, including:

*Interviews:* Face-to-face interviews were held with UNICEF staff; officials from the MoE; officials from the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MoFPED); district education officials; and officials from the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) in Uganda. Interviews provided a unique opportunity to delve deeper and obtain clarifications on the key aspects of UNGEI Uganda, including its design, programming, TORs, workplans, achievements and challenges to date (see Annex 6 for a list of those who participated in the evaluation). The interview guide focused on partners’ contributions to girls’ education and to the partnership, as well as their perceptions about the impacts, effectiveness and challenges of the partnership.

*Focus group discussions:* These were held with UNGEI district and sub-county committee members, pupils and teachers. Such discussions afforded the consultant the chance to listen to UNGEI beneficiaries regarding their candid assessments of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, as well as shortcomings of the UNGEI process.

*Formal desk review:* Documentary analysis of UNGEI workplans, minutes of meetings, progress reports, research findings and other materials provided additional information critical for evidence-based reporting. The main focus of this review process was to ascertain the status of girls’ education, the contribution of UNGEI to broad educational policy, development of a policy on the re-entry of pregnant girls to school, identification and sharing of good practices, and effective partnership in girls’ education.
2.6 Sampling frame

UNGEI Uganda is composed of many affiliates, namely, the United Nations family, NGOs, community-based organizations (CBOs), teacher education institutions, civil society, the private sector and communities. Data were collected from all these members. Specifically, the following constituents participated in the study:

- Government agencies (MoES and MoFPED);
- Members of the United Nations family (UNICEF);
- Donors (Irish Aid);
- Civil society organizations – FAWEU, Karambi Action For Life Improvement (KALI), Kind initiative for development Uganda (KIND UG), Mpondwe Moslem Women Association and Bwimaniro Women’s Group, Kasese;
- Beneficiaries of the programme at the community and school level, including pupils and students; and
- UNGEI committees at the district level.

Apart from teachers and pupils, all of the participants from the UNGEI partnership at national, district, and sub-county/community levels were purposively sampled. Uganda is divided into six administrative levels: village, parish, sub-county or municipality, county, district and national. A sub-county is the third administrative level, after village and parish. The districts were purposively selected to ensure representativeness in terms of:

- Their categorization as having ‘well’ functioning or ‘poorly’ functioning UNGEI committees (based on UNGEI reports from 2010);
- Their efforts to roll out UNGEI to the sub-county and lower levels; and
- Their regional location.

Basing on the above criteria, the districts of Abim (in the northeast, with well-functioning committees), Lira (in the north, with poorly functioning committees), and Kasese and Kyenjojo (in the west, with well-functioning committees that have rolled out UNGEI to the sub-county level) were selected. Such purposive sampling allowed for differential analysis of UNGEI performance across the districts and between the districts and national-level UNGEI partnerships.

The list of organizations and individual respondents who were interviewed and with whom focus group sessions were held is included in Annex 3.
2.7 Fieldwork

The data collection process progressed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16–22 March 2011</td>
<td>National-level data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March–1 April 2011</td>
<td>District-level data collection (Kasese and Kyenjojo districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–8 April 2011</td>
<td>National-level data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 April 2011</td>
<td>District-level data collection (Abim and Lira districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–22 April 2011</td>
<td>National-level data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Regional-level data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first half of the first week of data collection, the consultant was accompanied by the international lead consultant for the UNGEI evaluation. Thereafter, the consultant collected data from the remaining stakeholders. At the district level, the consultant met district education officials, women’s groups, teachers, head teachers and pupils.

2.8 Data analysis

Content analysis techniques involving line-by-line perusal of field notes, transcribed interviews and focus group discussions were applied. Data were coded with a view to generating patterns, categories or generalizations. Coding addressed the contribution of UNGEI to the formulation of more gender-responsive educational policies; determining policy for the readmission of pregnant girls/child mothers; identification and dissemination of good practices for girls’ education; and, enhancing partnerships in girls’ education and gender equality. Discrete pieces of data are continually perused and compared with a view to generating patterns, categories or generalizations, particularly to get a better understanding of the effectiveness of the partnership, as well as factors responsible for the differential impact of UNGEI between the ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ UNGEI districts, and UNGEI at national, district and sub-county levels. A comparative analysis of the results helped to improve the understanding of what works and what doesn’t work as far as promotion of gender parity/equality in education is concerned.

**Quality assurance:** Continuous review by the officer from the Social Policy and Evaluation section of UNICEF, the reference group and the international lead consultant helped to moderate the data collection and analysis and ensure overall quality reporting.

2.9 Methodology limitations

The evaluation results should be interpreted within the context of the following caveats:

- **Lack of objective measures of UNGEI outcomes:** While evidence-based reporting is necessary, it was statistically difficult to quantify desirable outcomes of UNGEI activities. For instance, if, as a result of a particular UNGEI intervention, girls learn to say no to early marriage, this attitudinal
change cannot be precisely quantified in numerical terms. Therefore, it is necessary to view UNGEI as a social movement that addresses issues of social change and whose contributions and successes can only be measured subjectively.

- **Unreliability of the national statistics**: The use of aggregate national education statistics to try to monitor and decipher the impact of UNGEI activities in Uganda encounters several major problems. First, the few districts in which UNGEI is concentrating its work are those with the lowest education performance indicators in the country. They are not reflective of the situation in the country as a whole. This undermines the ability to compare the evaluation findings. Second, even when UNGEI could have brought about improvements in girls’ access to and achievement in education in these few disadvantaged target districts, that impact would not be noticeable at the national level. Lastly, data on pregnant girls and child mothers who have returned to school are not available, even at the district level, apart from a limited amount of isolated school-level data. This makes it difficult to ascertain the impact UNGEI could be making in this area.

- **Inadequate records**: The desk review was constrained by poor record-keeping. Records from the time UNGEI was launched were difficult to obtain, as only a few, mainly from 2008, were available and obtained from some of the partner organizations. Although mapping of all the organizations focusing on girls’ education was undertaken, no report on this was available.

- **High staff turnover**: In all of the UNGEI partner organizations, the staff that was on the ground when UNGEI was launched had left those institutions. As a result, it was not easy to get in contact with them. This, together with inadequate records, created difficulties in piecing together UNGEI activities at the national level.
3. Context In Uganda: Background and the education sector

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

3.1 Uganda: Background

Socio-economic profile: According to the Human Development Index, Uganda is classified at 161 out of 187 countries, marking it as a country with low human development. Uganda’s population growth rate of 3.2 per cent is among the highest in the world (Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2007). The majority of the population is female (51 per cent) and falls within the bracket of younger than 15 years of age. The dependency ratio (i.e., the share of those 0–14 years old and older than 65 years old as a share of those aged 15–64) is, once again, among the highest in the world. This overextends the government in its bid to provide basic social services, including education. Yet, all is not lost. The Ugandan economy has been remarkably transformed in recent years following a series of developments that have restored macro-economic stability and have led to marked reductions in poverty levels. Uganda is actually on track to meeting the MDG of halving poverty by 2015 (National Development Plan (NDP), 2010).

Governance and women’s empowerment: In 2006, Uganda reintroduced a multi-party political dispensation after nearly two decades of the no-party democratic model of the National Resistance Movement government. The country’s constitution recognizes women’s right to political participation. The Equal Opportunities Act of 2007 and the Uganda Gender Policy provide a legal framework for inclusiveness and representation in all public offices. These have steadily increased the share of women who take part in political decision-making at all levels of society. The share of women in the national parliament has, for instance, increased from 18 per cent in 2000 to 33.2 percent in the eighth parliament (2006–2011). The numbers of women in the current cabinet increased from 15 in the last parliament to 24 in the current (The Monitor Newspaper, 2 June 2011).

3.2 Uganda’s education sector

Policy profile: Education in Uganda is divided into three levels: primary (seven years), secondary (lower – four years and upper – two years), and tertiary and university (two to five years). The Government of Uganda launched a policy of universal primary education (UPE) in 1997, and universal post-primary education and training as a major policy initiative in 2006. In 1998, the MoES developed and launched the Education Strategic Investment Plan (ESIP) 1998–2003 as its development framework for education, with UPE as the primary focus. The Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2004–2015 was prepared in 2003 and revised twice; the current government strategy for education is the ESSP 2010–2015. The ESSP commits the government to ensure that universal access to primary education is the highest sector priority. It targets the
removal of financial impediments to that objective, and focuses attention on improving regional and gender equity (Magona, 2009).

**Institutional framework:** The key decision-making body is the MoES Top Management Meeting, which has exclusive MoES participation and provides oversight and assurance for the ESIP/ESSP. The Education Sector Consultative Committee (ESCC) provides the main consultative forum on education strategy, policy and financing. It meets every two months and has the participation of MoES, MoFPED, Ministry of Public Service, Ministry of Local Government, main education institutions, education development partners (EDPs), civil society and the private sector (MoES, 2009), and is chaired by the Permanent Secretary. The MoES Planning Department functions as the Secretariat. A third level consists of a series of Technical Working Groups relating to the education sub-sectors and crosscutting issues (e.g., financial management, sector policy and management, and M&E), and which provide technical inputs to the work of the ESCC. These mechanisms have also been the basis for donor coordination through the EDPs.

**Trends in resource inflows:** Education sector expenditures have increased substantially since 1997. The increment was especially evident following the launch of UPE in 1997, when such spending averaged 17 per cent of yearly government expenditure in real terms. With the introduction of UPPET in 2006, allocations to the education sector increased by 33 per cent during two financial years. In nominal terms, the increases in education appear particularly dramatic – with allocations increasing from 250 billion Uganda shillings in 1997/98 to 900 billion Uganda shillings 2008/09 (Overseas Development Institute (ODI), 2008).

Despite this increase, education sector expenditures have declined as a share of government expenditure throughout the past 12 years, initially from 24 per cent in 1997/98 to 22 per cent in 1999/00. Until 2005/06, the share remained stable at between 21 per cent and 22 per cent. Since 2006/07, despite the introduction of Universal Secondary Education (USE), the share of education spending has decreased to 17 per cent, as the overall government priority has shifted towards productive sectors (ODI, 2008).

Four major weaknesses in operational efficiency persist: leakages of resources between central government and schools (e.g., ghost teachers, misuse of UPE grants to districts); leakages of resources within schools (e.g., high rates of absenteeism by pupils, teachers and head teachers); deployment of teachers across districts in a way that is unrelated to measures of need; and inefficient allocation of resources within government schools (e.g., large class sizes in early grades and lower sizes in higher grades) (ODI, 2008).

### 3.3 Girls’ education in Uganda

The introduction of UPE in 1997 significantly increased access to primary education for both boys and girls. The total enrolment rate tripled from about 2.7 million in 1996 to 8.2 million in 2009. The net enrolment rate (NER) also progressed, from 86 per cent (89 per cent for boys, 82 per cent for girls) in 2000 to 93 per cent (96 per cent for boys, 90 per cent for girls) in 2009 (see Table 1 below) (NDP, 2010). This represents an increase of 8 per cent in the NER of girls.
Table 1: Selected performance indicators for primary education in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio (GER)</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>132%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net enrolment ratio (NER)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion ratio to P7</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition ratio from P7 to S1</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NDP, 2010.

In the same way, the introduction of USE/UPPET in 2007 increased secondary school enrolment (S1–S6) by 25 per cent from 814,087 students in 2006 to 1,165,355 students in 2009, with girls constituting 45.6 per cent of the total enrolment. This also raised the gross enrolment ratio (GER) at the secondary school level from 21 per cent in 2000 to 29 per cent in 2008, and the transition rate from P7 to S1 from 56.3 per cent (56 per cent male, 56.6 per cent female) in 2000 to 62 per cent (64 per cent male, 60 per cent female) in 2009. The transition rate from S4 to S5 also rose by 9 percentage points, from 39 per cent in 2000 to 48 per cent in 2009 (MoES, 2009).

Similarly, between 2006 and 2009, enrolment in Business, Technical, Vocational Education and Training institutions increased by 14.5 per cent, from 25,682 students (25 per cent female, 75 per cent male) to 30,000 students (39 per cent female, 61 per cent male), respectively. Likewise, enrolment in higher education institutions (university and non-university) has risen from 10,000 in 2000 to about 180,000 in 2009 (Education Management Information System (EMIS), 2009), with females making up about 45 per cent of the total student population at Makerere University, one of the country’s oldest and most prestigious institutions.

However, completion rates remain low overall, and lower still for girls. For instance, just one-third of the girls who enrolled in primary education were still in school at the age of 18, compared with half of the boys (Uganda Demographic Health Survey 2006; EMIS, 2008; Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development [MoGLSD], 2008). Again, Table 1 clearly illustrates this. For instance, there was a decline in primary completion rates, from 63 per cent (71 per cent male, 55 per cent female) in 2001 to 52 per cent (55 per cent male, 48 per cent female) in 2009.

Thus, the words of Margaret Nsereko, former Assistant Commissioner for primary education, remain very instructive. In 2004 she stated: “If you take gender parity to mean numbers, then we are not doing very badly. But it is not just numbers. It is about access, retention and completion. While enrolment figures are high, our major challenge remains how to get and keep especially the girl-child in school as well as enhance her learning achievement.” (UNICEF, 2004) The statement is an allusion to the gender disparities evident in Uganda’s education system.
Girls constitute the largest proportion of out-of-school children in the population (UBOS, 2010) and lag behind boys in performance on national examinations. The dwindling completion rate is attributed to class repetition, which is estimated at 11 per cent, and to school dropouts, estimated at 6.7 per cent.

Additionally, the recently conducted impact evaluation of primary education in Uganda (MoES/Policy and Operations Evaluation Department of the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (IOB), 2008) shows that gender parity patterns vary according to districts, with the districts of Gulu, Katakwi, Kitgum, Kotido, Kyenjojo, Lira, Masindi, Moroto and Nebbi having the lowest enrolment for girls.

Girls’ education in Uganda is challenged by many limitations, including low completion rates and poor performance. Key causes of low completion among girls include: early pregnancy (MoES, 2011), sexual harassment, early marriage, female genital mutilation, lack of sanitation facilities in schools (MoGLSD, 2008) and long distances to reach school (World Bank, 2008). In addition, gender bias and stereotypes in textbooks, teaching-learning processes and teachers’ attitudes towards girls have been reported to negatively impact girls’ participation and learning achievement (Wright, 2008; Kakuru, 2006; Chege, 2004; Arnot, 2004). Other factors also affect girls’ completion and performance, including: hostile learning environments; shortages of trained female teachers to act as role models and improve learning; and negative societal attitudes towards girls’ education (Ejangu, 2004; Chelimo, 2003).

Girls often encounter learning problems because of the low expectations teachers have regarding their intellectual abilities as well as the low level of feedback from teachers. This is exacerbated by girls’ low valuation of their own abilities and lack of female teachers in ‘high status’ subjects such as mathematics and science (Aikman and Unterhalter, 2007). Textbooks also reinforce the low expectations of women and girls, as do curriculum and examination materials. Overall school environments are also not ‘girl-friendly’ and or equitable (Ward et al., 2006). The HIV/AIDS pandemic (which sometimes precipitates girls’ absenteeism, as they stay home to look after sick parents), and conflict and its aftermath also disproportionately undermine girls’ participation in education in Uganda. Not surprisingly, school completion and transition to secondary school remain a major challenge, mostly for girls (UNGEI, 2007).
4. Establishment and evolution of UNGEI in Uganda

This chapter provides an overview of the establishment and evolution of UNGEI in Uganda. It outlines the objectives and structures, various levels of operation, and key strategies, priorities and activities.

Globally, UNGEI was instituted by then United Nations Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, in 2000. The UNGEI vision, mission, purpose, objectives, operative strategies and principles are summarized in Box 1.

Box 1: UNGEI vision and mission

**UNGEI vision**

The vision consists of a world where all girls and boys will have equal access to free, quality education.

**Mission**

UNGEI is a pressure group whose mission is to ensure that the EFA goals on gender equality in education are met through collaborative efforts among United Nations agencies, civil society, governments and donor agencies.

**Purpose**

The main aim of UNGEI is to get actors in girls’ education thinking collectively about the different types of barriers/constraints to achieving gender parity and possible strategies for overcoming them.

**Objectives**

The central purpose of UNGEI is to enable all partners to:

- Identify ways in which development NGOs and their organizations can contribute to accelerate progress towards gender equality in education;
- Determine how agencies and other organizations and UNGEI can work together at international and country levels to assist countries to meet the MDGs related to education to which they have committed;
- Better understand the fit between UNGEI and agencies and other organizations’ ways of working with regard to action on girls’ education at the country level; and
- Contribute to shaping the strategic direction and activities of UNGEI.

**UNGEI strategies**

- Act as an honest ‘power broker’ between donors, governments and NGOs, as well as hold them accountable and urge them to action;
- Promote sharing of good practices;
- Support the inclusion of girls in advocacy for provision of education;
- Feed into existing partnerships and structures and only lead where no structure exists/share organizational and management support;
- Train a critical mass at all levels to focus on mainstreaming girls in all aspects of education.

4.1 Establishment of UNGEI

In Uganda, UNGEI was launched in December 2004 by the MoES. The launch attracted 90 participants from different institutions and the donor community, including some United Nations agencies, government ministries, NGOs, the private sector, local artistes, and young people represented by the Girls’ Education Movement (GEM). The vision and goal of UNGEI Uganda are shown in the Logic Model in Annex 7.

UNGEI was first launched at the national level and progressively expanded to districts in 2006, starting with Northern Uganda, which was then affected by war. Thereafter, UNGEI was introduced in Eastern Uganda and then Western Uganda. By the end of 2006, UNGEI had been rolled out to 14 districts and 23 sub-counties (UNICEF, 2007). To date, UNGEI has been launched in districts where UNICEF focuses its efforts. In each district, UNGEI district committees have ensured its expansion throughout the district by instituting sub-county committees. According to UNICEF officials, the initial expansion of UNGEI to ‘UNICEF districts’ was partly due to lack of funds for other partners to continue with the implementation of UNGEI activities, and partly because, in line with UNGEI strategies, UNICEF was in a better position to conduct the expansion.

4.2 Structure and membership of UNGEI in Uganda

UNGEI Uganda is a multi-sector partnership forum under the MoES, with a three-tier structure consisting of national, district and sub-county managerial levels. In addition, UNGEI Uganda is linked to UNGEI at regional and global levels. The Uganda structure is shown below.

Figure 1: UNGEI structure in Uganda
As seen in Figure 1, at the national level, UNGEI partners are drawn from a wide range of stakeholders. At the time of its launch, UNGEI membership at the national level included: the MoES, MoGLSD, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Health, the World Bank, UNICEF, the United Nations Population Fund, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), UNDP, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Food Programme (WFP), FAWE, Action Aid, the African Development Bank, the Canadian International Development Agency, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, the Danish International Development Agency, the European Union, the United Kingdom Department for International Development, Agence Française de Développement, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit, Ireland Aid, Japan International Cooperation Agency, the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, Save the Children Uganda, Youth Alive, GEM, Kyambogo University (representing teacher training institutions), the Directorate of Education Standards, the National Curriculum Development Centre, Makerere Institute of Social Research (Makerere University, Uganda Initiative for TDMS and PIASCY UNITY/USAID, the Netherlands Embassy, GEM, the Straight Talk Foundation, and World Vision (UNGEI TOR, 2004). Such multi-stakeholder involvement allowed for a rich knowledge mix, inclusiveness and fruitful discourse.

UNGEI at district level: UNICEF and MoES spearheaded the process of rolling out UNGEI to the districts in 2005 in the northern districts of Gulu, Kitgum and Lira. These districts, located in a war-torn region, had the lowest education indicators in the country. UNGEI was initially introduced in what came to be known as ‘UNICEF districts’. As a matter of policy, UNICEF previously prioritized the most resource-poor, hard to reach/stay districts of Uganda for its interventionist activities. Each district adopted an area-specific label, for instance Kasese Girls’ Education Initiative (KAGEI), Abim Initiative for Girls’ Education (ADIGE), Kyenjojo Girls’ Education Initiative (KYGIE), Kitgum Initiative for Girls’ Education (KIGE). Each developed TORs and workplans, which they proceeded to implement.

Membership at the district level included local government (education department), religious organizations, CBOs, politicians and role models. By the time of this evaluation, UNGEI committee members in Kasese District included the District Inspector of Schools (Chairperson), KALI, the Mpondwe Moslem Women Association, the Bwimaniro Women’s Group, representation from the Catholic church, the Muslim community, the Seventh Day Adventist church, the Church of Uganda, the Director of Rock Primary School (role model) and women members of parliament (as role models). In Kasese, members included the District Education Officer (DEO) as Chairperson, KIND Uganda, the Dorcus Vocational Institute, Chief Administrative Officer, a female member of parliament, and retired teachers (role models). Abim District did not have CBOs in its membership; instead members were drawn from among role models and sub-counties.

UNGEI at sub-county/community level: In the then conflict-prone areas of northern Uganda (the war in Northern Uganda lasted from 1986 to 2007), the UNGEI network made use of the Camp Education Committees (CECs). The CEC membership typically consists of a camp leader, a head teacher, a GEM representative and a member of the local government. In non-conflict areas, the sub-county UNGEI
consists of representatives including parish leadership, religious leaders, model parents (parents who have sent children to school), teachers and women’s groups.

4.3 UNGEI coordination/management in Uganda

**National-level coordination:** According to documentary review, at national level, UNGEI was supposed to be steered by an advisory committee of 25 members drawn from partner institutions (UNGEI, 2005). However, this coordination structure was not implemented. Instead, a GTF was established at the MoES to provide strategic guidance at the national level on all issues related to girls’ education (Draft UNGEI TOR, 2004). With specific reference to UNGEI, the GTF was tasked with:

- Setting the national agenda for UNGEI;
- Identifying key actors through partnership mapping;
- Generating and developing consensus on national TORs;
- Setting up an advocacy and communication network;
- Ensuring that gender equality takes centre stage in UNGEI action plans;
- Agreeing on bottom-up strategies for gender sensitization campaigns; and
- Drafting UNGEI action plans in tandem with the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process to ensure a policy fit.

The chairperson of the GTF is from the MoES (the Department of Pre-primary and Primary education). FAWE Uganda was elected co-chair and UNICEF Uganda was named the convener. The co-chair’s main function is to ensure active participation of all the members during meetings and to help oversee and monitor the implementation of the UNGEI process. Members of the GTF are drawn from organizations focusing on girls’ education, and most are actually members of UNGEI partnership. It is this team that plans for UNGEI activities at the national level.

**District level:** The top-most management organ at this level is referred to as the District Advisory Committee (DAC). A working group is established within the DAC to handle the administrative work of the district partnership. A district-level government official is the chair of the partnership, while the co-chair is selected from a local NGO. The office of the DEO provides technical support.

**Sub-county/community level:** At the sub-county level, a UNGEI chairperson is elected from among parish leaders. In line with UNGEI goals and tradition, the committee is chaired by a woman. In total, 13 members are in charge of steering UNGEI at this level.

4.4 Key strategies and activities of UNGEI in Uganda

**Priorities:** In a speech by the UNICEF Representative in Uganda at the launch of UNGEI in 2004, UNGEI priorities were spelled out as follows:
• Putting in place short- and medium-term measurable actions that guarantee access to, and completion of, quality education for boys and girls in conflict-affected areas; Sustaining and improving the level of equality in educational access that has been achieved and eliminating all forms of discrimination against girls as provided for in the 1995 Constitution of Uganda, and international norms and standards of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women;
• Ensuring gender equality and sensitivity in all aspects of education (including enrolment policies and practices, curricula, teacher behaviour and attitudes, equity in teaching force, learning environments, pupils’ safety, access to information and skills that enable girls to make positive life choices in areas such as reproductive health and HIV prevention, and the use of new technologies;
• Building partnerships that consist of political and resource commitments at the highest levels, to ensure that another generation of girls is not lost to illiteracy; and
• Sharing information, networking and funding for improved coordination and collaboration on girls’ education and UNGEI.

These priorities guided UNGEI strategies and activities.

Strategies: UNGEI strategies, in essence, imply bringing the voice of development partners and national and local NGOs to the planning table; generating workplans; and developing a strategy for a multi-organizational partnership. This ensures that the UNGEI structure is participatory and responsive to gender equality issues, and that gender equity takes centre stage in UNGEI action plans. UNGEI is guided by the principle of ‘division of labour’, which is based on the comparative advantage or area of strength of a particular partner to implement these strategies and workplans.

UNGEI activities include: conducting media campaigns; advocacy, such as need for targeted deployment of female teachers to hard-to-reach areas; gender sensitization; remedial teaching of science and mathematics, and child profiling; peer counselling; and life skills, sexual maturation and HIV/AIDS education (UNGEI, 2010). In addition, UNGEI conducts activities that strengthen partnerships and promote community and youth participation.

4.5 Vibrancy of UNGEI Uganda

A trend analysis of the vibrancy of UNGEI at national level reveals three distinct phases, including: the very active phase (2004–2006); the slowdown period (2007–2008) and the recuperation phase (2008–2010). This analysis is based on the number of activities undertaken, number of partners involved, and the coverage and pace of the activities, as follows:

The very active stage (2004–2006): During this phase, national-level UNGEI actively participated in:

• Mapping partners’ engagement in girls’ education and gender equality;
• Developing TORs at national and district levels;
• Rolling out UNGEI to the district level. During this period, the focus was Northern Uganda, which due to war had very low enrolment, retention and completion, especially of girls. UNGEI was
introduced in the districts of Abim, Gulu, Kaberamaido, Katakwi, Kitgum, Kotido and Lira, among others, during this phase;
- Advocating for targeted deployment of female teachers in hard-to-reach areas;
- Conducting research to inform policy, such as a study on training, recruitment and deployment regarding female primary teachers in Uganda;
- Participating in policy dialogue;
- Launching the ‘Go to School, Back to School, Stay in School’ campaign in February 2007 in Kotido District. During this campaign, partners who attended included the MoES, the MoGLSD, the local government of Kotido, UNICEF, WFP, Save the Children Uganda, the Uganda chapter of the African Network for the Prevention and Protection of Children against Abuse and Neglect (which is promoting the concept of ‘safe and protective schools’), and school-based GEM. The campaign was designed to benefit approximately 1.3 million children in and out of school, as well as 13,000 teachers in 1,600 schools in 18 districts of North and North Eastern Uganda (Abim, Amolatar, Amuria, Apac, Dokolo, Gulu, Kaabong, Kaberamaido, Katakwi, Kitgum, Kotido, Lira, Mt. Moroto, Nakapiripirit, Oyam, Pader and Soroti).

The slowdown period (2007–2008): In the second phase, expansion work continued to the districts in Western Uganda (Kasese and Kyenjojo), but at a slower pace, with diminishing support and monitoring of established UNGEI district committees. UNICEF remained the only active United Nations agency in the partnership.

The recuperation phase (2008–2010): The third and current phase of the evolution of UNGEI in Uganda coincided with the 2008 review of the Gender in Education Policy, which marked the commencement of revivalist activities, including:

- The organization of Girl-Child Education week in 2009;
- A study on ‘good practices’ by partner institutions;
- Research on pregnancy in schools; and
- to the beginning of the drafting of policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools.

4.6 UNGEI Uganda and the relationship with regional and global offices

Findings showed that the regional office has worked with UNGEI Uganda to set up the UNGEI task force and develop tools for the gender audit. In addition, the regional office:

- Hired the consultant to undertake the gender audit, which allowed for an in-depth analysis of the Ugandan situation;
- Provided financial support to initiate workshops, write TORs and conduct the gender audit; and
- Provided a forum and opportunity for sharing good practices. For example, Uganda attended a meeting in Nairobi and Nepal in which it shared such good practices.

The regional office links the country to the global level by providing a systematic update on gender issues to the global UNGEI office, and also by providing feedback to the country. However, the close
relationship was only evident at the early phase of UNGEI. Responses from current officials among the partner institutions showed deterioration in this close relationship. One of the officials explained it this way: “They only call us when they want something.”

The main challenge between country, regional and global levels is the use of UNICEF. This makes it difficult to separate UNGEI from UNICEF because the Regional Focal Point for UNGEI is a UNICEF staff member. It is perhaps because of this that many partners were not aware of any close working relationship between regional and local levels of UNGEI.
5. Findings with respect to UNGEI outcomes

This chapter presents the evaluation findings for the four outcome areas of UNGEI Uganda, namely:

1. Ensuring that policies promote girls’ education and gender equality;
2. Formulating a policy regarding re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers;
3. Reviewing and identifying progress, and documentation and dissemination of ‘good practices’; and
4. Strengthening partnerships in girls’ education.

In order to get a feel for the contributions of UNGEI Uganda to these outcomes, the contribution analysis approach was used. This involved:

- Outlining the situation with respect to the outcome area before UNGEI;
- Describing the situation today (changes since UNGEI);
- Assessing the impact of the changes that took place;
- Identifying the inputs and contribution of UNGEI to the area; and
- Making an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI involvement.

Data are presented in the order followed by of the contribution analysis described above. However, in order to avoid repetition, data on the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI interventions are presented in Section 6.

5.1 Outcome 1 – Policies promoting girls’ education and gender equality are in existence

Before UNGEI: Nearly all the major policy drivers aimed at improving girls’ education in Uganda pre-dated the launch of UNGEI in the country in 2004. These include:

- The 1995 Constitution of Uganda, which guarantees the right to education to all children, irrespective of gender;
- The 1997 policy on UPE, which aimed at improving access of boys and girls to education;
- The affirmative action admission policy, by which all female applicants to public universities (beginning with the 1990/91 academic year) are awarded 1.5 bonus points;
- Other policies aimed at enhancing access, including: the Complementary Opportunity for Education, the Alternative Basic Education for Karamoja (ABEK), the Basic Education for Urban Poor Areas, and the Special Needs Education programmes that address the educational needs of marginalized communities; and
- The 2001 GEM.

In addition to these national policies, Uganda embraced the EFA goals as well as the education-related MDGs. From these policies, there is a conspicuous focus on the need to ensure gender parity and equality in education. In that sense, therefore, these government-led educational policies (with a pro-girls stance) were
‘pre-emptive’ of the intent of UNGEI to add value (Purcell, 2010). For instance, the impact of the UPE programme in 1997 on girls’ school enrolment was particularly immediate and dramatic, as illustrated in Table 1.

**Situation in 2011: Changes since UNGEI:** Notwithstanding these initiatives, girls’ participation in education continued to lag behind that of their male counterparts. Gender disparity was most noticeable in completion rates (see Tables 1 and 2). The attrition rate at the primary education level in 2003 (a year before the launch of UNGEI) was so high that one informant remarked: “We had expected about 1 million to complete primary cycle but only about 200,000 did. Those who completed did not do well. Girls’ dropout rate outstripped that of the boys.” From the first cohort of UPE who graduated at the time of the UNGEI launch in 2004, it was evident that many had dropped out.

As a result, after the launch of UNGEI in 2004, more policies aimed at accelerating girls’ education have been created. These include:

- The 2007 National Gender Policy;
- The Gender in Education Policy, which was passed in 2009 and launched in November 2010;
- The 2007 USE/UPPET policy;
- The 2008 Education Bill, which made education compulsory;
- The 2007 Equal Opportunity Commission Act, which gave the commission powers to issue and enforce recommendations on equalization of opportunities between males and females within the education sector; and
- The commencement of the process of formulating a policy for re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school in 2008.

Similar policy initiatives are being undertaken at the district and lower levels. For example, a by-law on defilement and early marriage was passed in Abim District in 2008, while another in Kasese District on child protection against early marriage, child labour and sale of alcohol to children is in the process of being placed in the gazette.

In Gulu District, ‘Safe School Contracts’ were crafted and implemented by the CECs in partnership with GEM. These contracts were drawn up between teachers and the satellite communities, by which teachers agree not to be involved in acts of sexual harassment or elopement with school girls. The signed documents are displayed in easily accessible locations for publicity purposes. Similarly, the ‘Safe Community Contracts’ commit local leaders to the promotion of the right of girls to education. These are signed between local leaders and GEM. There are also deliberate efforts to organize child mothers, pregnant girls or rape victims into groups within the school to combat stigmatization.

Further, failure to achieve gender equity during the pre-UNGEI period led to the initiation of a series of activities aimed at enhancing the implementation of policies. For instance:

- The introduction of the ‘Promotion of Girls’ Education’ scheme designed to enhance the retention and performance of girls at the primary level;
• The implementation of the ‘Equity in the Classroom’ programme aimed at facilitating equal participation of girls and boys in the classroom;
• Introduction of the ‘Focusing Resources for Effective School Health’ project, which focuses on provision of safe water and sanitation to schools, provision of washrooms for girls, urinals for boys, and separate latrines for girls;
• the development of the TORs for a study regarding the training, recruitment and deployment of female primary teachers in Uganda; and
• the development and roll-out of national communication strategies that address girls’ education, as well as awareness-raising campaigns in Uganda.

Above all, a Gender Desk was established in 2007 in the MoES with a brief to ensure:

• Equitable access to basic education;
• Increased girls’ retention in school;
• Improved girls’ performance, especially in science and mathematics;
• Protection of girls against child abuse and other forms of molestation;
• Reform of the curriculum to make it more gender-sensitive;
• Educational facilities are made more conducive, particularly to girls and other disadvantaged children; and
• Training and re-training of teachers (particularly senior female/male teachers and career teachers) in gender-responsive methodology and practice.

Impact of changes: Increased enrolment remained the main impact of the post-UNGEI period. Completion remained low, as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Trends in completion rates to Primary Seven (2000–2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completion Rates</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMIS.
Despite the low completion rates, transition to the secondary level improved from 59 per cent (57 per cent for boys and 63 per cent for girls) in 2003 to 69 per cent in 2005 (69 per cent boys and 70 per cent girls). This is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Transition and completion rates for primary and secondary school (2000–2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate to S1</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Boys</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Girls</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate S4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Boys</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Girls</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMIS.

Evident in Table 2 is a progressive increase in the completion rates at Senior 4 from 18 per cent for boys and 14 per cent for girls in 2000 to 35 per cent for boys and 28 per cent for girls in 2007.

In addition, parents are better informed about the importance of girls’ education. In Kasese District, improvement in girls’ attendance in one of the secondary schools was attributed to the increased commitment of parents to ensure adequate provision of sanitary pads for their daughters. The sub-counties of Kyarumba and Maliba had established girls’ education committees whose other brief is to strengthen sensitization on girls’ education at the sub-county level.

Similarly, at the university level, the Affirmative Action admission policy resulted in an increase in the female student population at Makerere University to 45 per cent in 2008 (compared with 23 per cent in 1989).

GEM clubs have been introduced in 30 per cent of the primary schools in 14 districts (UNICEF, 2010). Further, GEM has enabled girls who had dropped out to return to schools (Naalawanga, 2005; Nassimbwa, 2004), in addition to improving menstruation management. Many of the GEM clubs sensitize the school community through posters and writings like the one shown below.
Contribution by UNGEI: Education policy-making or review processes have been initiated by the relevant sections in the MoES. For instance, policies related to the primary education sub-sector are prompted by the Department of Pre-primary and Primary Education, and then reviewed by the GTF for inclusion of gender issues. Thereafter the policies are submitted to the relevant organs of the ministry, particularly the Top Management Meeting and ESCC. In this process, the UNGEI contribution is evident in the review of policy. Representation of the UNGEI partnership in key decision-making organs of the MoES further improves the participation of UNGEI in policy reviews, ensuring that the girls’ education agenda is always highlighted. For instance, UNICEF – a lead agency of UNGEI – is a member of the ESCC, which is a de facto policy-making powerhouse in the sector.

Furthermore, it was the launch of UNGEI in 2004 that led to the institutionalization of the GTF in the MoES. Members of the GTF are drawn from UNGEI partners (all of the organizations with an interest in gender). The GTF became the lead adviser to the MoES on all gender-related issues. It directly participates in policy dialogues and acts as a mouthpiece on gender-related issues. This makes UNGEI a major driver of gender-related education in Uganda. For instance, a concept paper on the sector policy on pregnancies in schools was drafted and discussed during the UNGEI meeting of 5 November 2008 and in May 2011. FAWE, as an UNGEI partner, has been tasked to conduct a study whose findings would inform the policy on readmission of pregnant school girls. It is also possible that without UNGEI, the GTF would not have been institutionalized in the MoES, or would have been institutionalized later.

Although the net contribution of UNGEI to policy reform needs to be viewed against the backdrop of the government-led policy shift towards gender-consciousness in all development planning, faster implementation of these policies is partly thanks to the contribution of UNGEI. For instance, in order to
improve access and retention, UNGEI, at national, district and sub-county levels, actively participated in the ‘Go to School, Back to School, Stay in School’ campaign of 2007. UNGEI also advocated for the mainstreaming of the child-friendly school (CFS) initiative as an integral element of the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards for all educational institutions by the MoES in 2007. CFS aims at promoting girls’ education in an especially girl-friendly environment at all levels. Further, UNGEI campaigned for the rationalization of the School Facilities Grants to include funds for compulsory provision of separate latrines with doors, for both girls and boys. The grant also operates through a ranking system that prioritizes poorest schools and rewards schools with 48 per cent or more girls’ enrolment.

Some respondents also attributed increases in enrolment to UNGEI. For instance, the DEO of Kyenjojo said: “We attribute girls coming back to school to UNGEI. Previously it was education for all but girls were not emphasized. The training of senior woman teachers and senior man teachers has helped them to appreciate challenges of the girl-child.”

In addition, UNGEI has undertaken policy dissemination in order to create awareness among stakeholders expected to implement such policies. For instance, by the time of this study, the Gender in Education Policy had already been disseminated in the Central, Eastern and the Northwestern regions of Uganda, and plans to disseminate to other regions had also been finalized. The participants during dissemination include, among others, local leaders at the sub-county and parish levels, religious leaders, head teachers, NGOs and CBOs in education sectors. This ensures that all stakeholders not only understand the policies but also commit themselves to their implementation.

5.2 Outcome 2 – Policy promoting re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school is in existence

Before UNGEI: Prior to the launch of UNGEI in Uganda, not only was there lack of an official policy pertaining to the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school, but there was also no serious and sustained move by the government to counter the surging problem of early pregnancy-induced dropout of girls from school. Indeed, Kasente (2003) identified early pregnancy as the biggest hindrance to girls’ education in Uganda. This was exacerbated by the perception of such pregnancies by both the school authorities and the wider community as a punishable immorality. The expulsion of girls who conceived while still pursuing schooling was therefore seen as a morally justifiable decision.

The few interventions by various providers that did aim to address the compounding effect of high incidence of early pregnancy on gender disparities in education were separate and not coordinated. These included:

- The ‘abstinence-until-marriage’ campaign conducted by several non-state actors;
- The production of educational materials regarding reproduction health for primary schools by UNICEF and other providers;
- The inclusion by the MoES of HIV/AIDS and life-skills education in the school curriculum since 1993, on the prompting of development partners such as UNICEF;
• The UNICEF-led Sara Communication Initiative, translated in some Ugandan languages and serialized in local newspapers, provided educational messages on how to avoid pregnancy and also the importance of returning to school.

Despite these initiatives, the majority of head teachers adamantly continued to deny pregnant girls an opportunity to remain in school and sit their examinations. Moreover, the MoES itself did not put in place a strong mechanism for sanctioning such head teachers.

**Situation in 2011: Changes since UNGEI:** The teenage pregnancy rate in Uganda, at 31 per cent, is the highest in sub-Saharan Africa (Yolisigira Yazid in *The Monitor Newspaper*, 28 September 2010; 2006 UNFPA report). Approximately 21 per cent of Ugandan children are sexually active by age 11, and about 70 per cent are active by age 19. In 2008, almost 12 per cent of girls 15–19 years old were pregnant, while 19 per cent had already given birth (minutes of the UNGEI meeting held on 5 November 2008).

The post-UNGEI period is characterized by constant reminders to head teachers to permit pregnant girls to return to school. For instance:

• Since 2007, MoES has been writing circulars to schools urging head teachers not to expel pregnant girls and to allow child mothers to sit for the National Primary Leaving Examination and for ‘O’- and ‘A’-level examinations;
• Further, the process of formulating an official policy for re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school has started and is expected to be completed by October 2011.

As the policy formulation is still in progress, sensitization is ongoing and uses a multi-pronged strategy involving ‘school walks’, radio talk shows and multi-stakeholder workshops that bring together girls, parents, sub-county chiefs, community development officers, secretaries for education, local councils, faith-based organizations (FBOs) and the wider community. The participation of many stakeholders in the workshops guarantees wider social buy-in. There have also been school-level meetings with senior women teachers, senior men teachers, chairs of parent-teacher associations, chairs of School Management Committees (SMCs) and head girls to ensure that gender issues are addressed in school development plans.

**Impact of changes:** Although a policy aimed at promoting the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school is yet to be tabled, advocacy and sensitization efforts seem to be paying off, as evidenced in the following:

*Improved community awareness about the importance of sending child mothers back to school:* Although the pregnancy rate among girls remains high, there is willingness among parents to return the girls to school. Testimonies given by the beneficiary girls and letters from parents to UNGEI district chairpersons – to which the consultant had access – attest to this emerging shift in community attitudes. For example, one of the girls revealed that:

“I became pregnant when in P6 but I feared to go back to school. My parents encouraged me but I refused and got married. I stayed in the marriage for 7 years but the man was mistreating
me, and he got other wives. All my friends encouraged me to go back to my parents. My parents accepted to look after my three children.”

As shown in the photograph below, the community has accepted girls who attend schools with their children, unlike in the past, when girls had to leave their children behind.

Child mothers attend vocational training at Bwimaniro Women’s Group, Kasese.

*Increasing numbers of child mothers going back to school*: Although there is no reliable national statistical evidence regarding the numbers of child mothers who have returned to school to date, individual school-based data show significant numbers of such ‘returnees’. For instance, in 2006 at St. Martin’s Primary School in Gulu District, 26 child mothers were in school (UNICEF, 2006). At the time of this study, 16 child mothers were enrolled in Abim Secondary School. Similarly, 10 pregnant girls from one sub-county in Kasese District were allowed to sit the 2010 final national examinations.

*Increased alternative learning pathways for child mothers*: In addition to formal schools, there are several programmes for child mothers and other girls who have dropped out of the formal school system. For example, the Bwimaniro Women’s Group started a project in 2008 for out-of-school girls and child mothers that offered courses in nursery teaching, hairdressing, tailoring, poultry and handicraft. There are plans to introduce a bakery course in 2012. The project also doubles as a micro-
finance institution from which members can borrow and save money. By the time of this evaluation, 160 parents were saving with them. In Kyenjojo, Dorcus Vocational Institute also provides similar opportunities.

Dorus Vocational Institute provides alternative education for child mothers.

**Contribution by UNGEI:** The burgeoning nature of the problem of early pregnancy in Uganda, together with the continued denial of access to schools for pregnant girls and child mothers, motivated UNGEI Uganda to increase its focus on advocacy for a policy aimed at promoting the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school and to sensitize the community to return child mothers to schools.

An UNGEI chairperson, together with UNICEF staff, drafted the concept note on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers, before sharing it with other UNGEI partners during the GTF meeting for their input. The draft was discussed at the UNGEI meeting on 5 November 2008, and during the meeting the need for a comprehensive study on teenage pregnancy to inform the proposed policy regarding readmission to school was recommended. FAWE, an UNGEI partner, was assigned the task of undertaking the study.

Straight Talk, another UNGEI partner, is directly combating the teenage pregnancy predicament by periodically visiting schools to talk to girls about abstinence, while cautioning them against the dangers of ‘sugar daddies’.

Similarly, district UNGEI committees make periodic visits to schools to sensitize children on various issues relating to girls’ education. In Kasese, for instance, the district UNGEI committee visited all of the
schools in the municipality in 2010. In addition, KAGEI/KALI-supported training workshops were conducted for parent-teacher associations and SMCs in 2010 in 21 of the 28 sub-counties. In Kyenjojo, the committee identified girls who had dropped out due to pregnancy and advocated for their return to school. Furthermore, during the recent launch of the girls’ education programme in May 2011, which was sponsored by DfID, former child mothers from different districts were given the opportunity to share and learn from each others’ experiences.

Further, district and sub-county UNGEI committees, together with the district education office, mobilized and participated in ‘Go Back to School Walks’, which are described in Box 2.

**Box 2: School walk**

The ‘school walk’ initiative employed in Abim District aims to counter reluctance to observe the timely return to school at the start of each school term found among children and even teachers. School walk is also intended to sensitize key community members on the importance of girls’ education, and to mobilize them to support policies and programmes that will ensure quality education for girls and other vulnerable children. It is also aimed at encouraging girls who have dropped out to return to school.

The initiative is typically undertaken a week before the commencement of each school term. It is organized by the district education office, in collaboration with UNGEI district and sub-county committees. Community mobilization is undertaken by the UNGEI committee, while the school community is mobilized by the district education office. In addition political leaders also participate, and a band is hired to lead the walk so that both children and adults are attracted to the activity.

During the walk, children carry placards with messages such as ‘Send your daughter to school’, ‘School starts on Monday’ and ‘School is good’, to mention but a few.

The walk starts from a selected central point, passes through the surrounding villages and ends at a venue where district education officials, politicians and NGOs address the people. During the rally, pupils present songs, plays and dramas. The key message in all of the presentations is the importance of education and the need to send both boys and girls to school.

Further, through mobilization by district UNGEI committees, the returnee child mothers are now actively involved in counselling and encouraging the other colleagues who dropped out to return to school. This is also done through radio talk shows, as described in the box below.

**Box 3: Radio talk shows**

Radio talk shows are one avenue for reaching out to communities in hard-to-reach areas, such as mountainous areas characterized by poor and sometimes impassable roads. Radio shows make it possible to reach out to many people at a minimal cost, and are being used in Kasese District in Western Uganda.

The talk shows are organized by the district UNGEI committee using local FM radio stations. They are facilitated by child ‘returnees’, female role models from the community, or UNGEI district committee
members. Women’s groups are frequently invited to talk, and topics include returning girls to school after pregnancy, what to do when your daughter is defiled, and why educating girls is important, among many others. Through the talk shows, child mothers have shared their experiences and, in so doing, encouraged girls who have dropped out due to early pregnancy to return to school.

The talk shows typically start with information on the topic of the day, followed by a question-and-answer session in which the community is permitted to interact with the presenters by telephone. In this way, answers to the community’s questions are provided. In addition, problems affecting the education of girls are made known to the radio presenters.

In this way, the evaluation finds that UNGEI has deepened the community’s understanding of the socio-economic value of girls’ education. The community is now able to identify hurdles as well as key intervention points to improve girls’ access to education (MoES, 2007).

5.3 Outcome 3 – UNGEI contribution to the regular review of progress and good practices

Before UNGEI: Although there were several good practices in the delivery of education services in general, and in girls’ education in particular, even prior to the launch of UNGEI in Uganda, there was no systematic endeavour to document, disseminate and institutionalize these aspects. For example, for some time the following remained stand-alone projects, with minimal spillover effects:

- the CFS concept of FAWE Uganda (2001);
- the ‘Breakthrough to Literacy’ campaign of FAWE Uganda (2001);
- the ‘two-generation approach’ of the Uganda Rural Development and Training Programme in primary and secondary schools, which started in Kibaale in 2000. The approach involves joint sensitization of parents together with their daughters on issues of common interest; and
- the GEM in 2001.

Situation in 2011: Changes since UNGEI: The evaluation showed that the following have been identified and documented as good practice:

**GEM:** GEM Uganda is deemed to be a ‘composite’ good practice, essentially because of its composition and activities, which are replicable, sustainable, adaptable and cost-effective. For instance, GEM child-led outreach and advocacy places girls in the ‘driver’s seat’, which represents a striking departure from the previously ‘expert-led’ initiatives (Ward et al., 2006); in addition, GEM’s inclusion of boys as strategic allies has helped to convert them from their previous stance as bullies to active supporters of girls.

**School mapping** is another revolutionary GEM initiative in which children document the total number of school-age children with a breakdown by gender; the number of non-schooling girls; and the barriers that prevent girls from getting an education. The data generated have proven to be handy to local government for planning purposes.
**Peer guidance, counselling, and mentoring,** in which children, especially those in leadership positions, avail themselves to others as counsellors. Girls who need counselling on sensitive issues like menstruation, for example, find a willing ear in their peers (Herz and Sperling, 2004). Older children have also taken on the responsibility of mentoring younger children, helping them cope with situations that would otherwise be hard to deal with. Schools are now sensitive to the special needs of girls. Children, through their GEM clubs, also discuss how to keep their toilets clean.

**GEM income-generating activities** have encouraged the participation of children in the growing of vegetables, which they sell to fund club activities. Children also stage drama and music performances for the communities, and these too earn some income. This was evident in Kitojo Primary School and Nyakishenyi Primary School in Kyenjojo District. Money generated in this manner is used to buy scholastic materials for ‘returnees’ brought back by GEM club members.

**The two-generation approach:** Conducted in the first week of Term 1, this training introduces parents and their daughters to differential analysis by:

- asking them to jointly draw their perceived ideal home;
- establishing the status of their existent homes:
  - determining the development gap that needs to be closed; and
  - formulating strategies for closing the identified development gap.

A second workshop is organized at the end of the term, in which girls are expected to share with the parents their school experiences, including the skills and knowledge they have acquired. Both girls and parents are subsequently tasked to go back to their respective homes to implement the new skills and ideas. This is referred to as a ‘back home’ project. Community development officers then closely monitor the implementation process. Intergenerational interaction helps parents to fully appreciate the virtue of educating girls while simultaneously enhancing the communication skills and assertiveness of the girls.

**Promotion of the CFS concept:** This is a whole school improvement programme spearheaded by FAWE, which aims at transforming the ethos and culture of the school by establishing conditions for qualitative changes in teaching and learning. A CFS is a school that: respects the rights of the child; is effective and efficient; is gender-sensitive; is healthy; and is a safe and protective place. The students are involved in the CFS by evaluating school environmental factors – such as sanitation, safety, gender sensitivity, health and extra-curricular activities – that impact on a child’s school attendance and retention (UNESCO, 2007).

**Impact of changes:** The sharing of GEM as a good practice led to its expansion in schools. By 2010, GEM covered 23 districts with about 903 school-based clubs and an estimated membership of 356,701 – which translates into coverage of 22 per cent of the children in 31 per cent of the primary schools in the country’s 23 districts (UNICEF, 2010), thus making it one of the most popular clubs in primary school in Uganda. GEM has made it possible for children across Uganda to actively participate in charting their nation’s progress towards EFA.
The return of girls to school; improvements in girls’ enrolment and attendance; completion and transition rates; better menstruation management; school mapping; and the emergent ‘breaking the silence’ poise of the girl-child are all resulting from implementation of good practices such as GEM. This contrasts with the pre-UNGEI period in Uganda, which was typified by:

- Minimal involvement of children and youth in educational policy formulation, planning, programming, implementation, and M&E activities;
- Near gender-blindness in almost all aspects of education service delivery, including classroom processes, infrastructure and management practices; and
- The unofficial designation of girls and women as ‘voiceless’ people.

Further, GEM Uganda is now a fully registered NGO whose mission is to promote gender equality in quality education, and is thus a member of the GTF in its own right.

As a result of the sharing of good practices, Uganda is well known in the region as a country where efforts towards gender equality are paying off. This in turn has attracted countries within the region to learn from Uganda’s experiences. For instance, UNICEF and FAWE from Rwanda visited Uganda in May 2011 to learn how GEM operates.

**Contribution by UNGEI:** With the advent of UNGEI, the process of the identification, documentation, dissemination and institutionalization of ‘good practices’ became more purposeful and was scaled up as an integral aspect of the UNGEI agenda. It is the one area in which the contribution of UNGEI is most noticeable. Particular mention needs to be made of the following examples:

**Mentoring of GEM:** Since its launch, UNGEI Uganda has mentored GEM, provided a voice for it in policy dialogue meetings and advocated for its registration as an NGO, which was achieved in early 2011. The decision to mentor GEM is perhaps the single most important move that produced several examples of good practice in the delivery of girls’ education. UNGEI has supported the expansion of GEM in schools. For instance, in Kasese District, GEM was introduced by UNICEF in only two sub-counties, but the district UNGEI committee promoted its expansion to all sub-counties. In fact, the evaluation showed that GEM clubs were stronger in districts with vibrant UNGEI committees than in those with weaker ones. In Kyenjojo District, GEM clubs are active in about 90 per cent of the primary schools, compared with Lira District, where GEM is only in about 20 per cent of such schools.

**Provision of format for documenting good practice:** Through the publication of ‘Guidelines for Documentation of Best Practices in Girls’ Education’ in 2007 (UNICEF, 2008), UNGEI has provided partners with a format for documenting good practices. In this way, UNGEI has promoted documentation of good practices by each partner institution.

**Research and publications:** The evaluation finds that UNGEI has also filled existent knowledge and information gaps through its publications. In addition to guidelines for documentation of best practices in girls’ education, there is already a rich variety of UNGEI resource packages, including: facilitators’ guides; community training manuals (2007), as well as UNGEI monitoring tools for districts and sub-
counties; a concept paper on post-primary education, which has become a key document on education for adolescent girls (Karega and Chege, 2006); and the Gender Responsive Pedagogy Handbook for teachers;

5.4 Outcome 4 – UNGEI contribution to the strengthening of partnerships in girls’ education

Before UNGEI: Uganda’s education sector-wide approach (SWAp) was developed in the second half of the 1990s (Eilor, 2004). It was described by the 2003 joint evaluation of aid to basic education as, “perhaps the most highly developed example of a SWAp in the education sector to be found anywhere” (IOB, 2003). The government’s position on official development assistance has been set out in the ‘Partnership Principles between GoU and its Development Partners’ of 2003. Furthermore, Uganda and its main development partners are signatories to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008). These were – and still are – the principle mechanisms governing the partnership process in key government sectors, including education.

Another partnership that was established in the pre-UNGEI period (2001) is the Forum for Education NGOs in Uganda (FENU). FENU membership includes a whole range of national and international NGOs, FBOs, the Uganda National Teachers’ Union, women’s movements, child rights campaigners, HIV/AIDS activists, and even a network of women’s lawyers (FIDA Uganda) and individual education practitioners.

The mission of FENU is to provide a forum to all stakeholders for networking, capacity building and advocacy on education policy and practice. FENU works towards improvement in the quality, access, equity and sustainability of education for all. Specifically, FENU’s objectives include:

- To facilitate and coordinate networking and information sharing among education NGOs and CBOs;
- To strengthen the partnership between NGOs, CBOs and the MoES, donors and other education stakeholders;
- To participate in education policy formulation, implementation and M&E;
- To maintain a databank on all NGOs directly involved in education service provision in Uganda;
- To continually give valuable input to the improvement of curricula, especially regarding its relevancy to the socio-economic priorities of the country and empowerment of the individual;
- To create and maintain awareness of members about government education policies and their impact on the education system and service delivery.

FENU activities include: raising awareness and creating debate on various policy developments in relation to the ESSP; training in policy analysis and advocacy skills; advocating for the passing and implementation of the education policy for disadvantaged groups; mobilization of the district-level networks; working with the membership to promote community participation and local accountability in education; participation in the review of the primary school curriculum; and creation and support of two district resource centres in Mbale and Masindi.
However, all of the pre-UNGEI collaboration in the education sector was general, without a specific focus on gender. There was no formalized partnership in education that had girls’ education as its pivotal agenda. Gender featured as a crosscutting issue that required integration in all educational policymaking, planning, programming, implementation and M&E activities.

**Situation in 2011: Changes since UNGEI:** Despite the existence of these pre-UNGEI partnerships, NGOs and agencies in the education sector continue to implement isolated programmes that often duplicate each other. Yet the post-UNGEI period did not witness the establishment of many partnerships. A few efforts in this regard include the following:

- The UNGEI partnership was formalized with the production of a strategy paper entitled ‘Achieving Gender Parity in Education in Uganda: A strategy paper and framework for action’ in June 2005. This document provided guidelines for coordination of efforts by the different players in the country to achieve gender-related MDGs.
- An ‘Education in Emergency’ working group was created.
- Partnerships have been established between NGOs or between NGOs and CBOs. In addition, twinning arrangements between schools and institutions have become common. These are usually limited to two organizations. For instance, Tullow Oil and Link Community Development Uganda formed the Tullow Oil Link Community Development Schools Improvement Project (TOLSIP). The project aims to improve the quality of education provided to pupils attending eight selected schools in the Tullow Oil area of operation in Hoima and Buliisa Districts. The project also aims at providing a model for corporate social responsibility in support of UPE in Uganda. Activities carried out under the project include: School performance review; training of lower primary teachers in literacy; training of SMCs in enhanced community participation in education; and district capacity building, training and support.

In addition, the SWAp continues to bring together donors and development partners that focus on education in general, while FENU brings together all NGOs with a focus on education, as well as NGOs supporting education in conflict areas of Northern Uganda.

**Impact of changes:** For many years, the education policy in Uganda has been set by the MoES in consultation with a handful of powerful bilateral and multilateral donors under the Education Funding Agencies Group. The move away from separate donor projects towards multi-donor sector-wide programmes and budget support has increased the power of these donors.

Hence the establishment of other partnerships has influenced the Education Sector Review (ESR) and processes, such as the processes that fed into the ESIP II and the education elements within the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) – Uganda’s PRSP. Such partnerships have worked hard to ensure that core positions are agreed upon in advance of key meetings, so that representatives inside the meetings can speak regarding an agreed platform.

Consequently, partners that participate in the Education Funding Agencies Group speak on behalf of others. In this way, the bilateral and multilateral agencies and major power brokers in shaping aid to education – through SWAp, PEAP, the Poverty Action Fund, the EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI) or other
mechanisms (Ward, 2006) – support the leveraging of aid for gender mainstreaming and other important measures for girls’ education in Uganda.

FENU actively influences the ESR, as well as processes that will feed into the ESIP II and the education elements within the PEAP. As far as possible, FENU places emphasis on bringing grassroots voices to the forefront – the FENU Secretariat invites activists and officials from remote districts to speak directly at national meetings. FENU members have worked hard to ensure that representatives speak from an agreed platform rather than speaking for themselves. This was very evident during the May 2003 ESR workshop. By prioritizing issues collectively and working in close coordination, FENU has succeeded in influencing change.

Supported by Action Aid, Save the Children US, Save the Children Norway and GTZ, FENU’s work on non-formal education has been effective in reaching some of the 15 per cent of Ugandan children who still fail to access government schools (in spite of the UPE government policy) in the districts of Kampala, Kotido, Masindi, Moroto, Mubende and Nakasongola.

Twinning among schools has also enhanced infrastructure development. In Ruhira, internet connectivity enables a school to participate in the ‘School 2 School’ programme, an online video partnership. It also enables community health workers to contact the project ambulance at a moment’s notice should a mother go into unexpected or complicated labour, enabling her to reach the hospital for a safe, midwife-assisted delivery. It is also providing scholarships to girls; in 2009, it provided 11 scholarships.

Similarly, the TOLSIP project has directly benefited 5,000 pupils in Kaiso, Kyehooro, Nkondo and Toonya primary schools in Hoima District, and Bugana, Butiaba, Kakoora and Avogera primary schools in Buliisa District. The other beneficiaries from the project include: SMC members (72), head teachers and deputy head teachers (16), lower primary schoolteachers (16) and district officials.

Furthermore, the post-UNGEI period is characterized by less duplication and pooling of resources among NGOs and CBOs.

**Contribution by UNGEI:** The advent of UNGEI in 2004 marks an important point of departure as far as partnerships in girls’ education are concerned. This is because UNGEI became the pioneer partnership whose mandate had an exclusive focus on girls’ education. The evaluation found that the UNGEI partnership is uniquely gifted in more than one way.

It’s very launch brought together a wide range of NGOs, United Nations agencies, parents, local governments, civil society organizations (CSOs), CBOs, FBOs, artists, the private sector, bilateral and multilateral donors, government ministries – especially MoES, MoFPED, the Ministry of Health, as well as MoGLSD – and other actors in girls’ education with a rich mix of experiences and competencies (minutes of UNGEI pioneer meeting, 2004). These partners bring their comparative vantage points to the UNGEI planning table, where the harnessing of synergy is facilitated.
The CSOs, FBOs, CBOs and NGOs (acting within the UNGEI framework) have been very instrumental in the identification, documentation, institutionalization and scaling up of good practices. They bring a grassroots perspective from different parts of the country to the partnership (Williamson, 2008).

UNGEI uses strategies that yield sufficient synergy to enable each partner to derive an adequate sense of achievement as it works towards achieving gender parity. This means that UNGEI does not remove the partners’ independence in decision-making, but it does ensure that the partner consults more systematically on key decisions pertaining to girls’ education and works more effectively together in promotion of girls’ education. Hence, their continuous sharing and networking on issues pertaining to girls’ education.

At the district level, district and sub-county UNGEI committees have participated in data collection on school-age children in the community under their jurisdiction. This data feeds into the district planning process. As one of the education officers explained, “When ADIGE brings reports, we hold a review meeting and we look at the challenges and chart a way forward. When girls are defiled, members of the committee are informed and they in turn inform us and we take action.”
6. Overall assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership

A working definition of a partnership is: “a collaborative relationship between entities to work toward shared objectives through a mutually agreed division of labour” (World Bank, 1998, cited in Axelrod, 2001). Given this definition, this chapter will examine how effective and efficient the UNGEI partnership has been in relation to each of the four outcome areas. Thereafter, an overall assessment of UNGEI strengths and weakness, as well as the opportunities and threats facing the UNGEI partnership, is presented.

6.1 Assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI inputs to the four outcome areas

The key highlights of the overall synthesis are as follows:

Relevance: The education policy aims of UNGEI are consistent with those set by the Government of Uganda in its target of achieving UPE by 2015. The early trainings and community sensitization provided by UNGEI partners were important in improving the domestic capacity and standards of implementation of UPE and USE in the education sector in general and girls’ education in particular. Overall, however, UNGEI is not viewed as a high-profile network in Uganda, partly because the existing sector plans (ESIP and ESSP) already cover UNGEI objectives.

A few examples help illustrate the relevance of UNGEI:

- The UNGEI agenda is broadly in line with the priorities expressed in Uganda’s national development plan, the PEAP/NDP, as well as the EFA and MDGs;
- The network responds to a real demand for assistance in girls’ education, especially within the context of resource-deficient post-conflict districts in Uganda, and the scale of gender issues in education in the country;
- UNGEI aims to better harmonize the assistance provided by different development partners and to align it with national and sub-national priorities developed after extensive and intensive consultation with a wide spectrum of stakeholders;
- There are linkages and areas of complementarity between UNGEI focal intervention areas: i.e., education, food security, health (including HIV/AIDS), water and sanitation, school feeding, etc. For instance, the UNGEI school-feeding programme and the containment of HIV/AIDS among learners have supported the strategy to increase the access, retention and completion of the primary education cycle. Similarly, through lobbying and community mobilization, UNGEI has empowered local communities to demand and support girls’ education; and
- UNGEI fits into and works through existing local government structures and partners with different NGOs to collaboratively contribute to the development of girls’ education in Uganda.

Further, the uncoordinated efforts and lack of sharing of good practice that characterized the pre-UNGEI period makes UNGEI efforts in identification and dissemination of good practice of utmost relevance.
This is because trying out what has been tested in the Ugandan context or in similar contexts is more likely to succeed, making replication of such good practices cost-effective.

The documentation of good practices allows UNGEI partners and other stakeholders to learn from experience, to understand what works and what does not work, as well as how, why and in what conditions.

**Effectiveness**: The term ‘effectiveness’ is understood in the context of this study to refer to whether UNGEI is achieving its intended outcomes. Based on anecdotal information that the consultant cross-checked to the extent possible in the context of this evaluation, UNGEI is, generally speaking, ‘doing things right’, especially looking at the demand for girls’ education in Uganda, and the competence and motivation of UNGEI committee members.

The client communities in the districts where UNGEI is operational consider UNGEI to have been effective in:

- Identifying and disseminating good practice around girls’ education and gender equality;
- Improving policymaking and implementation through:
  - Equipping UNGEI partners and MoES staff with the skills for effective performance of their planning, policy analysis, management, implementation, information processing and M&E responsibilities;
  - Participating in gender audits and annual education sector reviews. UNGEI partners have raised the level of debate on girls’ education to a higher pedestal, thereby deepening the understanding of MoES staff regarding issues related to girls’ education and, in turn, enabling them to identify hurdles as well as key intervention points to improve girls’ access to quality education in a rights-based, child-friendly and gender-sensitive environment (MoES, 2007);
  - Contributing to the revitalization of the Gender Desk at the MoES and the position of the Senior Woman Teacher in schools;
  - Creating and facilitating a standby roster of specially trained and inducted teachers, who are conversant with gender-sensitive delivery modalities;
  - Increasing the responsiveness of school communities to girls’ educational initiatives and endeavours within their localities;
  - Upgrading the managerial skills among primary school head teachers, members of the SMC and some district-level staff using a multi-faceted strategy involving study tours, face-to-face training, and workshops; and
  - Collecting of data to inform policy.
- Promoting the return of child mothers to school.

Through advocacy and dialogue with central and local governments, and by interfacing with local communities, UNGEI has influenced the direction and content of gender in education policy. Its direct and continuing contacts at the district, sub-county and community levels gives its members a depth of crucial knowledge about conditions, trends and issues pertaining to girls’ education, which in turn gives them considerable credibility in policy discourse. UNGEI partners therefore have an edge during policy
discussions, as they are able to engage in policy conversations and debates at a more technical level (ODI, 2008).

In addition, a comprehensive communication strategy including workshops, seminars, radio talk shows, Girls’ Education Weeks, ‘school walks’, and publications such as brochures, posters and charts, has helped UNGEI create awareness about the importance of girls’ education. UNGEI has judiciously utilized the workshop process as a platform for knowledge-sharing and country-level planning of strategies for accelerating girls’ education. Cases in point include the stakeholder workshops, held in Kampala in 2008 and 2010. A Girls’ Education Week was also organized in 2009, which showcased a series of activities, including presentations on ‘good practices’. In this way, the attitudes of both head teachers and parents towards pregnancy are beginning to change, as more girls are being allowed to return to school.

Efficiency: UNGEI taps into the vast pool of its partners’ experiences and skills by emphasizing a division of labour based on the principle of comparative advantage (UNGEI, 2005). UNGEI recognizes the fact that, for some of its partners, girls’ education is an entry point for getting water and sanitation into communities. For others, girls’ education is seen as a means for creating a captive clientele for the improved nutritional status of children; or for combating the spread of HIV; or even for safeguarding children against various forms of abuse. And from the broader development perspective, girls’ education is seen by development partners as an instrument that can bring about wider societal change.

With regard to the efficiency of UNGEI, its cascading organizational structure allows for prudent utilization of resources and reciprocal relationship patterns between the constituent management levels. It also empowers the voiceless to influence policy; facilitates a two-way communication flow; enhances both vertical and horizontal accountability; minimizes role conflicts; provides for built-in checks and balances; and promotes customized as well as expedited decision-making.

UNGEI has improved both allocative and technical efficiency by: maintaining a link between its expenditure and results; strengthening regulations and compliance; ensuring increased human resource productivity through trainings; reducing bureaucratic red tape; eliminating corruption; and reducing duplication of functions through coordination.

6.2 Sustainability of the UNGEI results

The sustainability of the results achieved through UNGEI interventions is difficult to determine, partly because UNGEI continues to receive external financial assistance, and also because of the ‘intangibility’ of some of its impacts. For instance, it is difficult to accurately gauge the extent to which it has influenced the knowledge, attitudes and skills of some people.

In addition, the evaluation has established that there are some effective UNGEI-related interventions (such as returning girls to schools, radio talk shows, community visits and ‘school walks’), which are relatively expensive, in the sense that they are not likely to be sustained by the beneficiary communities or local governments without further external support.
Nevertheless, the evaluation finds that there are several reasons for optimism about the sustainability of the UNGEI process, even after the gradual withdrawal of external funding. These include:

- The groundbreaking success of UNGEI, especially at the grassroots level, which has helped to achieve buy-in by local communities, local governments and donors;
- The involvement of some of the largest, most stable and most extensively dispersed NGOs and CSOs, which is strategically important for UNGEI. The FBOs in particular are respected within the local communities and have existing resources, structures and systems upon which to build. They can undertake their actions in a very cost-effective manner due to their ability to leverage volunteers and other resources with minimal effort;
- The abilities of UNGEI partners. Most are excellent implementing partners because of their dedication to results, their ability to reach the grassroots of society and their capacity to mobilize communities for positive change;
- The stronger partnership with MoES. The ministry now recognizes the competence and potency of UNGEI and the value of its educational contribution to the national effort. UNGEI, for its part, recognizes the role of government policy design and evaluation; and
- The recognition of UNGEI structures at the community level, which are now being used by government organs to mobilize the community.

### 6.3 Strengths of the UNGEI partnership

Based on the information captured, the UNGEI partnership process in Uganda can be credited for leveraging both the central- and district-level governments, intensifying advocacy for girls’ education, raising the visibility of girls’ education in national policy debates, galvanizing the efforts of previously disunited actors in girls’ education, pressurizing the political leadership and policymakers, and using role models to advance girls’ education. The strengths of UNGEI are evident in the following areas:

**Inclusiveness of UNGEI partnership:** The partnership draws from a wide range of stakeholders, including government ministries, the United Nations family, and NGOs, among others. In the Gulu launch, UNGEI tapped the commitment of creative local artists and other prominent personalities to ‘give back to the community’, particularly in support of girls’ education (Gulu UNGEI TORs, 2005). UNGEI promotes greater involvement of boys as strategic allies and encourages the participation of prominent men and women as role models.

**Allowing partners to do what they do best:** The UNGEI partnership principle of comparative advantage is designed to enable one or two of the partners to carry out an activity that they are best suited to perform on behalf of UNGEI. UNICEF, for instance, utilizes the experience it has accumulated in M&E to commission many analytical studies to review existing situations, identify and document good practices, and offer innovative solutions. The publication of these good practices and evaluation study reports has triggered debates and broken new ground for policy solutions in girls’ education. It has also heightened the demand for mainstreaming of gender and gender budgeting into the education SWAp and sector improvement programmes.
Similarly, the findings from studies on violence in educational settings, with a special focus on gender-based violence – funded by Irish Aid – have been used to inform policy and practice. UNGEI partners have also participated in gender audits, the results of which were instrumental in the review of the gender policy (Kariuki, 2007). In addition, a concept paper on post-primary education, drafted by UNGEI partnering organizations provided the basis for policy discussions on the education of adolescent girls.

**Use of existing government structures and systems:** The UNGEI partnership makes use of existing structures not only to facilitate institutional buy-in, but also to cut down on operational costs. For example, in Northern Uganda, UNGEI adopted camp structures in its local-level work. In non-conflict areas, UNGEI also used the local government structure. The use of existing structures ensures that UNGEI activities are aligned to government priorities, and also enhances sustainability.

**UNGEI structure:** With a structure ranging from top policymakers to grassroots communities, UNGEI had a well laid-out management framework for effective communication. Thanks to this, the guidelines provided by the national level could be promptly implemented by district- and community-level structures (Kaluba, 2004). This decentralized structure also creates effective grassroots channels for addressing sociocultural factors that negatively affect girls’ education. Moreover, the multi-stakeholder involvement allowed for a rich knowledge mix and discourse. The structure also ensures that funds mobilized under UNGEI reach the community for the sole purpose of implementing activities. Moreover, resource limitations are addressed by engaging technical persons from government ministries, as well as United Nations agencies and NGOs. Since their salaries are covered by their respective employers, UNGEI is able to reduce costs (Lister, 2006).

Inferential analysis traces the partial success of this collaborative effort to the ability of UNGEI to:

- Provide a platform for bringing the pluralistic voices of its partners to a common planning table;
- Utilize the national EFA action plans along with the PRSP (PEAP), Common Country Assessment and United Nations Development Assistance Framework processes to ensure a policy fit;
- Have well articulated TORs and workplans for its involvement in girls’ education; and
- Conduct advocacy and communication in such a way that leads to a bottom-up development of a social movement for girls’ education.

### 6.4 Weaknesses of the UNGEI partnership

Judging from the opinions expressed by a cross section of informants and the evidence cited in various documents, UNGEI Uganda falls short on several benchmarks.

**Declining visibility:** Although UNGEI started as a rather vibrant partnership due to the commitment of partners, over time its influence in girls’ education appears to have faded (minutes of UNGEI meeting held on 8 April 2008). This diminishing visibility was, inter alia, attributed to:

- **A failure to regularize the UNGEI partnership:** Although mapping of all partners took place at the initiation of UNGEI Uganda and TORs were formulated, UNGEI was left as a ‘loose arrangement’.
To date, the network’s membership remains unclear, as several ‘partners’ were non-committal in declaring whether or not they are in the partnership. Although UNGEI Uganda seems to have started off with 17 member organizations, fewer than 10 could confirm their membership at the time of this evaluation.

- **Low levels of commitment to the partnership:** Some basic building blocks for a strong partnership appear to be missing, such as agreeing to a common Memorandum of Understanding. In addition, the partnership’s decisions seem not to be binding, and the ‘partners’ do not feel obliged to attend UNGEI meetings. Apart from UNICEF, FAWE, GEM, MoGLSD and MOES, attendance at meetings by other partners is very irregular. An earlier (2006) UNICEF study had actually noted that UNGEI needed to be formally institutionalized so that it can better coordinate the activities of constituent members and more effectively engage in national education discourse.

- **Further, the disintegration of the CECs in the north following the return of internally displaced persons to their original homes is indicative of the powerlessness and the unsustainability of UNGEI as a galvanizing forum for girls’ education in the country.**

- **Moreover, not all partners mobilize the requisite resources for translating UNGEI action plans into reality. As a result, many of the partners look to UNICEF as the lead financier. One respondent did concede that, “if UNICEF does not fund their planned activity, that marks the end and the activity is just shelved.” For instance, a proposal was drafted by FAWE in 2008 to revamp UNGEI, but it was shelved because of lack of funds.**

- **In addition, there is a low sense of ownership and collegiality among some of the ‘non-core’ partnering organizations. The ‘non-core’ organizations now appear to prefer to sit back and let UNICEF run much of the show. This denies UNGEI the requisite cohesiveness and status of a high-profile partnership in the country. In fact, at the district level, the UNICEF role is so dominant that the image and activities of UNGEI appear to get subsumed under the broader UNICEF agenda. To most frontline officials in the districts, the activities of the two are indistinguishable. Indeed, it was UNICEF that introduced UNGEI to the districts. The slow roll-out of UNGEI to the rest of the districts in Uganda after a period of seven years can, at least partially, be attributed to this disconnect in the partnership process.**

- **High turnover of staff:** Given the high rates of staff turnover among partner institutions, the current members of the partnership appear unclear about the concrete goals of the partnership and the strategy for their accomplishment. The new staff lacked knowledge about UNGEI, an indication of a lapse in vibrancy.

- **Failure to retain some influential partners:** At the time of this evaluation, UNICEF was the only United Nations organization still remaining in the UNGEI partnership. Attempts to get UNESCO fully on board have proved unsuccessful to date. Although WFP was initially very active in the UNGEI partnership, it has since left. However, the focus of UNGEI on pregnancy has helped draw UNFPA into the partnership. Even then, UNGEI and UNFPA have differing policy perspectives on the issue of girls’ pregnancy. While UNGEI is focused on what to do when a girl gets pregnant, UNFPA has a proactive focus on how to stop teenage pregnancy in the first place.

**Lack of a local Secretariat:** UNGEI Uganda lacks a Secretariat and physical office space of its own and continues to rely on UNICEF for support. This means any consultations on UNGEI issues take place either at the UNICEF offices or at the MoES. As a result, there is now a problem of divided loyalties among the partners. Some are of the view that UNICEF, rather than the MoES, would offer a better leadership and
coordination function if it were mandated to do so. This is because UNICEF is seen to be the one pushing for follow-up meetings. A few of the partners attributed the polarization of UNGEI activities in the country to a lack of elective and rotational office bearers.

**Inadequate funding:** Perhaps one of the most daunting challenges of the UNGEI partnership is inadequate funding of planned activities. In Uganda, gender is considered a crosscutting issue that is not allocated a specific budget line, but is expected to be integrated in all activities. Moreover, many of the partners seem to not be doing enough to mobilize funds. Nevertheless, all is not lost since districts are beginning to budget for girls’ education. In Kasese District, for example, provision for girls’ education and HIV/AIDS has been made in the current annual budget.

**Limited sharing and exchange of information at the district level:** While there has been sharing of good practices for partners at the national level, this is not being replicated at the district and community levels.

**Concentration of UNGEI efforts primarily in the primary education sub-sector:** The main thrust of UNGEI interventions remains confined to the pre-primary and primary sub-sector. This exacerbates the ‘bottleneck effect’ at the higher-level transition points. Apart from UNICEF/FAWE scholarships, the Science, Mathematics and Technology Project (SMTP), menstruation management, and a few other initiatives, UNGEI is largely invisible at the secondary, tertiary and higher-education levels. The mismatched prioritization of UPE and USE programmes has disturbed the articulation between primary and post-primary education. In fact, there was a strong demand for a more comprehensive UNGEI approach at the district level.

### 6.5 Opportunities for the UNGEI partnership

Weaknesses notwithstanding, there are many opportunities that UNGEI could exploit, including:

**Continued low completion of education:** It is clear that in spite of policies such as UPE and USE, many girls and boys still do not complete school. For instance, Table 2 shows that the completion rate to S4, while improving from 16 per cent (18 per cent for boys and 14 per cent for girls) in 2000 to 31 per cent (35 per cent for boys and 28 per cent for girls) in 2007, is still skewed against girls. The situation in pastoral and fishing communities is even worse. UNGEI could play an advocacy role for compulsory education up to age 18. There is a strong feeling among the pastoral and fishing communities that there is a low participation of boys.

**Continuing resistance by head teachers and local community for child mothers to return to school:** The evaluation has shown that many head teachers are still inherently opposed to the readmission of pregnant girls or child mothers to school. In one such case, five girls in Pokot secondary school were denied the chance to sit their end of Term 1 (January–April 2011) examinations because their pregnancy status was reported in one of the local newspapers (Arlong, 2011). As one head teacher bluntly put it, “It
is school policy not to readmit those who become pregnant. However, we recommend them for admission to other schools.”

**Increased cases of pregnancy:** Newspapers continue to report high cases of pregnancy-induced school dropout among girls. For instance, *the Daily Monitor* on Wednesday, 20 April 2011 reported that 65 girls of Kitodha primary school in Bugiri District had dropped out because of pregnancy. Kasese District alone had registered a staggering total of 203 cases of pregnancies in 2010 in both primary and secondary schools. The increase in the number of pregnancy cases calls for proactive responses to curb this trend. Instead of addressing the pregnancy problem, UNGEI could focus on preventing early pregnancy through sex education. Senior Women Teachers could be trained to provide this.

**Lack of child support:** The evaluation has revealed lack of support services for child mothers, including waiting rooms to house babysitters and for breastfeeding. This is making it difficult for many child mothers to go back to school. In Kasese District, one child mother was found breastfeeding her child under a tree. UNGEI could advocate for schools to provide space for young mothers to breastfeed their children.

**Stigma and bullying of child mothers:** The continued bullying of child mothers who choose to return to school by fellow school-goers and some members of the local community remains the biggest hindrance to the ‘return to school’ campaign. One girl admitted that, “The boys abuse me and call me ‘mama late’, because my child died at birth.” This is an area in which UNGEI could get involved, particularly focusing on sensitizing the school community, and with a strong emphasis on boys.

### 6.6 Threats to the UNGEI partnership

**Weak follow-up on agreed action areas:** There is low follow-up of resolutions from UNGEI national meetings and from activities at district-level UNGEI. As one district official remarked, “District UNGEIs were initially active but their enthusiasm has gradually waned with the growing weakening of central-level guidance and supervision.” Weak follow-up in turn affected adherence to joint workplans (UNGEI, 2010; UNICEF, 2007) because some partners view participation in the shared development of UNGEI workplans and activities as an additional burden, since they each have their own separate annual workplans (UNICEF, 2007; UNICEF, 2004; Ejangu, 2004; MoES/UNEC, 2007).

**Weak relationship between national and district-level UNGEI:** The growing disconnect between the national-level UNGEI and the satellite district UNGEIs was also highlighted during the network’s meeting held in Kampala (minutes of the UNGEI meeting on 8 April 2008) in Kampala.

**Failure to integrate UNGEI activities in each partner’s workplan:** It is clear from this evaluation that many partners have ceased integrating UNGEI activities in their workplans. Consequently, newly recruited staff in the organizations that are members of UNGEI lacked information about UNGEI. This is likely to weaken UNGEI further, as many of the new staff who should push forward the UNGEI agenda are unclear about what it is.
Poor record-keeping: According to the available documentation, MoES chairs UNGEI, FAWE Uganda co-chairs, and UNICEF is the convener. However, there is no mention in the documentation of which organization in charge of taking minutes, compiling and keeping other records and reports. Consequently, minutes of UNGEI meetings, as well as other records such as the report on the mapping exercise of 2005, among others, were not available.
7. Conclusions

This chapter assesses the partnership's activities and achievements. Although it is difficult to isolate and measure the impact of the UNGEI process in the promotion of girls’ education, since it complements the efforts of a myriad of other providers, evidence points to strong influence by UNGEI in the outcome areas related to identifying and disseminating good practice, a fairly strong influence on policy on gender equality, and a modest influence on strengthening partnerships. Although there is still no policy on re-entry of pregnant girls to schools, some UNGEI activities have led to the return of girls to school.

7.1 UNGEI activities and objectives

UNGEI activities revolve around enhancing achievements of the four outcomes as shown in the Logic Model (see Annex 7). Activities include advocacy, sensitization and dissemination of good practices through workshops, radio talk shows and ‘school walks’.

The partnership principle of division of labour (based on the logic of comparative advantage) is best demonstrated in the execution and scale-up of good practices. For example, while the UNICEF-supported GEM is now the official champion of the girl-child and school/community-based initiatives, FAWE Uganda is more adept on issues concerning CFS, gender-responsive pedagogy – especially girl-friendly SMTP delivery approaches and cost-saving measures in girls’ education. UNICEF is particularly conversant with the crafting of contextualized and local-specific educational programmes for resource-deficient ‘hard to reach/stay’ areas, including fragile conflict and post-conflict settings. Such capability-based division of labour promotes efficiency and sustainability of the good practices in girls’ education. The major challenge for UNGEI remains shortage of funding for scaling-up purposes.

7.2 Progress towards the achievement of UNGEI expected outcomes

Policy formulation: The catalytic role of UNGEI in the drafting of the 2008 ‘Gender in Education’ policy underscored the need to emphasize the use of a ‘gender lens’ when pursuing progress towards EFA. It is UNGEI that enriched the rights-based logic of the government’s policy by emphasizing the need for a gender perspective in educational policy, planning and programming. UNGEI has played a facilitative role in scaling up girls’ education, especially at the primary school level. However, implementation of these policies to achieve gender equality still remains a challenge.

Policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers: A policy permitting child mothers to return to school is still lacking and some head teachers are exploiting this policy gap to deny girls the opportunity to complete school. However, UNGEI advocacy work has enabled some pregnant girls and child mothers to re-enter school. Preparations by the MoES – in collaboration with the UNGEI partnership – to finalize the formulation of a formal policy on the readmission of pregnant girls/child mothers to school are at an advanced stage.
Identification and dissemination of good practices in girls’ education: This is an area in which the added value of UNGEI is perhaps most noticeable. Through the ‘Guidelines for Documentation of Best Practices in Girls’ Education’, there is consensus that UNGEI in Uganda has succeeded in creating a viable framework for a wide range of partners to identify good practices in girls’ education; to advocate for embedding them in education system reform processes; and to harness the resources necessary to expand key interventions in girls’ education. More specifically, UNGEI has, through its support for the efficacy of collaborative interventions, provided a forum for partners to:

- Share information on a select set of identified good practices in girls’ education considered to be prime candidates for scaling up. Best practice documents and practices are exchanged among partners. Examples include ‘Achieving Gender Parity in Education in Uganda: A Strategy Paper and Framework for Action’ in 2005; and the ‘Training Guide’ for community groups in 2007;
- Explore issues, factors and conditions that promote or constrain the scaling up of good practices, with the goal of developing and recommending strategies and models identified for scaling up good practices in girls’ education; and
- Prepare key elements of an appropriate advocacy campaign, on the basis of the outcomes of these two preceding objectives.

Strengthening partnership in girls’ education: UNGEI has strengthened the capacity of its partners – especially at the district and sub-county/community levels – to protect and advance the gains made in girls’ education thus far. The achievement of ‘community buy-in’ through grassroots mobilization, radio talk shows, sharing of good practices through workshops and ‘school walks’ are breakthrough initiatives. At the national level, however, UNGEI remains a loose amalgam of like-minded organizations with questionable commitment to the network. In addition, the influence of UNICEF/FAWE could inadvertently be eclipsing the statures of other, less visible partners – thereby impairing their commitment to UNGEI.

7.3 Contribution of UNGEI to changes around girls’ education

The UNGEI partnership responds to a real demand for assistance in addressing issues of girls’ education, especially within the context of resource deficiency in post-conflict and hard-to-reach areas and districts of Uganda. Focusing on policy dissemination eases government efforts to implement policies aimed at achieving MDG 3.

7.4 Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI

Relevance of UNGEI partnership in Uganda: UNGEI education policy aims are consistent with those set by the Government of Uganda for achieving UPE by 2015. The early training and community sensitization provided by UNGEI partners was important in improving the domestic capacity and standards of implementation of UPE and USE in the education sector in general and girls’ education in
particular. The UNGEI agenda is broadly in line with Uganda’s national development plan, the PEAP/NDP, as well as EFA and the MDGs.

Indeed, UNGEI Uganda provides a model for multi-stakeholder ownership and management of girls’ education, whereby the school community has been firmly placed ‘in the driver’s seat’. School communities are directly consulted on matters relating to their priority needs and perceptions about the quality of education service delivery. The findings from such consultative efforts are factored into the workplans and are used to inform resource allocation decision-making. As a result, there is now increased prioritization of school community-specific interventions and raised grassroots consciousness.

Effectiveness of UNGEI: UNGEI has been effective in engagement in policy dialogue, provision of technical advice, facilitation of reform (as in the introduction of gender-sensitive classroom teaching and learning, as well as in the provision of support supervision and school inspection), buffering (e.g., in the protection of the interests and concerns of the girl-child, orphans and other vulnerable children), and in the promotion of the return of child mothers to school.

Efficiency: The efficiency of UNGEI is most pronounced in its emphasis on the division of labour based on the principle of comparative advantage (UNGEI, 2005). This in turn reduced duplication and conflict. Through its partners, UNGEI monitors, tracks and evaluates its expenditures vis-à-vis the intended results. In addition, by strengthening empirical research to form the basis for UNGEI spending, it also ensures a match between UNGEI activities and community needs. Some value-for-money measures include ensuring that UNGEI expenditures are based on credible workplans; that an effective monitoring system is established within UNGEI to track and evaluate expenditures vis-à-vis the intended results; and strengthening empirical research efforts to form the basis for UNGEI spending.

7.5 Relationship with the regional level of UNGEI

Generally, the relationship between the regional UNGEI and UNGEI Uganda is not as close as it was when UNGEI was first launched. Moreover, since the Regional Focal Point is a UNICEF staff member, this makes it difficult for the UNGEI regional level to communicate directly to the chairperson of UNGEI Uganda, who is not a UNICEF staff member.

7.6 Relationship with the global level of UNGEI

As with the regional level, the relationship between the global UNGEI and UNGEI Uganda remains weak. The existing relationship appears to be on demand for reports, research/study or sharing of good practices.
8. Lessons learned

Several lessons can be gleaned from the information obtained through this evaluation, as follows:

8.1 Overall lessons around girls’ education and gender equality

Promotion of girls’ education requires multi-faceted/multi-sectoral interventions, since many problems related to girls’ education in particular lie outside the education sector, and since multi-sectoral strategies have been shown to improve girls’ education.

There is a need to look beyond education alone to include human development more comprehensively. For example, there are ongoing efforts to develop parental education that stresses early childhood care and development from a gender perspective. Modules and materials are also being developed in life-skills education.

The gender equity (parity) approach is necessary but not sufficient. It needs to be complemented by approaches that emphasize girls’ and women’s empowerment and full participation through gender mainstreaming. This calls for contextual analysis of gender roles and responsibilities and the need to link girls’ education to a human rights-based approach to programming. In addition, the experience of GEM has shown that boys are strong allies in ensuring a girl-friendly environment both at school and on the way to school. Empowering girls requires partnering with boys.

The linkages between access and quality have become clearer. With regard to gender equality in quality education, it is now clear that broader learning environments are critical, particularly in relation to the need to link schools with the local community and the donor constituency to ensure sustainability in terms of both participatory monitoring and funding of service delivery.

Adaptation of broader UNGEI strategies to local contexts, especially in conflict/post-conflict, pastoralist, nomadic or emergency situations is a pre-condition for success of intervention measures in girls’ education. This implies the development of tailored UNGEI resource packages/community training guides. UNGEI lessons have reinforced the wisdom of development practice gained through the years. For example, although the district UNGEI and GEM clubs are excellent models for girls’ empowerment, they have not been equally successful in all of the districts where they are operational. Anecdotal evidence from the informants seems to point to the relatively superior effectiveness of the Kasese and Kyenjojo district UNGEI over their counterpart in Lira. This illustrates the fact that good project or programme design is important, but successful implementation depends on local leadership and other environmental factors.

Given the required support, children – and especially girls – can work to address issues that affect them. Boys need to remain strategic allies and be mobilized to give space to the girls. Support by school management is critical. Where the head teachers and teachers are available, accommodative and
flexible, GEM has been successful. Management needs to be convinced that children can also develop strategies and produce results to improve their learning environments.

Evidence has shown that children can be important actors on gender issues given their natural drive towards learning and demonstrating their knowledge within the family and the community context. Through GEM and anti-AIDS clubs, girls’ education has moved from issues of access to empowerment. The young are key partners, and need to be involved and encouraged to participate. There is a need to invest more in them for capacity building and sustainability.

8.2 Lessons for the UNGEI partnership

Scaling up also calls for development of a social marketing strategy (advocacy and communication) to overcome resistance to change and create receptivity for social change; integration of M&E into the project design; and greater injections of human, financial and material resources for an accelerated drive towards meeting the MDG and EFA goals of 2015.

Political commitment is critical for scaling up good practices in girls’ education. Such commitment, as well as newly-created policies, has given rise to increased access for girls and improvement in the quality of education for all children. The highest political office in Uganda launched GEM. Political will is still an important ingredient for the success of any grassroots intervention.

Without follow-up and support supervision, implementation can be a problem. Schools that are not monitored tend to have poorly constructed installations/facilities and weak GEM clubs, and the teachers who were trained never implement what they learned in the workshops. In fact, GEM is strong where there is frequent monitoring by UNGEI.

The UNGEI structure, fanning out from top policymakers down to grassroots communities, eases communication flow, implementation and monitoring of activities.

Limited external resources seem to have a better catalytic effect when utilized at local/community levels rather than national-level launches. The district launches have strengthened mobilization and ensured the continuation of the roll-out process.

Partnerships with the private sector are still under-explored. Just like during the initial phase, there is a need to tap the commitment of creative artists/prominent personalities to give back to the community, especially in support of girls’ education/empowerment.

There is almost infinite scope for the formation of partnerships to support and scale up girls’ education because girls’ education is everybody’s business. This includes partnerships at the village, sub-county, district and national levels. Stakeholders need to be involved at all levels.

With regard to partnerships, advocacy and networking, UNGEI has put gender on the agenda whenever policymakers meet to discuss SWAp and sector investment programmes.
Management for results remains a major challenge. There is hitherto a growing commitment to monitoring girls’ education processes and outputs, but with less attention paid to outcomes and impact that can be directly attributed to UNGEI. Results have been seen in terms of: (i) commitment of stakeholders; (ii) processes such as community participation at the investment stage; and (iii) direct project outputs such as girls’ and boys’ access and retention rates.

Less interest has been directed to outcomes such as: community participation at the operational/implementation stage; and the effects of training on actual teaching practices and how girls experience school differently as a result of teachers’ training. Strong beliefs in the effectiveness of UNGEI are thus not always backed by strong objective evidence. Monitoring data concerning the numbers of teachers trained, or girls’ enrolment and attendance, per se, do not solely satisfy the requirements of programme M&E needed for accountability and for measuring impact. Mechanisms and factors that contribute to the success of specific UNGEI interventions and effects on gender equity and equality also need to be captured and documented.
9. **Recommendations**

9.1 **Sustaining UNGEI**

Although at the initiation of UNGEI Uganda, mapping of all the partners took place and TORs were formulated, UNGEI was left as a ‘loose arrangement’. UNGEI should regularize its partnership so as to improve the commitment of partners. In addition, the linkages between national- and district-level UNGEI were found to be weak. It is critical that UNGEI at the national level consciously liaise with the district and sub-county level UNGEI committees to reach the grassroots level.

The evaluation has established that some UNGEI interventions, such as returning girls to schools, radio talk shows and community visits, are relatively expensive and therefore difficult to sustain. UNGEI could form partnerships with the radio station owners to support such programmes. It could also advocate for scholarships, such as those administered by FAWE for ‘returnee’ child mothers. Expanding partnerships would make it easier for UNGEI to adopt multi-sectoral mitigation measures to improve gender equality. For instance, one partner could handle poverty alleviation while another deals with health and hygiene.

In addition, UNGEI should continue to conduct research to inform policy. Such research could be directed at:

- Collecting comparable education data from all districts;
- Tracking girls receiving scholarships over time to examine family dynamics that such support creates to enable girls to attend and remain in school; and
- Carrying out case studies to identify obstacles to the implementation of progressive educational policies that seek to promote girl-friendly environments and to change the social relations of gender. Among other things, this would lead to the development and implementation of school policies that do not expel pregnant girls, but rather enable them to complete their studies.

9.2 **Monitoring/dissemination of UNGEI activities**

There have been many dissemination workshops of UNGEI activities, but all of these have taken place at the national level, mainly in Kampala. There is a need to improve on knowledge-sharing among the different district and sub-county UNGEI committees.

9.3 **Scaling up UNGEI to non-participating districts**

So far in Uganda, UNGEI has focused on primary schools. The shift of government priority to secondary education doesn’t seem to have resonated with UNGEI. There is a need for UNGEI to shift to a broader, more coherent perspective of the challenges across the entire sector. For instance, there are more child mothers at the secondary school level who require encouragement to return to school.
Moreover, child mothers constitute nearly half of all maternal deaths in Uganda, due to an increased risk of complications during pregnancy, which in turn leads to obstetric fistula. There were 17 cases of child-maternal deaths in only one sub-county of Kasese District in 2010. It would therefore appear that the preoccupation of UNGEI to date with simply getting the policy on re-entry of pregnant girls passed, without addressing the root causes of early/unwanted pregnancies, is a necessary but insufficient strategy. Through its committees at the district level, UNGEI should provide sex education to schoolchildren.

This evaluation has shown that cases of child mothers returning to schools are higher in districts where UNGEI is operational. It is therefore important that UNGEI expand its activities to other districts.

9.4 Expanding funding sources

So far, UNGEI partners in Uganda appear to be relying on UNICEF for most of their funding. It is important that all of the partners mobilize funds from other sources for implementation of the activities.
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Purpose of the evaluation: This evaluation aims at exploring the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership. The outcomes include:

Outcome 1 – Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

Country partnerships:

a) What does the UNGEI partnership at the country level look like? (This is a more in-depth description of the country partnership, formed from desk review and in-country, also answering the questions of whether there are TORs for the partnership, whether there is an annual workplan, and the process that is typically undertaken to come up with an annual workplan for the partnership.)

b) Is there agreement among partners about the proposed UNGEI results framework?

c) Do the UNGEI coordination mechanism and activities of partners at the country level contribute to national policies promoting girls’ education and gender equality?

d) What constitutes the full UNGEI country-level partnership? This macro-level mapping of the partnership will ask the following questions for the national partnerships not participating in the exercise: Is there a formalized partnership with TOR? Is there an agreed annual workplan? If so, (a) describe the partnership's main activities and (b) are the workplan results reported annually to the UNGEI Regional Focal Point?

Outcome 2 – Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized

Country partnerships:

a) Does the country partnership have access to best knowledge, policies and practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality from sources attributable to the partnership?

b) What effort has the partnership made to ensure that this knowledge is applied?

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

Country partnerships:

a) What is the added value of UNGEI (i.e., what are some of the achievements that were made possible as a result of working under the partnership)?

b) Does the country coordination mechanism promote measuring and achieving results?

c) Does the country coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?

METHODOLOGY
The evaluation study will be mainly a mixed-method study. Data will be collected from multiple sources: a formal desk review, interviews with key/elite informants, interviews and/or focus groups with important groups of beneficiaries, self-administered surveys and direct observations of activities with beneficiaries wherever possible.

RESPONSIBILITIES AND MANAGEMENT

The consultancy will be jointly supervised by the UNGEI National Chairperson at the MoES and by Rosemary Rugamba-Rwanyange, UNICEF Education Specialist. Margo O’Sullivan, UNICEF Uganda’s Chief of Education, will provide the overall oversight on the implementation of this study.

Reference group: A reference group for the UNGEI evaluation will be established in Uganda comprising up to seven members. The national district partnerships will be representative of the composition of different partners in the MoES and development partners, ensuring appropriate representation from the partnership’s constituencies.

The Reference Group Chair will be responsible for oversight of evaluation activities, while members will advise on the following:

- Consultant’s TOR and workplan, including any adjustments required at inception or other phases;
- Approval of all evaluation products, including the final report; and
- Decision on a post-evaluation management response, action plan and dissemination strategy, and a consideration of how the evaluation findings are to be utilized.

The National Consultant in Uganda will be contracted by UNICEF Uganda Office to perform the following tasks:

- Assist in setting up a reference group for stakeholders in consultation with the UNGEI focal point in the MoES and/or the Chief of Education and Education Specialist at UNICEF Uganda;
- Customize, review and validate data collection tools (questionnaires, interview questions and protocols);
- Supervise data collection and data processing;
- Design and facilitate consultative workshops and meetings;
- Prepare country reports – draft and final reports – and develop PowerPoint presentations; and
- Ensure that the evaluation manager is regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation and possible causes of delays and issues to be resolved.

Payment:

Payment will be made in three instalments, consisting of 30 per cent upon receipt of the first report of the Egypt meeting and the Inception Report, 40 per cent upon presentation of a draft report and
findings of the field trips, and 30 per cent upon satisfactory completion and submission of deliverables approved by the MoES and the Chief, KCL, UNICEF.

**DELIVERABLES FOR UGANDA CONSULTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Anticipated delivery date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparations for consultation workshop</td>
<td>20 January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception Report and report of the consultation workshop</td>
<td>25 February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection, analysis and other field activities (consultative workshops/meetings)</td>
<td>22 April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit first draft of country report</td>
<td>13 May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit final country report</td>
<td>15 June 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total working days</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Inception Report, detailing evaluation activities for Uganda, be 15–20 pages in length, including the TOR and workplan, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the in-country reference group or global reference group.

The final report will not exceed 80 pages, including the executive summary and appendices. Appendices will include the TOR, description of methodology, list of background materials used, list of people interviewed, PowerPoint presentations and workshop materials.
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### Annex 3: UNGEI formative evaluation – Composition of the reference group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Organization</th>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Muhwezi</td>
<td>FAWE Uganda (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Rwanyange</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
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<td>Chair, Gender Task Force/UNGEI and Assistant Commissioner Basic Education, Ministry of Education &amp; Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Co-chair, UNGEI and Director, FAWEU</td>
</tr>
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<td>Program Officer, FAWEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Ernest Thabugha</td>
<td>Senior Inspector of Schools, Kasese Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Kulthum Masika Moshi</td>
<td>Chairperson, KAGEI and Inspector of Schools, Kasese Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Naome Mbambu</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Charity Nduhukire</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Miriam Dambya</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee representing Church of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Teddy Sanza</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee representing Catholic church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Sheik Kengele Suwed</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee representing the Muslim community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Irene Muhindo</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Jane Kamashamba</td>
<td>Director, Rock P.S. and Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Joshua Kambala</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Rock P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 March 2011</td>
<td>Florence Birigwa</td>
<td>Teacher, Rock P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<tr>
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<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Micha</td>
<td>Finance Assistant, Kasese Action for life Improvement (KAGEI partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Godfrey Bwere Bwambale</td>
<td>Chairperson, KAGEI Kyarumba sub-county committee, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Florence Musaka</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson, KAGEI Kyarumba sub-county committee, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Bikoba M. Jesreeh</td>
<td>Secretary, KAGEI Kyarumba sub-county committee, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Bahati Ali Bwambale</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI Kyarumba sub-county committee representing Muslim community, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Steven Kyana</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI Kyarumba sub-county Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Miriam Bafera</td>
<td>Chairperson, Bwimaniro Women’s Group – KAGEI partner, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Ronald Bwambale</td>
<td>Volunteer, Bwimaniro Women’s Group, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Swale Batuli</td>
<td>Secretary, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association – KAGEI partner, Bwera sub-county, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Mrs. Mupendo</td>
<td>Member, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association – KAGEI partner, Bwera sub-county, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>Biira Muzayina</td>
<td>Chairperson, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association – KAGEI partner, Bwera sub-county, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 March 2011</td>
<td>R. Assimwe</td>
<td>Member, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association – KAGEI partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Enid Kabugho</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Joeline Biira</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Janet Mosomboli</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Agnes Biira</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Agatha Tumusiime</td>
<td>Teacher, Rwenzori Girls S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Function/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Moses Muthahinga</td>
<td>Teacher, Rwenzori Girls S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Josephine Muhindo</td>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher, Rwenzori Girls S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 March 2011</td>
<td>Gertrude Tibakanya</td>
<td>DEO and Chair KYEGEI, Kyenjojo District local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
<td>Stella Kabanyobo</td>
<td>Inspector of Schools, Kyenjojo District local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
<td>Linda Timigamba</td>
<td>Woman MP and Secretary KYEGEI Committee, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
<td>Faith Kunihira</td>
<td>Member, KYEGEI Committee, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
<td>Keziah Ruharuza</td>
<td>Retired teacher and member, KYEGEI Committee, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
<td>Patrick Kyaligonza</td>
<td>Principal, Dorcus Vocational Institute, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
<td>Ivan Amanya</td>
<td>Public Relation Officer KIND Uganda (KYEGEI partner), Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
<td>Conrad Katandwe</td>
<td>Team Leader, KIND Uganda, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
<td>Mary Mucyenyi</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Nyakashenyi P.S., Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 March 2011</td>
<td>GEM Club members</td>
<td>8 pupils, Nyakashenyi P.S., Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
<td>John Bright</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Kisojo P.S., Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 April 2011</td>
<td>GEM Matron</td>
<td>GEM Matron, Kisojo P.S., Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
<td>Joel Okidi</td>
<td>Inspector of School (in charge of sports), Abim District local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
<td>George Walter Ochero</td>
<td>District Inspector of Schools, and Acting DEO, Abim District local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April 2011</td>
<td>Lily Adong</td>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>Okello Proscovia Daphine</td>
<td>Senior Woman Teacher, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>Esther Ruth Awili</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>Ruth Abalo</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>Susan Ochan Apeyok</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>Prossy Akech</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2011</td>
<td>Susan Asero</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Function/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>Alice Norah Abonyo</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>Joyce Betty Akech</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>Rose Otto Akongo Filder</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>Grace Awili Milly</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>Kevin Acen</td>
<td>Member, ADIGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>Godfrey Obin Ayen</td>
<td>Secretary, ADIGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>Esther Awor</td>
<td>Member, Morulem sub-county ADIGE member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>Jennifer Ataa</td>
<td>Member, Morulem sub-county ADIGE member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April</td>
<td>Jennifer Awori</td>
<td>Senior Woman Teacher, Abim S.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 April</td>
<td>Bosco Bwonyo</td>
<td>DIS Lirs District local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>Ayena Hon</td>
<td>LCV Secretary for Education, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>Jane Nyakecho</td>
<td>Plan International, WASH officer, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>Stella Ogwang</td>
<td>Probation Officer, Lira District local government, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Regina Betty Okwir</td>
<td>Head Teacher, Ngetta Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Jolly Acen</td>
<td>Community Development Officer, Lira District local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Anthony Kerwagi</td>
<td>Executive Director, Concerned Parents Association, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Joan Apoi</td>
<td>GEM Patron and Senior Woman Teacher, Ngetta Boys P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Shalom Alobo</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Wisdom Adong</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Andrew Awio</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>James Okabo</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 April</td>
<td>Flavia Atim</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 July</td>
<td>Aster Haregot</td>
<td>UNICEF regional office, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 5: Timeline of UNGEI events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>International context</th>
<th>Uganda context</th>
<th>Education policy in Uganda</th>
<th>UNGEI in Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>The Addis Ababa conference on education in Africa: Urges African governments to provide education for all.</td>
<td><strong>1962:</strong> Uganda gains independence with Milton Obote as Prime Minister. Uganda is characterized by good growth, low inflation and balanced current accounts. <strong>1966:</strong> Abrogation of the 1962 constitution and its replacement by a republican constitution.</td>
<td>Uganda’s education sector was also in good shape. <strong>1963:</strong> The Castle Education Commission is appointed to review the education system in order to meet the challenges of a newly independent Uganda. The Commission places a strong emphasis on quality education and argues for expansion of girls’ education, and for provision of adult education. The Commission changed the structure of education to the current 7:4:2: (2-5). <strong>1963:</strong> Education Act passed, putting all schools under government control. It also encouraged the promotion of Ugandan unity and development of a curriculum that reflects an ‘African identity and African personality’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1971:</strong> Milton Obote is toppled in coup led by Idi Amin. Uganda under military dictatorship. Rule of law ceased. There is endless civil unrest, insecurity and economic ruin. <strong>1972:</strong> Amin orders Asians out of Uganda. <strong>1972–1973:</strong> Uganda engages in border</td>
<td><strong>1970:</strong> Education Act passed. The Act provided guidelines for management of schools, operation of private schools, and teachers’ welfare. <strong>1977:</strong> Education Policy Review appointed but due to the overthrow of the government in 1979, its report was not passed. Deterioration of physical infrastructure due to poor maintenance, and shortage of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clashes with the United Republic of Tanzania.</td>
<td>teaching/learning facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1978</strong>: Uganda invades the United Republic of Tanzania with a view to annexing the Kagera region.</td>
<td>Education loses value; educated people feel unsafe and many flee the county.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1979</strong>: The United Republic of Tanzania invades Uganda, unifying the various anti-Amin forces under the Uganda National Liberation Front. Amin is overthrown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economy remains weak and instability continues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1986</strong>: The National Resistance Movement comes to power under Yoweri Museveni.</td>
<td>Political instability leads to deteriorated physical infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Movement adopts a Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) aimed to restore fiscal discipline and monetary stability, and to rehabilitate infrastructure (economic, social and institutional).</td>
<td>Textbooks and instructional materials are almost non-existent in most schools, making teaching and learning extremely difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAP involves trade liberalization, privatization, divestiture of public enterprises, civil service reforms, reorganization of tax revenue collection, etc. The economy responds favourably to measures under SAP.</td>
<td>Lack of textbooks creates a culture of writing of pamphlets, which replace textbooks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1987–1989</strong>: Establishment of the Education Policy Review Commission which:</td>
<td>The few remaining teachers who do not flee the country during the repression are underpaid, under-trained and demoralized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) establishes UPE as a goal and determines</td>
<td><strong>1987–1989</strong>: Establishment of the Education Policy Review Commission which:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td><strong>March 1990</strong>: World Conference on Education for All, in Jomtien, Thailand, adopts the World Declaration on Education for All, which states that all have a right to education. The conference recognizes the setbacks experienced in the 1980s by many nations in the South and makes a commitment to meeting the basic learning needs of every citizen.</td>
<td><strong>1995: New Constitution of Uganda</strong> legalizes political parties but maintains the ban on political activity. With regard to education, the constitution states that <em>all persons have a right to education</em>.</td>
<td>strategies to achieve it; and ii) emphasizes education of marginalized groups, including girls.</td>
<td><strong>1992</strong>: Government White Paper on Education in 1992. The White Paper emphasizes the importance of equal access to education, regardless of social status, sex, and ethnicity. Confirms UPE. Fee payment in primary schools stopped. Massive increase in enrolment (additional 2.3 million children (1.1 million girls and 1.2 million boys), bringing enrolment to 5.7 million in 1997. Acute shortage of classrooms, overcrowding, a decline in teaching quality, and insufficient materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1997</strong>: Following concerns about equitable growth, household poverty and poor social-sector services, the government reoriented the development programme towards poverty reduction and improvement in social services.</td>
<td>Within the PEAP framework, the Government adopts SWAps to address specific constraints. In education, this is known as the <strong>Education Strategic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997: Local Government Act</td>
<td>(a) enhance equitable access to education across income groups and gender;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralization of basic service delivery to districts, including primary education.</td>
<td>(b) improve quality of education; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) enhance the management of education service delivery at all levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998/99: Launching of Schools Facilities Grant, a decentralized modality for constructing and completing primary classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education For All (EFA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999: Launching of new Primary Education Curriculum – Expansion of subjects from 4 to 11 and introduction of local languages for first four years of primary schooling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment 1999–2000, involving six regional conferences, reveals that the EFA agenda has been neglected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>United Nations Millennium Summit: 189 world leaders sign up to try to end poverty by 2015, when they agree to meet the Millennium Development Goals</td>
<td>2000: Ugandans vote against multi-party politics.</td>
<td>2000: In support of UPE, the government increases funding for education from 2.6 per cent of GNP in 1996 to 4 per cent in 2000. By 2001, 32 per cent of the total discretionary recurrent budget is allocated to education (up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MDGs). The MDGs recognize the centrality of gender equality as a goal in itself (Goal 3), as well as the importance of the gender dimensions of each of the other goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>from 24 per cent in 1996) and, within it, the share of primary education reaches 70 per cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Education Forum: 164 governments adopt the Dakar Framework for Action, in which they promise to commit the necessary resources and effort to create a comprehensive and inclusive education system for all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI instituted by the Secretary-General in 2000, with a vision of, “A world where all girls and boys will have equal access to free, quality education.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UNGASS issues a Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS that includes important language on addressing the gender dimensions of the pandemic, “stressing that gender equality and the empowerment of women are fundamental elements in the reduction of the vulnerability of</td>
<td>2001 January: East African Community inaugurated in Arusha, laying groundwork for common East African (Kenya, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania) passport, flag, and economic and monetary integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001 elections: Museveni wins another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>G8 Washington, D.C., in April 2002 approves the EFA Action Plan and the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) amid overwhelming support from the international community. EFA, Amsterdam, Netherlands in April 2002: Developing countries and their external partners agree at a Dutch-World Bank sponsored conference on broad principles for scaling up EFA efforts; the Netherlands commits 135 million Euros to set the process in motion. G8 Kananaskis, Canada. June 2002: Agreement to increase bilateral assistance for the achievement of EFA and to work with bilateral and multilateral agencies to ensure implementation of the FTI. EFA Global Monitoring Report established to monitor progress towards the six EFA goals.</td>
<td>17 July 2002: Uganda accepts invitation to participate in the FTI. September 2002: Draft FTI country proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Financing for Development (Monetary, Mexico) – the first major attempt by the United Nations and the international community to integrate trade, monetary and financial matters into a consolidated framework for achieving development results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>February 2003</strong>: Rome Declaration on the harmonization of aid. The development community commits to work towards aligning its assistance around country development priorities and to harmonize donor policies and priorities around country systems.</td>
<td><strong>April 25 2003</strong> – FTI Uganda next steps letter’. Uganda receives letter outlining the next steps for Uganda in order to be included in the FTI.</td>
<td>The ESSP 2004–2015. The ESSP commits the government to prioritize universal access to primary education. It also focuses attention on improving regional and gender equity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTI Donors Meeting – Paris, <strong>March 2003</strong>: Donors agree on an operation plan for the FTI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The FTI Catalytic Fund is to enable countries lacking resources to scale up the implementation of FTI plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement to open FTI to all low-income countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Education Programme Development Fund (EPDF) established in <strong>November 2004</strong> under the FTI to support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>December 2004</strong>: UNGEI launched in Uganda by the MoES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Declaration endorsed by more than 100 countries to increase efforts in the harmonization, alignment and management of aid for results with a set of actions and indicators that can be monitored.</td>
<td>July 2005: Voters in a referendum overwhelmingly back a return to multi-party politics.</td>
<td>Ugandan President Museveni, in his 2006 Election Manifesto, declares that USE would be expanded to UPPET. The UPPET policy has four purposes: - increasing equitable access to post primary education and training (PPET); - assuring achievement of the MDG of gender parity in education delivery by 2015; - enhancing sustainability of UPE; and - reducing the high costs of PPET.</td>
<td>UNGEI is launched in the districts of Gulu and Lira.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>UN World Summit New York, September 2005: Delegates accused of producing a ‘watered-down’ outcome document, which merely reiterates existing pledges. However, the document referred to the centrality of gender equality to human security and human development and affirmed that achieving gender equality goals depends on the full implementation of the Beijing Platform and its five-year review, and led to the adoption of additional targets and indicators under the MDGs – including reproductive health and rights and sex-disaggregated data on informal employment.</td>
<td>February 2006: President Museveni wins multi-party elections,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International context</td>
<td>Uganda context</td>
<td>Education policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td><strong>Committee on the Rights of the Child (45th Session),</strong> <strong>May 2007</strong>, Brussels, organized by the European Commission, the United Kingdom and the World Bank, to review and gain commitment to achieve full primary education by 2015.</td>
<td><strong>EPDF to provide financial and technical support towards the preparation of the Education Sector Plan (US$250,000).</strong></td>
<td><strong>A revised and re-costed ESSP 2007–2015 is developed by the MoES to make it compliant with EFA FTI goals, and includes plan to introduce local language, ensure access to post-primary education, and strengthen science and technology education.</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNGEL launched in Eastern Uganda in the districts of Abim, Kaberamaido, Katakwi and Soroti.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2007:</strong> EPDF funds a capacity-development workshop on country leadership and implementation for results in the EFA. – FTI partnership held in Cape Town, in which Uganda participated. EPDF also funds two World Bank institute courses. Uganda participates in second course, entitled ‘Accountability, Governance, and Quality of Decentralized Education in Africa.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>September 2008:</strong> Accra summit on aid effectiveness. Donor countries agree to end the fragmentation of aid and donate half of aid directly to governments of low-income countries, rather than to individual projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Government launches a pilot Quality Education Initiative in 12 districts, in response to the poor learning outcomes of UPE.</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNGEL launched in Western Uganda in the districts of Kasese and Kyenjojo.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31 January 2008:</strong> Support to Uganda from the EFA FTI. FTI secretariat responds positively to Uganda. The secretariat proposes a simplified Quality Support Review, which will be both constructive and supportive.</td>
<td><strong>UNGEL strengthens advocacy on the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNGEL starts the process of drafting a policy on re-entry of pregnant girls to school.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 6: The evaluation framework

### Context: What was the situation at level zero? What was happening in-country before UNGEI?

1. What policy interventions to address challenges affecting girls’ education were in place before the establishment of UNGEI in Uganda?
2. Who initiated these policy interventions?
3. Which organizations supported these interventions?
4. Did any partnerships that support girls’ education exist during this period? If so, which ones?
5. What were their achievements?
6. What gaps still existed despite the interventions of such partnerships?

### Inputs: What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them?

1. What triggered the establishment of UNGEI in Uganda?
2. How did the members come together?
3. Who were the UNGEI members when it was launched in 2004?
   a. What activities is UNGEI involved in?
   b. How are UNGEI activities decided?
   c. Does your organization have a UNGEI workplan?

### Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI relevant? Was the design and management structure of UNGEI appropriate?

### Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, and intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy expenditure and service delivery.)

### Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to improving education-sector policies, planning, data, budgeting, level of finance, delivery, M&E and aid effectiveness?

### Efficiency – How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?

Comment on the suitability of UNGEI workplans in achieving its stated objectives. Are UNGEI priorities in line with what is reflected in the national policy development frameworks? Explain your response.

Besides UNGEI, which other organizations contributed to the achievements of the above outcomes?

- What are the main successes of the UNGEI partnership?
- What are the challenges of working in the UNGEI partnership?
- Are there threats to the sustainability of the UNGEI
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcomes</strong>: What has been the effect on quantity, quality, access and sustainability of primary education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What tangible improvements have occurred since the inception of UNGEI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What role did UNGEI play in these improvements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability**: Are the changes that took place in policy and planning, and interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How sustainable are UNGEI activities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OUTCOME 1: Policy and planning</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Context**: What was the situation at level zero with respect to policy and planning? What was happening in-country before UNGEI?

| 1. What policies have been put in place since the launch of UNGEI? |
| 2. Who initiated those policies? |

**Inputs**: What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them?

| 1. What role did UNGEI play in the formulation of these policies? |

| **Relevance** – Were the objectives of UNGEI support to policy and planning relevant? Was the design appropriate? |
| **Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes**: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, and intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.) |

| **Effectiveness** – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to developing policies and plans for girls’ education? To what extent did UNGEI contribute to the implementation of sector policies? |
| **Efficiency** – How economically was UNGEI support to country-level policy and planning translated into results? |
## OUTCOME 2: Policy of re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero with respect to education finance? What was happening in-country before UNGEI?

| 1. | Was there a policy on re-entry of pregnancy girls to school? |
| 2. | Who initiated the policy? |
| 3. | How were schools handling cases of pregnant girls? |

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-UNGEI inputs and processes took place during the same period?

| 1. | Is there any policy on re-entry of pregnant girls since the launch on UNGEI? |
| 2. | What role did UNGEI play in the formulation of that policy? |
| 3. | What other activities has UNGEI undertaken to address the issue of pregnancy and re-entry of child mothers to school? |

**Sustainability:** Are the changes that took place in policy and planning interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?

Comment on the sustainability of the partnership participation in policy formulation.
## Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI support to education and finance relevant? Was the design appropriate?

### Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, and intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.)

**Effectiveness** – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to the return of pregnant girls to school?

**Efficiency** – How economical was UNGEI support the formulation of policy on re-entry of pregnant girls?

### How relevant were UNGEI inputs and activities?

To what extent did UNGEI contribute to the return of pregnant girls to school?

How economical was UNGEI support the formulation of policy on re-entry of pregnant girls?

## Sustainability: Are the changes that took place in the education budget process and the level of finance for primary education likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?

### Outcomes 3: Good practices in girls’ education

#### Context: What was the situation at level zero with respect to some aspects of good practice in girls’ education? What was happening in-country before UNGEI?

What good practices existed in terms of the education of girls and gender equality?

Were these good practices known?

Who identified the good practices?

Were they shared with others? If so, who?

Were they documented and institutionalized? Please explain.

#### Inputs: What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-UNGEI inputs and processes took place during the same period?

What good practices have been identified since the launch of UNGEI?

Who identified them?

What role has UNGEI played in the identification?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have the good practices been shared? Who have they been shared with?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong> – Were the good practices that were identified, documented, implemented, scaled up and institutionalized by UNGEI relevant and appropriate for girls’ education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong> – To what extent did the good practices promoted under the UNGEI umbrella contribute to improved delivery of girls’ education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the good practices identified by UNGEI relevant and appropriate for girls’ education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the scaling up in line with government priorities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability: Are the good practices in girls’ education that have been implemented sustainable? How resilient are they to risks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OUTCOME 4: Effective partnership – including capacity building, M&E**

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero with respect to aid/partnership effectiveness, capacity building and M&E? What was happening in the sector before UNGEI? How effective was the sector partnership, capacity-building efforts and M&E?

1. What partnership in education existed before UNGEI?
2. Who were the members of that partnership?
3. What was their focus?

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-UNGEI inputs and processes took place during the same period?
1. What did UNGEI do to establish its partnership?
2. Who were the members of UNGEI partnership during the launch?
3. Who are the current members? If some members dropped out, why did they?
4. How did UNGEI devolve from the national to the community level?
5. How do the national and district/sub-county chapters of UNGEI relate?
6. What role has UNGEI played in strengthening the partnership on girls’ education and gender equality?
7. Besides UNGEI, which other organizations contributed to the strengthening of the partnership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector 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>Comment on the status of implementation of the UNGEI agenda at the district/community levels. Would you say it has been largely successful?</td>
<td>Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to improved partnership, aid management, capacity, collection of data and better information services? To what extent is there better use of data to inform policy and funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors account for this success, if any?</td>
<td>Efficiency – How economically was improved aid flow, partnership, capacity and support to country data and M&amp;E translated into results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What tangible improvements have occurred since the inception of UNGEI with regard to strengthening of the partnership process for the furtherance of girls’ education?</td>
<td>Does the UNGEI partnership add something that would not be possible without it? Please explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared with other partnerships, how do you rate UNGEI (in terms of strengths and weaknesses)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes UNGEI strong/weak?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability:**

1. What lessons have you learned by being involved in the UNGEI partnership?
2. Does your organization feel a sense of ownership of those activities and their outcomes?
3. How do the global, regional and national chapters of UNGEI relate?
Criteria for M&E of UNGEI goals:

Output 1:
- Evidence of gender-responsive education policies
- Availability of policy frameworks that support girls’ education
- Budgets allocated to improve participation of girls in school

Output 2:
- Number of pregnant girls and child mothers back to school
- Evidence of policy that allows child mothers back to school

Output 3:
- Number of organizations actively involved in UNGEI partnership
- Concerted efforts to address barriers to girls’ education
- Degree of satisfaction of member organizations

ANNEX 6:

Vision: Girls and boys in Uganda accessing and completing a quality education cycle at all levels of education, and contributing to a transformed and developed society

Goal: Achieve gender equality in education through strong partnerships and advocacy at global, regional and country levels

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

Outcome 2:
- A policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers

Outcome 3:
- Strengthened partnership in promotion of girl-child education

Outcome 4:
- Regular review of progress and good practices

Input 1.1 Strategic reviews of existing laws and policies on girls’ education and gender equality to update and inform policy decisions

Input 1.2 Capacity of national education systems to ensure effective and sustainable girls’ education and gender equality strengthened

Input 1.3 Monitoring of policies and laws promoting girls’ education and gender equality among different stakeholders

Input 2.1 Current situation of pregnant girls and child mothers reviewed

Input 2.2 Education policies reviewed to enhance re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools

Input 4.1 Good practices on girls’ education and gender quality identified and documented

Input 4.2 Good practices disseminated and utilized

Input from the UNGEI global, regional and UNGEI Uganda

Input from Uganda Government

Input from communities

Input from multilateral partners

Input from bilateral agencies

Input from NGOs, private

Annex 7: The logic model for UNGEI evaluation in Uganda

Vision: Girls and boys in Uganda accessing and completing a quality education cycle at all levels of education, and contributing to a transformed and developed society
Annex 8: Education statistics:

Figure 3: Trends in primary school enrolments in Uganda (2000–2009)

Table 3: Enrolment trends in primary and secondary education by gender (1996–2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary-school enrolments</th>
<th>Secondary-school enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,068,625</td>
<td>1,647,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,303,561</td>
<td>2,832,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,806,385</td>
<td>3,061,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6,288,239</td>
<td>3,301,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6,559,013</td>
<td>3,395,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6,900,916</td>
<td>3,528,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7,354,153</td>
<td>3,721,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,633,314</td>
<td>3,872,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6,707,845</td>
<td>3,397,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7,223,879</td>
<td>3,642,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,362,938</td>
<td>3,692,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7,537,971</td>
<td>3,779,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled using departmental records and educational statistical abstracts.
## Annex 9: Uganda’s progress towards the MDGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar</td>
<td>ON TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.B: Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people</td>
<td>NO TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.C: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</td>
<td>ON TRACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.A: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 3.A: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015</td>
<td>ON TRACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 4.A: Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-5 mortality rate</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 5.A: Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 5.B: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.A: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>REVERSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.B: Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it</td>
<td>ON TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.C: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss</td>
<td>SLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.C: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation</td>
<td>ON TRACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.D: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers</td>
<td>NO TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.A: Address the special needs of the least developed countries</td>
<td>REVERSAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.B: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term</td>
<td>ACHIEVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.C: In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries</td>
<td>STAGNANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.D: In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications</td>
<td>ON TRACK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: UBOS 2011.*