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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMFED</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC</td>
<td>Global Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHP+</td>
<td>International Health Partnership and Related Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI</td>
<td>United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United National Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the UN Girls’ Education Initiative

I. A BRIEF INTRODUCTION

1.1 UNGEI and Its Role in the World’s Education Stage

The United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) was launched by the UN Secretary-General at the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000, in a bid to narrow the global education gap between girls and boys. The Initiative has since been working as the Education for All (EFA) flagship for girls’ education, guided by the following vision:

“A world where all girls and boys are empowered through quality education to realize their full potential and contribute to transforming societies where gender equality becomes a reality.” (UNGEI)

The United National Children’s Fund (UNICEF) is the lead agency and serves as the UNGEI Secretariat. The global secretariat is housed at UNICEF’s headquarters in New York. A Global Advisory Committee (GAC), currently co-chaired by NORAD and replaced by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) in January 2009 and the Academy for Educational Development (AED), provides oversight on planning, decision-making, guidance and accountability issues. There are UNGEI Focal Points in each region and priority countries that support the coordination of girls’ education strategies and interventions at their respective levels.

UNGEI operates through existing mechanisms (e.g. poverty reduction strategies, sector wide approaches and UN development assistance frameworks) in partnership with a variety of organizations based in developing countries. Its partners include a wide range of stakeholders including governments, donors, the United Nations system, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society, the private sector, and communities and families across the world. UNGEI partners mobilize resources for targeted project interventions and country programs, as well as for large scale systemic

---

1 EFA is a global commitment initiated in 1990 to provide quality basic education by 2015 for all children, youth and adults, with six key education goals identified: 1) Expand early childhood care and education; 2) Provide free and compulsory primary education for all; 3) Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults; 4) Increase adult literacy by 50 per cent; 5) Achieve gender parity by 2005, gender equality by 2015; and 6) Improve the quality of education
http://www.ungei.org/whatisungei/index_211.html


interventions designed to improve whole education systems.

To further support developing countries’ capacity to meet the Millennium Development Goals (MDGS) related to universal primary education (MDG 2) and gender equality (MDG 3), UNGEI strives to support and influence country-driven initiatives by exploring practical and sustainable ways of integrating gender equity and equality in national education policies, programs, and plans. This can also take the form of providing technical knowledge and support.

1.2 Why this Monitoring & Evaluation Framework?

The aim of developing this framework is to support the implementation of UNGEI’s girls’ education and gender equality policy priorities. More specifically, such a framework is expected to help UNGEI members assess UNGEI’s progress and investments in gender equality and girls’ education and provide recommendations for a range of related policy and programming. It is designed as a self-assessment tool UNGEI members can use to either conduct their own assessments or as a framework to be applied by external evaluation teams contracted at the national, regional or global levels. The idea is to provide UNGEI members with a coherent and consistent means of determining the results of their advocacy initiatives and of the partnership itself so that they can use the results of this assessment to provide timely and strategic information that may influence future policy and programming, particularly. This would include, but not be limited to:

- further articulation of education policy from a gender equality lens
- identification of further links between gender equality, education and the Millennium Development Goals, Poverty Reduction Strategies and broader education policy, education priorities, such as HIV & AIDS and education in emergencies and conflict-affected fragile states, and current programming
- identification of possible priority areas for UNGEI in girls’ education and gender equality policy and programming
- collection and analysis of best practices and lessons learned in education and gender equality for dissemination within and outside the UNGEI partnership

1.3 Evaluation Framework Development Process

The M&E framework preparation process were carried out in conformity with the principles, standards and practices set out in the United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards. The results were formulated using the Results-Based Management approaches and language used in the guiding UNICEF document, compatible with standard UN terms and approaches for results-based management. A literature review, particularly of existing Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) framework for global partnerships, provided a reference point for initial thinking of how this UNGEI framework can be shaped.

As stakeholder participation is fundamental to UNGEI’s operation, a major part in the development of the framework followed a participatory process that aimed at facilitating meaningful involvement by partners, beneficiaries and other interested parties. Stakeholder representatives were invited to contribute to the thinking of the framework by responding to a questionnaire – designed in accordance
with questions raised in the TORs - as members of an UNGEI expert panel. Those contacted include:

- Members of the Global Advisory Committee
- Regional partnership members from East Asia and the Pacific, South-East Asia, West & Central Africa, and Eastern & Southern Africa Regions
- Representatives of country-level partnerships from Egypt, Lesotho, Nigeria, and Uganda

A list of those members of the UNGEI Stakeholder Expert Panel whose responses and feedback contributed significantly contributed to the formulation of this framework is included in Annex 4.

1.4 Evaluation Framework Structure

Recognizing that the UNGEI network is highly diverse both in terms of the nature of its membership and with regard to the resources available to conduct an evaluation, the Framework has been set up to provide a range of assessment options. These include:

1. A common Monitoring and Evaluation framework outlining the priority areas and results to be assessed and measured and a brief description of how to use this framework.
2. A tool outlining related results and sample indicators for each result that UNGEI partners can use and adapt to fit their own context. This tool concentrates on measuring results at the outputs, and outcomes level, as well as the related processes.
3. An addendum to this evaluation tool with additional possible categories of analysis for those UNGEI members with the resources to assess a more in-depth range of related results (refer to Annex 1).

The common framework outlined below has also been designed to align any related evaluation work with the following tenets of the Paris Declaration:

- **Country ownership** with involvement of national stakeholders in the whole process where possible
- **Alignment** with national education information systems
- **Harmonization** means that the focus should be on joint attribution to girls’ education initiatives and policies rather than individual attribution
- **Managing for results** focuses on the impact on girls’ education and a need for rapid feedback on outputs
- **Mutual accountability** implies transparency, independence, sharing and learning.

The common framework is based on a more detailed analysis of the following summarized results chain.
The key terminology in this results chain is defined as follows:\(^6\):

**Inputs:** The financial, human, material, technological and information resources used for the development intervention.

**Process:** The different policy, programming, communications or partnership processes used to facilitate effective use of outputs from different sources and to help achieve the results planned.

**Outputs:** The products and services which result from the completion of activities within a development intervention.

**Outcomes:** The intended or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs, usually requiring the collective effort of partners. Outcomes represent changes in development conditions which occur between the completion of outputs and the achievement of impact.

**Impact:** Positive and negative long-term effects on identifiable population groups produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. These effects can be economic, socio-cultural, institutional, environmental, technological or of other types.

The following evaluation framework was developed by Kartini International, a specialist firm in gender and evaluation, with inputs from a draft Performance Measurement Framework developed by UNGEI’s Monitoring and Evaluation Committee. It was further refined based on feedback from the

\(^5\) Adapted from International Health Partnership framework

\(^6\) All definitions except for the one for process are drawn from the section on Harmonized Terminology in the OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results-Based Management 2002.
evaluation framework stakeholder reference group and by incorporating elements of the other partnership and advocacy evaluation frameworks reviewed. The indicators outlined were also validated through a series of consultations with UNGEI stakeholders.

The issues identified by the stakeholder panel of experts and emerging from the literature review encompass multiple themes. To keep the focus clear, the draft UNGEI common M&E framework has distilled these themes down to overall results and partnership principles. The framework focuses on two different types of results and integrates the partnership principles into these results. The two results themes focus on:

1. Developmental results on the ground.
2. Results at the partnership level. This includes the effective establishment of processes that support the developmental results.

Within this context the two overarching results this common evaluation framework measures is designed to measure includes:

1. The UNGEI partnership influences educational and related development results at country, regional and global levels.
2. The UNGEI partnership functions effectively, efficiently and according to good practice of successful partnerships in order to achieve developmental results.

**Figure I** below presents the proposed Common Evaluation Framework of the UNGEI partnership. It has been designed to assist UNGEI partners to:

1. Evaluate the partnership dimension, in particular the added value or unintended consequences of the alliance in contrast to what would have happened in its absence
2. Evaluate program results, including issues related to program design, program results, and program processes
3. Evaluate the degree to which the principles of the alliance have been met (e.g. harmonization, additionality, etc.)

The framework is divided into three sections. The first two outline the general sequence of the results chain related to the two overarching results identified as the priority for measuring in the consultation process. The third, at the bottom of the figure, suggests the proposed actions required for the monitoring, performance and evaluation of inputs from UNGEI partners. The framework is presented as a general guideline UNGEI partners can use to adapt to their specific context and monitoring and evaluation resources by developing their own indicators to fit this framework. Alternatively they can draw upon the sample set of indicators outlined in the Sample Evaluation Tool in Section 4.
### UNGEI Common Performance Measurement Framework

#### A. Operational Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1 Inputs</th>
<th>A.2 Processes</th>
<th>A.3 Outputs</th>
<th>A.4 Outcomes</th>
<th>A.5 Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1 Development of clear ToRs for the UNGEI partnership/ network</td>
<td><strong>A.2.1</strong> Establishment of UNGEI working groups; appointment of focal points in host institutions</td>
<td>A.3.1 Shared leadership and roles by partnership members</td>
<td>A.4.1 Clarity of shared purpose and vision among UNGEI partners</td>
<td>A.5.1 UNGEI partnership and advocacy initiatives positively influence girls’ education &amp; related development results at the country, regional and global levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2 UNGEI Secretariat locates and inventories good practices in advocacy materials, communication, etc</td>
<td><strong>A.2.2</strong> Lessons learned, good practices, advocacy materials, training tool kits, etc., available &amp; shared with all working groups &amp; focal points</td>
<td>A.3.2 UNGEI members are addressing weaknesses or expanding strengths based on best practices in the country</td>
<td>A.4.2 UNGEI partnership functions effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.3 Curriculums developed and trainers of trainers prepared for capacity building efforts</td>
<td><strong>A.2.3</strong> Relevant training provided for and by UNGEI members</td>
<td>A.3.3 UNGEI members work plans promote girls’ education at national, regional and global levels</td>
<td>A.4.3 UNGEI partnership functions efficiently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.4 Development of UNGEI Common Performance Evaluation Framework</td>
<td><strong>A.2.4</strong> Gender &amp; Education sector analytic capacity of UNGEI partners strengthened, especially in baseline research &amp; evaluations</td>
<td>A.3.4 Reliable and timely data available from UNGEI partner-initiated research and evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Developmental Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.1 Inputs</th>
<th>B.2 Processes</th>
<th>B.3 Outputs</th>
<th>B.4 Outcome</th>
<th>B.5 Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1.1 Best practices identified</td>
<td><strong>B.2.1</strong> National plan capacity building programmes</td>
<td>B.3.1 Gender objectives reflected clearly in education policies, action plans, &amp; supporting processes</td>
<td>B.4.1 Improved service coverage for girls in the education sector</td>
<td>B.5.1 Improved completion by girls at primary level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.2 Technical support mobilized</td>
<td><strong>B.2.2</strong> Accountability frameworks</td>
<td>B.3.2 International efforts &amp; national plans aligned</td>
<td>B.4.2 Improved gender responsiveness and sensitivity of the education system</td>
<td>B.5.2 Improved enrolment and attendance by girls at Junior Secondary and Secondary levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1.3 Funding for start-up activities authorized</td>
<td><strong>B.2.3</strong> Gender Analysis in education frameworks</td>
<td>B.3.3 Resource allocation for girls’ education advocacy &amp; programme initiatives meet needs for scaling up programming &amp; strengthening girls’ participation &amp; access</td>
<td>B.4.3 Sustainability of education financing to support increased and improved girls’ education</td>
<td>B.5.3 Reduced gender inequality within education sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B.2.4</strong> Integration of girls’ education issues in education policy dialogue</td>
<td>B.3.4 Reliable &amp; timely data available from country level education information systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>B.5.4 Increased participation in school life and access to academic opportunities by girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B.2.5</strong> Promotion of a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.0 Monitoring and Evaluation Actions needed for each step of results chain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process monitoring</th>
<th>Resource tracking</th>
<th>Implementation monitoring</th>
<th>Education system monitoring</th>
<th>Coverage monitoring</th>
<th>Impact Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. **KEY CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS**

The operational results can be measured at all three levels, while the developmental results will generally be measured at the national, country level.

2.1 **Inputs and Processes Columns**

Domestic, regional and international inputs and processes related to the promotion of girls’ education are listed in the two columns to the left side of the diagram above. In this context Operational Results refers to UNGEI Secretariat operations, UNGEI working group processes, plus the training and strengthening of the gender capacity of UNGEI partners. At this operational level ideally UNGEI inputs should be leading to the establishment of UNGEI processes at the national, regional and international levels, and the increased capacity of UNGEI partners in gender and education issues and analysis and UNGEI partners would be assessing to what degree they have achieved these objectives as a result of their participation in the UNGEI network.

They will also be called upon to assess if these operational inputs and processes have helped develop the underlying structures and process needed to complement the developmental inputs and processes related to the identification of best practices, provision of technical support, authorization of funding, the development and implementation of accountability and gender analysis frameworks, and development of approaches to girls’ education and national capacity-building programmes. These developmental inputs should be fostering processes such as the establishment of gender analysis in education frameworks, the increased integration of girls’ education issues in education policy dialogue and the promotion of a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education. They should also be leading to improved accountability systems for girls’ education by strengthening performance monitoring, placing an increased focus on results and evaluation, and enhancing the use of education data and information. UNGEI partners would track these inputs by monitoring these different processes and tracking the related resources.7

2.2 **Outputs Column**

At the operational results level the framework’s center column focuses on the expected outputs stemming from the inputs and processes outlined in the Inputs and Processes columns. Assessments at this level include a review of UNGEI partner leadership and roles, plus an assessment of how well UNGEI members are addressing weaknesses or expanding strengths based on best practices in country, national, regional and international education work plans and the availability of reliable and timely data available from UNGEI partner-initiated research and evaluations. As much as possible these actions and results should be directly attributable to support received from UNGEI member participation in the UNGEI partnership.

At the developmental results level of the framework the assessment focuses on the degree to which gender objectives are reflected in educational policies, action plans, and supporting processes, how well national plans related to girls’ education and international efforts are aligned, whether the resources allocated for girls’ education advocacy and programme initiatives are meeting national/regional/global needs for scaling up related programming and the strengthening of girls academic achievement and participation in

---

school life, and the availability of reliable and timely data from country level education information systems. The premise behind these outputs is the inputs and processes outlined in columns 1 & 2 should be leading to a more explicit inclusion of gender objectives in diverse government policy and program mechanisms and to the related programming being funded adequately and a corresponding increase in girls access to quality education. The focus here is on measuring results at the planning and design stages of girls’ education initiatives and related inputs into educational policy, work plans and budgets and the ability of the UNGEI partners to positively influence these processes.

From an evaluation perspective for both the operational and developmental results the focus would be on monitoring the implementation of the different processes identified.

2.3 Outcomes Column

The operational outcomes outlined in the fourth column include a clarity of shared purpose and vision among UNGEI partners and that the UNGEI partnership functions effectively and efficiently. These would be the logical outcomes of the outputs generated by the inputs and processes outlined in the first two columns. In turn, the efficient and effective operation of the UNGEI partnership should serve to lay a foundation for the achievement of the partnership’s anticipated developmental outcomes.

These developmental outcomes include: improved education service coverage for girls; increased utilization of education services by girls; improved gender responsiveness and sensitivity of the education system and the sustainability of related education financing. In this context coverage refers to the proportion of the female population who are receiving or making use of a related intervention as compared to the total population that that needs this service. This is normally influenced by supply (provision of services), demand and uptake by people in need of services. However, from a gender perspective, the appropriateness of these services and interventions is also a critical factor influencing the extent of coverage and, consequently, is also an important result that needs to be measured.

The focus at this level is on monitoring the extent of coverage and related factors using data gathered through national education information management systems. Since the three developmental outcomes are all closely related and in many ways are interdependent, UNGEI partners will also likely find that they will be able to use similar data sources and closely related performance indicators to help measure these results.

2.4 Impact Column

The end goal of increasing coverage for girls in the education sector is to improve girls’ quality of life and to provide them with more options in their lives. To achieve this end goal at the operational level it is critical that the UNGEI partnership and advocacy initiatives are able to positively influence girls’ education and related development results at the country, regional and global levels. This presupposes that the UNGEI partners have the capacity to so, as well as ready access to related analytical tools and education models and systems (best practices) that they can use to foster positive changes related to girls’ education at these different levels.

---

The specific developmental results at the impact level that are a pre-condition for the achievement of an improved quality of life and life choices for girls include: improved completion by girls at the primary level; improved enrolment and attendance by girls at Junior Secondary and Secondary levels; reduced gender inequality within the education sector; and increased participation in school life and increased access to academic opportunities by girls.

UNGEI partners can gather data for the first two impacts through national education information management systems. To measure “reduced gender inequality within the education sector” will require the use of a combination of the quantitative data related to girls’ enrollment and completion rates at different levels of schooling, as well as a set of qualitative indicators that measure changes in the specific gender inequalities in the education sector in a specific context. At this level UNGEI partners will be monitoring for the overall impact of their interventions on girls participation in education and the reduction of the specific gender inequalities that exist at the national level.

2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation Actions Needed

Each results category in the results chain requires the collection of different types of data and a focus on different types of monitoring and evaluation. For Inputs you will need to track what kinds of resources are allocated to support the different processes being proposed. Consequently, you would also need to monitor for which processes have been put in place to promote girls’ education.

At the Processes level you would be focusing on the monitoring of the implementation of the different processes proposed and therefore would be collecting data that demonstrates both what kind of processes have been implemented and what is the substantive focus of these processes.

At the Outputs level you would need to monitor for the more immediate results stemming from the combination of inputs and processes in utilized. For results 2.2.3 and 2.3.4, the primary source of this information will be data produced by the education system on education financing, types of programming, enrolment, attendance and completion rates by girls and boys at the different education levels, etc. For results 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 you would need to review policy, strategy and action plan documents produced by the education system.

For Outcomes the focus of the monitoring process would need to be on what kind of coverage the education system is providing to support girls’ education and how much coverage has actually been achieved as a result. This data would also come primarily from national education information management systems.

At the Impact level, you would be doing impact monitoring. While much of this data can be gathered from national education information management systems to obtain some of the more qualitative data there may in some circumstances also be a need to commission or conduct additional surveys and studies.

Overall this combined monitoring process will help you to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the processes used to promote girls education, how well they are strengthening girls access to quality education and what the impact of these different processes and related
resources is on girls enrolment, attendance and completion rates at the primary, junior secondary and secondary school levels and how much girls are able to participate in school life and have access to academic opportunities vis-à-vis boys in the same schools.

### 2.6 Principles

The primary principles behind the common framework for the evaluation of the UNGEI partnership are:

1. **Collective action** – while each UNGEI partner will be using the framework to assess results stemming from their participation in the UNGEI network at their own particular level, the results of these situational evaluations would be shared with the UNGEI Secretariat. This will facilitate the development of an overall assessment of the contribution of the collective efforts of the education sector’s response to girls’ education needs at the country, regional or global levels.

2. **Alignment with country processes** – it is assumed that responses to girls’ education needs at the country level are building upon national processes that each country has already established to evaluate and review progress in the implementation of national girls’ education plans and strategies.

3. **Harmonized approaches to performance assessment** – the assessment process will use common protocols, standardized outcome indicators and measurement tools, with appropriate country adaptations and leadership to minimize separate evaluation efforts of individual initiatives, grants and programs.

4. **Involvement of education information management system** – there should be systematic involvement of national institutions in the monitoring and evaluation of performance related to girls’ education.

5. **Adequate funding** needs to be reserved to pay for monitoring and evaluating performance related to increasing gender equality in the education system. Therefore any girls’ education initiatives planned as a result of or with the support of the UNGEI network would need to ensure that funding for this type of monitoring, evaluation and operational research activities is included in the related budgets.

6. **Balance between country participation and independence** – the evaluation process should to be driven by country needs but also ensure that it is possible to maintain the independence of the evaluation. There is also a need to protect the different stakeholders concerned from any potentially adverse consequences of participating in the related evaluation or monitoring processes.9

7. **Additionality** – there is also a need to assess to what extent the existence of the UNGEI partnership and its inputs are directly contributing to developmental results related to girls’ education being achieved at the country, regional or global levels and for which there is clear evidence of attribution (either full or partial) for these results. This principle probably reflects the greatest technical challenge of this evaluation process and is one

---

reason one of the two overarching results in the Common Evaluation Framework focuses on operational results, i.e., those related to the actual operation of the UNGEI network and partnership.

3. USING THE COMMON EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The framework provides an overall set of results to measure. It is, however, left up to each UNGEI partner to determine how to adapt this framework to fit their particular evaluation needs. For those partners that would like to either simplify the evaluation design process or would like more guidance on how they could do this, there is a detailed evaluation tool outlined in Section 4 which follows. UNGEI partners that would prefer to design their own evaluation based on the Common Framework, will need to keep the design factors outlined below in mind. As the UNGEI Secretariat specifically requested that the UNGEI Common Evaluation Framework adapt the framework developed by the International Health Partnership and Related Initiatives (IHP+) and use it as a model for use by the education sector, the following section summarizes key points from this model as outlined in the IHP+ model in Section 4 of on the implications of the model for monitoring and evaluation.

3.1 Process Monitoring and Resource Tracking

To monitor processes, it is necessary to track the resources allocated to support them from both domestic and external (aid) sources. UNGEI partners will also need to analyze country education sector information. At the regional and global levels, UNGEI partners would need to focus more on the resources and processes related to the operational results outlined in the Framework. For the developmental results you would be tracking related resources and analyzing education sector data primarily at the national, country level.

3.2 Integrated Evaluation Plans

There is also a need to advocate for the development, support and implementation of evaluation plans in line with the general principles of the common framework to assess country progress on an on-going basis. This needs to be accompanied by an assessment of in which areas special research or evaluation studies would be required to address complex questions that cannot be covered readily by collecting and gathering data from the standard education information management systems.10

3.3 Indicators and Measurement Issues

If you are going to be developing your own indicators as opposed to using the sample tool provided in the Section 4 of this framework, you will need to develop a core set of indicators that are closely aligned to the Common Framework to ensure the results of your evaluation can be harmonized with that of other UNGEI partners. In this context, for indicators for monitoring performance the selection process would focus on indicators that could be used to set baselines, performance targets and for reporting purposes.11 For an evaluation these indicators would need to emphasis on girls’ education outcomes, based on

10 Ibid. p. 15
11 International Health Partnership. Op. cit., p. 15
3.3.1 Outputs Indicators:
The primary results at the outputs level for the UNGEI Common Evaluation Framework focus on different aspects of planning for the integration of girls’ education issues in education policies and programming. Therefore your performance indicators at this level will need to draw upon key planning documents and processes and will be largely qualitative in nature. For example, for the output “gender equality objectives are reflected clearly in education policies, action plans and supporting processes” the performance indicators would need to assess the content of these policies, etc. as opposed to counting how frequently girls’ education issues are mentioned. Thus one indicator could be to look for evidence of gender analysis that goes beyond participation levels to address the underlying social norms and economic factors that have led to an imbalance between girls and boys’ primary school completion rates. Another would be to determine if any funding or programming decisions have been made based on the results of the gender analysis in these planning documents.

3.3.2 Outcome Indicators:
The primary outcomes for the UNGEI Common Evaluation Framework focus on the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership at the operational results level and on improved coverage for girls in the education sector at the developmental results level. The main data sources for coverage rates would be school enrollment and completion rates, and population-based surveys such as national censuses (refer to Annex 3 for additional suggestions for data sources). Depending upon the country, there may also be additional useful data that is collected at the individual school and Ministry of Education levels. As noted previously to measure improved gender responsiveness and sensitivity of the education system, you will need to use predominantly qualitative indicators such as “implementation of curriculum review for gender bias” and similar types of performance measures. For the operational outcomes you will also need to focus more on the use of qualitative indicators, although there is some room also for quantitative indicators such as “the number of hits on the UNGEI website by UNGEI members”. The source of the qualitative data will vary according to the indicator, but is likely to rely on a combination of a review of relevant documents and key informant interviews.

3.3.3 Impact Indicators
At the country level performance indicators for the operational impacts would need to rely upon a review of national education policies, action plans, program documents, etc. to determine if there is evidence of the use of girls’ education initiatives or models promoted by UNGEI, as well as key informant interviews and possibly focus group discussions with education officials. At the regional and global levels, it is likely that key sources of information would include related international and regional conference proceedings or minutes of UNGEI working groups, amongst others.
At the developmental impact level key information sources for performance indicators would include national education statistics, national censuses, etc. for the first two impact results looking at girls’ enrollment and completion rates. While you could use some of the same indicators to measure aspects of reduced gender inequality within the education sector, there would also be a need to include qualitative indicators such as reduced incidence of gender bias in primary school and junior secondary curriculum. The nature of the more qualitative performance indicators you develop to assess the reduction of gender inequality in the education sector therefore will determine the primary information sources and data collection methods for these particular indicators and may vary from country to country. Much depends upon what you will have established as the primary gender inequities in the education sector as a part of the original baseline development at the beginning of the girls’ education initiatives.

3.4 Evaluation Design Issues

The IHP+ model provides a good summary of the different evaluation design issues you would also need to consider for the UNGEI Common Evaluation Framework. These include:

- **Definition of results:** how will “results” be defined for performance-based disbursement?
- **Periodicity and timing:** how often is information needed on outcomes and impact, in terms of performance-based disbursement? When should your evaluation take place?
- **Placement of interventions:** is there a bias in the placement of girls’ education interventions that will affect outcomes from the perspective of greater levels of benefits accruing more easily accessible and better off populations or a greater scope for improvement in the poorest and least served areas?
- **Existing data sources:** can you time the evaluation to coincide with related data collection processes and thereby integrate any additional data collection needed into the existing education information system? What is the coverage and quality of the existing education information system? Is it likely to improve during the timeline of the evaluation?
- **Contextual factors:** How much information is needed on socioeconomic changes and on separate girls’ education programs that can influence coverage and impact?
- **Economic assessments:** What are the aims of the economic component of the evaluation? How does the scope of the initiative affect the design of economic evaluation (e.g. catalytic or leveraging function and/or direct disbursement of funds)?

You can use these questions to help develop your own set of performance indicators, as well as design the data collection and analysis methods needed to support the evaluation process.

4. SAMPLE EVALUATION TOOL

The Common Evaluation Framework is based on the two overarching operational and developmental results. Consultations with the UNGEI Monitoring and Evaluation Committee and members of an

---

evaluation framework reference group identified groups of related sub-results at the operational and developmental results levels. This sample evaluation tool takes the Common Evaluation Framework and these sets of sub-results and provides UNGEI partners with a set of performance indicators for each sub-result using a four-level rating scale of poor, fair, good and excellent. The idea is to provide a ready-to-use evaluation tool that can be applied in multiple countries and contexts and which will provide a common standard for the major categories of analysis. UNGEI partners can also review the different sub-results and related indicators to determine which ones would be most applicable in their particular context so that they can develop their own custom-made evaluation design and sets of variables.

The sample evaluation tool is set up as follows:

1. It is divided into two sets of overarching results based on the two overall operational and development results.
2. It outlines a set of sub-results and related indicators for both of the two overarching results.
3. Each sub-result has an overall category of analysis which is accompanied by a rating scale that ranges from poor, fair, good to excellent. Each rating for each category of analysis has a detailed description of the indicators used to determine what level of progress has been achieved for each sub-result.
4. For the self-assessment process, evaluators would need to review the indicators and develop a consistent means of obtaining the data required to determine the status of each sub-result. This will differ from country to country and region to region, but typically would include development of a set of interview questions related to each category of analysis, organizing interviews and/or focus group discussions with key stakeholders and reviewing related documentation.

The indicators that constitute the core assessment tool for the sample evaluation tool Framework are outlined below. They are followed by a detailed set of guidance notes UNGEI network members and evaluators can use to ensure that they are applying the evaluation criteria consistently and to review sample questions they could ask to obtain the data required to make the assessment for each sub-result.

The sample evaluation tool includes a total of two overarching results, 10 sub-results and 18 categories of analysis with accompanying ratings indicators. UNGEI members can also add to or adapt this framework to fit the context in which they are conducting their assessments as needed. For those UNGEI partners for whom there is a need for a more in-depth analysis and assessment process there is an additional set of seven sub-results and 16 related indicators that they can use to complement or strengthen the draft Common UNGEI Performance Evaluation Framework.

The key categories of analysis in this tool are organized by the type of result to be measured. The two overarching operational and developmental results are:

**Operational Result 1.0:**

The UNGEI partnership functions effectively, efficiently and according to good practice of successful partnerships in order to achieve developmental results.

**Developmental Result 2.0:**

The UNGEI partnership and advocacy initiatives positively influences educational and related development results at country, regional and global levels.
The main evaluation framework then asks UNGEI members to assess 11 sub-results under these two overarching operational and developmental results. These sub-results include:

**1.0 Partnership and Process (Operational) Results**

1. UNGEI structures and processes contribute to effective advocacy and programming to support girls’ education.
2. UNGEI partners both contribute and gain resources and experiences on an equal footing and have collegial, as opposed to hierarchal relationships.
3. Development and implementation of an UNGEI global and regional communication and advocacy strategy.
4. Capacity in gender analysis is strengthened among UNGEI partners.
5. Effective peer learning/sharing of best practices exists between countries and regions.
6. Careful alignment of initiative activities with other reform initiatives and activities (systems thinking) and of linkages among the diverse partner activities is established.
7. UNGEI partnership is recognized as a key resource on girls’ education initiatives, tools and approaches.

**2.0 Developmental Results**

1. Educational policies, action plans, programs and supporting processes at country, regional and global levels clearly reflect the gender objectives in MDG and EFA goals.
2. Increased availability of relevant gender equality in education materials for advocacy and teaching/learning accessible at country, regional, and global levels.
3. Increased profile and long term commitment to the promotion of girls’ education at the country, regional and global levels.
4. UNGEI is more fully integrated with EFA and related Frameworks.
5. Creation of an enabling education environment that facilitates girls’ education.

For those countries and UNGEI members that wish to conduct a more in-depth assessment there is an additional set of results that they can measure found in Annex 1. These complementary results include:

1. Strengthening of civil society and private sector participation in UNGEI at all levels
2. Regional focal points strengthened.
3. Global, Regional and Country level girls’ education advocacy initiatives are strengthened
4. Honest, open multiple-path internal communications exist within the partnership.
5. An ongoing participatory learning and action mechanism exists to respond to changing needs.
6. UNGEI partnership able to respond to local context with realistic goals and objectives
7. UNGEI partners have a clear understanding of their responsibilities and privileges.
The framework is also based on the following seven principles and the performance indicators designed to assess progress on and adherence to these principles:

1. Harmonization of all national level education plans (i.e., basic education, junior and secondary education, post-secondary and vocational education, adult literacy, etc.) so that there is both an overall strategic vision for education and the integration of girls’ education issues throughout this continuum.

2. Promotion of gender equality in education through the development of specific policy to address gender issues, i.e., the development of a national policy on gender in basic education.

3. Promotion of complementarity between sectors.

4. Promotion of a stronger voice and more visibility for girls’ education issues.

5. Acceleration of positive results, leveraging of resources and capitalization of experience acquired from successes of ongoing programs.


7. Additionality of the contribution of the UNGEI network to the promotion of girls’ education at the country, regional or global level.

Sample evaluation tool, with detailed indicators, ratings/assessment category descriptions and related guidance notes follow.

4.1 Sample UNGEI Evaluation Tool and Guidance Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT GOAL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve the quality and availability of girls’ education in support of the gender-related EFA goals and MDGs – of eliminating the gender gap in primary and secondary education originally set for 2005, and ensuring that by 2015, all children, girls and boys alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling and have access to all levels of education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONAL GOAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The UNGEI partnership mechanism is strengthened to contribute to the achievement of gender-related EFA and MDG goals at national, regional, and global levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Operational Results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UNGEI partnership functions effectively, efficiently and according to good practice of successful partnerships in order to achieve developmental results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Result 1.1: UNGEI structures and processes contribute to effective advocacy and programming to support girls’ education. (Effectiveness and efficiency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of functional working groups/Focal Points that facilitate sharing of lessons, good practices, advocacy materials, training tool kits, etc.</td>
<td>a) No working groups or Focal Points for advocacy established at any level to facilitate sharing of lessons, good practices, advocacy materials, training tool kits, etc. [or] b) The working groups established meet infrequently and neither have a clear idea of what their objectives should be nor have organized related follow-up activities. [or] d) Working groups and focal points are isolated within host institutions in their work to integrate gender perspectives into local, national and regional educational messages.</td>
<td>a) Working groups or Focal Points for advocacy established at just one level (either national, regional or global) to facilitate sharing of lessons, good practices, advocacy materials, training tool kits, etc. [or] b) The working groups meet occasionally, understand what their objectives are, but have developed an action plan that will only be able to meet a few of these objectives. [or] c) Working groups and focal points have occasional meetings within host institutions to promote and discuss their work to integrate gender perspectives into local, national and regional educational messages.</td>
<td>a) Working groups or Focal Points for advocacy established at two levels (either national, regional or global) to facilitate sharing of lessons, good practices, advocacy materials, training tool kits, etc. [or] b) The working groups have clear objectives, meet on a regular basis using a combination of face to face meetings, teleconferences and email consultations and are able to meet most of their action plan objectives. [or] c) Working groups and focal points have regular meetings within host institutions to promote and discuss their work to integrate gender perspectives into education systems.</td>
<td>a) Working groups or Focal Points for advocacy established at all levels to facilitate sharing of lessons, good practices, advocacy materials, training tool kits, etc. [or] b) The working groups have clear objectives, meet on a regular basis using a combination of face to face meetings, teleconferences and email consultations and are able to meet all of their work plan objectives. [or] c) Working groups and focal points have regular meetings within host institutions to promote and discuss their work to integrate gender perspectives in the education system and host institutions are now promoting these messages elsewhere either within the institution or with other institutional partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.1.1**

This indicator is intended to measure:
- The existence and functionality of UNGEI working groups and focal points within diverse host institutions at the national, regional and global levels

To assess this you will need to:
- Count how frequently the working groups and focal points meet and whether they use more than one means of communications to share information and make decisions (e.g., face to face meetings, emails, teleconferences)
- Whether these groups have been able to develop and implement clear action plans related to gender equality in education
- Whether these groups/focal points have been able to influence actions beyond the actual working group or host organization

You can find this information by:
- Reviewing working group meeting minutes
- Interviewing focal points and working group members
- Interviewing relevant personnel in the host organization
- Reviewing major communications vehicles generated by the host organization to determine if they include key messages about gender equality in education

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Process A.2.1, Outputs A.3.1 & A.3.2, and Outcomes A.4.1 and A.4.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of routine monitoring mechanisms at sub-national and national levels with agreed key performance indicators and targets.</td>
<td>a) Indicators and targets are nonexistent or few at one or both sub-national and national levels. [or] b) Indicators and targets are vague, or confusing, either too easy or impossible to achieve; are not clearly linked to aspirations and strategy and may change from year to year. c) There are no routine management monitoring mechanisms at either the sub-national or national level or else monitoring is sporadic and reactive in nature (i.e., in response to crises or funding demands).</td>
<td>a) There are agreed key performance indicators and targets at just one level. b) Realistic indicators and targets exist in some key areas, but may lack aggressiveness, or be short-term in nature, lack milestones, or mostly focus on inputs or often renegotiated. c) There are no routine management monitoring mechanisms at all levels or else monitoring is sporadic and tends to be reactive in nature (i.e., in response to crises, etc.)</td>
<td>a) There are agreed key performance indicators and targets at both the sub-national and national levels. b) There are quantified, aggressive targets in most areas, but indicators still mainly focused on outputs/ outcomes with some “inputs”. c) Typically include multiyear targets, though may lack milestones.</td>
<td>a) There are agreed key performance indicators and targets at both the sub-national and national levels [plus] b) A limited set of quantified, genuinely demanding performance targets and measurable indicators in all areas that are output/ outcome-focused. c) Indicators and targets have annual milestones, and are long-term nature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.1.2**

You are measuring:

- The existence and quality of performance monitoring systems related to targets in gender equality in education
- The scope and clarity of the targets and indicators set
- Whether the indicators used are both quantitative and qualitative in nature
- If the targets set are ambitious without being impossible to achieve and if the related change indicators are measurable with in the context of institutional capacity and budgets
• If there is a system in place to conduct on-going monitoring of education system performance related to increasing gender equality in education at either or both the sub-national and national levels.
• If there is a consistent use of previously agreed measures related to increasing gender equality in education (i.e., standards, indicators, statistical classifications, etc.)

You can find this information by:
• Reviewing education plans and strategies
• Reviewing program and project documents and monitoring plans and progress reports
• Reviewing the FTI Indicative Framework and UNGEI materials on monitoring gender equality in education

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Output A.3.4 & Outcomes A.4.2 and A.4.3 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Existence of routine monitoring mechanisms at the regional and global levels with agreed key performance indicators and targets.</td>
<td>a) Indicators and targets are non-existent or few. [or] b) Indicators and targets are vague, or confusing, either too easy or impossible to achieve; are not clearly linked to aspirations and strategy and may change from year to year [or] c) Indicators and targets largely unknown or ignored by Network members. [or] d) There are no routine management monitoring mechanisms at all levels or else monitoring is sporadic and reactive in nature (i.e., in response to crises or funding demands).</td>
<td>a) There are agreed key performance indicators and targets at just one level. b) Realistic indicators and targets exist in some key areas, but may lack aggressiveness, or be short-term in nature, lack milestones, or mostly focus on inputs or often renegotiated. c) Network members may or may not know and adopt indicators and targets. d) There are no routine management monitoring mechanisms at all levels or else monitoring is sporadic and tends to be reactive in nature (i.e., in response to crises, etc.)</td>
<td>a) There are agreed key performance indicators and targets at both the regional and global levels. b) There are quantified, aggressive targets in most areas, but indicators still mainly focused on outputs/ outcomes with some “inputs”. c) Typically include multiyear targets, though may lack milestones. d) Indicators and targets are known and adopted by most Network members who usually use them to broadly guide work.</td>
<td>a) There are agreed key performance indicators and targets at both the regional and global levels. b) Limited set of quantified, genuinely demanding performance targets and measurable indicators in all areas that are output/ outcome-focused. c) Indicators and targets have annual milestones, and are long-term nature. d) Network members consistently adopt agreed indicators targets and work diligently to achieve them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.1.3**

You are measuring:
- The existence and quality of performance monitoring systems related to targets in gender equality in education at the regional and global levels among UNGEI partners and if UNGEI partners have engaged in the planning needed to lead to the agreed targets
• The scope and clarity of the targets and indicators set
• Whether the indicators used are both quantitative and qualitative in nature
• If the targets set are ambitious without being impossible to achieve and if the related change indicators are measurable within the context of institutional capacity and budgets
• If there is a system in place to conduct ongoing monitoring of education system performance related to increasing gender equality in education at either or both the sub-national and national levels.
• If there is a consistent use of previously agreed measures related to increasing gender equality in education (i.e., standards, indicators, statistical classifications, etc.)

You can find this information by:
• Reviewing the FTI Indicative Framework and UNGEI materials on monitoring gender equality in education
• Zoë will be providing more sources here

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Output A.3.4 & Outcomes A.4.2 and A.4.3 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 1.2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI partners are able to contribute to the Network on an equal footing and have collegial, as opposed to hierarchal relationships. (Effectiveness and Efficiency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1</td>
<td>Sharing of various roles by partners and extent of their contribution to UNGEI pool of resources.</td>
<td>One partner tends to wind up undertaking most of the roles and leadership for the work required. UNGEI partners either never or seldom contribute to UNGEI’s pool of resources.</td>
<td>Several of the same partners undertake most of the roles and leadership for the work required. Only some UNGEI partners occasionally contribute to UNGEI’s pool of resources.</td>
<td>70% of partners take turns sharing the roles and leadership required to achieve UNGEI’s functions and work. Around half of UNGEI partners regularly contribute to UNGEI’s pool of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.2.1**

You will be measuring:
- To what degree UNGEI partners are able to contribute to and gain from their participation in the Network
- Whether the Network’s leadership roles are fairly evenly distributed or if any particular groups or countries are dominating the process

You can find this information by:
- Reviewing the minutes of working group meetings
- Reviewing UNGEI resources to determine their origin (i.e., which partners have contributed them)

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Output A.3.1 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Existence of clear Terms of Reference governing partnerships at all levels</td>
<td>There are no terms of reference governing the partnership at all levels.</td>
<td>There are terms of reference governing the partnership only at one of the global, regional or national levels or there are existing terms of reference but they do not distinguish clearly between the different levels of the partnership.</td>
<td>There are terms of reference governing the partnership that clearly outline partnership responsibilities and privileges at two of the global, regional or national levels.</td>
<td>There are terms of reference governing the partnership which clearly outline partnership responsibilities and privileges at all three levels (global, regional and national).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.2.2**

You are measuring:
- Whether UNGEI and its related working groups, committees, etc. at the national, regional and global levels are guided/governed by a clear set of terms of reference and mission statement
- Whether these terms of reference differentiate between the roles and responsibilities of UNGEI members at the three different levels

You can collect this data by:
- Reviewing UNGEI Terms of Reference
- Interviewing a representative sample of UNGEI members at the national, regional and global levels

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Process A.2.1, Output A.3.1 and Outcome A.4.1 and A.2.4 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.3</td>
<td>Development and implementation of an effective UNGEI global and regional communication and advocacy strategy. (Effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Extent of UNGEI member involvement in development of global and regional communication and advocacy strategy</td>
<td>No or very few UNGEI members involved in development of global and regional communication and advocacy strategy [or] No strategy developed yet</td>
<td>Only UNGEI members from either the global or regional level involved in development of global and regional communication and advocacy strategy</td>
<td>UNGEI members from both regional and global levels involved in development of global and regional communication and advocacy strategy</td>
<td>UNGEI members from both regional and global levels involved in development of global and regional communication and advocacy strategy and extensive consultations related to the strategy development held with national level UNGEI members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.3.1**

You are measuring:
- If UNGEI has developed a global and regional communication and advocacy strategy
- How much involvement of UNGEI members there is or has been in the development of this strategy at the national, regional and global levels

You can collect this data by:
- Reviewing UNGEI documents to determine if there is a current global and regional communication and advocacy strategy
- Interviewing a representative sample of UNGEI members at the national, regional and global levels

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess Outcomes A.4.1 and A.2.4 in the overall evaluation framework.
**Indicator**

1.3.2 UNGEI members receive timely and adequate information through the partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most UNGEI members do not feel that they receive timely and adequate information through the UNGEI partnership</td>
<td>Only UNGEI members at one level (national, regional or global) feel that they receive timely and adequate information through the UNGEI partnership</td>
<td>UNGEI members at two levels (national, regional or global) feel that they receive timely and adequate information through the UNGEI partnership</td>
<td>UNGEI members at all levels (national, regional or global) feel that they receive timely and adequate information through the UNGEI partnership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.3.2**

You are measuring:

- The number and level of UNGEI members that feel they receive timely and adequate (useful) information through the UNGEI partnership

You can collect this data by:

- Reviewing UNGEI documents sent out by the partnership and the Secretariat to determine what type of information is sent, how often it is sent and to whom it is sent
- Interviewing a representative sample of UNGEI members at the national, regional and global levels

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess Outcomes A.4.1 and A.2.4 in the overall evaluation framework.
### Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.4.1

**You are measuring:**
- The capacity of UNGEI Focal Point and partners to conduct effective gender analysis

**You can do this by assessing if the gender analysis conducted by the Focal Points:**
- Is based on a recognizable gender analysis framework such as Access and Control analysis or Empowerment analysis
- Has considered gender-related risks in the analysis
- Assesses both quantitative and qualitative gender issues
- Includes relevant sex-disaggregated data that can be used to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation process?
- Includes clear recommendations based on the findings of the gender analysis for actions the education sector can take to address the gender inequalities identified
- Includes a cost estimate (either ballpark or detailed) of what it would entail to carry out these recommendations

**You can find this information by:**
- Reviewing planning/programme/project documents and related reports in which the Focal Points have had input
- Interviewing the Focal Points to ascertain what kind of methodology they use when conducting gender analysis

**You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Processes A.2.3 and A.2.4 in the overall evaluation framework.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.5:</td>
<td>Effective peer learning/sharing of best practices exists between countries and regions. (Effectiveness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5.1 UNGEI partners, particularly government ministries and civil society organizations develop and disseminate information about new approaches and tools for integrating gender equality into national level processes to other UNGEI partners.</td>
<td>Few or no UNGEI partners develop and disseminate information about new approaches and tools for integrating gender equality into national level processes to other UNGEI partners.</td>
<td>About one-third of UNGEI partners develop and disseminate information about new approaches and tools for integrating gender equality into national level processes developed.</td>
<td>Between 34% and two-thirds of UNGEI partners develop and disseminate information about new approaches and tools for integrating gender equality into national level processes and engage in active dialogue on these themes.</td>
<td>Over two-thirds of UNGEI partners develop and disseminate information about new approaches and tools for integrating gender equality into national level processes and engage in active dialogue on these themes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.5.1**

You are measuring:
- The extent to which UNGEI partners are both developing resource materials related to increasing gender equality in education and sharing these resources with each other

You can do this by:
- Collecting UNGEI partner newsletters, reports and other publications and reviewing them to see what kind of coverage they give to gender equality in education resources and tools
- Asking UNGEI partners for copies of any tools and resources they have developed and a list of with which institutions they have shared these resources and tools
- Reviewing minutes from national level policy dialogue meetings to determine if there has been active dialogue about any of the UNGEI partner-generated tools and resources
- Reviewing what mechanisms exist for this kind of information sharing at the sub-national, national, regional and global levels
- Documenting the volume of these activities

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Process A.2.2 and Output A.3.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 1.6:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful alignment of initiative activities with other reform initiatives and activities (systems thinking) and of linkages among the diverse partner activities is established. (Efficiency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.6.1 | Realistic parameters of what UNGEI can and cannot do | Majority of UNGEI partners expect UNGEI Secretariat to do most of the work required in the global and regional work plans. Partners have minimal knowledge and understanding of other players and alternative models in program and policy areas. | Limited coordination of global, regional, and national work plans with other reform initiatives and some duplication of efforts. Partners have basic knowledge of players and alternative models in policy and program areas. | Regular coordination of global, regional, and national work plans with other reform initiatives and little duplication of efforts. Partners have solid knowledge of players and alternative models in program area | Regular coordination of global, regional, and national work plans with other reform initiatives and systematic complementarity of efforts. Partners have extensive knowledge of players and alternative models in policy program areas |

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.6.1**

You are measuring:
- Whether UNGEI partners have a realistic sense of what they can ask the UNGEI Secretariat to do on behalf of the partnership
- Whether the UNGEI workplans at the national, regional and global levels complement each other’s work and are aligned to other international initiatives such as the MDGs
- The degree of awareness of who are the major actors and alternative policy and program models related to gender equality in education issues

You can find this information by:
- Interviewing UNGEI Secretariat staff
- Interviewing chairs of UNGEI committees and working groups
- Developing and distributing a survey to UNGEI members or conducting a representative sample of phone interviews with UNGEI members at all three levels

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Output A.3.1 and Outcome A.3.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.6.2 Clear parameters of work programs between individual partners and collective partnership.</td>
<td>Work plans do not present clear parameters of work between individual partners and collective partnerships, leading to some duplication of efforts and miscommunication.</td>
<td>Work plans are clear about some aspects, but not all of the parameters of work between individual partners and collective partnerships, leading to some duplication of efforts and miscommunication.</td>
<td>Work plans are clear about the parameters of work between individual partners and collective partnerships, and there is little duplication of efforts.</td>
<td>Work plans are clear about the parameters of work between individual partners and collective partnerships, and individual and collective partnership efforts are complementary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.6.2**

You are measuring:
- Whether UNGEI generated workplans clearly differentiate between the work being done by individual partners as a part of their institutional mandate and the actions agreed upon by the collective partnership
- Whether there is any duplication of effort between the work done by individual UNGEI members and that done by the collective partnership at the national, regional or global level

You can find this information by:
- Reviewing the workplans generated by the collective UNGEI partnership at different levels
- Comparing these workplans to the work undertaken by a representative sample of individual UNGEI partners (through interviews and/or surveys)

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Output A.3.1 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 1.7: UNGEI partnership is recognized as authority and resource on girls’ education initiatives, tools and approaches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7.1 Frequency of use/citation of UNGEI resources and publications.</td>
<td>a) Little or no use UNGEI resources or publications such as OpEds, Girls EdNet activities, UNGEI newsletter and website etc. and limited coverage of these by the media.</td>
<td>a) Occasional use of UNGEI resources or publications such as OpEds, Girls EdNet activities, UNGEI newsletter and website etc and occasional coverage of these by the media.</td>
<td>a) Regular use of UNGEI publications, OpEds, etc. and regular coverage of these by the media.</td>
<td>a) Frequent use of UNGEI publications, OpEds, etc. and frequent and high profile coverage of these by the media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Little or no citation of UNGEI’s work in national education policies, plans and programmes.</td>
<td>b) Occasional citation of UNGEI’s work in national education policies, plans and programmes.</td>
<td>b) Regular citation of UNGEI’s work in national education policies, plans and programmes.</td>
<td>b) Frequent citation of UNGEI’s work in national education policies, plans and programmes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.7.1**

You will be measuring:
- The extent to which UNGEI resources and publications are being used as one means of assessing whether UNGEI is recognized as an authority and resource on girls’ education initiatives, tools and approaches
- Assess the frequency with which key documents in the education sector cite UNGEI resources or publications

You can find this information by:
- Reviewing national education policies, plans and programme documents and checking the footnotes to determine if the sources cited are UNGEI-related

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Outcome A.4.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
2.0 Developmental Results: The UNGEI partnership and advocacy initiatives positively influences educational and related development results at country, regional and global levels

Result 2.1:
Educational policies, action plans, programs and supporting processes at country, regional and global levels clearly reflect the gender objectives in MDG and EFA goals (6 sample indicators outlined).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>No explicit gender strategies are being pursued in educational policies, action plans, and programs at the country level.</td>
<td>One or two gender strategies are being pursued but are limited to small actions that do not require much systemic change or budget allocations.</td>
<td>Several gender strategies are being pursued integrated in educational policies, action plans, and programs at the country level that address the priority gender inequalities within the education system.</td>
<td>A comprehensive set of gender strategies integrated in educational policies, action plans, and programs at the country level are being pursued which address all of the key gender inequalities within the education system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.1.1**

You will be measuring:

- The existence and quality of explicit educational gender strategies in national education policies, action plans and programmes.
- The existence of an explicit gender strategy by reviewing the education policy, action plan or related programme documents to see if there a detailed gender strategy has been included (e.g., as opposed to a paragraph or a few sentences stating that the document will pay attention to gender in education issues.)
- If commitments to gender equality in education actions are reflected in budget allocations for the policy, action plan or program and assess if sufficient funding has been allocated to implement the gender in education strategy.
- Whether the strategies included focus solely on one issue or if they take a more comprehensive approach that target the priority gender inequities in the education system and practice in a particular country.

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Output B.3.2 in the overall evaluation framework.

To find this information:

- Review education policies, strategies and action plans for their gender equality components
- Collect key programme documents and review these to determine if they include an explicit gender equality strategy
### Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.1.2

**You will be measuring:**

- Whether or not a particular education system has put a plan in place to build its institutional and staff capacity to address gender inequalities in education in a particular country
- The existence of supporting processes such as gender analysis, gender mainstreaming and gender-sensitive monitoring and education.

**To do this you will need to:**

- Look for whether or not institutional needs assessments address gender equality issues plus related staff skills and institutional processes.
- Assess the quality of the capacity-building and institutional development plans by reviewing how comprehensive the related staff training is (i.e., it includes more than short workshops as a means of staff training) and whether or not any systematic, follow-up processes have been put in place to ensure that staff are both able to and are applying what they have learned in their day to day work.

You can find this information by reviewing institutional needs assessment reports, staff training plans and institutional development plans plus annual reports, any kind of progress reports on institutional programming, and through interviews, informal networks, etc.

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help monitor Process B.2.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>The quality of gender analysis in education sector plans.</td>
<td>No evidence of gender analysis or its use in planning processes and monitoring.</td>
<td>Gender analysis limited to quantitative indicators such as measuring male/female participation levels.</td>
<td>Gender analysis uses both qualitative and quantitative categories of analysis and gender analysis results used to inform planning processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.1.3**

You will be measuring:

- If gender analysis is included in education sector plans
- If the gender analysis has considered gender-related risks in its analysis
- If the analysis assesses both quantitative and qualitative gender issues
- If the education sector plan’s analysis includes relevant sex-disaggregated data that can be used to facilitate the monitoring and evaluation process?
- If the education sector plan has acted on the key issues of concern identified in the analysis and addressed these issues in the plan’s proposed activities and budget

You can collect this data by reviewing national education sector plans and by interviewing Ministry of Education planning staff.

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Process B.2.3 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Extent of gender considerations in resource allocation within sectoral and national planning and budgeting processes, including funding specifically earmarked for the achievement of girls’ education.</td>
<td>No funds specifically earmarked for the achievement of girls’ education.</td>
<td>Limited funds specifically earmarked for girls’ education (compared to the extent of gender disparities in girls and boys’ education within that particular context).</td>
<td>Clear gender equality objectives established within sectoral and national planning and budgeting processes accompanied by sufficient funding to implement them.</td>
<td>Gender equality considerations integrated throughout sectoral and national budgeting processes and adequate funding specifically earmarked to achieve girls’ education objectives in each relevant sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.1.4**

You will be measuring:
- The extent and type of funding allocated to promote gender equality in the education sector
- Look for whether there are earmarked funds to support the promotion of gender equality in education and calculate what proportion of the budget these funds represent.
- Assess whether the funds allocated are sufficient to implement the planned activities
- Determine if the types of funding allocated are only for one-time only projects, and/or annual inputs for gender equality activities

You can find this information by:
- Reviewing education sector budgets.
- In instances where the gender related initiatives have not been separated out, you will likely need to review project documents for those specific initiatives.

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Output B.3.3 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>Stakeholder advocacy initiatives of stakeholders do not take a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education in national plans, PRSPs, gender strategies and work with other groups involved in education or gender.</td>
<td>Stakeholder advocacy initiatives take a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education in one of: national plans, PRSPs, gender strategies and work with other groups involved in education or gender.</td>
<td>Stakeholder advocacy initiatives promote a multi-sectoral approach in girls’ education in at least two of: national plans, PRSPs, gender strategies or work with other groups involved in education or gender.</td>
<td>Advocacy initiatives of stakeholders actively, systematically and explicitly promote a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education in national plans, PRSPs, gender strategies and work with other groups involved in education or gender.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.1.5**
You are measuring:
- The extent to which the different actors in the education sector have adopted a multi-sectoral approach to girls’ education within national plans, PRSPs and gender strategies and in their work with other groups involved in gender and/or education issues.
- A multi-sector approach refers to one that involves more than just the Ministry of Education as a key actor and looks at and includes all forms of education in which girls could be involved (e.g., non-formal education, skills training, etc.).

You can find this data by reviewing national plans, PRSPs, and national gender strategies and by interviewing Ministry personnel in the Women’s or Gender Ministries and in any ministry that traditionally offers educational programming.

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help monitor Process B.2.5 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6 Implementation of international legal instruments such as the CRC and CEDAW to monitor progress on girls’ participation in education</td>
<td>No evidence of the implementation of the relevant international legal instruments to monitor progress on girls’ participation in education.</td>
<td>Monitoring and other reports make occasional reference to the implementation of international legal instruments to monitor progress on girls’ participation in education.</td>
<td>Regular reports made on the progress made on girls’ participation in education using international legal instruments.</td>
<td>Regular reports made on the progress made on girls’ participation in education using international legal instruments and changes made in national education plans, etc. based on the results of these progress reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.1.6**

You are measuring:
- The extent to which different international legal instruments such as the CRC and CEDAW are being used to monitor progress on girls’ participation in education

You can find this data by:
- Reviewing the education section national compliance report for these international legal instruments plans
- Reviewing shadow reports produced by civil society organizations on the implementation of the different international rights instruments.

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure the following results from the overall framework:
- **Outcome B.4.1** “Improved service coverage for girls in the education sector”; and
- **Outcome B.4.2** “Improved gender responsiveness and sensitivity of the education system”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 2.2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased availability of relevant gender equality in education materials for advocacy and teaching/learning accessible at country, regional, and global levels,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2.1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of relevant gender equality in education advocacy/teaching and learning materials produced by UNGEI members.</strong></td>
<td>Little or no gender equality in education advocacy/teaching and learning materials available at all levels.</td>
<td>Some relevant gender equality in education advocacy/teaching and learning materials at one level.</td>
<td>Relevant gender equality in education advocacy/teaching and learning materials readily available at two of the national, global and regional levels.</td>
<td>Relevant gender equality in education advocacy/teaching and learning materials readily available at all three levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little or no promotion by UNGEI members of these materials at all levels.</td>
<td>Active promotion of these materials by UNGEI members to only a narrow target group at any of the levels.</td>
<td>Active promotion of these materials by UNGEI members to key stakeholders for at least two levels.</td>
<td>Active promotion of these materials by UNGEI members to key stakeholders at all three levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.2.1**

You will be measuring:
- What types of gender equality materials in education are available to the personnel responsible for implementing gender equality initiatives at the sub-national, national, regional and/or global levels (i.e., to Ministry of Education personnel, teachers, etc.)
- How accessible this material is (e.g. only by internet, in hardcopy, if it is free or at low cost, etc.)
- You would be only assessing the level applicable to your context (i.e., sub-national, national, regional or global)

You can collect this data by:
- Reviewing relevant website usage statistics
- Surveys and interviews with representative groups of teachers and Ministry of Education personnel
- Interviewing the producers of the materials in question to find out who has access to their materials

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Process A.2.2 and Outcome A.4.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
### Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.2.2

You need to:
- Identify which education policy dialogue fora are the strategic ones for promoting girls’ education and review the extent of UNGEI partner agency representation in policy dialogue for the level you are evaluating (local/national, regional, etc.)
- Identify how many UNGEI partners there are at this level and how present they are during policy dialogue meetings

You can find this data by:
- First identifying how many UNGEI partners there are in the country being assessed
- Attending education policy dialogue meetings and documenting how many of these UNGEI partners are participating
- Interviewing Ministry of Education or UNGEI partners who have attended these meetings
- Reviewing attendance lists from policy dialogue meetings

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Output A.3.1 and Outcomes A.4.1 and A.4.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result 2.3:</strong></td>
<td>Increased profile of and long term commitment made to the promotion of girls’ education at the country, regional and global levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Profile and nature of commitment to promotion of girls’ education among development partners.</td>
<td>There is little or no profile of gender equality in education. Where the profile exists, it is in the context of short-term initiatives that do not address underlying structural gender equality issues.</td>
<td>Gender equality in education is mentioned occasionally in the national plans and PRSPs, but is not accompanied by a clear statement of commitment to effect changes in the underlying structural causes of gender inequality in the education system and a limited amount of related programming.</td>
<td>Gender equality issues in education are integrated throughout national plans and PRSPs; these documents are accompanied by an analysis of the underlying structural causes of gender inequality in education, and clear statements of commitment to support related long-term initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.3.1**

You will be measuring:
- How visible gender equality issues in education are at either the national, regional or global level and whether they are seen as a priority
- Whether the commitment being made to gender equality in education by the key stakeholders is of a short term or long term nature

You can find this data by:
- Reviewing PRSPs national education plans, policies, and related programme documents

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help measure Outputs B.3.1 and B.3.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
### Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.4.1

You are measuring:

- The degree of support of UNGEI partners for the assessment of country readiness to address gender inequality as a part of the EFA framework as a means of assessing how relevant the UNGEI contribution to this process has been and how well UNGEI has integrated EFA and related frameworks.

You can find this data by:

- Conducting a survey of UNGEI partners at the national level.

You can also use the data collected for this indicator to help measure Output B.3.2 in the overall evaluation framework.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.4:</td>
<td>UNGEI is more fully integrated with EFA and related Frameworks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1 UNGEI partners provide support for the assessment of country readiness to address gender inequality as part of the EFA framework. (Relevance)</td>
<td>UNGEI partners do not provide any support for the assessment of country readiness to address gender inequality as part of the EFA framework.</td>
<td>UNGEI partners provide limited support (either in terms of human resources or financial) for the assessment of country readiness to address gender inequality as part of the EFA framework.</td>
<td>UNGEI partners provide adequate financial support for the assessment of country readiness to address gender inequality as part of the EFA framework.</td>
<td>UNGEI partners provide adequate financial and human resource support for the assessment of country readiness to address gender inequality as part of the EFA framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result 2.5: Creation of enabling environment that facilitates girls’ education</td>
<td>Few UNGEI members promote the construction of facilities and development of policy and programme initiatives that will increase girls’ access to education at the sub-national and national levels</td>
<td>Less than one-third of UNGEI members promote the construction of facilities and development of policy and programme initiatives that will increase girls’ access to education at the sub-national and national levels</td>
<td>Between 34% and 66% of UNGEI members promote the construction of facilities and development of policy and programme initiatives that will increase girls’ access to education at the sub-national and national levels</td>
<td>Over 66% of UNGEI members promote the construction of facilities and development of policy and programme initiatives that will increase girls’ access to education at the sub-national and national levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 2.5.1**

You are measuring:
- The extent to which and whether UNGEI partners are actively contributing to the creation of an enabling environment that facilitates girls’ education by promoting the construction of facilities and development of policy and programme initiatives that will increase girls’ access to education at the sub-national and national levels.

You can find this data by:
- Conducting a survey of UNGEI partners at the national and sub-national levels.

You can also use the data collected for this indicator to help measure Outputs A.3.3, and B.3.3 and Impact A.5.1 in the overall evaluation framework.
Annex 1: Additional Indicators to Support More In-depth Assessment Process

Notes:

For those UNGEI partners that want to conduct a more in-depth evaluation, the following represent a combination of additional indicators for the core developmental and operational results outlined in the tool, as well as some additional results and related indicators you may find relevant for your context. The numbering system continues in sequence from that outlined in the sample tool so that each indicator is referenced to either one of the core results listed in the tool or are allocated a new number related to a new results statement.

Additional Operational Results Indicators

Result 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4</td>
<td>Little or no contributions by different UNGEI partners at dialogue tables and working groups.</td>
<td>Contributions made by different UNGEI partners at the different dialogue tables and working groups approximately one-third half the time they are represented.</td>
<td>Regular contributions made by different UNGEI partners at each dialogue table and working group.</td>
<td>Significant contributions made by different UNGEI partners at each dialogue table and working group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.1.4**

You will be measuring to what degree UNGEI members at a particular level (national, regional or global) are contributing to the dialogue about and planning of initiatives and policies designed to facilitate girls’ education and are documenting this experience.

You can collect this data by:
- Participating in education policy dialogues
- Reviewing the minutes of related meetings
- Surveying or interviewing UNGEI partners and other stakeholders at a particular level who participate in education policy dialogue
- Reviewing the minutes of the UNGEI working group meetings
- Interviewing or surveying UNGEI working group members

You may also be able to use the data collected for this indicator to help assess Outcome A.4.2 and Output B.2.4.
## Result 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Ability of regional Focal Points to provide adequate technical support to regions for activity implementation, including information on access to funding.</td>
<td>Most regional Focal Points find it challenging or lack the skills and resources required to regions for activity implementation, including information on access to funding.</td>
<td>Some regional Focal Points are able to provide adequate technical for activity implementation, including information on access to funding.</td>
<td>The majority of regional Focal Points are able to provide adequate technical support to the regions for activity implementation, but may have less information about on access to funding.</td>
<td>The majority of regional Focal Points are able to provide adequate technical support for both activity implementation, and information on access to funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Guidance Notes, indicator 1.1.5

You will be measuring:
- the capacity of UNGEI regional focal points with regard to their being able to provide sufficient technical support to other UNGEI members in the region
- This technical support would include information about diverse potential means of funding UNGEI and girls’ education related activities.

You can collect this data by:
- Interviewing or surveying UNGEI regional focal points
- Interviewing or surveying UNGEI members in each region

You may also be able to use the data collected for this indicator to help monitor and assess Process A.2.1 and Outcome B.2.3.
Result 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3</td>
<td>Little or no participation of regional networks/coalitions in GAC meetings.</td>
<td>Occasional participation of some regional networks/coalitions in GAC meetings.</td>
<td>Regular participation of some regional networks/coalitions in GAC meetings.</td>
<td>Active participation of all regional networks/coalitions in GAC meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, indicator 1.2.3**

You will be measuring:
- The extent of participation of regional networks and coalitions in GAC meetings.

To collect this data you can:
- Review GAC meeting minutes
- Interview or survey GAC members
- Interview or survey relevant network and coalition members.

You can also use this indicator to help assess Output B.3.1 and Outcome B.4.2.
### Guidance Note, indicator 1.2.4

For this indicator you will be measuring:
- The degree and extent to which UNGEI members have a shared purpose and clarity of vision.

To measure this you would need to:
- Interview or survey UNGEI members about their understanding of UNGEI mission and purpose.

You can also use this data to assess Outcome A.4.1.

#### Result 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 Degree of clarity of partnership mission</td>
<td>No written mission or limited expression of the Network’s reason for existence. Partnership lacks clarity or specificity. Mission either held by very few in Network or rarely referred to.</td>
<td>Some expression of Network’s reason for existence that reflects its values and purpose, but may lack clarity. Lacks broad agreement or rarely referred to.</td>
<td>Clear expression of Network’s reason for existence that reflects its values and purpose. Held by many within Network and often referred to.</td>
<td>Clear expression of Network’s reason for existence that describes an enduring reality that reflects its values and purpose. Broadly held within Network and frequently referred to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Result 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5 Nature and extent of partnerships, alliances development.</td>
<td>Limited use of partnerships and alliances among different types of organizations at the three different levels.</td>
<td>Early stages of building relationships and collaborating with different types of organizations at different levels (global, regional and national)</td>
<td>Effectively built and leveraged key relationships among different types of organizations among partnership members.</td>
<td>Built, leveraged, and maintained strong, high-impact, relationships with variety of relevant parties (national, regional and global entities from diverse sectors). Relationships deeply anchored in stable, long-term, mutually beneficial collaboration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance Notes, indicator 1.2.5

You will be measuring:
- Whether UNGEI’s membership includes partnerships and alliances
- The extent of partnerships and alliances within UNGEI membership.

To collect this data you can:
- Review UNGEI Secretariat documentation related to UNGEI membership
- Interview or survey UNGEI members

You can also use this indicator to help assess Output B.3.1 and Outcome B.4.2.
Result 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>No internal communication protocol exists within the partnership.</td>
<td>An internal communication protocol is in the process of development but has not been agreed, tested, monitored, and revised.</td>
<td>An internal communication protocol is in place which has been agreed and tested, and is used by at least 60% of the membership.</td>
<td>An internal communication protocol is in place which has been agreed and tested, and is used by over 60% of the membership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, indicator 1.3.3**

For this indicator you will be measuring whether honest, open multiple-path internal communications exist within the partnership. This is another aspect of UNGEI partner effectiveness. Specifically you would be determining if:

- There is an effective communications protocol and system within the UNGEI partnership that has been agreed upon, tested for workability, monitored for implementation and then revised as needed.

To collect this data you need to:

- Monitor UNGEI communications among partners
- Review any existing or past communications protocols
- Interview UNGEI Secretariat staff and UNGEI members.

You can also use the data from this indicator to help assess Outcomes A.4.2 and A.4.3.
### Result 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.2 Formal participatory learning mechanism has been put in place to encourage and facilitate sharing of experiences.</td>
<td>No formal mechanism is in place to encourage and facilitate sharing of experiences, e.g., sharing is done solely on an ad hoc basis.</td>
<td>Formal mechanism/systems exist in a few areas but either not user-friendly or not comprehensive enough to have an impact in place to encourage and to facilitate sharing of experiences so lessons learned are not disseminated widely. Systems known by only a few people, or only occasionally used</td>
<td>Well-designed, user-friendly formal mechanisms in place to encourage and facilitate sharing of experiences, and lessons learned disseminated regularly and documented systematically. Systems are known by many people within the Network and often used</td>
<td>Well-designed, user-friendly formal mechanisms in place to encourage and facilitate sharing of experiences, lessons learned and disseminated, and disseminate knowledge internally in all relevant areas. All Network members aware of systems, knowledgeable in their use, and make frequent use of them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, Indicator 1.5.2**

You are measuring:

- Whether the UNGEI partnership has established an effective mechanism to share lessons learned and other learning experiences
- Whether any formal participatory learning mechanism established is easy to use
- Whether UNGEI partners are aware of and using any formal participatory learning mechanism(s) that have been established
- Whether the information disseminated is reaching UNGEI partners

You find this information by:

- Interviewing a representative sample of UNGEI members regarding what processes they have been using to share lessons learned, etc.
- Trying to access any formal mechanisms put in place to facilitate the sharing of experiences (e.g. get on list serve for UNGEI newsletter)

You can also use data collected for this indicator to help assess or monitor Process A.2.2, Output A.3.2 and Outcomes A.4.2 and A.4.3 in the overall evaluation framework.
Result 1.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.2 Diversity of partners represented.</td>
<td>Partners drawn mainly from one type of organization at all levels.</td>
<td>Partners drawn from several types of organization at some but not all levels.</td>
<td>Partners drawn wide range of types of organization at least two levels.</td>
<td>Partners drawn wide range of types of organization at all levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Note, indicator 1.7.2**

For this indicator you will be measuring both:
- The relevance of UNGEI to those involved in the education sector or with girls’ education by determining how broad a group of stakeholders are involved in the network
- The effectiveness of the Network in attracting a diverse group of members.

To do this, you will need to collect the following data:
- Number and type of UNGEI members

You can also use this data to contribute to the assessment of Outcome A.4.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
Result 1.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.3 Continuity of partner organization representation in the network.</td>
<td>Little or no continuity in partner organizations representation in the network.</td>
<td>One-third of partner organizations maintain continuity of representation in the network.</td>
<td>Between one-third and 70% of partner organizations maintain continuity of representation in the network.</td>
<td>Over 70% of partner organizations maintain continuity of representation in the network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, 1.7.3**

For this indicator you will be measuring:
- The sustainability of the UNGEI Network by assessing what percentage of members maintains their representation within diverse Network fora and activities.

To obtain this data you will need to:
- Review membership data to determine the length of membership
- Review UNGEI working group and committee meeting minutes to determine which organizations are represented in these bodies.

You can also use the data collected for this indicator to help assess Outcome A.4.2.
Result 1.8

**Result 1.8:**
Strengthening of civil society and private sector participation in UNGEI at all levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.8.1 Contributions made by civil society organizations to UNGEI at all levels.</td>
<td>Little or no contributions made by civil society organizations and the private sector to UNGEI at all levels.</td>
<td>Occasional contributions by civil society organizations and the private sector to UNGEI at some levels.</td>
<td>Regular contributions by civil society organizations and the private sector to UNGEI at more than one level.</td>
<td>Ongoing contributions by civil society organizations and the private sector to UNGEI at all levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, indicator 1.8.1**

This indicator is closely related to operational result 1.1. “UNGEI partners ... have collegial and as opposed to hierarchal relationships and can also be used to help measure Outcomes A.4.2: “UNGEI partnership functions effectively”.

For this indicator you will be measuring:
- The extent and regularity of civil society contributions to UNGEI at the sub-national, national, regional and global levels.

You can collect this data by:
- Reviewing which organizations are involved in UNGEI at the sub-national, national, regional and global levels
- Reviewing UNGEI working group minutes
- Surveying UNGEI civil society and private sector members to determine the extent of their contribution
- Interviewing the UNGEI Secretariat staff regarding UNGEI member participation at the regional and global levels.

You can also use this data to contribute to the assessment of Output A.3.1 and Outcome A.4.2 in the overall evaluation framework.
Additional Developmental Results and Indicators

Result 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>Global, regional and national work plans reflect local context and designed to meet local needs using resources available with clear outline of modus operandi.</td>
<td>Global, regional and national work plans reflect the local context to but only some of the goals and objectives achievable in the local context or with the resources available. The activities planned are designed are likely to address some of the priority gender equality and education issues at the levels concerned. The plans indicate which organizations will be responsible for implementing which activities, but have not developed a solid, accompanying monitoring and evaluation plan.</td>
<td>Global, regional and national work plans reflect the local context most of the goals and objectives are achievable in the local context and with the resources available. The plans indicate which organizations will be responsible for implementing which activities, but have not developed a solid, accompanying monitoring and evaluation plan.</td>
<td>Global, regional and national work plans reflect the local context most of the goals and objectives are achievable in the local context and with the resources available. The activities planned are designed directly address the priority gender equality and education issues at the level concerned and are linked to these issues at the other two levels. The plans indicate which organizations will be responsible for implementing which activities. The global and regional work plans include a clear monitoring and evaluation plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidance Notes, indicator 2.1.7

For this indicator you will be measuring how well the UNGEI partnership is able to respond to local context with realistic goals and objectives. This would be one measure of the partnership’s effectiveness. Specifically you would be measuring:

- How well global, regional and national level work plans reflect the local context related to girls’ education
- Whether these work plans are designed to meet local needs related to girls’ education using resources available with clear outline of modus operandi.

To collect this data you will need to:
- Review UNGEI work plans at the global, regional and national levels
- Conduct an analysis of the local context related to girls’ education.

You can also use this data to contribute to the assessment of Processes A.2.4 and B.2.5 and Outputs B.3.2 and B.3.4.
### Result 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2 Regularity of allocation of resources (human and financial) to contribute to UNGEI’s goals and mission.</td>
<td>Few or sporadic allocations of resources (human and financial) to contribute to UNGEI’s goals and mission.</td>
<td>Allocation of resources (human and financial) to contribute to UNGEI’s goals and mission only on a project by project basis.</td>
<td>Allocation of resources (human and financial) to contribute to UNGEI’s goals and mission included in annual work plans and budgets of network partner(s).</td>
<td>Allocation of resources (human and financial) to contribute to UNGEI’s goals and mission included in annual work plans and budgets of network partner(s) and disbursed in each financial reporting period (e.g., quarterly).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance Notes, indicator 2.5.2**

For this indicator you will be measuring:
- The frequency and sustainability of financial and human resource allocations to support improvements in girls’ education initiated by UNGEI members at the national, regional and global levels.

To find this data you will need to:
- Review programme and project documentation and other related planning documents.

You can also use the data collected for this indicator to help assess Output B.3.3 and Outcome B.4.3.
### Annex 2: Sample Indicators to Assess UNGEI Secretariat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Passion and vision</td>
<td>Low energy level and commitment. Little continued attention to Network vision.</td>
<td>Good energy level Visible commitment to Network and its vision.</td>
<td>Shows constant, visible commitment to Network and its vision. Excites others around vision</td>
<td>Contagiously energetic and highly committed. Lives the Network’s vision. Compellingly articulates path to achieving vision that enables others to see where they are going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevance of UNGEI Secretariat services</td>
<td>Core services and related activities vaguely defined and lack clear alignment with mission and goals. Core services and related activities seem scattered and largely unrelated to each other.</td>
<td>Some services and related activities well defined and can be solidly linked with mission and goals. Service offerings and related activities may be somewhat scattered and not fully integrated into clear strategy.</td>
<td>Core services and related activities well defined and aligned with mission and goals. Core services and related activities fit together well as part of clear strategy.</td>
<td>All services and related activities well defined and fully aligned with mission and goals. Services and related activities are clearly linked to one another and to overall strategy. Synergies across services and related activities are captured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Staffing</td>
<td>There is only sufficient staff to provide basic services to Network members.</td>
<td>There is sufficient Secretariat staff to deliver some of the stated core services to Network members.</td>
<td>There is sufficient Secretariat staff to deliver core services.</td>
<td>There is sufficient Secretariat staff to deliver core services and to initiate new services as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Performance measurement</td>
<td>Very limited measurement and tracking of Network performance. All or most evaluation based on anecdotal evidence.</td>
<td>Performance partially measured and progress partially tracked. Lacks data-driven, externally validated</td>
<td>Network performance measured and progress tracked in multiple ways on regular basis (e.g., annually).</td>
<td>Well-developed comprehensive, integrated system for measuring Network’s performance in different areas (e.g., effectiveness of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance analysis and program adjustments</td>
<td>Few external performance comparisons made.</td>
<td>Some efforts made to benchmark activities and outcomes against similar networks.</td>
<td>Effective internal and external benchmarking occurs but driven largely by top management and/or confined to selected areas.</td>
<td>Comprehensive internal and external benchmarking part of the culture and used by Network partners in target-setting. High awareness of how all activities and advocacy strategies rate against internal and external best-in-class benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity

| 6. Network processes use and development | Makes limited use set of processes (e.g., decision making, planning, reviews) for ensuring effective functioning of the Network. Use of processes is variable, or processes are seen as ad hoc requirements with no monitoring or assessment of processes. | Has established basic set of processes in core areas for ensuring efficient functioning of Network. Processes known, used, and truly accepted by only portion of Network members. There is limited monitoring and assessment of processes, with few improvements made in response to results. | Has established and negotiated a solid, well-designed set of processes in place in core areas to ensure smooth, effective functioning of Network. Processes known and accepted by many, often used and contribute to increased impact. Occasional monitoring and assessment of processes, with some improvements made in response to results. | Well-designed and efficient set of processes in place in all areas to ensure effective and efficient functioning. Secretariat processes are widely known, used and accepted among Network members, and are key to ensuring full impact of Network. Secretariat conducts continual monitoring and assessment of processes, and systematic improvement made in response to results. |

| 7. Strategic Planning | Secretariat has limited ability and tendency to develop strategic plan, either | Secretariat has some ability and tendency to develop high-level strategic plan | Secretariat has ability and tendency to develop and refine concrete, | Secretariat has ability to develop and refine concrete, realistic and detailed strategic |
| 8. Content Orientation | Secretariat has narrow policy and advocacy focus which views financials as a constraint. Secretariat content orientation delays decision making. Mandates rather than leads change. | Secretariat promotes some diversity in policy and advocacy focus with some appreciation for cost-effectiveness constantly delivers satisfactory impact given resources. Secretariat promptly addresses issues, and understands implications and impact of change on people. | Secretariat sees and promotes financial soundness as essential part of policy and programme advocacy impact. Secretariat focuses on ways to better use existing resources to deliver highest impact possible. Secretariat has a sense of urgency in addressing issues and rapidly moves from decision to action. Secretariat develops and implements actions to overcome resistance to change. | Secretariat guides Network to succeed simultaneously in dual mission of policy and programme impact and optimal financial efficiency. Secretariat constantly seeks and finds new opportunities to improve impact. Secretariat anticipates possible problems. Secretariat has sense of urgency about upcoming challenges. Secretariat communicates compelling need for change that creates drive. Secretariat helps align entire Network to support change effort. |
Annex 3:

Zoë to review Susan Durston’s document *(Guidelines for the Asia and Pacific EFA Mid-Decade Assessment)* for relevance
Annex 4: Partnership Expert Panel Respondents (Reference Group)

**COUNTRY LEVEL**

**Bernard Batidzirai**  
Chief, Education Section, UNICEF Lesotho Country Office

**Inas Hegazi**  
Chief, Education Section, UNICEF Egypt Country Office

**Maman Sidikou**  
Chief, Education Section, UNICEF Nigeria Country Office

**Sheila Wamahiu**  
Chief, Education Section, UNICEF Uganda Country Office

**REGIONAL LEVEL**

**Vigdis Cristofoli**  
UNGEI Regional Focal Point  
Education Specialist, UNICEF West & Central Africa Regional Office (based in Dakar)

**Susan Durston**  
UNICEF Regional Education Advisor  
UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia (based in Kathmandu)

**Aster Haregot**  
UNGEI Regional Focal Point  
UNICEF Eastern & Southern Africa Regional Office (based in Nairobi)

**Maki Hayashikawa**  
UNGEI Regional Partner  
Programme Specialist in Gender, UNESCO Bangkok

**Elliott Prasse-Freeman**  
UNGEI Regional Partner  
Education Development Center (EDC) Project Coordinator, Regional Office (based in Bangkok)

**GLOBAL LEVEL (Global Advisory Committee)**

**Nora Fyles and Zoë Kahn**  
Former and Current Chair of UNGEI M&E Group respectively, Senior Education Specialist and Senior Education Analyst respectively, CIDA

**Lucy Lake**  
GAC Co-Chair, Deputy Executive Director & Director of Programmes, CAMFED International
Øystein Lyngroth
GAC Co-Chair, Advisor on UNICEF/UNGEI, Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Nitya Rao
Member of UNGEI M&E Group, ASPBAE
Annex 5: Members of UNGEI Monitoring and Evaluation Committee

**Chair: CIDA**
Nora Fyles followed by Zoë Kahn
Respectively Senior Education Specialist and Senior Education Analyst

**Members**
- **CAMFED**
  Penina Mlama followed by Lucy Lake
  GAC Co-Chair
  Respectively Executive Director, CAMFED Tanzania, and Deputy Executive Director & Director of Programmes, CAMFED International

- **ASPBAE**
  Nitya Rao
  Lecturer, University of East Anglia

- **DFID**
  Phil Rose, Head of Education and Skills Team
  Sally Gear, Advisor, Gender & Education

- **UNICEF West and Central Africa Regional Office**
  Vigdis Cristofoli, UNGEI Regional Focal Point
  Vanya Berrouët, Education Specialist
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