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Executive Summary

This report documents the findings and recommendations of the formative evaluation of the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI). The evaluation took place in 2011, ten years after the establishment of UNGEI and sought to:

- Establish a baseline for UNGEI, and
- Document achievements and challenges in the three UNGEI outcome areas:
  - Policy and advocacy for girls’ education and gender equality
  - Good practice identification and dissemination
  - Partnership establishment

The evaluation examined the interactions between the global, country and regional levels of the partnership. In addition, it validated through the evaluation process, the proposed UNGEI Monitoring and Evaluation Framework which will form the basis for future assessment of progress.

The evaluation took place over a period of nine months and covered four case studies - Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria, and Uganda – and an evaluation of the East Asia and the Pacific (EAP) regional partnership. In addition, a mapping was conducted for 57 countries which were on record as either having an active partnership or some UNGEI-led activities, as well as conducting interviews with global stakeholders, and undertaking a review of documentation. Quality assurance was provided by UNICEF Monitoring and Evaluation Officers, while national, regional and global reference groups commented on the methodology, draft and final reports.

Challenges to the evaluation included retroactively establishing baselines for each partnership in contexts where records and documentation were not systematically kept. The high staff turn-over in agencies complicated the task further, as did the poor security in some countries. Notwithstanding these limitations, the evaluation was able to collect and triangulate sufficient data for the key areas of inquiry, allowing it to respond to the main evaluation questions.

Overall conclusions

Evaluation findings underscore that UNGEI has played a prominent policy advocacy role for girls’ education and gender equality in selected fora. This role has been particularly prominent globally, in the EARP region, as well as in selected countries – such as Nigeria and Uganda.

As a result of its policy advocacy role, UNGEI has established itself as a recognized partnership in the global dialogue around girl’s education and gender equality. UNGEI’s participation and technical inputs at global education fora and initiatives – such as the Education for All Global Monitoring Report – have
contributed to a stronger focus on girls’ education and gender equality in policy dialogue, in documentation, and in policy discussions. The regional level where UNGEI is resourced with Regional Focal Points (RFPs) had two different approaches. The East Asia and Pacific Region (EAPR) has established a formal partnership which has made substantive contribution to policy and advocacy. However, the EAPR partnership approach was found to be limited by the absence of outreach into the countries in the region, and by the fact that there is little evidence that it uses the member organizations as a channel for reaching into countries for advocacy purposes. In the other regions (Eastern and Southern Africa Region, Middle East and North Africa, West and Central Africa Region) the focus has instead been on supporting national partnerships in their efforts towards advancing girls’ education and gender equality. UNGEI members and stakeholders are of the opinion that UNGEI should continue to play a key role in policy advocacy efforts in the immediate and medium term.

The evaluation finds that at global, national and regional levels UNGEI has played a role in collecting, synthesizing, and disseminating good practice. In the case study countries, the evaluation found evidence of good practices being implemented and shared, of capacity being built around good practice identification and reporting, and of good practices being used to inform policy development. At the regional level the EAP region has been particularly active in producing toolkits and studies through collective efforts by the UNGEI members, and these products are considered relevant and of high quality. However it is not clear to what extent these have informed policy and practice (at regional and national levels). At global level, UNGEI’s work on good practice is considered valuable although some stakeholders highlighted that they would like to see UNGEI establish itself as a leading reference on good practice in girls’ education and gender equality – something which is not presently a goal of UNGEI.

For the future, many stakeholders would like to see UNGEI play a more prominent overall knowledge management role in the education and gender equality agenda. In this role UNGEI would function as a knowledge hub of best practice, delivered for and by partner agencies.

UNGEI has also constituted a valuable mechanism for coordination and priority setting among its members. UNGEI has successfully established a global partnership that is valued by its members. UNGEI’s governance structures have been strengthened over the past years and have allowed the partnership to take decisions and move forward in its main areas of activity. However, responsibility for operational decision making at the global level – in particular between the Global Advisory Committee (GAC) and the UNGEI Secretariat - needs clarifying and strengthening so as to ensure efficient and effective follow-up of activities. Additionally, the technical capacity of UNGEI at the global level still falls short of what the partnership needs to advance its goals (at all levels). There is also a need for the GAC to strengthen its understanding of the national level, for the membership and functioning of UNGEI to be examined in light of the changing landscape in girls’ education and gender equality, and to find ways to strengthen the institutional commitment to UNGEI (as opposed to the individual commitment).

At national level, the evaluation found that UNGEI has active partnerships in 33 of 57 countries previously reported as having partnerships. These UNGEI country partnerships have goals which mirror those of the global partnership, underscoring the relevance of UNGEI’s agenda. Almost all 33 country partnerships operate at the national level and a substantial number have UNGEI partnerships operating
at sub-national levels. Countries engage in a wide range of activities. Advocacy/sensitization, training and capacity building, and materials production and dissemination figure prominently among the activities. There is less of a focus on promoting coordination, on research and on monitoring. The in-school population at primary level is the largest beneficiary of UNGEI at country level, followed by in school secondary. More than half of the countries also include activities for out of school primary children. In terms of formalization of the partnership, a total of 14 countries meet the three criteria that UNGEI has established for the existence of a partnership. Financial resources are by far the most frequently cited challenge for partnerships. In ten countries partnerships that were established have since ceased to exist. Reasons for the demise of the partnership vary from country to country.

In countries where strong partnerships exist, UNGEI was found to have positioned itself as a valuable and strong player in policy dialogue and advocacy, and has also played a major role in promoting and sharing of good practice. The evaluation did not do an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the partnerships across all the countries, but the case studies seem to indicate that critical factors for success of country partnerships relate to government commitment, leadership of the partnership, partnership composition, technical capacity, outreach to local levels and structures, and mechanisms for decision making and operation. However the evaluation also found that some of these areas – in particular those related to the strengthening of the partnership models, in-country training and support, and exchanges between partnerships for sharing of experience, have received relatively little support. In terms of capacity, a number of countries underscored capacity challenges of the UNGEI group itself and the need for improving areas such as technical knowledge on gender issues as well as communication skills. The country analysis also highlighted a need identified by country stakeholders for a sound analysis of the factors explaining the persistence of the disparities between girls and boys. This was considered particularly critical as a basis for decisions around future operations and policies, as well as essential to building the capacity of the partnerships. The evaluation also noted that a substantial number of countries have no or very poor systems for monitoring and evaluation of UNGEI’s operations and activities. For the future, country partnerships could benefit from stronger support in strengthening partnerships management, as well as technical inputs into locally relevant areas of capacity building, exchange of experience between partnerships, monitoring and evaluation, and research. The feedback to the evaluation highlighted that UNGEI should strengthen its strategic planning and its technical capacity to meet these needs. In this context, the UNGEI Monitoring and Evaluation Framework is considered a valid and important tool by countries and regions for improving the monitoring and priority setting of the partnership.

Overall and for the future, the evaluation highlights that the goals for which UNGEI was established continue to be valid and important even in a changed development aid and education context. A

---

1 The UNGEI standard for determining if a partnership can be formally identified as part of UNGEI requires that the partnership in question meet the following criteria: a) have terms of reference which formalize the mandate, members and governance of the national or sub-national partnership; b) have an annual work plan that is monitored by the national partnership; and c) report against the annual work plan to the UNGEI RFP.
stronger and more pronounced engagement of partners in the girls’ education and gender equality agenda has been achieved in the past ten years and provides an opportunity for continuing to harness collective efforts. Progress in gender parity in education in many countries has been a key achievement over the past decade – and one to which UNGEI contributed. However, considerable - and more complex - challenges and gaps in girls’ education and gender equality remain and will require more difficult to achieve changes. This implies an adjusted policy advocacy role for UNGEI - with a more targeted agenda that builds on UNGEI’s strengths.

The evaluation finds that UNGEI has clear areas of strengths and added value. A major area of strength has been its interaction and input into a select number of influential global initiatives where it has sought to present evidence and highlight key issues. The diversity of its membership – which includes the different levels at which UNGEI operates (global, regional and country level) is a further strength. This has opened up the discussion between partners, improved understanding of issues, resulted in collaborative efforts, and in a stronger focus on strengthening the evidence base around girls’ education and gender equality. However, UNGEI has been less successful in consistently monitoring the progress on girls’ education at regional and country levels. These strengths provide a solid basis for further sharpening its strategies and for continuing to influence the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in the coming years.

UNGEI’s organizational structure has been an important operational basis for its work. UNGEI’s strong link with UNICEF has allowed it to tap into UNICEF’s technical and other resources, but has at times made it difficult to identify a distinct UNGEI contribution. The UNGEI Secretariat has provided key follow-up between UNGEI meetings, and has sustained the link with the regional and country levels. However, UNGEI’s technical capacity has at times been insufficient and the use of working groups has not always provided an efficient solution. Regional Focal Points (RFPs) based at UNICEF regional offices are a key link between the different levels of UNGEI, although the amount of time devoted to the regional activities by respective RFPs varies considerably. RFPs provided important support in the mobilization phase to establish country level partnerships, as well as technical and financial inputs into country level processes. There is room for further engagement and improvement of mechanisms and models for partnership functioning and in capacity building. RFPs are thus a useful resource which could be further tapped for ensuring that the country partnership mechanisms are further strengthened, and that UNGEI’s global decision making is better informed by country needs.

Recommendations

The evaluation findings result in the following main areas of recommendation:

1. **UNGEI should make policy advocacy the main priority for its future endeavors at global level and equip itself to be a strong advocate for the priorities that it identifies.** In this role, UNGEI should be guided/supported by:
   a. An evidence-based focused agenda of policy advocacy priorities in girls’ education and gender equality for the coming 5-10 years, clearly identifying advocacy goals, targets
and strategies, as well as the means for measuring progress and outcomes, at the levels at which UNGEI operates.

b. The establishment of an advisory/guidance panel on policy advocacy as part of UNGEI’s organizational structure. The panel should bring together key experts in this area to provide technical inputs into the main decision making structures of UNGEI on priorities and assist in monitoring progress.

c. The recruitment of an additional full time staff member for the Secretariat to support its technical input into the policy advocacy agenda.

2. **UNGEI should develop a plan of priority activities and publications that is aligned with UNGEI’s proposed medium term agenda in policy advocacy.** This plan should include:

a. Mechanisms for strong and consistent engagement with the international academic community to strengthen relevant good practice identification, documentation and dissemination

b. Clear dissemination strategies and targets for publications, as well as a strategy of tracking impact of a sample of its publications to learn lessons and inform strategizing on future endeavors.

c. The development and dissemination of a practical guideline for country partnerships and actors to identifying, synthesizing and disseminating good practice

3. **Strengthen the global UNGEI partnership by:**

a. Reviewing the membership of the GAC with a view to adding members that play a key role in the overall context and phasing out members in line with UNGEI’s revised focus and priorities.

b. Recruiting of a small number of country level members to enhance the understanding and responsiveness of the GAC to country level issues.

c. Putting in place clear directives for the involvement of institutions in the GAC (as opposed to individuals); member institutions should take it upon themselves to revise the terms of reference to reflect responsibilities of participating staff members as institutional representatives on the UNGEI GAC.

4. **Enhance the capacity and the relevance of the work that is done by UNGEI at regional level by:**

a. Negotiating with UNICEF that UNGEI RFPs devote a major portion of their time to UNGEI

b. Prioritizing a focus on the national level, and in particular on strengthening country partnerships, across all the regions, rather than the establishment of regional partnerships

c. Working with RFPs to develop multi-year regional strategies and plans outlining priorities for UNGEI’s support from the country and regional level based on an assessment of progress and gaps

d. Putting in place mechanisms for knowledge sharing and dissemination between RFPs and national members.
e. **Continuing to make policy advocacy the main focus of UNGEI in the EAP region** while using partner structures to develop outreach strategies which will influence policy dialogue and decision making at country level. The formalization of an UNGEI partnership with one or several countries in the region is recommended in this context as a way to both inform and be informed by country needs.

5. **Strengthening national level partnerships by:**
   
   a. Developing and implementing a prioritized capacity building plan for national level partnerships. The plan should identify priority countries, identify the main areas of weakness, and where and how UNGEI might prioritize strengthening of these partnerships.
   
   b. Identifying strategies for advocating and securing stronger involvement of national leadership in UNGEI.
   
   c. Providing technical and financial support to priority countries in conducting situation analysis of the factors explaining the persistence of the disparities among girls and boys.
   
   d. Conducting a further analysis of the funding situation and options for funding country level partnerships, and identifying priority actions for ensuring that partnerships have a small budget that allows them to function and provide seed money for selected activities – this could possibly be done by devolving some of the UNICEF budget within UNICEF’s thematic funding to the country level.
   
   e. Prioritizing continued work on strengthening the monitoring and evaluation of UNGEI’s operations which has been carried out by the Monitoring and Evaluation working group.
1. Introduction

Background and purpose of the evaluation

This report documents the overall findings and recommendations of the Formative Evaluation of the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI). The report compiles the evaluation findings of four country case studies, a regional case study, and a global investigation of the UNGEI partnership.

Aims and objectives of the evaluation

UNGEI was launched in 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar with the purpose of supporting the achievement of Millennium Development Goal (MDG) 3 on promoting gender equality and empowering women. This evaluation takes place 10 years after UNGEI was established and has two main objectives, as noted in the terms of reference:

“To establish a baseline against which progress towards achieving results can be measured in the future” and

To explore “the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at country level, and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership.”

The full terms of reference for the evaluation can be found in Annex 1.

The evaluation uses UNGEI’s three outcome areas as a foundation for examining progress and establishing the baseline. The country and regional assessments that were part of this evaluation therefore sought to assess the progress in these outcome areas. Specifically, this related to assessing the extent to which:

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

As a formative exercise, the evaluation also sought to assess UNGEI’s functioning, processes and emerging outcomes, with a focus on learning lessons and improving future processes and outcomes. Since UNGEI was established at the start of a decade that has seen a progressive emphasis on gender issues as well as various key developments in education and the development landscape, this evaluation has sought to examine the progress and findings in relation to these contextual changes.

---

1 In the original terms of reference, these objectives are in the reverse order. They have been inverted here to align with the order in which these two themes will be discussed in the report. The evaluation’s key findings with respect to the baseline referred to in the first objective will be discussed in Chapter 4, while the findings with respect to the achievement of UNGEI outcomes is discussed in Chapters 5 and 6.
**Audience and expected outcomes of the evaluation**

The evaluation is targeted at UNGEI members in general, as well as at stakeholders who have been involved in the partnership. It is anticipated that the formative evaluation of UNGEI will contribute to helping the partnership:

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

The findings will also likely interest participants in other global partnership arrangements, as well as stakeholders engaged in girls’ education and gender equality issues at global, regional and country levels.

**Scope and coverage of the evaluation**

Four countries\(^3\) were selected for detailed case studies: Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda. At the regional level, the East Asia and Pacific (EAP) area was selected to be a specific case study of a regional level UNGEI partnership. For each of the countries and for the regional level partnership, separate terms of reference were used. These can be found in the separate case study reports. Overall, and in line with the general terms of reference, the country and regional studies sought to:

- Document key changes that had taken place in girls’ education and gender equality over time in UNGEI’s key outcome areas (as adopted at the country/regional level);
- Identify where and in what ways UNGEI had made a specific contribution or enhanced the contribution of others;
- Provide evidence of the outputs and outcomes of these interventions; and
- Assess the relevance, effectiveness and outcomes of UNGEI’s interventions and their sustainability.

In addition, the country and regional evaluations were also charged with documenting the governance and administrative structures of the partnership, its operational mechanisms, and contributions to gender-responsive changes in the education sector.

---

\(^3\) The countries were selected to reflect the various regions where UNGEI is active. An additional criterion was that the level of activity should be sufficient to allow for the evaluation to make a relevant assessment. A fifth country – Côte d’Ivoire – had to withdraw from the evaluation because of security concerns.
At the global level, the evaluation included a comprehensive mapping of the UNGEI partnership in all participating countries, as well as data collection and interviews with global stakeholders and a comprehensive review of documentation.

**Structure of this report**

This report is presented in eight chapters. The first chapter provides the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation. Chapter 2 presents the methodology and process of the evaluation, discusses key tools and data collection techniques, and underscores limitations of the evaluation. In Chapter 3, the establishment and evolution of UNGEI is reviewed. Chapter 4 is the first of three chapters that present the findings of the evaluation. It presents the current status of UNGEI at country level based on the survey and case study data collected, while Chapter 5 presents evaluation findings with respect to UNGEI’s contribution at country level in the three focus areas (policy, good practice and partnerships). Chapter 6 assesses contributions at the regional level and is followed by an assessment of global contributions in Chapter 7.

Recommendations of the evaluation are presented in Chapter 8. Several annexes complement the discussion in the report and provide details on the methodology and findings.

**Chapter summary**

*This report documents the findings and recommendations of the formative evaluation of UNGEI. The evaluation aims to: a) establish a baseline against which progress towards achieving results can be measured in the future; and b) explore the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at country level, and the extent to which global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership.*

*The evaluation covers four country case studies: Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria, and Uganda. At the regional level, East Asia and the Pacific was selected to be a specific case study of regional UNGEI partnership. At the global level, the evaluation included a comprehensive mapping of the UNGEI partnership in all participating countries, as well as data collection and interviews with global stakeholders and a comprehensive review of documentation.*
2. Evaluation process and methodology

This chapter highlights the key methodological aspects of the evaluation. It discusses the methodological underpinnings and the approach and steps of the evaluation, describes the main evaluation tools, and provides an overview of the main evaluation phases. Key limitations of the evaluation are discussed in the final section.

Contribution analysis

The methodological basis for evaluation is contribution analysis (Mayne, 1999). Contribution analysis explicitly addresses the issue of attribution, which is frequently a challenge to evaluations, and which is a particular challenge in partnership or multi-actor contexts, where it can be difficult to identify whether a particular actor or initiative actually contributed to an outcome. Contribution analysis addresses this challenge by looking for a plausible association between inputs and outcomes. This approach pragmatically combines qualitative and quantitative information on the context and changes, which is used to build an overall judgement on contribution.

Contribution analysis holds the organizations and partnerships being evaluated to a high standard. Rather than examining what change took place and assuming that this change happened because of the presence of UNGEI, this evaluation approach aims to establish whether and to what extent UNGEI contributed to the changes. Thus, contribution analysis constructs a plausible story of influence for UNGEI in this evaluation.

The use of contribution analysis in this context implies that the evaluation focused on assessing the specific contribution of UNGEI to changes that took place at country level and in the EAP region with respect to girls’ education and gender equality, and made a judgement regarding the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI’s interventions and the impact and sustainability of these outcomes. In making this assessment, the evaluation also examines the role of UNGEI’s regional and global levels and how these levels supported the identified processes of change.

The steps of a contribution analysis follow a logical order and are shown in Figure 1.
Key evaluation tools

A key tool in the evaluation process was the **valuation framework**. This framework (see Annex 2) was specifically conceived for this evaluation to systematically go through the steps of the contribution analysis as presented above. The framework was also used to record and triangulate evaluation findings and to ensure that all areas of the evaluation were fully and comprehensively addressed.

A second key element of the evaluation approach is the **UNGEI logic model** (see Annex 3). This model schematically set out how the partnership is intended to work at the different levels at which it operates, and what the theory and assumptions underlying it were. It links outcomes (short and long term) to activities (the results chain) and to the vision and goals of the partnerships, and presents the key indicators being proposed to monitor UNGEI’s outcomes and goals. Country- and region-specific logic models were developed for each of the levels of the evaluation using the overall model as a reference.
The evaluation methodology also included the development of a **stakeholder map** for participating countries, for the regional partnership, and for the global level. A selection of stakeholder maps is presented in Annex 4. These allowed for the identification of the main partners at country, regional and global levels, including those who had been involved earlier in the evaluation period.

At all levels of the evaluation, stakeholders close to UNGEI as well as those working on gender and education issues more broadly during the time period covered by the evaluation were included, thereby covering current and former members of UNGEI, members of the United Nations family, government agencies, civil society organizations, independent researchers/consultants, and beneficiaries. A **sampling frame** (see Table 1) was developed and used to identify target numbers of respondents in each category at each level of the evaluation. **Interview guidelines** were developed by each of the consultants to examine the key issues. The interview guidelines for the global level are included in Annex 5. Stakeholders’ views on key issues of the evaluation were **triangulated** and fed into the evaluation’s findings.

**Evaluation process**

The evaluation started in January 2011 and spanned a period of nine months. The phasing of the evaluation and a detailed timeline for the evaluation can be found in Annex 6.

The evaluation took place in three interconnected phases, as shown in the diagram below. The first phase began with a meeting focused on producing and validating the evaluation instruments. In addition to the consultants, this meeting included UNGEI/gender focal points from ministries of education of participating countries, and UNICEF officers responsible for UNGEI in their respective country offices (country, regional and global levels), as well as a representative of the UNGEI GAC. The meeting produced an agreed-upon methodology, including a sampling frame and evaluation framework for the evaluation. The last task of the first phase was drafting of inception reports for each of the evaluation’s levels. These reports were reviewed by reference groups established at country, regional and global level for this purpose.

Data collection took place during the second phase, resulting in the production of a draft of preliminary findings that were shared with the reference groups, as well as a full draft report and a final report. A second, smaller meeting of the consultant team took place at the end of the data collection to share preliminary findings, identify outstanding gaps and reflect on emerging recommendations.

---

4 For details on stakeholders at the regional and country levels, please see the separate reports.

5 For details, please see the country reports.
Overview of data collection methods for the country and regional studies

Data collection is described in detail in each of the separate case study reports. In brief, data were collected using the following techniques:

- Face-to-face and telephone interviews that took place at global, regional and country levels. The interviews focused on stakeholders’ assessment of the context and the changes that had taken place, the role of UNGEI and other partners, their perceptions of the impacts and effectiveness of the partnership, and their assessment of the ongoing challenges and the future role of UNGEI (an overview of the sample is provided in Table 1);
- Focus group discussions that were held at the community level in each country and that provided the opportunity to obtain inputs from the beneficiaries regarding the interventions, the changes that had taken place and possible shortcomings; and
- Formal desk reviews, which included documentary analysis of UNGEI workplans, minutes of meetings, reports, research findings and other materials. The main focus was to ascertain the state of girls’ education and gender equality at the various levels of the evaluation, as well as key policy developments, and to examine evidence of UNGEI approaches, products and contributions to policy.

Data collection for the global UNGEI study

Data collection for the global UNGEI study included the following:

- **Global level interviews**: At the global level, a total of 45 informants divided into 12 categories were identified. Specific categories of respondents to target were identified during the inception workshop at the start of the evaluation. Respondents suggested additional interviewees during
the interview process itself, and a small number was added to the list. Each of the interviewees was contacted by email to set up a date and time for the interview. All interviews took place by phone and lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. A semi-structured interview guideline was used for the interviews (see Annex 5). Table 1 shows the categories of informants identified and the number of people interviewed in each category, and Annex 7 provides a detailed list of global level interviewees.

- **A survey of UNGEI countries**: The survey contained questions related to the status of the partnership, its levels of operation, membership, beneficiaries, outcomes and challenges. The survey was sent by email to 57 countries from seven different regions to be completed by UNICEF staff members in each country. A copy of the survey can be found in Annex 8. The results of the survey are discussed in Chapter 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Interviewees initially identified</th>
<th>Number of interviews conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founders</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC members (current)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC past co-chairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-GAC civil society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-GAC donors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 academics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 government</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF headquarters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI focal points (current and former)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other partnerships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data analysis**

Content analysis techniques were used to analyse the data at various levels. Data were coded with a view to generating patterns, categories and generalizations regarding UNGEI’s contribution. The evaluation framework consolidated the findings from the content analysis in a format that allowed the evaluators to make an objective assessment of UNGEI’s contribution.

**Quality assurance and support**

At country and regional levels, the relevant UNICEF M&E officers provided support to the evaluation’s design and implementation. In addition, country, regional and global reference groups were established to comment on the evaluation’s various interim and final products (inception reports, draft reports and the final report).

**Limitations**

In interpreting and using these findings, several limitations need to be taken into account, including:
a) **The challenge of establishing a baseline for a partnership operating at different levels and across a large number of countries and regions.** As the data for most of the countries and regions were collected at a distance, this posed challenges in accessing informants and documentation, as well as for the triangulation of data. A survey was used to collect most of the data, but this did not allow for follow-up questions for clarification on issues, and limited the scope and depth of the analysis that emerged.

b) **The challenge of evaluating a complex environment:** An evaluation of partnership arrangements is challenging because the joint nature of many activities makes it difficult to distinguish between the specific contributions of each partner. In the case of UNGEI, the very close link with UNICEF has meant that it is frequently very difficult to distinguish between the activities of UNGEI and UNICEF. Therefore it is difficult to make a clear analysis of contributions specifically by UNGEI and those of other organizations/initiatives.

c) **Inadequate record-keeping and documentation:** The evaluation has had to rely, in some cases, on the memory of informants without being able to confirm or triangulate findings with other documentary sources.

d) **Unreliability of statistics:** The methodology required the establishment of a baseline in order to make an assessment of the change, the outcomes, and where UNGEI had contributed at country and regional levels. The absence of reliable statistics at country level was a major challenge in this exercise.

e) **Limitations in establishing outcomes:** At its various levels of operation, UNGEI has lacked a system for objective measurement of outcomes of its interventions/priority areas of focus. This constituted a particular challenge for the evaluation in terms of determining what the partnership has achieved.

f) **High staff turnover in agencies** in some of the settings complicated the process of getting inputs from key informants, again with particular implications for the earlier period of the evaluation.

g) **Finally, issues of security** in some countries (specifically Egypt and Nigeria during the evaluation period) due to political unrest and election processes impacted the evaluation process, resulting in delays as well as changes in fieldwork processes and coverage.

Notwithstanding these limitations, the evaluation team was able to collect data and triangulate its key findings. The evaluation therefore represents a comprehensive overview of the partnership and a valid analysis of the key issues identified in the terms of reference.
Chapter summary

The methodological basis for evaluation is contribution analysis. This methodology follows a number of logical steps in examining UNGEI’s contribution to each of the contexts that are being evaluated. Specific tools for the evaluation were documented in a methodological guide for the evaluation, and included:

- An evaluation framework conceived specifically to examine the steps of contribution analysis;
- UNGEI logic models that schematically set out how the partnership is intended to work and the theory and assumptions underlying it for each of the levels of the evaluation; and
- The development of stakeholder maps, a sampling frame and interview guidelines to guide the interview process.

The evaluation took place over nine months in three phases: an inception process, data collection, and reporting and finalization. Content analysis was used to analyse the data. Quality assurance was provided by UNICEF M&E officers and by reference groups at country, regional and global levels.

Limitations of the evaluation included the challenges of establishing a baseline retrospectively and evaluating a complex range of initiatives; inadequate record-keeping and documentation; unreliability of statistics; a lack of measures of outcomes; high staff turnover in agencies; and poor security in some countries.
3. Establishment, evolution and functioning of UNGEI

Chapter overview

This chapter provides an overview of the establishment and evolution of UNGEI as a background to subsequent chapters. The chapter discusses the origins of the partnership, the context within which it was established, and how this context has changed. It explores how UNGEI has evolved through time and its key areas of focus, and highlights some of the challenges it has faced. The chapter draws on the findings of the global mapping of UNGEI, on selected documentation (see bibliography), and on information provided by a number of key informants. The chapter starts with a brief discussion of the origins of the partnership.

The establishment of UNGEI

The roots of UNGEI lie in the African Girls’ Education Initiative (AGEI), which was launched in Africa by UNICEF in the 1990s and which established itself in 34 countries by the end of that decade. The overall objective of the AGEI was to get more girls into school in order to derive benefits and overcome constraints in girls’ education. The initiative had 14 guiding principles underlying a focus on learning by doing, including, among others: national attention to policies, creating partnerships, community building, gender sensitivity and advocacy. Many of these areas are recognizable today in UNGEI. Funding for AGEI came mainly from the Government of Norway, with a smaller contribution from the Government of Canada. AGEI successfully advocated for girls’ education in Africa, and generated experiences on which UNGEI could build. The link between UNGEI and AGEI also explains the close continued relationship with UNICEF, as this agency played a lead role in implementing AGEI.

UNGEI was launched in 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, by Kofi Annan, former Secretary-General of the United Nations. UNGEI’s establishment was a wider call to action on the part of United Nations Member States to partner in promoting girls’ education and gender equality in support of the newly-launched MDGs, in particular MDG 3, which focused on promoting gender equality and empowering women. UNGEI was thus conceived as a means of encouraging actors to collectively identify barriers and constraints to girls’ education and gender equality, and to identify and collaborate on priority strategies for overcoming them. It was initially foreseen that UNGEI would be in place for 10 years, and its existence has been extended to the horizon of the MDG target date of 2015. UNGEI was also established as one of the United Nations’ flagship initiatives for Education for All (EFA).6

A number of countries followed the call for action from the Dakar EFA meeting in 2000 to establish UNGEI partnerships at the country level, starting with Egypt, which established its partnership that year. This was followed by Mali in 2001, and Burkina Faso, Burundi, Nepal and the United Republic of

---

6 Following the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000, a number of global Education for All (EFA) partnerships and initiatives were established or strengthened. The purpose of the EFA flagships is to: support countries in their quest to achieve the EFA goals; enable a specific focus on a dimension of EFA that poses particular problems; and strengthen collaboration and coordination among stakeholders. By 2003, there were nine EFA flagship programmes.
Tanzania in 2002, with other countries and regions following in later years. At the global level, the partnership was much slower to become operational.

The composition, size and levels at which the partnership operates vary considerably across countries and contexts. However, UNGEI members at country level typically include the ministry of education (MoE) as well as other relevant government departments, members of the United Nations family, other multilateral organizations, bilateral partners, and international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Some partnerships include independent individuals and other institutions (local personalities, researchers and universities), the private sector, and community-based organizations (CBOs).

**The overall context and how it has evolved**

When UNGEI was first established in 2000, there were no global partnerships promoting gender issues in education. Most international organizations did not have a strong focus on gender. The period since has seen a growing number of partnerships and initiatives being established. These include: the Global Campaign for Education (GCE), which was established at the same time as UNGEI and which brings together civil society organizations around advocacy efforts to address the challenges of providing EFA; the International Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE), which was also established in 2000 and which aims to improve inter-agency communication and collaboration within the context of education in emergencies; the Inter-Agency Network on Women and Gender Equality (established in 2001), which works to ensure coordination around gender equality throughout the United Nations system; the Beyond Access Project, which was set up in 2003 by Oxfam GB, the University of London and the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) and aims at contributing to the MDGs by generating knowledge and practice regarding gender equality and education; the Coalition for Adolescent Girls, which brings together more than 30 international organizations involved in a wide range of programmes that target girls trapped in poverty; and the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) – formerly the EFA/Fast Track Initiative (FTI), which is funded by multiple agencies and hosted by the World Bank, and which has provided funding and technical support to the implementation of endorsed country education plans, and has included a focus on gender.

Throughout the past decade, many organizations have also launched specific initiatives around gender equality and girls’ education, often in close collaboration with other partners. For example, in 2006, Plan International launched a specific campaign to fight gender inequality, promote girls’ rights and lift girls out of poverty. Since 2007, Plan International has produced, with the collaboration of others (including UNGEI), annual reports on the situation of girls under specific thematic areas of focus. The theme of the 2012 report and the next campaign is girls’ education. Another initiative targeting girls is the World Bank Adolescent Girls Initiative, which was established in 2008 and seeks to promote the transition of adolescent girls from school to productive employment through targeted interventions. The initiative is being implemented in Afghanistan, Jordan, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Liberia, Nepal,

---

7 In accordance with its new designation, the FTI will be referred to as the GPE for the remainder of this document.
Rwanda and South Sudan. In 2007, a United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Adolescent Girls (UNIATF) was convened by UNICEF, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Fund for International Partnerships (UNFIP) to improve inter-agency programming in addressing the most marginalized and disadvantaged adolescent girls, focusing on making their situation known and prescribing practical action to fulfil their rights. In addition, a number of lead international development agencies, such as the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), DFID, CIDA and the World Bank have made gender one of two or three prime agency priorities.

Recent years (2010–2011) have seen a launching of several additional high-profile initiatives aimed at addressing girls’ education and gender equality, in particular:

- The establishment of UN-Women in 2010, which brings together a number of earlier United Nations initiatives (including the former United Nations Development Fund for Women – UNIFEM) and aims to support intergovernmental bodies in the formulation and implementation of policies, global standards and norms and to hold the United Nations system accountable for its own commitments on gender equality, including regular monitoring of system-wide progress.

- The Global Compact on Learning (GCL) established in 2011, is a global, multi-partner effort to provide a policy agenda and series of concrete steps for various actors to commit to advancing learning for girls and boys in the world’s poorest countries. The GCL’s priority policy areas are: early childhood development (ECD), literacy and numeracy in lower primary education, and relevant post-primary education opportunities, with particular attention to those most left behind, including poor girls and conflict-affected young people.

- The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural (UNESCO) Global Partnership for Girls and Women’s Education – ‘Better Life, Better Future’, also established in 2011. This partnership seeks to addresses two identified gap areas requiring increased attention – namely, secondary education and adult literacy. The partnership’s focus is developing projects that will: a) address the dropout of adolescent girls between primary and secondary education and in lower secondary school, and b) scale up women’s literacy programmes through stronger advocacy and partnerships.

- The United Kingdom Girls’ Education Challenge, launched by DFID, is a new project that calls on the private sector, charities and NGOs to find better ways of getting girls into school in the poorest countries in Africa and Asia. The target is to provide education opportunities for up to 1 million girls. The project will make available more than £350 million through a competitive process that will encourage organizations to set up schemes targeting marginalized girls of primary and lower secondary age.

The landscape is therefore different today from what it was 10 years ago. There are vastly more actors and initiatives related to gender and education, and there is a much stronger institutional focus on gender as a key cross-cutting theme. The increased focus on girls’ education and gender equality by so many entities has enhanced the profile of and attention to these critical issues, and has provided
opportunities to generate more visibility and a greater critical mass, which in many ways is helpful to UNGEI’s agenda.

However, challenges have also emerged, in particular in terms of overlapping agendas between stakeholders, and difficulties in coordination and getting the attention of key players, both at the global level and on the ground. The strong focus on girls’ education and gender equality has also meant that some important related areas, such as the humanitarian response to education, have lost ground and have had little visibility. For UNGEI, this has implications in terms of identifying how it positions itself and manoeuvres in a more complex environment; determining what agendas it should prioritize; and ascertaining the most appropriate strategies for moving forward.

A further challenge is that UNGEI was established at the beginning of a decade that saw a strong push for education (in 2000 there were 130 million children out of school; in 2011, this number stood at 67 million), with various ambitious goals and targets being set in global forums, and with education being seen as a necessary condition for achieving other MDGs. There is a discernible move away from education as the primary driver, with more emphasis being given to the economic and productive sectors as the basis for growth and development. The challenge for UNGEI is to continue to not only highlight the importance of girls’ education and gender equality, but to also do this in a context where the education agenda has shifted overall and is not necessarily getting the same level of attention, priority and funding.

The global economic crisis that began in 2008 and the ensuring challenges have meant there is greater scrutiny of the use of development money. This period has also seen a trend towards demands for greater accountability and an ability to demonstrate results. The focus on results has allowed UNGEI (and other organizations) to improve planning processes and monitor change. However, demonstrating results can also be a challenge for partnership arrangements that, because of the collaborative nature of their work, cannot easily identify or attribute results to a single entity or intervention.

Finally, the decade has seen significant achievements in terms of education expansion, as well as favourable trends in some of the gender indicators in selected countries. In this context, the ‘UNGEI at 10’ report (UNGEI, 2010) highlights that:

- Preschool enrolment of girls – which is critical to later development and participation in education – has improved in most regions over the past decade, including in the Arab States; however, there is still very low enrolment in many less developed regions. For example, in the Arab States and sub-Saharan Africa, less than 20 per cent of girls are enrolled in pre-primary education.

- The net enrolment ratio (NER) for boys and girls across most regions has seen an upward trend. The NER increase for girls has been particularly impressive in regions that started with a low level – e.g., South and West Asia and sub-Saharan Africa.

- The number of primary school-age children who are out of school has been reduced impressively by 57 million. The proportion of girls in the out-of-school population has also
increased from 58 per cent in 1999 to 53 per cent in 2009 (UIS, 2009). However, this proportion is still very high in some regions, such as in the Arab States and South and West Asia, and (proportional to the overall population) in sub-Saharan Africa.

In the context of these significant achievements, particularly noting the fact that the gender-parity target in primary education has been achieved in many countries, there is a tendency to interpret these data as an accomplishment of the gender agenda and as a rationale for moving on to other issues. This may mean complex issues that have an impact on girls’ participation and benefits from schooling that remain to be addressed will not get attention. This includes issues that continue to affect girls’ education, including gender-based violence (GBV), water and sanitation facilities, teen pregnancy, quality of education/learning, and girls’ transition to secondary education — all complex issues related to the unequal opportunities and returns that girls have from education.8

The vision, mission and strategies of UNGEI

UNGEI’s vision, formalized at a 2008 meeting of the partnership in Kathmandu, Nepal, is: “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.” Although this vision was only formally approved in 2008, early documents had outlined a similar vision that guided the partnership from an earlier stage in its priority setting. (The delay in formally approving the vision highlights, however, some of the challenges in operationalizing and formalizing UNGEI early on, which is further discussed below.)

Three strategies that guide UNGEI in achieving this mission are:

- Developing and disseminating technical outputs and supporting capacity development;
- Promoting policy dialogue and advocacy; and
- Coordinating and aligning with the prevailing aid architecture.

These strategies have been adapted at regional and country levels to reflect local realities and priorities. In addition, many countries, while opting to work under the overall UNGEI banner, have adopted a different name for the partnership. In some cases, this was because a partnership regarding girls’ education and/or gender equality was already in place and the process was therefore one of acknowledging and integrating UNGEI into this existing arrangement. In other cases the name change reflected a desire to specifically remove the United Nations designation from the acronym to broaden the partnership beyond the United Nations banner, and/or to include a broader focus on gender, as opposed to girls’ education.

---

8 Annex 11 contains a gender timeline that highlights some of the key events that have taken place since 2000.
The evolution of UNGEI

Support for UNGEI from then-United Nations Secretary-General Annan was critical in giving it an initial impetus. However, concrete action was slow in the years immediately following the launch, for a variety of reasons.

There was initially a lack of clarity or consensus on how the partnership would function, and whether it would even be a partnership as opposed to a movement. There was also substantial resistance (or “push back” in the words of one evaluation respondent) to gender and girls’ education as a major driver for action, reflecting the context at the time and the limited priority that was given to gender in general. This was in spite of emerging data on gross disparities that presented convincing and compelling evidence of the need for action on girls’ education and gender equality.

As a result, substantial time was needed to advocate for the necessity of the partnership after its initial inception, even within some of the organizations that were actively engaged or central to its establishment. In addition, the lack of experience with global partnership arrangements, which were new concepts at that time, further complicated the process. Initially, weak coordination and a lack of clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the partnership’s different levels also meant that much time was needed to establish priorities and mechanisms for functioning. In this sense, UNGEI has been a pioneering partnership that has contributed to the maturation of the international aid architecture, as well as to a greater understanding by its members of partnership arrangements and their strengths and weaknesses.

To get UNGEI off the ground, various meetings were organized at the margins of other global events during the years that followed (2001 through 2004), during which partners who had committed to UNGEI globally discussed and reflected on the modalities for its implementation. In the initial years, a small number of activities were also undertaken by UNGEI, although these were not linked to any formal workplan or strategy for the partnership.

The strategic partnership that was established with the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) relatively early on proved critical to moving the partnership into a more operational phase. FAWE’s reach into countries in Africa and its experience and understanding of girls’ education issues at the local level proved very beneficial to greater understanding and prioritization by UNGEI. The involvement of a number of key persons who had been instrumental in AGEI and in other early girls’ education initiatives was also important.

Two additional key factors gave UNGEI a stronger impetus to move forward from 2004. First was the establishment of clear organizational structures (see below), which resulted in UNGEI moving from a loose arrangement implementing somewhat ad hoc activities to a more structured form. Work by co-chairs in 2004 and 2005 concentrated on formalizing the structures for the partnerships. This included clarifying the partnership’s objectives and goals, drawing up terms of reference, and streamlining structures and their responsibilities. The engagement of CIDA, DFID, the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), and the Campaign for Female Education (CAMFED) played a key role during this period.
The second factor was the adoption by UNGEI partners of a strategy that focused on: (1) expansion of UNGEI’s network at global and regional levels by increasing the membership to a larger range of partners and organizations; and (2) making a concerted effort to interact and promote more formal partnerships at the country level.

As a result of these decisions, UNGEI became more directly engaged with national education ministries, with sector planning processes including sector-wide approaches (SWAs) and with processes to develop United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs). Regional focal points (RFPs), financed by UNICEF with funding from bilateral partners for girls’ education, and with a specific UNGEI responsibility, were put in place to support implementation of UNGEI at the country level.

The regional support has subsequently evolved differently in different regions. In some cases, a strong focus was placed on capacity building of education sectors through actions such as gender budgeting and gender audits, and in other cases RFPs targeted countries with specific needs (such as those affected by conflict). This experience allowed UNGEI at the global level (GAC) to undertake gender analysis of some of the early GPE education-sector plans.

**UNGEI functioning**

### 3.1. Governance structures at global level

The main governance structures for UNGEI were put in place in 2004. This followed on consultations held in 2002 with donors and civil society organizations, which recommended that UNGEI broaden and strengthen its advisory and consultative mechanisms in order to engage a wider range of partners, including the private sector. It also followed a 2003 review of UNGEI as a flagship mechanism, which concluded that UNGEI needed to be given a more formal structure at country level as well as global level.

In terms of its global organizational structure, UNGEI has a Secretariat, based at UNICEF in New York, as well as a GAC, which is presided by two co-chairs on a rotational basis. This structure engages with UNGEI RFPs who are placed in UNICEF regional offices, and with countries from those regions that have UNGEI partnerships in place or are otherwise engaged in priority areas that UNGEI supports.
3.2. The GAC

The GAC was established in 2004 with a mandate of providing strategic guidance and facilitating the development and implementation of UNGEI’s vision, strategies and plans at country, regional and global levels in support of the MDGs and EFA goals. The GAC’s role is therefore one of strategizing and priority setting, including:

- Supporting UNGEI’s facilitating/coordinating role at country and regional levels;
- Strengthening UNGEI linkages with other partners, networks and coalitions;
- Advising on the use of UNGEI as a vocal and visible advocate for girls’ education;
- Reviewing progress on implementation of UNGEI objectives and ensuring that objectives, strategies and plans are in line with changing realities;
- Promoting the exchange of information from UNGEI country and regional levels to key international decision-making forums;
- Working with member organizations to ensure that resources are available for UNGEI implementation at national, regional and global levels;
- Supporting the development of a communication strategy by UNGEI;
- Assisting in the definition of UNGEI’s role in monitoring the status and trends in girls’ education;
- Reviewing progress on UNGEI’s implementation; and
- Establishing working groups to address specific issues.

The GAC currently has 18 members: six United Nations members, five civil society members, five bilateral agencies, one intergovernmental organization, and one private sector member. The GAC holds four annual meetings, one of which takes place in person, and three of which are virtual. As can be seen in Figure 2, the GAC is presided by two co-chairs.

In between the meetings, issues that require decisions and follow-up are coordinated by the Secretariat in consultation with the GAC co-chairs. The Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education
(ASPBAE) and CIDA have been co-chairs since 2010 and 2012, respectively. The two-member co-chair position rotates every two years.

Membership of the GAC has evolved over time, as some members have left and new members have been added. New members are incorporated on the basis of a process of discussion and consensus building within the GAC. The decision on the admission of new members is based on a variety of criteria, including the mandate of the organization and ensuring a broad and balanced membership. In 2010, for example, CISCO was admitted as the first private sector partner of the GAC.

The GAC organizes business and technical meetings on an annual basis. One meeting a year has been organized in conjunction with the EFA working group, allowing UNGEI to feed into EFA processes. More recently, UNGEI has also held global and regional meetings at country levels, starting with a 2008 meeting in the Asia-Pacific region in Kathmandu, Nepal. The first UNGEI global conference, entitled ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality (E4)’, was held in Dakar, Senegal in 2010, 10 years after UNGEI was established in the same city. These meetings have included participation from countries from the region and beyond. Specific working groups were set up to organize these meetings. In terms of activities and actions, GAC meetings discuss progress against the annual workplan and identify actions for the coming year.

3.3. The UNGEI Secretariat and the relationship of UNGEI to UNICEF

UNICEF has hosted the UNGEI Secretariat at its headquarters in New York since 2000. The Secretariat is based in UNICEF’s Education Section, which provides UNICEF’s technical and programmatic inputs to EFA and the MDGs on education and gender. The structural relationship between UNGEI and UNICEF means that UNICEF carries the responsibility for UNGEI technically and financially at the levels at which the partnership operates; i.e., UNICEF provides the human and financial resources that allow UNGEI to function. To do this, it receives financial support for its education budget from donors (outlined in more detail below).

In the beginning years, there was no designated full-time coordinator for UNGEI; instead, this responsibility fell under the portfolio/responsibility of a senior education adviser at UNICEF headquarters, who carried out UNGEI work, in addition to his or her other duties. In 2006, a full-time coordinator was appointed. This allowed the partnership to have a firmer and more visible presence at the global level and also to follow up more coherently and consistently on the decisions taken by the group.

Under the current arrangement, the UNGEI Secretariat is staffed by a full-time coordinator and a part-time (50 per cent) technical staff member (P4 level), and it also has administrative support. The coordinator position and other staff members (including the aforementioned RFP) as well as the functioning of the Secretariat are paid for by UNICEF. UNICEF’s communication division has also

---

9 There have been two coordinators throughout the period. The first coordinator was in place for just under a year. The coordinator at the time of the review in 2011 has been in place since 2007, and is due to retire in 2012.
allocated a full-time staff member to UNGEI, who is responsible for managing the UNGEI website and for providing general support in the area of communication and publications, including at regional and country levels. In practice, the hosting arrangement by UNICEF has meant that UNGEI is able to draw on technical input from the education section, beyond the staff members specifically assigned to UNGEI.

The coordinator plays a key role in representing UNGEI and in the Secretariat’s day-to-day functioning. The terms of reference for the position specify that the coordinator serves as the: “Head of the UNGEI Secretariat, providing programmatic and managerial support for the Global Advisory Committee on technical interventions, planning, advocacy, communications, and monitoring and evaluation”. The terms also underscore the important external role that the coordinator plays in “working with a wide range of [United Nations] agency partners and other participatory partners to strengthen UNGEI as a global platform for advocacy, action, guidance and monitoring of progress on girls’ education at global, regional and country levels.” Within UNICEF, the coordinator reports to the Chief of the Education Section. While there is no formal accountability to the GAC, the terms of reference emphasize that the Secretariat is responsible for preparing periodic briefs and reports for the GAC and for serving as the Secretary to the GAC.

Since 2009, UNGEI also has an honorary Global Chair, Her Majesty Queen Rania Al Abdullah of Jordan. She has used various advocacy opportunities to advocate for UNGEI; produced written statements that have included references to girls’ education and UNGEI where appropriate; requested periodic updates on UNGEI’s activities; provided an introduction to the UNGEI supported video, ‘To Educate a Girl’; and expressed a particular interest in seeing UNGEI (and UNICEF) develop a stronger strategic emphasis on the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, where a number of countries (Djibouti, the Sudan and Yemen) face considerable girls’ education and gender equality challenges.

3.4. UNGEI Working Groups

In recent years, the GAC has used working groups to further particular areas of interest to UNGEI. The groups generally focus on a specific activity or outcome and have been of a limited duration.

---

10 The video can be viewed at <www.viewchange.org/videos/to-educate-a-girl>.
The working groups have three main purposes: enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the GAC’s work with respect to the group’s specific theme; supporting the functioning of the wider partnership at national and regional levels related to the particular theme that they represent; and constituting a means for members to contribute to UNGEI’s functioning. Participants in the working group come from the GAC membership and participation is entirely voluntary. The activities of the working group are supported by the Secretariat and by the inputs of consultants as necessary.

Currently, four working groups have been incorporated into UNGEI’s governance structures, covering the following areas: advocacy and communication; country processes; knowledge management; and monitoring and evaluation. The table below provides an overview of the main purpose of each working group currently in place.

### Table 3 – Current UNGEI working groups and their objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and communication</td>
<td>Identifying and planning for global advocacy initiatives and communication with external audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country processes</td>
<td>Maximizing the partnership’s support from the global level to the country (and sub-national) level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge management</td>
<td>Developing and overseeing the implementation of a knowledge management strategy for the global partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Overseeing M&amp;E activities of the partnership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The working groups complement the work being done by the Secretariat and are expected to benefit from the comparative advantages the members bring, including by ensuring that various UNGEI constituencies are represented. The terms of reference for the working groups specify that each should have a workplan that is concise and results-oriented, and that periodic feedback to the GAC will be provided. Final decision-making on all major working group proposals is undertaken by the GAC, including periodic review of progress and determining whether the working group should continue its activities.

At the time of this evaluation, UNGEI was engaged in a process of organizational review that, among other things, aimed to examine GAC membership in light of the shifting development landscape. Other objectives of the organizational review were to critically review UNGEI’s mandate, support and reputation, organizational capacity and resources, and to make decisions on any necessary reorganization and repositioning. The present evaluation is one of the inputs into this process.

3.5. UNGEI at regional level

As Table 4 shows, UNGEI regions coincide with the regions used by UNICEF: Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA), West and Central Africa (WCA), East Asia and the Pacific (EAP), Middle East and North Africa (MENA), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), and South Asia (SA).

Table 4 - UNGEI current and former partnerships, by regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Countries with active UNGEI partnership</th>
<th>Countries where UNGEI partnership is no longer active</th>
<th>Countries where UNGEI partnership has never existed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA)</td>
<td>Botswana, Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi</td>
<td>Rwanda, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Angola, Lesotho, Mauritania, South Africa, Comoros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West and Central Africa (WCA)</td>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Gambia, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Congo, Equatorial Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa (MENA)</td>
<td>Egypt, South Sudan</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Djibouti, Gulf Area Office, Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Countries with active UNGEI partnership</td>
<td>Countries where UNGEI partnership is no longer active</td>
<td>Countries where UNGEI partnership has never existed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific (EAP)</td>
<td>• China</td>
<td>• Mongolia</td>
<td>• Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Papua New Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia (SA)</td>
<td>• Afghanistan</td>
<td>• India</td>
<td>• Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bangladesh</td>
<td>• Nepal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bhutan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe (CEE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guatemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)</td>
<td>• Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From an organizational perspective, at the regional level UNGEI has RFPs in place in all regions with significant gender disparities in education, with the exception of MENA. The RFP is based in the UNICEF regional office and liaises with both the country and global levels of UNGEI. The RFP participates in the GAC meetings and prepares periodic reports on the region’s activities and progress. He/she provides support to the regional coordination/initiatives and to the country level as necessary. The RFP role involves a substantial amount of advocacy, communication and liaising between partners, sharing of experience and good practice, and provision of technical inputs into country- and regional-level process in accordance with the identified needs.

Administratively, the UNGEI RFP is a separate additional position to the regular UNICEF staff, and this position has been put in place at the regional level to support the implementation of UNGEI. In practice, RFPs have different terms of reference, which reflect the specificities of each region and of the UNICEF regional office. Generally, the RFPs devote a portion of their time to other duties related to education and/or girls’ education issues. Within the UNICEF structure, the RFP reports to the Regional Education Adviser, who in turn reports to the UNICEF Regional Director.

3.6. At country level

UNGEI partnerships mainly operate at the country level, where they take different forms. The extent to which UNGEI is present depends on the country context. Some countries have seen local versions of the UNGEI network emerging with decentralized structures, while others have strengthened existing structures and networks for girls’ education and gender equality in line with the UNGEI mandate. The exact scope of UNGEI and the different forms that exist are explored in more detail through the country
and regional aspects of the evaluation, as well as through the mapping exercise that is part of the evaluation.

In countries with an UNGEI partnership, there is a country focal point (CFP), who provides a link between the regional level and country activities and partnerships. In smaller UNICEF offices, the role of the CFP is played by the Chief of Education. In larger offices, the education specialist will be responsible for girls’ education and therefore also for UNGEI. The CFPs are thus regular UNICEF staff members who have UNGEI as part of their portfolio. The evaluation did not explore in how many cases UNGEI responsibilities are specifically included in the terms of reference for CFPs.

**UNGEI activities/actions**

UNGEI engages in a variety of activities that are grouped around three priority strategies. The table below summarizes the focus of these priority strategies and provides examples of some of the activities that have taken place.¹¹ A more detailed discussion of UNGEI’s activities and actions will be the subject of subsequent chapters (see chapters 5, 6 and 7), which present the evaluation findings with respect to the outcomes at the country, regional and global levels, respectively.

**Table 5 – UNGEI activities by focus area at global, regional, and country levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus area</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy dialogue and advocacy</strong></td>
<td>• Engagement with the EFA Global Monitoring Report (GMR) to integrate girls’ education and gender equality issues;</td>
<td>• Advocacy to make education strategies more gender-sensitive;</td>
<td>• Advice and support to government on drafting policies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocacy at the high-level EFA meetings;</td>
<td>• Advocacy for national communication strategies;</td>
<td>• Lobbying and advocacy for policy change;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support for the mainstreaming of gender issues into the country plans provided by GPE.¹²</td>
<td>• Advocacy for specific policies such as the re-admission of girls;</td>
<td>• Support to studies as an input into policy dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical support, capacity building, good practices</strong></td>
<td>• Engagement with other networks to encourage joint efforts;</td>
<td>• Research and publications on regional issues and good practices in girls’ education and gender equality, e.g., on early childhood development, school and work issues;</td>
<td>• Capacity building on gender issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of toolkits and guidelines, e.g., on equity and inclusion;</td>
<td>• Publication of regional newsletters and briefs;</td>
<td>• Documentation of good practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of tools to guide practice by its members, such as the UNGEI Child Protection</td>
<td>• Conducting/facilitating of</td>
<td>• Support to selected studies;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity building related to stakeholders in advocacy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implementation of innovative programmes to address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹ The ‘UNGEI at 10’ publication (UNGEI, 2010) provides a comprehensive overview of the activities that UNGEI has undertaken throughout the past decade.

¹² Formerly known as FTI.
### 3.7. UNGEI funding

Through an arrangement set up in 2002, funding for UNGEI is provided to UNICEF in the form of thematic funding. The thematic funding is provided by donors to fund UNICEF’s multi-annual medium-term strategic plan (MTSP), which covers five thematic areas including a funding line for basic education and gender equality.\(^\text{13}\) For UNICEF, thematic funding provides the opportunity for more systematic medium- and long-term planning with lower transaction costs. For donors, the thematic funding is a relevant way of supporting priorities, without earmarking specific projects. Norway has been the principal donor to the basic education and gender equality thematic funding (with a total of $378 million between 2006 and 2011), followed by Spain (total $108 million during the same period), Sweden ($63 million), Brazil ($9 million) and several smaller donors and national committees for UNICEF.

Under this funding arrangement, UNGEI activities are allocated annually in UNICEF’s basic education and gender equality budget. However, there is no specific annual or multi-annual budget allocation for UNGEI. This arrangement has provided flexibility in terms of accessing additional funding (through the overall education budget). However, it has meant that the GAC has little insight into the available funding envelope and into the overall costs of UNGEI operation (globally, regionally and at country level), as staff inputs (both full-time and occasional inputs from regular UNICEF staff members) and other costs (office space, overhead, etc.) are not easily distinguishable from UNICEF’s regular operational costs, and are not reflected in financial figures in the overview of expenditure.

Annual UNICEF reporting to donors on UNGEI is included in the overall annual Thematic Reports that are published by UNICEF. In addition, the Secretariat provides periodic updates to the GAC on the implementation of its annual plans. In addition, UNGEI produced a specific report in 2010 on its first 10 years, with details on activities and achievements. UNGEI intends to produce these more detailed reports every two years.

\(^{13}\) The other areas of thematic funding include: the humanitarian response (the largest area), child protection, young child survival and development, and HIV and AIDS and children.
The recent annual updates for UNGEI (2007 to 2011) provide an insight into the expenditure on UNGEI activities at the global level (excluding staff costs). A summary (drawn from these reports) can be found in Table 6 below.

**Table 6 – Overview of UNGEI activity expenditure at global level between 2007 and 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (US $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>517,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>788,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>411,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>710,000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** This amount reflects the requested budget only, as final expenditure figures for 2011 were not available at the time the evaluation report was being produced.

These figures do not include staff expenditure at global level, nor do they reflect the regional and country-level budgets/expenditure for UNGEI activities and staff, for which an overview is not available. These figures thus only reflect a small portion of the financial input to UNGEI. In terms of indicative numbers for the regional level, estimates from interviews with UNICEF officers at the regional level suggest that the annual budget at the regional level ranges from US$100,000 to US$400,000 per region per year (excluding staff and operational costs). At country level, the expenditure in Burkina Faso in 2010 amounted to US$314,000.

**UNGEI – Areas of achievement/impact**

An impact assessment of UNGEI has not yet been carried out. Feedback documented in the minutes of UNGEI meetings as well as in the ‘UNGEI at 10’ report (UNGEI, 2010) suggests that UNGEI’s impact areas include:

1. Generating awareness among stakeholders at various levels (global, regional, country) of the need to prioritize gender equality in education in policy and budgeting;
2. Encouraging synergies and collaboration among stakeholders in terms of approaches and initiatives;
3. Producing tools and guidelines for gender-sensitive planning, gender assessments and reviews;
4. Building gender-mainstreaming practices by creating evidence-based resources; and
5. Strengthening partnerships among public and private actors around the gender equality agenda.

**Monitoring**

Baselines for UNGEI at country and regional levels were not initially established. As a result of the work of the UNGEI M&E working group, a framework tool for monitoring and evaluating UNGEI has been
designed and validated at the country level. The framework’s purpose is to guide UNGEI partners in making assessments regarding their own progress. The working group also supported the formative evaluation of UNGEI that is the subject of this report.

Chapter summary

UNGEI was established in 2000 in a context that was markedly different from today. The partnership includes government, development partners, civil society and private/individual actors at global, regional and country levels, and focuses on empowering girls and boys through quality education.

Three strategies guide UNGEI’s activities: advocacy and policy influencing; technical outputs and capacity development; and strengthening partnerships for girls’ education and gender equality. At the global level, a global advisory committee sets the priorities for UNGEI, and is supported by a UNICEF-housed Secretariat for UNGEI. Partnerships at the country level have evolved to reflect local realities and priorities in more than 30 countries. Support at the country level is provided by regional focal points based in UNICEF regional offices.

UNGEI achievements include raising awareness and capacity on girls’ education and gender issues, and strengthening policy and implementation through partnership and advocacy.
4. UNGEI at country level: Status, organization and focus

Chapter overview

This chapter presents an overview of the status of the UNGEI partnership at the country level. The analysis is based on two sets of data collected by the evaluation, namely, an email survey\(^{14}\) that was sent out to UNGEI countries as well as information collected through the evaluation country case studies in Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda. In addition, the evaluation process consulted documentation submitted by many of the countries that completed the survey, as well as documentation provided by the UNGEI Secretariat and collected at country level.

Status of the UNGEI partnership at country level

UNGEI partnerships are in place and active in at least 33 countries across the seven regions of UNGEI.\(^{15}\) In 10 countries, the partnership was reported to have ceased to exist (the reasons for this are discussed below). Eight countries – while listed as being UNGEI countries by the Secretariat – responded that UNGEI had never existed in these countries.

Table 7 – Level of UNGEI activity in respondent countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNGEI presence</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countries where UNGEI never existed (8 countries)</td>
<td>Cambodia, Comoros, Gulf Area Office, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries where UNGEI is no longer active (10 countries)</td>
<td>Angola, Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Lesotho, Mauritania, Mongolia, South Africa and Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries where UNGEI is active (33 countries)</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea, Côte d’Ivoire, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Swaziland, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{14}\) Some 57 countries from seven regions were asked to complete the survey, a copy of which can be found in Annex 5. After two reminders, 51 of the countries contacted returned completed surveys, corresponding to a response rate of 90 per cent. The survey was filled out by UNICEF officials in each country.

\(^{15}\) Some 51 out of 57 countries responded to the survey. It is possible that UNGEI partnerships are active in some of the outstanding six countries; however, the evaluation was unable to verify this.
Overview of the active partnerships

4.1. Name and objectives of the UNGEI partnerships

The majority of partnerships at country level (65 per cent) report that they retain the overall goals of UNGEI but choose to go under a different name.¹⁶ This is illustrated by the overview of the goals from the case study countries provided in the table below. This table also clearly shows significant difference in terms of the scope and emphasis of the goals.

Table 8 – Goals of the partnerships in the evaluation case study countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Decrease the gender gap in primary education enrolment rates by 2007 in the villages of the nine governorates targeted by the initiative by 60 per cent of its value in the year 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>UNGEI contributes to the achievement of the EFA and MDG goals for gender equality and girls’ education through a strong partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Ensure a quality life for all girls in Nigeria through quality education, where gender disparity and all inhibiting factors to girls’ education are completely eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Achieve gender equality in education through strong partnerships and advocacy at global, regional and country levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁶ As noted later in this chapter, the use of the UNGEI acronym is not a criterion for being considered an active member of UNGEI.
Most countries have a focus on the three outcome areas of UNGEI – policy, capacity building and partnership – however, some countries report having additional goals. This is the case, for example, in one of the evaluation case study countries – Uganda – which, in addition to the three UNGEI areas of focus, has a fourth specific goal (also related to policy) of “formulating a policy on the re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers.”

A number of countries submitted additional explanations regarding the name of the partnership. The fact that UNGEI includes the United Nations in the acronym is perceived in some cases to limit the inclusiveness of the partnership and is therefore not used. Many countries adopt the name of the country as a replacement for the United Nations, thus becoming the Egypt Girls’ Education Initiative (EGEI), for example. A number of respondents highlighted the fact that the focus on girls in the acronym rather than gender does not reflect the complexity of gender issues in general and the reality in some countries. For example, the Philippines underscored that they “have been urging that ‘UNGEI’ should be re-phrased as a (broader) Gender Equality Initiative.” In the case of Mongolia, a country where UNGEI is reported to no longer be active, the respondent indicated that there is “no regular team or task force for the activities within the UNGEI framework,” and specifically pointed out that “boys’ education is a more crucial issue compared to girls’ education.”

4.2. Establishment of UNGEI

New UNGEI partnerships have been established every year since UNGEI was created. Countries in which an UNGEI presence was established between 2000 and 2003 include Burundi, Egypt (one of the case study countries), Ethiopia, Mali, Nepal (informal establishment), Peru and the United Republic of Tanzania. This was followed by a second wave (16 countries) between 2004 and 2006 (see Table 9). In 11 countries, UNGEI has been established within the past four years (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, Chad, Liberia, Madagascar, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Senegal and Swaziland).

Two of the survey countries report having launched UNGEI early on, but have recently reactivated or formally launched the partnership after an initial period of activity. This includes Nepal, where the partnership was initially informally established in 2002 and then formally launched in 2008. Mali also saw an early creation of the UNGEI network (in 2001) and a reactivation in 2009 through a formal launch by the Minister of Education.
Table 9 - Chronological overview of the establishment of UNGEI partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country names</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Egypt, Peru</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mali (informally)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Burundi, Nepal (informally), United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Benin, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, Uganda</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Burkina Faso, Philippines, Sierra Leone</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Kenya, South Sudan, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Bangladesh, Madagascar, Nepal (formal launch), Senegal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Botswana, Liberia, Mali (formal launch)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Chad, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Swaziland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Uganda case study used a trend analysis\(^\text{17}\) to examine how the partnership has fared over time. The analysis identifies three stages in the evolution of UNGEI:

- A very active stage (2004–2006) when UNGEI participated actively in mapping gender activities in education, developing terms of reference, rolling out UNGEI to district level, conducting advocacy activities, undertaking research and launching a number of specific campaigns, such as ‘Go to school, back to school, stay in school’;

- A ‘slow-down’ period (2007–2008) with some expansion work but diminishing support from the national level, with UNICEF being the only active United Nations agency in the partnership (the others having dropped off); and

- A recuperation phase (2008 onward), which appears to have been spurred by the review of the Gender in Education Policy and revival of activities such as the organization of the girl-child education week, a study on good practices by institutions, research on pregnancy in schools, and a focused goal of drafting a policy on the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools.

The survey did not explore issues related to the process of establishment. However, the case study countries provide some insight into the challenges of getting UNGEI off the ground at the country level. In the case of UNGEI Nepal, for example, the evaluation found that: “The start-up of UNGEI reportedly suffered from not having proper guidance from Headquarters and from the UNICEF Regional Office for

\(^{17}\) The trend analysis was based on the number of activities undertaken, the number of partners involved, the coverage, and the pace of activities. (Further details can be found in the Uganda Case Study Report.)
South Asia (ROSA).” The report notes that although the issues on girls’ education were known, UNICEF Nepal was not clear about how to get UNGEI moving. More recently, guidelines from the GAC have reportedly made the processes clearer. This explains why in Nepal the partnership is considered as having operated informally from 2002 until 2008, when it was formally established.

These findings highlight the very different patterns countries have in terms of timing and the process for establishing UNGEI, making it difficult to identify commonalities among them. Some countries experience a fast start-up and then a levelling off or reduction in activities. As indicated above, in some cases this has resulted in a re-launching or official launch of UNGEI to give the partnership a boost.

4.3. Membership of UNGEI at country level

The survey shows that UNGEI partnerships vary considerably in terms of the number and kinds of stakeholder groups that are members. In Bangladesh, for example, only four stakeholder groups are part of UNGEI, namely, UNICEF, the MoE, NGOs and individual partners. Nepal, on the other hand, integrates all 10 stakeholder categories that were included in the survey (see Figure 3) in a national forum known as the Girls’ Education and Gender Equality Network (GEGEN), which is chaired by the Director General of the Department of Education.

In the survey of UNGEI countries and as shown in Figure 4, the MoE, UNICEF and local NGOs are mentioned most frequently as being members of UNGEI partnerships at the country level. International NGOs such as Save the Children, FAWE, World Vision and Action Aid also play an important role. Other government ministries are included in two-thirds of the countries. Three out of five countries include other United Nations members, community-based organizations and other groups (including donor agencies). Interestingly, the private sector and individuals/champions are included in only a small number of partnerships. The private sector is cited as a partner in Botswana, Cameroon, Egypt, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, South Sudan and Zimbabwe.

Text box 1 – UNGEI in Egypt

In Egypt, where UNGEI was initiated in 2000, the Egypt Girls’ and Education Initiative (EGEI) is headed by the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM). Partners include eight United Nations organizations, 18 ministries, organizations from the informal and private sectors, and a number of NGOs at the central and governorate level.
It is possible that the number and type of members affect the complexity and effectiveness of the partnership – although this will also be influenced by the mechanisms for leadership, the management and the level of organization of the partnership. However, the survey did not further explore these issues and the evaluation can therefore not provide firm conclusions on this matter.

4.4. Levels of operation of the partnership

At country level, the expectation is that UNGEI will operate through a national forum or coordinating body, possibly with sub-national representation (regional and/or local), depending on the country context and priorities. The survey therefore sought to establish what levels of operation were in place across the UNGEI countries.

The findings indicate that the vast majority of countries (more than 90 per cent) have a national coordinating structure (31 out of 33 countries) and that 21 countries (64 per cent) also have UNGEI representation at sub-national level (defined as “region, province, district, Woreda, etc.”). However, operation of UNGEI at the local level (defined as “city, town, village, community”) was reported by slightly more than one-third of the countries, all but one of which is located in Africa (Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Nepal, Nigeria, Senegal, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe).
The evaluation case study countries provide further insights into the levels of operation, which encompass three levels in Uganda and Egypt and two levels in Nigeria and Nepal.

**Figure 5 – Levels of operation in UNGEI countries**

**Figure 6 – Levels of operation of the UNGEI partnership in Uganda**

- **National-level membership**
  - United Nations agencies, NGOs, government ministries, a teacher training institution, donors, media, local artists, private sector, children/young people

- **District-level membership**
  - Local government (Education Department), politicians, deputy chief administrative officer, religious organizations, chairpersons of women’s organizations, female role models, district speakers

- **Sub-county level**
  - Religious leaders, model parents (parents who have sent children to school), teachers and chairpersons of women’s groups
In Uganda, UNGEI is a multi-sector partnership forum with a three-tier structure consisting of national, district and sub-county managerial levels, in addition to linkages to UNGEI at regional and global levels. The stakeholders who participate in each of the levels are shown in Figure 6.

The process of rolling out UNGEI to districts in Uganda was facilitated by the fact that UNICEF had been working in these areas, and that the districts were actually known as ‘UNICEF districts’, as the case study highlights. At the sub-county/community level, the report notes that the UNGEI network built on existing Camp Education Committees that were created in conflict-prone areas of northern Uganda and consisted of a camp leader, a head teacher, a Girls’ Education Movement (GEM) representative and a member of local government. In non-conflict areas, UNGEI committees comprised religious leaders, model parents (parents who sent children to school), teachers and women’s groups.

In Nigeria (as well as in Nepal), the partnership operates on two levels: national and state. The state level is housed in the State Universal Basic Education Board or the State Ministry of Education. At this level, the States First Ladies (wives of governors of these states) have played a very active role in equipping the Nigeria Girls’ Education Initiative (NGEI) Secretariat, which the case study of that country shows was instrumental in generating high-profile attention and commitment to girls’ education and gender equality.

The Nigerian structure is also interesting in that a selection of its members at the national level come together in a Technical Working Group (TWG) that manages the partnership on a day-to-day basis; the Secretariat is provided by a coalition of civil society organizations grouped together in the Civil Society Action Committee on Education for All (CSACEFA). In addition, the national level also includes a number of working groups, as shown in Figure 7.
In Egypt, the partnership operates at national and local levels. At the national level, a task force is in place, while a village level task force and education committees support implementation at the local level. The structure focuses on establishing, implementing and providing oversight and support to community schools.\(^{18}\)

The information collected through the survey does not make it possible to establish the extent to which the existence of various partnership levels explains the partnership’s effectiveness. However, evidence from the country case studies does highlight that multiple levels allow the partnership to understand the specificities of the context, to put in place specific initiatives to address challenges, to broaden stakeholder involvement and provide a wide forum for advocacy and discussion, and to monitor progress as well as identify persistent or emerging challenges.

### 4.5. Main areas of activity

Using open-ended questioning, the survey sought to identify the partnership’s main areas of activity. Detailed responses from the countries that responded are captured in Annex 9, but a brief summary is provided below.

For many countries, the main areas of activities are **advocacy and sensitization** on gender issues, as well as **training and capacity building** at various levels. Advocacy and sensitization focus both on senior-level decision-making for government and politicians on issues such as free primary education for all (e.g., the Democratic Republic of the Congo) and for the adoption of specific laws (e.g., the law for the promotion of rural girls and adolescent education in Peru). Advocacy and sensitization also focus on community level activities such as social mobilization for school-age enrolment in Chad and Papua New Guinea,

\(^{18}\) Further details on this structure can be found in the Egypt case study report.
annual back-to-school campaigns in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Uganda, and community mobilization to overcome barriers to education in Côte d’Ivoire.

The table below shows how the advocacy and sensitization component has been operationalized in terms of strategies and activities in Nigeria.

**Table 10 – Nigeria: Advocacy and sensitization targets, expectations and activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Target groups/ Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Advocacy/ Sensitization | • Policymakers at national/state levels;  
                          • Traditional and religious leaders, communities, parents and pupils.  | • Encourage them to adopt NGEI and to inaugurate it at state level;  
                                                                                       • Integrate gender concerns into education sector plans and budgets. |
|                    |                                                                                             | • Advocacy visits to states/local government areas, traditional and religious leaders, communities;  
                                                                                       • Policy dialogue with state education officials;  
                                                                                       • Advocacy training workshop supported by UNICEF;  
                                                                                       • Radio and television phone-in shows, dramas and documentaries on benefits of girls’ education. |

The main capacity building activity, an important area of focus in many countries, was the training of female teachers, as highlighted in a number of countries (e.g., Afghanistan and Egypt), as well as the general training of teachers on gender issues (e.g., Egypt, the Gambia, Guinea, Madagascar and Rwanda). However, capacity building also includes other target groups, such as: decision makers and UNGEI members (e.g., Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, Nigeria and Senegal); MoE staff, Young Champions and policymakers (e.g., Nepal); and GEM to provide peer support at the school level (e.g., Uganda).

Both in advocacy and capacity building, frequent reference is made to media campaigns; for example, in the case of Nigeria, Pakistan and Uganda, where radio and/or television are used to promote girls’ education and to discuss gender issues in general. Text box 3 highlights Uganda’s experience with using radio talk shows.

**Text box 3 – Uganda: Using radio to encourage young mothers to return to school**

In Uganda, radio talk shows are an avenue for reaching out to hard-to-reach communities in remote and mountainous areas. District UNGEI committees organize the shows using the local area FM radio stations. Facilitators include children, female role models from the community, and UNGEI district committee members. Women’s groups are frequently invited to talk to girls. Topics discussed include: returning girls to school after pregnancy; what to do when your daughter is defiled; and why educating girls is important. Through the talk shows, child mothers have shared their experiences with others and have encouraged girls who dropped out due to pregnancy to return to school.

**Material development and dissemination and sharing good practices** were also important areas of activity in many countries. Bangladesh reports producing materials related to the promotion of girls’ education and adolescent issues. Malawi mentions developing and reviewing girls’ club handbooks as well as manuals for mothers’ groups. Other countries with activities in this area include Nigeria, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

**School-level activities** such as the promotion of child-friendly schooling (e.g., Botswana), the promotion of clubs at school level (e.g., the United
Republic of Tanzania and Uganda), and advocacy/training for the reduction of gender-based violence (e.g., Burkina Faso, Burundi, Rwanda, Senegal and Uganda) also get prominent attention. This includes school construction (e.g., Egypt) and improvements such as establishing sanitary and hygiene facilities in schools (e.g., Rwanda).

Local activities that go beyond the school include initiatives to support birth registration, as in Cameroon. Provision of financial support and grants are mentioned in about one-third of countries. This includes help with scholarships (e.g., Cameroon, Kenya, Madagascar, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe), but also support for school materials and meals in Egypt, procuring of textbooks, stationery and uniforms for vulnerable children in Zimbabwe and in Madagascar, where vulnerable girls are provided with bicycles and canoes, facilitating access to school. It should be noted that many of these activities (scholarships, textbooks, uniforms, etc.) were cited in the survey as being specific to UNGEI but are actually education cluster activities that are supported by UNICEF and benefit the goals of UNGEI and UNICEF.

**A number of areas are mentioned only infrequently.** Thus, while UNGEI is mentioned as a useful mechanism for promoting coordination among government and other stakeholders (e.g., Malawi), this gets less emphasis in the responses than might have been expected, particularly because this is one of UNGEI’s three strategic areas of focus. The country case studies highlight some of the particular challenges of partnership building, which may explain why this area is less prominently mentioned in the surveys.

A few countries (e.g., Benin and Guinea) mention efforts to promote preschool education at the community level. Research is mentioned only in Botswana, where a baseline study on gender in tertiary institutions was performed, and in Ethiopia, where a national assessment on gender was conducted. Some countries (e.g., Botswana and Burundi) focus very specifically on the promotion of mathematics and science education for girls, including sensitizing decision makers and parents, as well as developing specific programmes.

Finally, it was not possible to establish whether activities in survey countries were primarily driven by UNGEI, were the result of collaboration between partners, or whether UNGEI only had a minor role. For case study countries, however, it was possible to verify that examples discussed are activities that were conducted as a result of UNGEI priority setting. Case studies are discussed in Chapter 5, which examines the outcomes at country level more comprehensively.

---

**Text box 4 - Scholarships for training female teachers in Nigeria**

The National Certificate of Education Teachers’ Scholarship Scheme aims to increase the number of female teachers, to serve as role models in rural communities where female enrolment in basic education is low.

Under the scheme, young women are admitted into a three-year programme and receive a stipend. Upon completion, they are to return to their communities to teach.

The scheme is now in its third year and is sponsored by UNICEF, state and local governments and NGOs. More than 2,300 women have benefitted from the scholarships in three states.

It is hoped that the programme will increase the pool of female teachers, of whom there are few in the northern states, and that it will improve teacher retention in rural communities.
4.6. Main beneficiaries of UNGEI activities at country level

The evaluation also sought to establish the main beneficiaries of UNGEI activities in the countries where the partnership is operational. Figure 8 shows the main beneficiaries of UNGEI related to in-school primary level children in all survey countries, followed by in-school secondary level children (both in more than three-quarters of the countries). Out-of-school primary level children and vulnerable girls are beneficiaries in just under two-thirds of countries.

Figure 8 – Number of countries and beneficiaries of UNGEI at country level

Data from the survey show that relatively few countries focus on out-of-school secondary girls and on vulnerable girls as specific categories. The case studies also highlight a similar trend. In Egypt, non-enrolled and dropout girls between 6 and 13 years old have been the focus. In Uganda, activities have prioritized out-of-school girls at the primary level, although more recently a link has been made to girls in secondary education. In Nepal, the focus has been on bringing out-of-school children to school, mainly for primary school-age children ranging from 5 to 9 years old.

The need for a broader focus for UNGEI on the secondary level was a point raised by a number of stakeholders in the global interviews. It was felt that a more comprehensive approach to gender issues in education would ensure that UNGEI focuses on gender issues across the education system (pre-primary, primary, secondary and beyond, as well as non-formal education).

Finally, the survey highlights that, in a number of countries, UNGEI partnerships have identified particular target groups for priority interventions. Under the open-ended category of ‘other groups of beneficiaries’, which was only ticked off by a small number of countries, respondents cited nomadic children (Afghanistan), children with disabilities (Zimbabwe), indigenous girls (Peru), children from

19 The target also includes “boys who need to join this type of school in the same age range by a ratio that does not exceed 25 per cent of class capacity” (UNGEI country evaluation for Egypt, 2011).
ethnic minorities (Cameroon), mothers’ clubs (the Gambia) and school-based management groups (Nigeria and Senegal).

4.7. Formalization, work planning and reporting by the partnership

The UNGEI standard for determining if a partnership can be formally identified as part of UNGEI requires that the partnership in question must:

- Have terms of reference that formalize the mandate, members and governance of the national or sub-national partnership;
- Have an annual workplan that is monitored by the national partnership; and
- Report against the annual workplan to the UNGEI regional focal point.

The group does not need to use the UNGEI acronym in its name to be considered part of the network (in fact, as noted above, many countries do not use the acronym).

In order to determine the level of formalization and organization by the UNGEI partnerships at country level in line with these criteria, countries were asked if they have formal terms of reference and/or a workplan, and whether the partnership reports to the global or regional level regarding that workplan. As Figure 9 shows, 26 of 33 countries surveyed (79 per cent) reported having formal terms of reference for the partnership.

Figure 9 – Percentage of countries with formal terms of reference for the partnership
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A slightly smaller number of countries with active UNGEI partnerships (24, or 72 per cent) also have an agreed annual workplan, as shown in Figure 10, while just more than half indicated that the workplan has been shared with the UNGEI Secretariat and/or the regional focal point (also Figure 10). With respect to reporting, only 39 per cent of the countries indicate that they reported against their annual workplan.
A total of 14 out of 33 countries (42.4 per cent) that declared having an active UNGEI partnership meet the three criteria for determining if a partnership has been formalized. Four additional countries have terms of reference and a workplan, but have not shared the latter document with the focal points, and therefore almost meet the criteria.

Figure 11 – Overview of the degree of formalization of partnerships at country level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria met</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terms of reference, workplan and annual reporting to focal point (14 countries)</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Malawi, Mali, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference and workplan, but no reporting to focal point (4 countries)</td>
<td>Burundi, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 10 – Percentage of countries with an annual workplan
The country case studies underscore the challenges that the lack of formalization can bring. In the case of Nepal, terms of reference are in place but annual work planning and reporting does not exist. As discussed in Chapter 5, this has had repercussions for the effectiveness of the partnership. In Egypt, terms of reference for the partnership do not exist and there is no joint annual work planning. In fact, EGEI has a coordinating entity (NCCM),\(^{20}\) which works bilaterally with implementing partners, with no opportunity for joint strategizing or priority setting. In addition, the coordination that does take place focuses on the implementation of the model that the NCCM uses to address the educational needs of out-of-school girls in rural communities, but does not constitute a more comprehensive forum for discussion, reflection and priority setting around girls’ education and gender equality issues overall. As noted in the case study, this diminishes the extent to which EGEI can be considered a true partnership.

### 4.8. Challenges

The mapping survey included an open question asking respondents to identify the three main challenges facing the partnership in their country. These responses were analysed, and the most frequently mentioned challenges are summarized below:

**Lack of funding and resources for activity implementation**

This was the most frequently mentioned challenge, and involves not only funding but also human resources for implementation in some countries. A number of countries underscored that in the absence of a budget allocation for UNGEI, agreed-upon strategies are not implemented, impacting the level of enthusiasm for the partnership.

Lack of funding appears to particularly affect implementation at the field level, where resources are often scarce. This was highlighted clearly in the Uganda case study, where activities in one district visited had suffered considerably when funding for girls’ education was no longer forthcoming.\(^{21}\) In addition, funding constraints were also noted as having implications for the capacity of the UNGEI group to monitor and evaluate what is going on at the local level and to use this in decision-making and priority setting.

In contexts where individual agencies take it upon themselves to fund certain activities, respondents highlighted that these activities are then not associated with UNGEI but rather with the specific funder. Respondents in some countries also noted a lack of capacity by UNGEI to tap into and efficiently utilize resources.

---

\(^{20}\) In the aftermath of the revolution in Egypt, the Ministry of Family and Population which comprises several separate councils that were established by the state – including the NCCM – was dissolved. However, the councils have survived and their programmes are continuing as before in the spring of 2011.

\(^{21}\) Kasese District had been one of the UNICEF districts, and as such funding had been available through UNICEF to promote the activities that were being prioritized through the priority setting by the district committee.
Getting partners to commit time and effort to the partnership amid competing priorities

As several countries highlighted, while some partners will come to general meetings, very few commit to actual implementation of activities by, for example, participating in working groups and moving activities forward. In some cases this has meant that UNICEF has taken the bulk of the responsibility for implementation, or that activities have not been implemented. In addition, commitment to the partnership is often reported to be at an individual rather than institutional level. Thus, when staff members change jobs commitment discontinues. This also effectively reduces the extent to which participation in the UNGEI network by the organization in question translates into mainstreaming of girls’ education and gender equality issues within the priority setting of the organization itself.

Weak commitment and capacity at government level

Issues mentioned in this context include a lack of capacity and resources for coordinating actions with partners and failure by decision makers to take leadership of the process (with gender issues, for example, being relegated to a lower level employee). In some countries, there are no designated officials at ministry level for gender. In others, a high turnover of staff in ministries (and lack of timely replacements) affects capacity most. A number of countries also highlighted the problem of competing priorities (other thematic groups and initiatives, often within the same target group, including competing groups set up within the United Nations family) and of poor record keeping and documentation of the interventions that UNGEI and its partners undertake.

Poor capacity and understanding of the issues around gender

A number of countries underscored challenges in terms of the capacity of the UNGEI group itself and the need for improvement of technical knowledge and communication skills.

Contextual issues such as poor security, political instability and cultural barriers

Contextual issues affected UNGEI’s operation in a number of countries. These include countries where cultural barriers pose particular challenges to addressing gender issues. A number of countries also underscored issues related to instability and conflict as having major implications for programming and implementation.

Lack of monitoring and evaluation and capacity challenges

A substantial number of countries have no or very poor systems for monitoring and evaluating UNGEI’s operations and activities. Countries underscored the need for a sound analysis of the factors that cause disparities among girls and boys to persist as a basis for future operational and policy direction. The lack of institutional memory and documentation (see above) was also highlighted as a barrier to UNGEI activities.
Non-active partnerships

Ten countries reported that partnerships were no longer active (Angola, Congo, Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Guatemala, Lesotho, Mauritania, Mongolia, South Africa and Tajikistan). These partnerships were asked a total of six questions related to the name of the partnership, the date the partnership ceased to exist, who the members had been, at what level the partnership had been operational, whether terms of reference had existed, and the main reasons (maximum of two) why the partnership had ceased to exist. The findings show the following:

- Half the non-active partnerships (5 out of 10) had a different name, but similar goals to those of UNGEI. Four partnerships had used the name UNGEI, and one country (Angola) had a different name and a different goal.
- Most of the partnerships that are now not active ceased to exist between 2007 and 2010 (the survey did not ask countries to report when the partnership had been established).
- When they were active, the membership of the partnerships roughly followed the pattern found for other active partnerships, with UNICEF and the MoE being the most frequently mentioned. Most countries also cited other government ministries, international and local NGOs. Other members of the United Nations family were members in half the countries, and local and community-based organizations were also members in four countries. Only one country had representation from private sector organizations (Guatemala).
- All partnerships with the exception of South Africa had a national level presence, but no sub-national or local representation. In South Africa, the partnership also existed at sub-national and local levels.
- Most of the countries (60 per cent) had no formal terms of reference at the time the partnership was active.

The two most common reasons selected for ceasing of operation were ‘the most active people from different organizations moved on to other jobs’ (six countries) and ‘other’ (seven countries). In the ‘other’ category, the following reasons were mentioned:

- Lack of commitment/interest by MoE (Djibouti);
- Other partners/initiatives are already working on the topic (Congo);
- Key staff have moved on (Equatorial Guinea, Lesotho);
- No real need, as gender progress has been significant (Guatemala);
- Political instability and changes in the leading institutions (Mauritania);
- Lack of political commitment (Tajikistan).

Four countries also indicated that the goals of the partnership were no longer relevant to the country context (Djibouti, Guatemala, Mongolia and South Africa).

Conclusions and discussion

UNGEI has an active presence in a large number of countries and has a strong focus at primary level on in- and out-of-school girls. The implementation at country level follows the overall goals and priorities of
UNGEI, but the activities implemented appear to reflect local issues and priorities – and may also be a function of (limited) funding given the fact that funding is identified as a major constraint for the partnership.

The data also indicate that the level of formalization of partnerships is still weak. A substantial number of countries lack clear terms of reference and an agreed-upon workplan and reporting system. A number of major challenges to implementation continue to exist, in particular related to funding, inadequate knowledge and skills for managing partnerships, and lack of commitment by partners. The fact that both capacity and commitment are identified as major constraints points to considerable challenges in having an effective functioning partnership.

Chapter summary

- UNGEI partnerships are in place in 33 countries, covering six regions. The majority of these partnerships do not use the name UNGEI but report retaining the overall goals that UNGEI subscribes to as their own.
- UNGEI partnerships have been established every year since UNGEI was created. In the three-year period from 2004 to 2006, half of the active partnerships were established.
- UNICEF, the MoE and local NGOs are partners in almost all countries. Many partnerships also include other government ministries, international NGOs, other United Nations agencies and community-based organizations. Private sector and individual champions are included in only a small number of countries.
- Almost all country partnerships operate at the national level and fewer than two out of three countries have UNGEI representation at the sub-national level. However, only one-third operate at the local (community) level.
- Countries engage in a wide range of activities; advocacy/sensitization, training and capacity building, and materials production and dissemination figure prominently among the activities. There is less of a focus on promoting coordination, researching and monitoring.
- The in-school population at primary level is the largest beneficiary of UNGEI at country level, followed by in-school secondary. More than half of the countries also include activities for out-of-school primary children. However, out-of-school secondary is emphasized in only a quarter of the countries.
- In terms of formalization of the partnership, a total of 14 countries meet the three criteria that UNGEI has established for the existence of a partnership. Less than 40 per cent of the countries annually report on their activities to the RFP.
- Financial resources are by far the most frequently cited challenge for partnerships. Securing commitment by partners, issues of capacity, contextual issues, and lack of monitoring and evaluation are also cited as major challenges.
- In 10 countries, partnerships that were established have since ceased to exist. Reasons for the demise of the partnership vary from country to country.
5. The contribution of UNGEI at country level

Chapter overview

This chapter focuses on the contribution and impact that UNGEI has had at country level. The bulk of this chapter therefore targets the first part of the second objective of this evaluation by exploring “the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at country level and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership.”\(^{22}\) The second part of this objective related to the role of the (regional and) global levels will be the focus of Chapters 6 and 7.

The analysis presented here draws together the findings from the four country studies. It examines in detail what contribution UNGEI has made at country level, if any, to the areas of policy development, capacity building/good practice, and partnership strengthening. The chapter will discuss some of the strategies and choices that were made, and provide selected examples of how the country partnerships have operated to achieve the outcomes.

The findings presented in this chapter were obtained through the contribution analysis approach, which was central to the data collection for this evaluation. Additional details are provided in country study reports, which are used to draw conclusions about the contribution of UNGEI and highlight how the evaluation in each country examined each of the outcome areas:

- The initial situation (before UNGEI was established);
- Changes since the establishment of UNGEI;\(^ {23}\)
- Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution to these changes;
- Emerging outcomes; and
- The relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of UNGEI’s interventions, and (where possible) the impact and sustainability.

As explained in the methodology, data for this assessment were collected in each country through a combination of interviews, focus groups, field visits and document analysis that focused on triangulating information in order to reach firm conclusions.

Two caveats need to be highlighted ahead of the discussion of the findings. First, in interpreting the findings from the country studies, it is important to take into account that the country-specific objectives and focus areas for UNGEI, while similar, are not identical, and that this has a bearing on the different outcomes. Second, and as will be shown through the discussion, country contexts vary

\(^{22}\) The regional level is not explicitly mentioned in this objective, but is given prominent attention in the analysis given its role vis-à-vis both the country partnerships and the global partnership.

\(^{23}\) This refers to all of the changes in the context, not just those related to UNGEI.
significantly and will have – in some contexts more than others – impacted the extent to which outcomes were achieved.

The case study countries at a glance

As background to the analysis of UNGEI’s contribution in the case study countries, this section briefly introduces the situation in each country with respect to girls’ education and gender equality, and also highlights some of the key characteristics of the partnership in each country. Additional details can be found in each of the country case study reports.24

5.1. Egypt

The context: In Egypt, the gender gap in primary education enrolment has steadily declined in the past two decades. Central to this achievement has been the decision by the government to establish community schools in areas where educational facilities do not exist, with the aim of reducing drop out and repetition rates, especially for girls.

The partnership: The Egyptian Girls’ Education Initiative (EGEI) was established in 2000. EGEI focuses on the concept of community schools with the goal of “decreasing the gap in primary education enrolment rates by 2007 in villages of seven governorates targeted by the initiative by 60 per cent of its value in the year 2002.” The partnership focus areas are identical to those of UNGEI at the global level and include policy, good practices and partnership strengthening for the purpose of implementing the community school model, which is central to the EGEI initiative.

The partnership exists at national and local levels. At the national level, EGEI is housed within the NCCM and has a task force that brings together stakeholders from government, donors, civil society and the private sector. The operational arm of EGEI is the GEI Secretariat, which monitors the seven governorates where EGEI is active. A United Nations task force also provides support at this level. At the local level, the partnership has local task forces as well as education committees.

5.2. Nepal

The context: The situation of girls’ education has changed greatly since 2000. Not only has gender parity almost been achieved, but the transition rate from one cohort to another has also improved, with girls having higher transition rates from primary to secondary school than boys. However, there are gender gaps and challenges at the secondary level that need to be addressed. With only 6 per cent of children out of school, Nepal has made significant progress. However, bringing these last children to school will require a different approach and/or incentive package, as they are from vulnerable families.

The partnership: The origin of UNGEI is traced back to a loose network that was established in 2002 and which carried out a number of activities in the subsequent years, but without the UNGEI logo. After the official launching of the partnership in Nepal in 2008, UNGEI has become more prominent. The

24 Country case study reports are available at <www.ungei.org>.
partnership’s overall goal is to contribute to the achievement of the EFA and MDG goals for gender equality and girls’ education. The three focus areas that guide the work of UNGEI in Nepal mirror those of the global partnership in focusing on policies, good practices and partnership building.

Currently, the UNGEI network exists at national and district levels, under the name ‘Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Network (GE Network)’. The GE Network, which was initially in place in seven districts, was expanded to all 75 districts in 2011 as part of a government institutionalization process. The work of the central and district level networks is supported by two other groups that work on gender issues, namely, the United Nations Girls’ Education Theme Group and the Women Parliamentarians’ Networking Group for Girls’ Education. The UNGEI partnership in Nepal meets twice a year to share workplans and review progress.

5.3. Nigeria

The context: When NGEI was formed in 2005, Nigeria had a net primary enrolment Ratio (NER) of 83.7 per cent. With the NER for males at 87 per cent and for females at 81.3 per cent, the gender parity index stood at a very reasonable 0.93. However, this overall statistic hides persistent gender disparities against girls in northern parts of the country. The underlying causes of these gender disparities in education include: lack of awareness of the value of girls’ education, widespread poverty, inadequate school infrastructure, cultural and religious biases, early marriage and teenage pregnancy.

The partnership: NGEI was established in May 2005 and built on two earlier initiatives with similar objectives. The overall goal of NGEI is to contribute to the achievement of the EFA and MDG goals for gender equality and girls’ education. Key strategies and activities at each level include: advocacy/sensitization; capacity building; resource mobilization; and documentation and dissemination of good practices for promoting girls’ education.

NGEI has a well-developed structure for implementation, with a clear definition of goals and division of responsibilities. NGEI operates through a two-tiered structure. At the national level, the partnership consists of a technical working group, which runs the partnership and has three sub-committees (advocacy, information/communication, and fundraising). A civil society umbrella organization provides the Secretariat for UNGEI. In the four states where UNGEI has been launched and is operational, State NGEI steering committees are in place.

5.4. Uganda

The context: Uganda has made progress in providing access to schooling, as evidenced by the massive increase in enrolment after the introduction of universal primary and secondary education. Total enrolment tripled from about 2.7 million in 1996 to 8.2 million in 2009. Net enrolment progressed from

25 All 197 women parliamentarians are members of the Women Parliamentarians Networking Group for Girls’ Education and advocate for girls’ education. The United Nations Girls’ Education Theme Group includes five United Nations agencies as members and is coordinated by the UNGEI focal point in Nepal. These working groups meet with their constituents and make decisions to support the government on girls’ education and gender equality either through GEGEN or directly.
86 per cent (89 per cent for boys, 82 per cent for girls) in 2000 to 93 per cent (96 per cent for boys, 90 per cent for girls) in 2009, representing an increase of 8 percentage points in the NER of girls.

However, considerable inequalities remain in regional, social class and gender divides. Girls, particularly in rural areas, continue to lag behind on nearly all indicators to do with access, quality and efficiency. In addition, girls constitute the largest proportion of out-of-school children and perform worse than boys in national examinations. Drop-out due to pregnancy and other factors such as HIV/AIDS seriously undermine girls’ participation and performance.

The partnership: UNGEI was launched in Uganda in December 2004. The overall goal of UNGEI Uganda is to achieve gender equality in education through strong partnerships and advocacy at global, regional and country levels. The partnership focuses on four outcome areas, namely: policies promoting girls’ education and gender equality; developing a specific policy for re-entry to school by pregnant girls and child mothers; strengthening partnerships to promote girl-child education; and regular review of progress and good practice.

UNGEI Uganda has a three-tier management structure, spanning the national, district and sub-county/community levels, which provides strategic guidance on girls’ education within their areas of jurisdiction. Despite being a fairly inclusive multi-stakeholder partnership, UNGEI Uganda largely remains a loose coalition of non-committal partners, with no Secretariat and physical office space of its own, as well as a rather amorphous administrative structure and loose coordination between the national, district and community levels.

UNGEI’s contribution to policy strengthening

Table 11 provides a schematic overview of policy evolution in each of the countries and an assessment of UNGEI’s contribution. The sections that follow consecutively discuss each of the columns of the table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and specific policy goal and starting date</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Egypt (2000) Goal: Policies promoting girls’ education and gender equality are in existence. | Some education policies in place:  
- Several international agreements had been ratified;  
- Community school had been used to expand education access in disadvantaged areas;  
- Education policy did not include a specific girls’ education or gender focus. | Some policy changes took place:  
- The National Strategic Plan for Pre-University Education Reform in Egypt includes a programme to support community-based education for girls;  
- A ministerial decree has been issued to raise the age limit of graduates from girl-friendly schools (GFS) so they can complete their pre-university education. | EGEI’s contribution was modest and included:  
- A protocol was signed between NCCM and the MoE in 2008 to scale up GFS in all governorates;  
- Capacity building of local task forces was promoted;  
- Coordination of United Nations agencies to support EGEI;  
- Sensitization of parents and girls, which has led to greater demand for GFS and put pressure on policymakers. | Through joint efforts of EGEI with stakeholders, community-based education for girls is now a policy priority. In the areas where EGEI is active, GFSs have helped expand opportunities for access to primary education and reduce the gender gap through the construction of more than 1,100 such schools, enrolling more than 34,000 pupils. |
| Nepal (2002/08) Goal: Mainstreaming girls’ education and gender equality in the national education plan. | A number of policies on girls’ education and gender were in place:  
- Early policy priority for girls’ education dates back to the 1971 National Education System Plan (1971), which included one female teacher per school;  
- Policies were also in place regarding the distribution of free textbooks and ensuring a primary school exists within walking distance of each village. | Further policies that integrate gender priorities were adopted including:  
- EFA national action plan;  
- Secondary education support programme;  
- Greater participation of women lawmakers in education;  
- Gender-responsive budgeting;  
- Draft Education Act (pending approval by Parliament). | UNGEI’s contribution was modest and included:  
- Creating space for building capacity of women parliamentarians to lobby on the basis of a 15-point commitment for girls’ education and 12-point agenda to incorporate in Education Act;  
- Coordinating United Nations agencies to support the development of the gender equity support programme and incorporate gender issues in the School Sector Reform Plan;  
| Nigeria (2005) Goal: Policies promoting girls’ education and gender equality are in existence. | Various education and gender equality policies were in place, including:  
- National Policy on Education;  
- National Policy for Women;  
- Compulsory Free Basic Education Act;  
- Child Rights Act; | Gender policies have been strengthened through the adoption of:  
- National Gender Policy;  
- National Gender in Basic Education Policy and guidelines;  
- Nigeria Child Rights Act and domestication at state level; | NGEI made a substantive contribution to policy strengthening through:  
- Dialogue with policymakers;  
- Sensitization of key stakeholders (religious leaders, parents and girls);  
- Establishment of technical working groups; | Education policies are more gender-sensitive. Through efforts with other partners and in areas where NGEI is active, these policies have contributed to improved enrolment and completion rates for girls, and improved transition rates to junior secondary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country and specific policy goal and starting date</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Uganda (2004) Goal: Ensuring that policies promote girls’ education and gender equality. | Nearly all major policy drivers aimed at improving girls’ education were in place prior to the establishment of UNGEI. These policies had a strong focus on gender parity and equality. This included:  
- The 1995 constitution;  
- Universal primary education (1997);  
- A number of specific acts to address marginalized communities;  
- Girls’ Education Movement. | Further specific gender policies were put in place, including:  
- National Gender Policy;  
- Gender in Education Policy;  
- Education Bill for Compulsory Education;  
- Equal Opportunity Commission Act;  
- Policy formulation for re-entry of pregnant girls and mother initiated. | UNGEI contributed substantially to faster implementation of policies. Its role has been especially important in:  
- Drafting the Gender in Education Policy (2008);  
- Drafting a policy on re-entry of girls and child mothers;  
- Reviewing policy proposals to ensure girls’ education is highlighted;  
- Institutionalizing a gender task force in the MoE;  
- Championing specific campaigns such as ‘Go to school, back to school, stay in school’, and CFS;  
- Policy dissemination. | Raised level of policy dialogue and gender consciousness of the government, providers of girls’ education and beneficiaries; more prominence of girls’ education in education policy discourse.  
Parents better informed about the importance of girls’ education.  
Increase in girls’ participation in education at various levels. |

5.4. The situation at the outset

From the above, it is clear that the point of departure in the case study countries was by no means similar. The analysis in the Uganda case study highlights that nearly all of the major policy drivers aimed at improving girls’ education were already in place before UNGEI was established in late 2004. Not only was Uganda a signatory to the EFA and MDG goals, but a range of policies that existed included the 1995 Uganda constitution, which guarantees the right to education for all children, irrespective of gender; the 1997 Universal Primary Education policy, which specifically highlights the importance of girls’ and boys’ access to education; the Affirmative Action policy, by which female applicants to public universities were awarded 1.5 bonus points; as well as a number of other acts aimed at enhancing access. Thus, UNGEI Uganda came into being in a context where considerable commitment existed on the part of the government and other partners, and where a substantial amount of progress had already been made.

In Nigeria, the situation at the start of UNGEI in 2005 was roughly similar to that of Uganda. Various policies with a bearing on girls’ education and gender equality had already been passed, including the important Universal Compulsory Basic Education Act (2004). In addition, UNGEI followed in the
footsteps of two important girls’ education initiatives that focused on implementing some of these policies, including the Strategy for the Acceleration of Girls’ Education in Nigeria (SAGEN, 2003).

Nepal and Egypt present slightly different cases, and in general more challenging policy environments. Nepal’s National Education System Plan of 1971 included a policy of at least one female teacher per school, but this had gone partially unimplemented when UNGEI was informally started in Nepal. In Egypt there had been a focus on enrolling all children in primary school without discrimination, although some restrictions exist in practice, as admission to schools is based on age (with children who fall outside the age range not being admitted). To close the gender gap in primary education, community schools were established in 1992. This was followed by the establishment of one-classroom schools in 1993 in areas where there were high numbers of out-of-school girls. Due to the difference between this type of school and formal primary schools, a department for one-class schools was established in the MoE to provide support and supervision.

5.5. Subsequent progress/change in policy

In all four countries, policy changes around girls’ education and gender equality were observed after the introduction of UNGEI. The extent to which the establishment of UNGEI and the subsequent policy developments are related will be further analysed below. The degree to which the subsequent policy changes made real inroads in providing specific and concrete guidance for priority setting and implementation varies considerably across the countries. As might be expected, most gains were made in countries that had already made progress.

Uganda and Nigeria have seen considerable policy fine-tuning in the period since the establishment of their respective UNGEI partnerships. In the case of Uganda, further and more specific policies aimed at girls’ education were put in place, including the National Gender Policy (2007), Gender in Education Policy (2010), and the Education Equal Opportunity Commission Act (2007), which all enforced equalization of opportunities between males and females in the sector. Importantly, and as the country case study notes, these policy initiatives were not limited to the national level. Districts also passed various legal ordinances of relevance to girls’ participation in education, such as the Kasese Child Protection Act against Early Marriage, Child Labour and the Sale of Alcohol, and the Abim district by-law on defilement and early marriage. A favourable policy environment led to the initiation of a series of activities aimed at enhancing implementation of the policies (see text box 5). Summary data discussed earlier (Chapter 4, Table 11) show that Nigeria

---

Text box 5 – Uganda: Examples of activities targeting policy implementation
- The introduction of the Promotion of Girls’ Education scheme designed to enhance girl retention and performance at primary level;
- The implementation of the Equity in the Classroom programme targeting equal participation of girls and boys in the classroom;
- The development and roll-out of national communication strategies to raise awareness around girls’ education.
represents a similar evolution, with various specific gender policies being developed after 2005, and with gender planning and budgeting being prioritized.\textsuperscript{26}

Policy also evolved in Nepal in the post-2002 period. These policies concerned education overall but – with the exception of the policy on Greater Participation of Women Law Makers in Education – were not primarily targeting gender issues. In other words, progress is evident in that education policies include a gender perspective, but more detailed policy directives on specific strategies for addressing girls’ education and gender equality issues have not emerged during the period between 2002 and 2010.

In Egypt, the period following the establishment of UNGEI in 2000 has seen the inclusion of the community-based education programme in the National Strategic Plan for Pre-University Education, thus making it part of official government policy. However, the case study did not find evidence of the overall education policy having evolved to better identify and target girls’ education and gender inequality concerns.

\textbf{5.6. UNGEI’s contribution to policy}

The focus and degree of strategizing in each of the UNGEI case study countries has been different. In two countries – Nigeria and Uganda – the evaluation concludes that UNGEI has made a substantial contribution to policy strengthening.

The differences in impact in the area of policy reflect the range of country situations and the extent to which the UNGEI partnership engages in strategic decision-making and implementation to achieve its objectives. The latter point, as will be seen in the analysis, is likely strongly related to the strength of the partnership itself.

The fertile ground that UNGEI was born into, combined with specific challenges that were not being addressed through policy efforts, resulted in UNGEI Uganda adopting a two-pronged approach in support of policy strengthening (and therefore having four outcome areas rather than three common to most UNGEI partnerships), as follows:

- On one hand, the Uganda partnership focused on participating in key decision-making organs of the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) to influence policy discussion and decision making in general (through dialogue, selected studies and policy dissemination).

\textsuperscript{26} This report cannot cover each country in detail, but the Nigeria policy case is discussed in great and elucidating detail in the UNGEI country report for Nigeria.
On the other hand, the partnership selected a specific problem affecting girl’s participation in education – that of teenage pregnancy — as a concrete focus to influence policy.

The work in this second area targets the drafting and institutionalization of a policy that promotes the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers in schools. It involved multi-pronged community sensitization to generate wide support for the policy and to get input into its formulation. As this report was being prepared, the policy formulation was at an advanced stage.

The contribution and impact of UNGEI to policy formulation in Uganda is summarized by the case study report as follows:

“UNGEI’s exclusive focus on girls’ education approach has helped raise the level of policy dialogue between the Government of Uganda, providers of girls’ education and beneficiaries as well as gender consciousness and the prominence of girls’ education in the education policy discourse. UNGEI has become a key player in Uganda’s girls’ education policy development.” (Ezati, 2011, p. 8)

It concludes that UNGEI, together with other partners, has contributed to the improved attendance, retention and completion rates that have been observed in selected areas of the country. Concurrently, in the specific area of advancing a policy for the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers, the evaluation finds that although the policy has yet to be finalized and approved:

“UNGEI has, in collaboration with the MoES, put in place several initiatives ... [that]... together with the circulars the MoES has kept sending to the school administrators urging them not to expel pregnant girls from school, are starting to change the community mindset to embrace the rationale for re-entry of pregnant girls or child mothers.” (Ibid)

Both statements underscore that in Uganda, UNGEI has made a key contribution to the area of policy strengthening. A challenge for the evaluation – to be addressed below – consists in identifying factors that allowed Uganda to be effective and to tease out implications for UNGEI interventions in other countries.

**UNGEI in Nigeria has also left a mark on the policy landscape. NGEI has concentrated its work in policy strengthening on three specific areas of focus** that were identified as representing important gaps for effectively addressing the challenge of girls’ education and gender equality in that country, namely:

- The development of a National Policy on Gender in Basic Education;
- The publication of guidelines for the implementation of the above-mentioned policy; and
- The drafting of a manual on gender-sensitive planning.

---

27 The teenage pregnancy rate in Uganda, at 31 per cent, is the highest in sub-Saharan Africa. Approximately 21 per cent of children in Uganda are sexually active by the age of 11 and 70 per cent are sexually active by the age of 19.
All three of these outcomes areas have reportedly been achieved. The National Policy on Gender in Basic Education has been produced and is being used in the preparation of Strategic Education Sector Plans and in the Strategic Education Sector Operational Plan, although the policy has not been domesticated by states – a limitation on its implementation at the state level, according to some stakeholders.

In addition, other policy developments have also taken place, such as the domestication of the Child Rights Charter by several states, which has included distribution of summaries of some provisions of the charter related to such issues as forced marriage and child withdrawal from schools (for example, in Niger State) to schools and school-based management committees.

The Nigeria case study finds that UNGEI’s contribution to these changes has been substantial and has taken place at various levels, including through:

- Policy dialogue with policymakers and sensitization of religious and traditional leaders, parents and girls, which has led to increased awareness of the importance of girls’ education. This has generated a demand for increased school places, which has to be met by policymakers.

- The participation of officials of Ministries of Education at federal and state levels as members of the NGEI technical working groups/steering committees in NGEI activities has enhanced their abilities to influence policy decision making and integrate NGEI decisions into their ministries’ programmes and budgets (for example, promotion of mothers’ associations in Federal Unity School).

- State patrons of NGEI in the form of the wives of governors (State first ladies) have championed girls’ education, and this has facilitated the adoption of gender-friendly education policies (see text box 7).

- Civil society organizations, individually and collectively as members of CSACEFA and NGEI steering committees, have also contributed to the adoption of gender-sensitive policies and programmes.

**Text box 7 – Nigeria: Involving the wives of governors in advocacy for girls’ education**

- The First Ladies in Niger and Bauchi States have been at the forefront of advocacy and sensitization campaigns to local government areas, traditional and religious leaders and government;
- The First Lady of Bauchi State advocated for the replication of the Girls’ Education Programme in the 14 local government areas;
- The First Lady of Niger State spearheaded activities leading to the launching of NGEI in the state.
The contribution of UNGEI in Nepal and Egypt has been more modest, for different reasons. In Nepal, although there have been a number of policy shifts during the decade – spurred and facilitated by the shift in the country from a kingdom to a republican state – the contribution of UNGEI to these changes has been relatively minor. Progress in the area of policy has consisted of a gender audit in education and the formulation of a Girls’ Education Strategy Paper and School Sector Reform Plan, which have informed girls’ education and gender equality policies and practices. UNGEI contributed to the policy outcome by:

- Providing training for gender focal persons on gender mainstreaming in education;
- Facilitating United Nations agencies in identifying relevant areas of support to the Government of Nepal;
- Supporting women parliamentarians to unite for girls’ education and informing them of issues of equality and marginalization.

However, progress in policy has not been driven by UNGEI and the dialogue among UNGEI partners has – in particular in the latter part of the evaluation period – been largely limited to the United Nations. The evaluation concludes that in Nepal, UNGEI’s role in policy advocacy has been limited overall and that UNGEI has not established itself as an important actor in the policy landscape. Rather, the driver for progress in girls’ education has been the Government of Nepal, which has progressively mainstreamed girls’ education and gender equality into the system. UNGEI has had only a limited degree of effectiveness at this level.

In Egypt, the main contribution of EGEI has been implementing a model for promoting girls’ education and gender equality that allows girls’ from disadvantaged areas to receive high-quality education based on active learning (see text box 8). This model has now been integrated in the National Strategic Plan for Pre-University Education Reform in Egypt, giving it both legitimacy and sustainability from a policy perspective. However, the evaluation finds that beyond this specific model, EGEI has contributed very little to policy dialogue around girls’ education and gender equality in Egypt. Respondents in the country indicate that the EGEI partnership is focused on implementation and that the relationship between partners is on a one-to-one basis with the NCCM for the purpose of advancing the model. EGEI is not a forum for broader analysis of the policy landscape and identification of gaps and strategies by partners.

5.7. Areas of emerging outcomes/impact

Across the four countries, to a different degree in each context, UNGEI’s work at the policy level has contributed to raising awareness, which has translated into policies that created conditions for girls to go to school. In Nigeria and Uganda, these policy efforts have also translated into decentralized policy development, which has allowed specific vulnerable groups such as young mothers to go back to school.
UNGEI’s contribution to good practices

Table 12 provides a schematic overview of the approach to the use of good practices in each of the countries and how this has evolved. It also makes an assessment of UNGEI’s contribution in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, goal and starting date</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt (2000)</td>
<td>Good practices are identified in the context of specific initiatives. There is no coordinating dialogue around good practice identification and dissemination. Community schools were a stand-alone initiative and were implemented on a project basis.</td>
<td>Good practices continue to be identified in the context of specific initiatives rather than through collective efforts. Lessons related to the following areas have been identified in the model promoted by EGEI and used to improve its implementation: • Management of the initiative; • Pedagogical practices; • Monitoring; • Capacity building; • Documentation of EGEI.</td>
<td>UNGEI has made a substantial contribution to good practice, but a modest contribution to dissemination. It has created capacity among its partners to do so in the context of the model that it is using for girls’ education. It has also organized training workshops for education committees on the promotion of gender equality and girls’ education. However, beyond these specific partners, it has not engaged in the systematization of good practices.</td>
<td>Improved understanding of the GFS model and of methodologies for enhancing enrolment, participation and performance of girls in the community schools supported by EGEI. Increased understanding, capacity and commitment to girls’ education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal (2008)</td>
<td>A number of good practices were part of policy but were not being well documented. This included: recruitment of female teachers in each school, feeder hostels, gender auditing and girls’ scholarships.</td>
<td>Good practices have continued to evolve but are implemented mostly as projects and are not being institutionalized as government policy, including: • Young Champions (YCs); • Economic support for families of girl students; • Women parliamentarians.</td>
<td>UNGEI contributed substantially to promoting a number of good practices. This contribution was of an enabling nature through technical support and funding for training. However, there was no evidence of UNGEI involvement in lobbying for the institutionalization of these good practices.</td>
<td>Introduction of good practices, such as the ‘oil for quality education’ programme (World Food Programme/UNICEF) and the involvement of women parliamentarians in lobbying. Active involvement of YCs in community mobilization for education. Commitment to gender issues is stronger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria (2003)</td>
<td>A number of good practices had already been adopted. However, these had not been identified or documented as such. This included such initiatives as all-girls’ colleges and schools and financial support for girls’ education.</td>
<td>Good practices are being systematically documented and disseminated and are being integrated in state-level plans. There is regular discussion on good practices in key education forums Partners’ capacity for identification and documentation of good practices has been enhanced.</td>
<td>NGEI has played a key role in the documentation, systematization and discussion of good practices through: • Advocacy and policy dialogue with education agencies; • Sensitization; • Organization of training workshops for state partners on identification and documentation of good practices; • Dissemination during NGEI</td>
<td>Adoption and integration of good practices on girls’ education in state-level plans and education-sector operational plans. The good practices are credited with having contributed to improved enrolment and completion rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country, goal and starting date</td>
<td>Situation before UNGEI</td>
<td>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</td>
<td>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</td>
<td>Outcomes and emerging impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Uganda (2004)                   | Several good practices existed but there was no systematic endeavour to document, disseminate and institutionalize them. Most remained stand-alone initiatives and were implemented on a project basis. | Additional good practices have been identified and documented, including GEM, the two-generational approach, and the promotion of child-friendly schools. | UNGEI made a noticeable and direct contribution to identification, documentation, dissemination and institutionalization of good practices, through:  
• Mentoring of GEM;  
• Provision of formats for documenting good practice;  
• Research and publications. | There has been increased sharing of information, scaling up of good practices and improved advocacy for girls’ education and gender equality. Also there is greater acceptance and support of girls’ education. Uganda is known in the region as an innovator on gender issues. |

The conclusions from the table broadly reflect the pattern identified with respect to the first focus area. The evaluation finds that **Nigeria and Uganda have successfully played a prominent role in the identification, documentation and systematization of good practices. The contribution by Nepal and Egypt has been more modest.** The specifics of this are reviewed in the next few sections.

### 5.8. The situation at the outset

Across the four countries, the situation at the outset was roughly similar. **Good practices were being identified to a limited degree in the context of individual initiatives;** however, they were not being systematically identified. Processes for documentation, dissemination and institutionalization were generally weak. There were no systematic efforts or forums in place to facilitate the integration of good practices in policy dialogue. In the case of Uganda, these good practices included the Child Friendly Schools approach, the Breakthrough to Literacy Campaign, the two-generation approach of joint sensitization of parents together with daughters, and the GEM. However, “for some time the following remained ‘stand alone’ projects with minimal spillover effects” (Ezati, 2011, p.45). Nigeria and Nepal were somewhat ahead in that a number of good practices had already been adopted but they were not being identified and documented as such.

### 5.9. Subsequent progress

In **Nepal and Egypt**, the situation with respect to good practices has evolved modestly. **Good practices are being identified but many continue to be implemented as projects.** In the case of Nepal, these good practices include initiatives such as: a) the involvement of Young Champions in community mobilization for enrolment, retention and improving quality of education of girls in school; b) the provision of economic support for the families of girls and students; and c) the involvement of women parliamentarians in advocacy around girls’ education. However, the impetus and support for these initiatives comes from external actors and has not been integrated into government policy. In the case
of Egypt, there has been considerable effort to identify and learn from good practices in the community model that EGEI is using. However, efforts have concentrated on this specific initiative and have not extended beyond it.

In Nigeria and Uganda, good practices are being systematically documented and disseminated, and integrated into plans at national and decentralized levels. There is regular discussion on good practices in education forums in both countries, and a marked improvement in the capacity of stakeholders to identify and document key practices.

Table 13 – Nigeria: Progress in identification and dissemination of good practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good practice</th>
<th>Progress made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives to reduce barriers to education</td>
<td>Several states have adopted this. In Niger, Bauchi and Katsina States, there is free education for all children up to senior secondary. The government of Niger State also pays for examination fees for the Senior Secondary School Exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures for safety of girls going to school</td>
<td>The Child Rights Act makes provisions for safety of girls going to school. In Bauchi State, girls in school uniform have free bus rides to school in the state capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures against sexual harassment and violence</td>
<td>The Child Rights Act provides for measures against sexual harassment. It was domesticated in Niger State in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender responsive school managers trained in gender equality</td>
<td>Training workshops have been organized for members of school-based management committees, which must include women representation as well as the head teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes supporting girls’ re-entry to school after pregnancy/marriage</td>
<td>The Universal Basic Education Act provides for re-entry of girls to school. Niger and Bauchi States have introduced a specific ‘second chance’ programme to this effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools have separate toilets</td>
<td>Schools are being renovated and separate facilities provided. In Niger State, more than 1,000 schools out of 2,900 have toilets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good practices are also used for advocacy purposes where concerted efforts are made to integrate these into policy. The impact of this work has been important even beyond the borders of Nigeria and Uganda, which are both known in the region for their efforts in gender equality.

Table 13 systematically traces how some of the best practices from Nigeria were used to influence policy and practice. Text box 9 highlights the case of a specific initiative from Uganda – the GEM. This case study shows how the adoption and
dissemination of this good practice has impacted educational planning, implementation and monitoring at local levels. A particular point to highlight is the greater involvement of children and young people – especially girls – in educational processes. GEM Uganda is seen as a ‘composite’ good practice because of its composition and activities, which are replicable, sustainable, adaptable and cost-effective. For instance, the GEM child-led outreach and advocacy places the girl child in the driver’s seat. The inclusion of boys as strategic allies has also helped convert them into active supporters for girls.

5.10 UNGEI’s focus and contribution

In Nigeria and Uganda, UNGEI has contributed to a more purposeful and scaled-up documentation and dissemination of good practices through a variety of activities designed to complement one another. This has included the following:

- A national study by NGEI (Nigeria) in 2005 to document good practices;28
- Dissemination workshops of good practices (e.g., Nigeria 2007);
- Mentoring of specific initiatives by UNGEI (Uganda – see below);
- Research and publication of selected good practices, including guidelines for the documentation of best practices in girls’ education (Uganda);
- Dissemination of good practices to decentralized levels;
- Systematic sharing and discussion of good practices in UNGEI meetings;
- Systematic efforts to integrate the discussion of good practices in other meetings and forums.

As noted in this list, UNGEI Uganda has specifically sought to mentor GEM, raising the important experience from GEM in policy meetings and advocating for its registration as an NGO, an achievement that was realized in early 2011. The evaluation finds that the decision to mentor GEM is perhaps the single-most important move that UNGEI Uganda made as it produced several examples of good practice in the delivery of girls’ education.

In Nepal, UNGEI’s specific objective with respect to good practices is defined as following “good practices aimed at increasing access to education of marginalized children and especially girls institutionalized at the national level.” The Nepal case study finds that four areas of good practice exist where UNGEI partners have been actively involved. These are briefly described in the table below.

---

The evaluation concludes that UNGEI’s involvement in these good practices has been of a modest enabling nature in Nepal, contributing to initiatives through:

- Its role in sensitizing, convincing and encouraging national-level stakeholders to prioritize girls’ education through workshops such as those organized in the context of the YC initiative;
- Discussions between WFP and UNICEF on the partnerships for supporting families of girl students, which originated from the discussion among United Nations partners in the context of coordination around girls’ education; and
- Partner coordination for technical and financial support to the building of capacity of the women parliamentarians.

However, no evidence was found of UNGEI having made specific efforts to ensure the institutionalization of these good practices.

### 5.11 Areas of emerging outcomes/impact

In Nigeria and Uganda, the focus on good practice has: a) ensured that decision-making is informed by knowledge of good practice; b) resulted in the adoption and integration of good practices on girls’ education in central and decentralized plans and implementation (see Table 14); and c) contributed to a knowledge base for the region.

Both country case studies conclude that this, in turn, has impacted enrolment and retention rates for girls at primary level (particularly in areas where UNGEI is active at decentralized levels). The impact of these changes is deemed to be relatively sustainable as more areas of the country adopt these good practices. As noted in the Nigeria report, “the changes are sustainable, though the availability of funds for education will influence the rates at which they are institutionalized” (Okojie, 2011, p. 50).
In Nepal, good practices have been developed through specific projects, which—within their direct scope of influence—have resulted in greater awareness of girls’ education and have provided economic incentives for girls to return to school. It remains to be seen what impact these initiatives will have in the long run, as they are not institutionalized and depend on external funding. In Egypt, there has been an impact on enrolment and participation of girls in schools, but this is limited to the areas where girl-friendly schools were established, and the continued implementation of this initiative will depend on the extent to which it becomes further institutionalized. The increased awareness of parents and girls concerning the importance of girls’ education has generated a demand for increased girl-friendly schools, which has to be met by policymakers.

**UNGEI’s contribution to partnership building**

This section of the report summarizes the findings of the various country studies with respect to partnership facilitation/building. Table 15 provides a schematic overview of the evolution in this area in each of the countries and summarizes the assessment from the country studies of UNGEI’s contribution and impact in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, goal and starting date</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Egypt (2000)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Goal: UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.</td>
<td>There was no specific mechanism in place for the coordination of gender issues in the education sector except the case of community schools, where there was coordination between UNICEF and the MoE.</td>
<td>While the National Council for Childhood and Motherhood (NCCM) has coordinated with selected partners to implement the community school model, there is no forum for regular coordination of partners.</td>
<td>EGEI has not specifically contributed to stronger partnerships for girls’ education. The collaboration for the implementation of the community school model takes place bilaterally between NCCM and individual partners. This collaboration has, however, contributed to mainstreaming the importance of girls’ education among a large group of partners.</td>
<td>The cooperation between NCCM and selected partners has allowed for a larger number of girls in the target areas to access and complete school and to transition to secondary school. However, there has been no spin-off of this coordination to other areas of gender priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nepal (2008)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Goal: UNGEI brings together partners to reach consensus on national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality.</td>
<td>No specific partnerships for girls’ education existed, although there were various education partnerships between the MoE and others, including with the private sector, concerning education.</td>
<td>Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Networks have been put in place at central and district levels. A United Nations partnership on girls’ education and gender equality is in place.</td>
<td>UNGEI brought together partners to reach consensus on the national strategy on girls’ education and gender equality. However, active participation has been affected by lack of adequate management of the partnerships and has fizzled out. In practice, UNGEI coordination takes place within the United Nations.</td>
<td>UNGEI has had a limited impact on partnership building, and this has been mostly among the United Nations agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nigeria (2005)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Goal: Facilitation by A number of initiatives for</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI was established as a</td>
<td>UNGEI has provided relevant inputs into strengthening the</td>
<td>Stronger planning and coordination of gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country, goal and starting date</td>
<td>Situation before UNGEI</td>
<td>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</td>
<td>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</td>
<td>Outcomes and emerging impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| NGEI of an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality. | coordinating and strengthening girls’ education were in place. | national network for promoting girls’ education and gender equality, and is formally established in four states. | partnership for girls’ education through:  
- Preparation of terms of reference and guidelines for NGEI;  
- Establishment of national and state chapters of NGEI, which meet regularly and discuss strategies and progress; and  
- Specific activities to strengthen partner capacity for gender mainstreaming. | issues is evident at state level. |
No formalized partnership existed that had girls’ education as the pivotal agenda. | A formalized partnership (UNGEI) is now in place for gender equality and girls’ education.  
A few additional partnerships were established, including an education in emergencies working group, various NGO/CBO partnerships and various twinning arrangements between institutions. | UNGEI has played a decisive and key role in bringing partners together especially at sub-national level, by:  
- Convening and linking partners who were not interacting systematically;  
- Strengthening capacity of partners at district and sub-county/community level to protect and advance girls’ education; and  
- Innovative grassroots mobilization through radio talk shows, good practices and Walk to School campaigns. | District and local level mobilization and commitment to gender issues has been strengthened. |

As can be seen below, each of the countries – albeit with a slightly different formulation – aimed at putting in place a partnership around girls’ education and gender equality. In the case of Nepal, the specific focus of the partnership was on consensus building, whereas Nigeria sought to establish an effective partnership bringing together partners that had hitherto coordinated in smaller forums. The next sections review how partnership building has evolved in practice in each of the countries.

5.12. **The situation before UNGEI**

The situation of partnership building also shows some marked differences at the outset. Prior to the establishment of EGEI in Egypt, there was coordination between UNICEF and the MoE around girls’ education issues in the context of community schools. However, there was no formal mechanism for coordination among partners around girls’ education, although other mechanisms for coordination in education in general did exist.

In Nepal, the period prior to the introduction of UNGEI in the country in 2002 had seen some efforts in coordination between the Government of Nepal and the private sector. The Ninth Education Plan...
(1997–2001) formalized this to some extent by including reference to the importance of community and private involvement in education. This has been given further emphasis in subsequent plans. However, at the beginning of the period under consideration the coordination in the education sector was limited and there were no specific partnership arrangements in place around girls’ education.

Nigeria represented a different situation in that a number of coordination efforts already existed prior to UNGEI, including two partnerships/initiatives targeted at girls’ education. For civil society, CSACEFA was coordinating education issues in general, and also included a cross-cutting focus on gender. For girls’ education and gender issues specifically, there had been coordination around AGEI – a forerunner of UNGEI – and around SAGEN, the strategy for acceleration of girls’ education.

In Uganda, too, substantial coordination existed among partners in education even prior to UNGEI, although it was not exclusively targeted at girls’ education and gender issues. This included mechanisms such as the sector-wide approach to programming in the education sector, which was put in place in the second half of the 1990s and brought together a range of government, donor and civil society partners around education planning, implementation and monitoring. The Forum for Education NGOs in Uganda also had a coordinating function and aimed at facilitating networking and coordination among its member organizations with the purpose of improving the quality access, equality and sustainability for EFA. However, none of the coordination mechanisms had girls’ education as its primary agenda, although some of the discussions and focus of the existing coordination mechanism did include gender as a cross-cutting issue, and there was no formalized partnership in education that focused on girls’ education and gender equality issues.

5.13. Subsequent progress

In Egypt, the year 2000 saw the establishment of EGEI (incorporated in the NCCM). This brought together a wide range of partners to implement the expansion of girls’ education through community schools. The partnership includes beneficiaries, governmental actors, civil society, private sector donors and international actors, with the specific objective of quality education in grades 1–6 in deprived areas, with priority admission (at least 75 per cent) of girls. Within the partnership, each partner has a specific role with respect to the model’s implementation (Table 16).
Table 16 - Roles/contribution of each EGEI partner in Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Donation of land and buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCCM</td>
<td>Coordination, funds for school construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Books and appointment of teachers, supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Follow-up for implementation and provision of selected material and non-material inputs, including training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector donors</td>
<td>Funding and in-kind contributions for schools and materials, maintenance, medical assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International actors</td>
<td>Financial support for training, provision of technical assistance, school construction, nutritional support, nutrition training, project to combat child labour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2002, Nepal has seen the establishment of an UNGEI network. In addition, the government has established Girls’ Education and Gender Equity Networks (GEGEN) at central and district levels and has recently expanded these to all 75 districts, with gender focal points in each district. The UNGEI partnership itself, while initially quite broad in terms of representation and focus, has dwindled in terms of size and footprint, and regular participation comes almost exclusively from United Nations agencies.

In Nigeria, where the UNGEI partnership was established in 2005, the scope and effectiveness of the partnership has grown progressively, and most partners acknowledge that UNGEI is a relevant actor nationally. The partnership has a wide range of members and is fully operational, with coordination and operational structures in place at both national level and in four states. At both national and state levels, partners meet regularly – guided by terms of reference and guidelines – to plan and review progress and to provide guidance and support for the implementation of activities.

In Uganda, a number of new networks have emerged since 2005. In addition to UNGEI Uganda, this includes an Education in Emergencies working group and various partnerships among NGOs. UNGEI Uganda operates at the three levels specified earlier: national, district and sub-county. It is considered a key actor at the national and decentralized levels and has an important advisory and supportive role in the implementation of education plans in that country.

5.14. UNGEI’s focus and contribution

This section outlines UNGEI partnership-building efforts and where the partnership has contributed. It also highlights areas where the country studies indicate that partnership building has not been entirely effective. Overall, the evaluation finds that the focus of UNGEI in all four countries has been on establishing a viable partnership for girls’ education and gender equality. Nigeria and Uganda have successfully done so, although areas of improvement remain. The partnerships in Egypt and Nepal have been established, but with considerable weaknesses.

In Egypt, as noted earlier, the focus of coordination has been on the implementation of a community school model for girls’ education. A substantial amount of training of partners has taken place in this
context and has been important in the expansion of the model. The training has covered such areas as: planning, monitoring and evaluation; community participation; report writing; active learning techniques; and strategies and methodologies for girls’ education. In this context, the evaluation report for Egypt notes that, “there is no doubt that without the various partnerships... these numbers of schools could not be established and the capacities of all cadres that were trained could not be raised” (Shawky, 2011, p. 46).

While this has very successfully expanded the number of schools and pupils who benefit from quality education and is therefore an achievement in its own right, the partnership in Egypt has been limited in scope for various reasons, including its limited mandate. There has been little focus on strengthening coordination more widely around girls’ education and gender issues. The partnership does not have a unified workplan, nor does it have a monitoring system or communication strategy, even for the activity that it is implementing. For many of the partners, their engagement with EGEI is one of collaboration in very specific points of ‘service delivery’, e.g., training and materials support, and this does not enhance their own institutions’ engagement with girls’ education and gender-equality issues beyond the direct activities related to the GFS model.

UNGEI in Nepal was initially set up as an informal partnership and had a role in convening a wide range of partners around issues related to girls’ education. Initial inputs by UNICEF in UNGEI’s initiation contributed to capacity enhancement of gender focal persons in the education system at ministerial, departmental and district levels, which later resulted in the establishment of district level GEGEN. Likewise, inter-agency meetings called by the UNGEI focal person for sharing of information and progress to some extent enhanced the coordination among members of the United Nations Girls’ Education Theme Group and resulted in inter-agency collaboration on initiatives such as the support for families of girl students with cooking oil. However, in practice most of the coordination has taken place among United Nations agencies, and the participation of non-United Nations partners in the UNGEI partnership has dwindled. The government has its own coordination mechanisms around gender and does not accord a major role to UNGEI in this area. Some of the prominent NGOs disengaged, as they have not felt adequately represented and do not see UNGEI as a forum that will advance their agenda points. The lack of leadership and insufficient management and coordination has impacted the effectiveness of the partnership. In the absence of active participation and a joint workplan, activities have mostly been advanced by UNICEF, and there is insufficient clarity – including for the UNICEF staff member who is the UNGEI focal point – as to what UNGEI priorities and activities are.

In Nigeria, there has been a concerted effort and a considerable degree of success in establishing a strong and representative partnership, with clear objectives and structures, and with decentralized structures. This has included formalizing the operational structures (with terms of reference, annual plans and reporting at all levels of the partnership), regularly convening the members, and strengthening partner capacity for gender mainstreaming. On the latter point, various activities have been organized by member and non-member organizations such as the federal Ministry of Women Affairs, UNIFEM, UNICEF, and the Gender Education Unit of the Ministries of Education. The areas of capacity building have included, among others, gender budgeting, training for school-based
management committees on school management from a gender perspective, and gender mainstreaming.

A point of weakness is, however, that much of the training has benefited national level partners – although there too, gaps remain in terms of training on leadership skills, workshop methods and strategic planning. Training and capacity building for state level partners is still deemed particularly insufficient. Priority areas in this respect include advocacy, development of workplans and fundraising. A relatively strong partnership has thus been established in Nigeria with the particularly strong point of having deliberately and successfully established partnerships at the decentralized (state) level. According to the case study report, “most of the reservations about the partnership were expressed at the national level where some partners complained about the lack of a proper structure and haziness of NGEI at the national level, inadequate specification of roles and responsibilities of NGEI Technical Working Group members/officers, lifespan of the TWG, etc. ... NGEI appeared to be better defined at the state level where roles and responsibilities of partners were outlined in the workplans and there was a Desk Officer for the Technical Committee” (Okojie, 2011, p. 55).

In Uganda, a strong and vibrant partnership has emerged with clearly defined structures at central, district and local levels. The partnership has a clear mandate, a strong commitment by its members guided by approved structures, coherent work planning and coordination and a focus on monitoring, although the lack of funding does affect the capacity of the partnership in this latter area. The partnership works because partners bring their comparative advantages to the UNGEI planning table, where harnessing of synergy is facilitated. A key strength of the partnership as underscored in the country study is that, “UNGEI uses strategies that yield sufficient synergy to enable each partner to derive an adequate sense of achievement as they work towards achieving gender parity. This means UNGEI does not remove the partners’ independence in decision-making but does ensure they consult more systematically on girls’ education and work more effectively together in the promotion of girls’ education” (Ezati, 2011, p. 52). At decentralized levels, the district and sub-county UNGEI committees have been effective in priority setting. This has included participation in data collection on school-age children in the community, which is fed into the district planning process. In this way, UNGEI has contributed to concrete issues of relevance on the ground.

Across the four cases studies, funding for the functioning of the partnership emerges as a constraint to effective coordination and to the implementation of activities. The fact that there is no budget for UNGEI makes it difficult to initiate activities and to support initiatives that are ongoing but need additional funding. In some cases, UNICEF has used its education funding to bridge the gap, but this has had the drawback of contributing to a loss of identification of the partners with UNGEI and a reduced visibility of the partnership.

5.15. Areas of emerging outcomes/impact

The focus on partnership building has resulted in the establishment of UNGEI partnerships in all four countries. However, the outcomes of these partnerships have varied across the countries. In Nigeria and Uganda, the partnerships have produced stronger planning and coordination on gender issues. In the case of Uganda this is evident both at national and decentralized levels, whereas in Nigeria the biggest
gains have been at the state level in terms of better coordination and stronger collaboration around girls’ education and gender equality. In Egypt, a partnership has developed around a specific model of community education for girls. However, this partnership model has focused mainly on bringing together stakeholders to contribute to specific aspects of the model, and has not produced discernible impacts on other areas of girls’ education and gender prioritization. Nepal’s partnership has been successful in enhancing coordination among United Nations agencies, as is evidenced by a number of joint efforts that were described in this chapter. However, the partnership has had little expression beyond the direct involvement of these agencies.

Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact

A working definition of a partnership is “a collaborative relationship between entities to work toward shared objectives through a mutually agreed division of labour” (World Bank, 1998, cited in Axelrod, 2001). Given this definition, this section examines how relevant, effective and efficient the UNGEI partnerships at country level have been in relation to what they have set out to achieve. A number of considerations around impact are also made, although with the caveat that this is difficult to establish in the absence of consistent monitoring and more formal impact assessment (beyond the scope of this evaluation).

A note on Egypt is necessary at this juncture. The analysis above will have highlighted that the model in place in this country is essentially about coordination rather than partnership. Evaluating the Egypt partnership against the same criteria as the other partnerships is somewhat problematic in this respect. More importantly, this also gives rise to the question regarding whether UNGEI should accommodate such types of narrow and time-bound partnerships. This is an issue to which the report returns in the section on conclusions and recommendations.

Relevance

Table 17 highlights the strengths of the UNGEI partnerships across the case study countries, and underscores that one of the key strengths is the degree to which the UNGEI partnership goals and priorities are consistent with those set by the governments in Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda. While the extent to which this has been achieved varies somewhat across the countries, the analysis shows that in general, UNGEI partnerships have sought to ensure their relevance by:

- Basing their mandate on national priorities as expressed in policy documents for the country and the sector;
- From the perspective of stakeholders, responding to a real need for support in girls’ education and gender equality; and
- Working through existing local government structures and partners with different stakeholders to collaboratively contribute to the development of girls’ education and gender equality in the different contexts.

The evaluation concludes that UNGEI country partnerships have been relevant to country contexts and needs and have focused on areas that are a priority for these contexts. The fact that the three key areas
of focus of UNGEI (policy, best practice and partnerships) have been adopted across the countries and are being implemented is a further indication of relevance.

**Effectiveness**

The term effectiveness is understood to refer to whether UNGEI is achieving its intended outcomes. It appears from the country studies that UNGEI is, generally speaking, “doing things right” in light of the needs, but that the extent to which outcomes are being achieved varies substantially. This reflects the strengths and weaknesses present across the partnerships (Tables 15 and 16).

In terms of policy, the case studies highlight that Nigeria and Uganda have been particularly effective in influencing policy, while the partnerships in Egypt and Nepal have made less of a mark on the policy environment.

Best practices have been identified across the four countries. However, the extent to which the UNGEI partnerships have played a role in systematizing and disseminating these is reduced in Nepal and Egypt.

Finally, with respect to partnership building, Nigeria and Uganda have established strong and viable partnerships. Nepal’s partnership faces considerable challenges. Egypt also faces particular challenges, not in the least related to the fact that the model in place in the country is essentially about coordination rather than partnership.

**Table 17 – Strengths of the UNGEI partnerships in the case study countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong> to MDG and EFA goals.</td>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong> to country priorities.</td>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong> to the Nigerian context.</td>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong> to country priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success in mobilizing commitment and support from a range of partners.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy and lobbying</strong> for selected policy efforts, particularly the Girls’ Education Strategy Paper.</td>
<td><strong>Collaboration</strong> that taps into the expertise of each partner and generates synergies.</td>
<td><strong>Inclusiveness</strong> of the partnership based on the principle of allowing partners to do what they do best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Success of the model in galvanizing support of communities and parents.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Facilitation</strong> of the group of United Nations agencies with corresponding development of workplans and joint initiatives.</td>
<td>Capacity to mobilize support for girls’ education among traditional and religious leaders.</td>
<td>Capacity to advocate and communicate in a manner that leads to <strong>bottom-up engagement</strong> in girls’ education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Putting in place bottom-up planning processes.</strong></td>
<td>Capacity to support a number of <strong>innovative approaches.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Capacity to apply pressure – “a chorus of voices cannot be ignored.”</strong></td>
<td>Bringing a plurality of voices to a <strong>common planning</strong> table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on quality education as the basis for addressing the needs of girls’ education.</strong></td>
<td>Mobilizing <strong>specific groups</strong> such as women parliamentarians and YCs.</td>
<td><strong>Establishment of structures</strong> that can sustain NGEI’s ideals.</td>
<td>Using <strong>existing government structures.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building <strong>capacity</strong> at local level, i.e., of UNGEI focal persons.</td>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong> and better organization of activities.</td>
<td>Existence of terms of reference and a <strong>clear workplan.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Efficiency**

Efficiency is understood to refer to how economically inputs were translated into results. *Across the country reports, challenges are highlighted that affect the strength and vibrancy of the partnerships,* although to differing extents. The Uganda report notes that in spite of the improved level of coordination and joint planning, NGOs and agencies in the education sector continue to implement isolated programmes, often duplicating each other. Lack of funding is an issue that affects implementation and monitoring across the countries.

**Table 18 – Weaknesses/threats to the country-level partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Egypt</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Nigeria</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus of the partnership on one activity area – no wider gender focus.</td>
<td>Lack of dedicated resources and reliance on UNICEF for funding.</td>
<td>Lack of budget resulting in certain activities not being implemented.</td>
<td>Lack of resources and insufficient mobilization of resources among partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination limited to implementation of a specific model, rather than overall priorities.</td>
<td>Lack of commitment/engagement by partners, i.e., limited scope of the partnership.</td>
<td>Lack of time by some partners, especially at national level.</td>
<td>Loose nature of the partnership, declining visibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership based on specific inputs/service delivery rather than joint decision-making and priority setting.</td>
<td>Difficulty in distinguishing between UNICEF and UNGEI activities.</td>
<td>Absence of strong NGOs with national scope.</td>
<td>Dominant role of UNICEF reduces the identification of partners with UNGEI and subsumes some activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor record-keeping.</td>
<td>Weak partnership structures and weak leadership.</td>
<td>Lack of dedicated staff at national level to act as focal point.</td>
<td>Low commitment at national level and loss of some influential partners, (e.g., UNESCO and WFP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No unified database.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary nature of the partnership.</td>
<td>Failure to integrate UNGEI into each partner’s workplan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate documentation of the partnership and poor advocacy beyond functional states.</td>
<td>Concentration of UNGEI efforts in the primary education sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted earlier, the fact that there is no budget for UNGEI affects implementation, and the use of UNICEF funding to compensate for this has in some cases resulted in reduced identification of the partners with UNGEI as well as a reduction in the partnership’s visibility.

**Sustainability**

Sustainability refers to the extent to which changes that have taken place are likely to persist. *The sustainability of the results achieved through UNGEI interventions is difficult to determine,* partly because of the fact that UNGEI continues to receive external financial assistance, and also due to the ‘intangibility’ of some of the UNGEI impacts. However, the country reports from Nigeria and Uganda are optimistic about the potential for sustainability, citing, among other things, the maturity of the partnership, the existence of key structures and processes, its reach down to the grassroots level, the degree of recognition of UNGEI within the overall context, and its integration in the policy context.
Impact

In all four countries, the partnership is credited to a greater or lesser extent with having brought together organizations around a common agenda. In Egypt – where the focus has been on a particular set of schools and on the promotion of active learning – the partnership has been able to make a distinct contribution to the quality of education. In Nepal, the dialogue among partners contributed to the Draft Education Act being more gender-equal. In Nigeria and in Uganda, in addition to improvements in enrolment and transition rates as a result of joint efforts by UNGEI partners, the partnerships have had a specific contribution in ensuring that teenage mothers go back to school. In Uganda, there has also been an impact in terms of an increase in girls’ participation in higher education.
Chapter summary

This chapter analysed progress at country level in the three focus areas of UNGEI.

In all four countries where case studies were conducted, UNGEI partnerships have been established with objectives that mirror those of the global partnership by focusing on policy, good practices and the strengthening of partnerships for girls’ education and gender equality. The analysis highlights sharp differences in starting points in each of these areas.

Overall, the evaluation also finds variable levels of progress across the countries:

- **Strong partnerships** – although not without areas for potential improvement – have been established in Nigeria and Uganda. The evaluation finds considerable evidence of policy influence and impact. The partnerships in Nigeria and Uganda have some unique differences, but in both countries they are considered important actors at national and decentralized levels.
- **Good practices** have been identified and their dissemination is having an impact on decision-making and implementation.
- **In Nepal, UNGEI has made a modest contribution in all three areas.** Policy influence has been limited in scope and effectiveness. A number of good practices have seen support through UNGEI, but there has been little effort/success in generalizing these or other practices. The partnership itself has suffered from lack of commitment, leadership and clear decision-making.
- **UNGEI in Egypt has evolved differently from the other partnerships in that it focuses on a particular identified gender issue at primary level.** In strict terms it is not a partnership, but rather a cooperation model. While successful in addressing this particular need, the partnership has not been effectively engaging in wider gender issues in education and is not seen as a forum for discussion on girls’ education and gender equality issues.

The table below summarizes the main findings of the evaluation for the three focus areas per country:

Table 19 – Case study countries: Summary of contribution analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Good practices</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Modest contribution, limited to community school model.</td>
<td>Contribution limited to the model being promoted by EGEI.</td>
<td>Limited success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Modest contribution.</td>
<td>Contribution limited to implementing selected initiatives that represent good practices.</td>
<td>Limited success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Considerable contribution.</td>
<td>Considerable contribution to dissemination and adoption of good practices.</td>
<td>Strong partnership established at national and decentralized levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Considerable contribution, with two-pronged approach allowing for general and specific policy focus.</td>
<td>Considerable contribution to dissemination and adoption of good practices.</td>
<td>Strong partnership in place, particularly at decentralized levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The contribution of UNGEI at regional level

Chapter overview

The purpose of this chapter is to:

- Provide an overview of the regional levels of UNGEI.
- Provide a preliminary assessment of the extent to which the regional levels contribute to the effectiveness of the UNGEI partnership. In this context, the evaluation was asked specifically to report on:
  - The nature of the partnerships at regional level;
  - The efforts that UNGEI regional coordination mechanisms have made to facilitate access to best knowledge, policies and practices;
  - The extent to which regional coordination mechanisms promote achieving and measuring results; and
  - Whether the regional coordination mechanism, and in particular the RFP, work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI.

A fifth question related to whether there is agreement among regional- and country-level partners about the proposed UNGEI results framework is addressed separately in Chapter 7 of this report.

To analyse these questions, the discussion on the regional level of UNGEI is divided into three sections, as follows:

- **The first part of this chapter examines the evaluation findings related to the support and oversight that UNGEI provides at the regional level in four of its regions** – East and Southern Africa (ESA), West and Central Africa (WCA), the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), and South Asia (SA). As noted in Chapter 3, focal points known as RFPs are in place in regional UNICEF offices (with the exception of MENA) and play supportive/oversight roles vis-à-vis UNGEI partnerships. RFPs are supported in selected countries by UNGEI country focal points (UNICEF officers at country level). In practice, the role (and corresponding terms of reference) of RFPs vary to reflect the specificities and needs of each regional arrangement, and the observations related to UNGEI at the regional level need to be understood in this light. This section draws on the analysis in the four country case studies, on a documentary analysis, and on interviews with current and former RFPs, as well as on interviews with UNICEF country focal points (i.e., UNICEF staff who have a responsibility for supporting UNGEI activities at country level).

- **The second part of this chapter focuses on the findings from the case study of the UNGEI-EAP regional partnership in East Asia and the Pacific**. This region has a formal regional partnership in place that brings together members of regional organizations. This is a different model from
the regions discussed in the first part of the chapter, which either have less formal regional arrangements or none at all, and which have had a stronger focus on supporting country level operations and partnerships. In this respect, the EAP model reflects a strategic choice by UNGEI to proceed in this manner, given the specificities and opportunities that existed in that region—particularly because of the strong tradition of regional coordination and the presence of a large number of regional organizations in the same geographical location (Bangkok, Thailand). This section draws on the in-depth regional evaluation of the EAP partnership, as well as on interviews with select informants, including current and former EAP RFPs and UNECE regional education advisers.

- **The final part of the chapter summarizes the evaluation’s answers to the specific questions in the terms of reference on regional partnerships**, with respect to: the nature of the partnerships; the efforts to facilitate access to knowledge, policies and practices; the extent to which partnerships promote achieving and measurement of results; and the functioning of the regional coordination and RFP mechanisms.

**Regional level support of UNGEI in ESA, WCA, MENA and SA**

### 6.1. Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA)

The ESA region includes 21 countries, of which 12 reported having an active UNGEI partnership at country level. Burundi is one of these countries and text box 10 provides a snapshot of the key characteristics of the UNGEI Burundi partnership.

A regional partnership involving a full range of regional actors has not emerged in this region. In practice, the regional UNGEI partnership was established to encompass the FAWE regional secretariat, in coordination with the UNGEI RFP (who retired in early 2011). The main rationale for this approach was to avoid duplication of efforts that were being undertaken by FAWE as a regional body, and also to contribute to the capacity building of FAWE as an African-grown organization. With the departure of the RFP, a new approach was attempted in 2011. However, this has been suspended due to the departure of the new RFP. A critique of this approach pointed out by some

---

A separate report is available for this evaluation.

---

**Text box 10 – The UNGEI partnership in Burundi**

The partnership was established in 2002. Members include the Ministry of Education, other government ministries, and NGOs. The partnership operates at national, sub-national and local level.

The main areas of activity have included:

- Promoting girls’ access to and retention in education;
- Advocacy for girls’ education;
- Provision of gender training;
- Support to UNGEI clubs and UNGEI pilot schools;
- Sensitization of female leaders at provincial level;
- Advocacy for the fight against gender-based violence; and
- Sensitization of girls and parents to undertake studies in the areas of mathematics, sciences and technology.

Key challenges include: poverty; social and cultural barriers; and lack of awareness of gender issues.
interviewees is that it puts disproportionate responsibility on certain regional actors without sufficiently engaging others.

Under this regional approach, the main objective for the ESA region has been to strengthen capacity for the implementation of girls’ education and gender equality efforts. This has been done through a two-pronged approach including providing technical inputs at country level on specific topics, and establishing and supporting UNGEI partnerships at the country level. The collaboration between FAWE and UNGEI in this context has focused on providing technical support to MoE and country governments to strengthen country level efforts. A particular area of focus has been the mainstreaming of gender-sensitive policies in national plans, in the EFA/GPE endorsement process where relevant, and in the overall aid architecture.

Since the first RFP was put in place in 2004, activities that have taken place in the region have included:

- Gender mainstreaming in various country plans (Burundi, Lesotho and Rwanda);
- Gender audits (Burundi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) and gender-budgeting exercises, which were conducted in all countries with an active partnership and allowed for an in-depth analysis of each country, providing a basis for identifying priority areas of action in each country. In the majority of these countries, the gender audits are aligned with mid-term review processes and are used for GPE appraisal and alignment of gender policies;
- Efforts in teacher training, including reviewing curricula for gender-sensitivity (Kenya and Zimbabwe), and the introduction of gender-responsive pedagogy in teacher training (Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe);
- Promoting closer integration of gender and HIV/AIDS, among other issues, by incorporating gender issues into HIV/AIDS prevention materials in Angola, Lesotho, Namibia and Zimbabwe;
- Policy efforts, including for readmission of young mothers to school in Malawi, Uganda and Zambia;
- Capacity building of education officials through a variety of efforts, such as gender-awareness workshops focused on specific topics (e.g., gender-based violence (GBV), rape and sexual exploitation, etc.);
- A range of advocacy efforts to ensure that gender is seen as a cross-cutting issue, not just a girls’ issue, including through the drafting of issue papers and gender toolkits, as well as by promoting exchange visits for learning and sharing of experiences and the involvement of girls in gender issues through GEM to empower girls; and
- Research in collaboration with other partners such as the 2008 UNGEI and African Union study on gender and culture in education, and a study of excluded and out-of-school children in the region.

In terms of implementation, technical support was provided by the RFP who devoted approximately 70 per cent of her time to UNGEI. For certain activities, consultancy support was also used. In addition to UNGEI, the RFP also worked on related issues, such as early childhood development and other disparities (disabled, nomads, HIV-affected, etc.) The budget for support to UNGEI from the regional
level has amounted to approximately $400,000 per year (not including staff costs and other funds made available by UNICEF at country level).

6.2. West and Central Africa (WCA)

UNGEI has attempted to establish a regional partnership for WCA countries, but efforts have met with only limited success to date.

The first effort dates back to April 2006, when a regional body to advance girls’ education, gender equality and equality in education assembled a range of 30 regional partners. This effort was based on the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) initiative of introducing girls’ education as a key priority area. At the time, the network agreed that the focus would be on: technical support to country level; advocacy through regional events; capacity building on gender in education; and knowledge management through joint research and documentation exercises. However, after an initial period of collaboration among the partners, subsequent commitment and engagement in the regional dialogue faded. A 2009 report of the WCA regional partnership highlights that poor leadership and coordination, as well as challenges to finding financial resources, were hampering the effectiveness of the partnership.

Regional coordination was given a new impetus in 2009/10 with regional UNGEI institutional members (UNESCO, ECOWAS, international NGOs, UNICEF) working together to support the organization of the UNGEI E4 conference in Dakar. The 2010 meeting of regional partners in Dakar provided an opportunity to bring together regional partners and revitalize regional coordination. This meeting produced an agreed regional action plan for UNGEI for the subsequent year. However, implementation of the plan was again affected by low commitment by partners, as well as by the departure of the RFP. Extensive efforts to re-engage the partners who had committed in that process by the current RFP have failed to generate much momentum, indicating that the planned regional coordination lacks buy-in from partners and that a new approach might be needed. In operational terms, the rapid turnover in RFPs in this region since the first RFP was put in place in 2007 appears to have played a role in the consistency and continuity of support. However, at a more overarching level, RFP reporting from 2008 to 2011 highlights that the main issue relates to the limited commitment of regional entities to coordination efforts.

While there has been only limited success in establishing a regional partnership, there has been an emphasis on establishing country partnerships in the region (which currently exist in Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Côte d’Ivoire and the Democratic Republic of the Congo) and on providing support to a range of priority activities at country level. This has included activities such as:

- Joint studies, for example a 2010 study on violence in school settings;
- Capacity building through gender audits, gender mainstreaming and sharing experience among countries;
- Support to programming, e.g., for countries going through GPE processes, to ensure that gender programming and budgeting is taken into consideration;
• Legislation, e.g., the adoption of codes of conduct to fight GBV (the Gambia) and enacting laws (Nigeria);
• Developing an enabling environment, for example through mothers’ clubs (e.g., the Gambia, Burkina Faso);
• Advocacy, e.g., through the drafting of a communication strategy for girls’ education for the region.

The focus in terms of advocacy activities has been on disseminating messages regarding girls’ education and violence by NGOs through the media in the region. Capacity building has included the development of guidebooks for gender planning by Action Aid and rolling these out at the country level. In the area of knowledge management, a recent study by the International Centre for the Education of Girls has highlighted the importance of girls and provided key advocacy messages.

In addition, in 2010 UNGEI organized a global conference in Dakar on gender in education to mark the tenth anniversary of the launch of the global partnership and to recommit key actors from 22 countries to reach the gender- and education-related MDG and EFA targets. That meeting resulted in the development of 16 national partnership workplans for 2011, including five from WCA countries.

For 2012, UNGEI is now putting in place a revised approach to this region, which will focus on developing/strengthening country-level partnerships, ensuring they are strong and vibrant, and addressing the priorities of the region and countries concerned. In this context, the main objectives of UNGEI for the region include:

• Developing and implementing an advocacy strategy against violence in schools;
• Building capacity on gender-sensitive planning in education; and
• Promoting knowledge management through the dissemination of evidence and studies on girls’ education.

At an operational and country level, UNGEI activities are supported by UNICEF CFPs. Until recently, the contact between the RFP and CFP has reportedly been sporadic, and mainly related to requesting plans and reports – i.e., “a fairly timid approach,” as noted by one of the country interviewees. An important point of departure for UNGEI for the coming period in this region will therefore be to improve and enhance dialogue and coordination among the countries through monthly contact between the RFP and CFPs, web exchanges and focal point meetings.
Inputs provided by UNGEI to the country level in principle include financial as well as technical support to the priority areas identified, although in practice the technical input has been limited. Countries reported that the guidelines for annual work planning produced at the global level have been useful. For 2012, each of the CFPs will work with the national partnerships to develop an annual plan using the UNGEI M&E framework, and this should form the basis for more intensive collaboration and exchange.

The WCA RFP devotes approximately one-quarter of his or her time to UNGEI. The portfolio includes a number of other related and complementary areas of work, including out-of-school children, equality and bottleneck analysis, education in emergencies and overall support to country office planning. As is the case in the other regions, the funding for UNGEI at regional and country levels comes from UNICEF’s basic education and gender quality thematic funding, but figures on annual funding are not available. For 2012, WCA is working with a rough estimated budget of $200,000 for the regional level (not including the RFP salary and the allocations made at country level). No specific figures exist for country-level contribution. Data from Burkina Faso for 2011 – which may not be representative of the other countries – show that just over $300,000 was spent on a variety of activities related to girls’ education and gender equality, including the production of a film about girls who leave school, various capacity building activities, provision of school kits, the development of an integrated communication plan, installation of water and sanitation in selected schools, and the organization of a technical round table.

6.3. Middle East and North Africa (MENA)

The MENA region represents a range of considerable diversity, including least developed countries (LDCs), middle-income countries (MICs) and high-income countries (HICs). Some of these countries are facing emergencies caused by conflict. Trends in girls’ education and gender equality vary considerably across the countries, with conflict countries (Iraq, Occupied Palestinian Territory and now Libya) being most affected. Within the regions, the LDCs (Yemen, Djibouti and the Sudan) are generally the ones where gender disparity is most evident, while in the MICs (Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and Tunisia) and HICs (Gulf countries), the issue of equality surfaces prominently.

To date, the MENA region has not had an RFP, which reflects a deliberate choice of the UNICEF regional office at the time not to create such a position. However, in 2011, the senior management of UNICEF’s MENA Regional Office decided to establish a post for UNGEI for the first time, and the first-ever RFP was being recruited at the time of the writing of this evaluation report.

In the absence of an RFP, the regional Education Adviser for the MENA region has supported the roll out of UNGEI, engaging both in regional initiatives and providing support to country partnerships. For example, there has been a focus on developing partnerships with media as a means of advocating for girls’ education and gender equality. This has included the production and broadcasting of videos on girls’ education in selected countries (Egypt, Syria and Yemen), as well as the organization of several forums to engage media in advocacy on girls’ education. In addition, at regional level there have been efforts to integrate girls’ education and gender equality into regional priority setting in areas such as ECD, in the development of a regional framework with equality indicators, and in a regional strategy on adolescents. However, a regional UNGEI partnership was never established in this region.
With the support from the regional adviser, Egypt and South Sudan have established UNGEI partnerships at the country level. These countries were deliberately targeted given the particularly stark challenges they face in the area of girls’ education and gender equality. In addition, a number of countries (including Djibouti and Morocco), although not formally engaged in UNGEI, have actively committed to promoting girls’ education.

In terms of country partnerships, Egypt, as discussed in this report, has developed a national partnership with specific characteristics that is based on a model of provision of primary education for girls. In South Sudan, the UNGEI partnership has resulted in the development of strategies that reflect the specificities of each case, in particular with respect to issues regarding nomadic girls’ education. In Yemen, a Business Partnership for Girls’ Education was formed in 2006 to accelerate efforts related to girls’ education and to reduce the gender gap. This partnership does not meet the criteria to be considered part of UNGEI, but as this is the case for a number of the other countries, Yemen is still counted as a partnership country. The country partnership in Djibouti is no longer active, as the partnership was no longer considered relevant to the country by the MoE, and the main people involved in the partnership moved on to other jobs.\(^30\) However, as noted, Djibouti continues to be committed to girls’ education.

Activities in the region, and in particular in the partnership countries, follow the three outcome areas identified for UNGEI around policy, advocacy and the establishment of effective partnerships. Specifically, some of the achievements in the countries with partnerships include:

- Development of national and regional plans for girls’ education and gender equality, e.g., the development of a Girls’ Education Strategic Plan for 2007–2011 for the Sudan, which has resulted in annual workplans, and has served as a basis for resource mobilization;
- Advocacy campaigns, e.g., the ‘Knock the Door Campaign’ in the Sudan to raise awareness and increase enrolment of girls in education, and television spots and billboards in Egypt;
- Putting in place policies, e.g., in the Sudan to encourage married girls to continue their education;
- Training and capacity building, e.g., training of school management committees to address violence in Yemen, and the establishment of specific departments for girls’ education in relevant institutions in selected countries (Egypt and the Sudan); and
- Strengthening M&E, e.g., through routine collection and dissemination of disaggregated data in Egypt;
- Promoting and supporting research, e.g., in Yemen to evaluate the impact of the recruitment of female teachers on enrolment of girls; and
- Documenting best practices from the countries in the region, e.g., the integration of gender issues in teacher training in Sudan, and the provision of school materials and uniforms to girls in Yemen.

\(^{30}\) This information was obtained through the UNGEI mapping survey.
In the SA region, UNGEI’s focus has mainly been on strengthening country-level partnerships. Specifically, UNGEI in SA has focused on:

- Supporting countries in establishing results-oriented partnerships around girls’ education and gender equality;
- Strengthening the partnerships that already exist and supporting these countries in developing activities at sub-national levels;
- Supporting country offices in accessing the evidence for effective policy dialogue around girls’ education and gender equality; and
- Advocating for specific interventions that address the highly variable needs of countries in the area of girls’ education and gender equality.

In terms of activities, UNGEI activities through the RFP have included:

- Assistance to form and/or strengthen partnerships at country level, both at national and sub-national levels;
- Capacity building through workshops and consultations. This has included training for Young Champions at regional and national levels (Bhutan and the Maldives) and training on gender dimensions in education at the national level (Afghanistan), as well as helping partnerships to locate suitable consultants;
- Knowledge creation, sharing and advocacy based on evidence – in particular around knowledge gaps (for example, the UNGEI issues paper series and, more recently, the gender in education report card (with the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education [ASPBAE]), a toolkit on disparities in education in South Asia (with UNICEF) and the study on public-private partnerships (with the South Asia Forum for Education); and
- Documentation of good practices (for 2012 this will include documenting the processes of country partnership formation in India and Pakistan). These countries were selected based on mutual discussion.

A variety of country-level arrangements for partnerships have developed over time, essentially reflecting the different opportunities and characteristics of the countries concerned. As a result, in Afghanistan a national-level partnership emerged first and has since been followed by a sub-national partnership in one region, with a second in the process of establishment. Pakistan, on the other hand, initiated its work on girls’ education and gender equality at the decentralized (state) level, followed a number of years later by the establishment of a national partnership. In India – a large and very diverse country – advocacy at the national level has very recently resulted in the establishment of an informal national partnership, but sub-national level partnerships have been put in place and are functioning in a number of regions. Thus, a series of sub-national consultations culminated in a National Convention on Girls’ Education in New Delhi in December 2011 that developed a draft national girls’ education roadmap to 2015 for finalization and implementation at the state level.
Initially, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India and Pakistan were identified as priority countries for UNGEI SA given that they all have large populations and a substantial number of out-of-school children, especially girls. However, support has also been provided to other countries, including Bhutan, Nepal and the Maldives. UNGEI’s approach from the regional level has been to be both responsive to country-level demands as well as proactive when opportunities for advocacy present themselves. An example of a responsive approach includes the Maldives, where the government has requested UNGEI to support a national workshop as a follow-up to a study on public-private partnerships. Conversely, in India, the Right to Education Act, which promoted a clustering of states, resulted in the opportunity for organizing a national convention on girls’ education as an entry point for working towards a national partnership. The focus on sensitizing parliamentarians around the region has also been a key opportunity and has provided an entry point for UNGEI SA to engage with countries that don’t have partnerships in place, such as Bhutan.

There is no functioning regional partnership in place at present in the SA region. A regional UNGEI partnership was established in late 2006 and functioned for some time, but is largely inactive today and does not produce an annual workplan or report. The main challenges to having an operational regional partnership have included that the partner organizations are spread around the region (as opposed to in the EAPR, where most regional offices are in Bangkok), as well as lack of time and resources for coming together at regional level, and in some cases a lack of organizational prioritization for the topic of girls’ education and gender equality.

However, closer coordination among a subset of organizations operating in the region has evolved out of this regional partnership effort, in particular between the Commonwealth Secretariat, ASPBAE, the South Asia Forum for Education Development, the South Asian Women’s Network and UNICEF. Since 2006, these organizations have continued to collaborate on activities across the region, such as the Gender in Education Report Card, the promotion of public-private partnerships, and the mobilization of parliamentarians across the region.

The SA region has recently issued its first newsletter for UNGEI, presenting highlights of the work that UNGEI has been doing and seeking to communicate with partners in the region and beyond.

In practical terms UNGEI activities have been supported by an RFP based in Kathmandu. The same RFP has been in place since mid-2006. The RFP’s title includes a reference to UNGEI and her terms of reference have a strong focus on supporting UNGEI’s implementation. In practice, the RFP spends about 80 per cent of her time on UNGEI activities. The remaining time is devoted to complementary activities, such as providing inputs from a gender and girls’ education perspective, and work on EFA, equality, marginalized children, and on UNICEF country-planning processes such as mid-term reviews, country programme documents and the UNDAF.

As is the case in WCAR, the RFP liaises with UNGEI focal points in UNICEF country offices to implement the activities in the region. In practice, the level of engagement at country level depends on the profile of the person at the country office, the extent to which UNGEI is part of his or her terms of reference/professional interest, and the needs and priorities of the country office. The RFP reports that
there has been a growing commitment on the part of country offices to UNGEI. In Bangladesh, for example, the country officer has UNGEI as part of her title and her responsibilities vis-à-vis UNGEI are clearly reflected in her terms of reference.

UNGEI activities are included in the UNICEF annual plan for the region. Activities (at regional and country levels) are funded both from the regional UNICEF budget and from selected UNICEF country office budgets for education. In practice, the funding of activities is agreed upon between the regional and country offices, with country offices or country partners approaching the UNICEF regional office if they are unable to proffer sufficient funding or when the funding is truly regional in nature. At the regional level, the annual expenditure on UNGEI (excluding the salary of the RFP and expenditure by UNICEF country offices on UNGEI) is approximately $100,000.

6.5. Observations on the functioning of the regional support of UNGEI in ESA, WCA, MENA and SA

This section highlights some of the main observations from the interviews and documentary analysis regarding the functioning of the regional mechanism in the four regions.

The RFP mechanism is seen as important and relevant by the majority of interviewees. The RFP mechanism provides a presence at the regional level, and a link with UNGEI at the global level. It also allows for exchange of experience (within and between regions) and for working on common priorities (advocacy, capacity building, sharing of good practice, etc.). As one interviewee noted, “At the regional level, girls’ education is no one else’s full-time job, so the RFPs are really helpful in reminding us of the importance of paying attention to this topic.”

The RFP mechanisms vary considerably in how they function. Links between RFP and the country level vary from quite strong to relatively weak or even non-existent. The country evaluation reports, the mapping exercise and the interviews highlight that in a number of cases the interaction between RFP and the country level is limited to contacts around reporting, and that in those cases there is room for a more focused engagement that addresses the priorities of the countries. Reasons for this appear to include the high turnover in RFP staff in some regions and insufficient focus (in particular in the first years of RFP support) on country-level needs. Addressing this has been identified as priority in WCA.

In terms of activities in the regions, there has been a strong focus on advocacy, capacity building in technical areas (gender audits, etc.), and on identifying and sharing good practice. However, there has been less consistent input into identifying and addressing issues that affect the strength and vibrancy of partnerships. Systematic monitoring and reporting of results has also been an area that has not been sufficiently prioritized.

There has been limited success in strengthening regional coordination. The majority of interviewees suggested that focusing on regional coordination may not be the most effective way of strengthening the capacity of countries to address girls’ education and gender equality, in particular if there is not a strong tradition of regional collaboration. Interviewees indicated that a more pragmatic approach of
working with selected like-minded regional partners – as has been the case in the ESA region – and prioritizing country-level support in line with identified needs might work better.

The relatively strong link between the regional and global level has facilitated information sharing and has contributed to a common agenda. The face-to-face meetings with the GAC are seen as very useful and helpful to the regional level. They provide an opportunity for interaction between the RFP and individual GAC members and provide space for discussion on concrete areas of collaboration and follow-up. They also provide a key opportunity for learning from other regions. The virtual GAC sessions are considered similarly useful, as these have provided for more frequent interaction and updates. However, some respondents noted these were less effective as a means of dialogue than the in-person meetings, mainly due to the limitations of the medium.

Support by the Secretariat to the RFPs is very helpful. The Secretariat is seen as proactive and responsive. The fact that it is able to mobilize resources (technical support) – sometimes from within UNICEF – is considered an important asset.

Tools and inputs by UNGEI at the global level that have a direct bearing on country and regional work – such as the M&E framework and the review of annual plans – are seen as a helpful and useful input into regional efforts as well as country planning and reporting. Both RFPs and CFPs would like to see more of such practical interactions between the global, regional and country levels of UNGEI.

The next section of the report examines the evaluation’s findings with respect to the EAP region, where the regional partnership was studied in depth not as a coordinating mechanism, but as a distinct model. As noted earlier, this partnership is of a different nature than the other regional arrangements because of the specificities and the opportunities that it represents. This section provides an overview of the context and the EAP partnership and then follows a contribution-analysis approach in examining for each of the areas of focus of UNGEI-EAP what the situation was like before the partnership, what has changed, what UNGEI-EAP did, and what its areas of impact are.

**UNGEI-EAP: a regional partnership**

**6.6. The context**

Home to more than 2 billion people, the EAP region is made up of close to 60 per cent of the world’s population. The region reflects a wide range of economic, social, religious and cultural diversity. Approximately 70 per cent of the world’s natural disasters take place in the EAP region.

The broad question of “what’s gender got to do with it?” highlights the significance of a range of issues. In some cases, neither boys nor girls have the opportunity to go school. In others, schools may seem to ‘fail boys’ so that they choose not to go to school.

According to the 2009 UNGEI ‘Snapshot: Gender Equality in Education: East Asia and the Pacific’, most countries in the region had achieved gender parity in primary education by 2005. However, as noted in the report, these aggregated figures mask ongoing disparities. For example, girls in certain parts of Cambodia and Indonesia remain disadvantaged when it comes to school attendance, and at the same
time, the rates of attendance of boys in schools in Mongolia and Myanmar is less than that of girls. When it comes to secondary education, the status of countries in relation to achieving gender parity varies widely. Thailand, for example, has far fewer boys than girls attending secondary school, while fewer girls attend secondary school in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Cambodia. Viet Nam was close to achieving parity in 2009, but again, there are sections of the country with high rates of out-of-school girls.

Alongside issues of gender are those of location and educational attainment, survival rate and leadership; proportion of female teachers to male teachers; levels of literacy, gender-responsive budgeting, gender policies and birth registration; language of instruction; and water and sanitation, transition rates from primary to school, access to pre-primary school and other related issues. What is clear from this analysis is the need for greater disaggregation of data and a fine-tuning of focus, ranging from the development of more nuanced tools of analysis for understanding gender gaps, to a greater appreciation of sub-national differences in such a vast region.

The inclusion of a study of a regional partnership within the UNGEI evaluation was strategic for a variety of reasons, starting with the idea that regional partnerships are an under-studied area. The fact that the creation of the UNGEI-EAP partnership dates back almost to the beginning of UNGEI means that it had the potential to offer a strong historical analysis. Each of the UNGEI partnerships at country level are themselves located within a regional structure, so the inclusion of a dedicated regional partnership that has been supported over the life of UNGEI was sought to offer potential insights into what might be possible across the various regional structures, especially since an RFP works with each of the UNGEI country partnerships. Finally, the inclusion of a regional partnership that does not have direct links to a country partnership could provide insights into future directions for UNGEI, particularly in relation to expanding the focus of the UNGEI-EAP partnership to the country level.

6.7. The partnership

UNGEI-EAP was launched in May 2002. As noted earlier, it is the only partnership operating at a regional level, with specific regional partners and specific goals. The overall goal of the partnership is: “to contribute to the achievement of the EFA and MDG goals for gender equality through a strong partnership,” and the three outcome areas mirror those seen at the global level: i) promotion of policies on girls’ education and gender issues; ii) informing institutional frameworks by knowledge and evidence; and iii) facilitating an effective partnership for girls’ education and equality.

UNGEI-EAP is housed in the UNICEF EAPRO and led by the UNGEI RFP under the direction of the UNICEF Senior Education Adviser. A communications officer and research assistant provide part-time and full-time support, respectively, to UNGEI-EAP.

Membership of UNGEI-EAP has evolved over time. In 2011, it included a total of 20 members representing a number of regional organizations and initiatives, international NGOs, the United Nations family and CISCO as the first private sector organization (since 2010), as well as independent consultants and individuals. The link to UNGEI at the global level is made through the participation of the EAP RFP in GAC meetings.
Over time the EAP partnership has become more structured. Members meet every two months, and the partnership produces an annual workplan that is shared with all members. An e-newsletter published several times a year provides an update of UNGEI-EAP activities and work by its members. Key activity areas of the partnership under each strategic goal include:

**Goal 1 – Promotion of policies**

- Dialogue and presence at EFA thematic working groups and support to regional dialogue through the EFA mid-decade Assessment.
- Participation in commemorative events – e.g., International Women’s Day and World Day against Child Labour, where UNGEI may also team up with other organizations and issue a joint statement.

**Goal 2 – Knowledge and evidence**

- Various research studies initiated by one or more partners and brought into the partnership to become collaborative products – e.g., the International Labour Organization (ILO) initiated research on a School-to-Work study.
- Organization or support to capacity building workshops around key themes, such as advocacy training.

The partnership also produces publications. Some of these are regular, such as the newsletter, but they may also be single publications around a theme or specific piece of research. These publications aim at enhancing all three of the areas by influencing policy, contributing to the knowledge base, and supporting advocacy and partnership building.

**Goal 3 – Partnerships**

- Advocacy and organization/participation in regional meetings, often with specific thematic focus and with issues being carried across different meetings.

*6.8. Systematically integrating gender in policy dialogue*

The table below highlights what the situation was like in the region with respect to policy dialogue before UNGEI, as well as what has changed and what UNGEI’s contribution has been.


Table 20 - UNGEI-EAP contribution to gender in policy dialogue in the region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender is systematically taken into account in all aspects of policy dialogue.</td>
<td>Policy dialogue on girls’ education limited primarily to individual countries within the region, although the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO) played a role in the 1990s.</td>
<td>Greater level of policy dialogue in the region. The commissioning of studies, advocacy briefs, joint statements, regional round tables and conferences on areas such as evidence-based analysis, gender-responsive budgeting, work-to-school transitions in early grades, school-to-work transitions for girls in secondary school, and gender and language.</td>
<td>Policy dialogue narratives credit UNGEI with playing a key role. UNGEI has a part in results achieved through collaboration between different organizations, and also participates in dialogue and has a presence at the EFA thematic working groups in the region.</td>
<td>Difficult to determine the impact of the various initiatives taken on by UNGEI. UNGEI is keeping gender on the agenda and working towards a unified response; however, it is not easy to measure impact because there is no monitoring at country level and no structures for monitoring regional impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9. The situation with respect to policy before UNGEI-EAP

There is little evidence of any coordinated policy dialogue at the regional level prior to the establishment of UNGEI in 2002, although there were a number of country initiatives in the region in the mid-to-late 1990s and beyond. There was no structured forum for discussion and coordination of regional policy dialogue around girls’ education and gender issues. The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization (SEAMEO), as noted in the table above, played a role in the 1990s and has also contributed to work related to girls’ education since the inception of UNGEI, but does not offer a focus on girls.

6.10. Subsequent progress in policy overall (after UNGEI-EAP)

The interviews and documentary analysis reveal a much greater level of dialogue and discussion around girls’ education and gender equality in the region since the beginning of the past decade. The number of organizations that were originally part of the partnership has increased since 2002. There has been an incremental growth also in the number of events that have girls’ education and gender equality as an important area of focus (particularly in relation to regional conferences and workshops sponsored by UNGEI, as well as participation in such events as International Women’s Day, World Teachers’ Day and International Child Labour Day).

In fact, the UNGEI regional evaluation report points out that there has been substantial progress in policy discussion at the regional level, particularly in relation to issues such as transitions from work to school, school to work, and teacher preparation, and that UNGEI has also provided leadership in supporting shifting agendas. For example, various members and countries are now calling for more focus on boys as part of the gender equality agenda and in response to a concern that in some parts of the region it is boys who are most disadvantaged.
6.11. UNGEI’s focus and contribution to policy

The evaluation finds that promoting policy dialogue has been an important feature of UNGEI’s work in the region. UNGEI is identified as having played a key role in promoting and sharpening the policy dialogue through advocacy briefs, joint statements, and participation in regional roundtables and conferences. Various studies commissioned through or by UNGEI-EAP are credited with having contributed to the more mature policy dialogue; e.g., the Making Education Work: The Gender Dimension of the School-to-Work Transition (Indonesia, Philippines, Viet Nam) study. UNGEI-EAP has also focused on developing policy briefs, such as those relating to ‘Getting Girls out of Work and Into School’, and others on issues such as female teachers and single-sex classrooms.

However, in a context that has seen a lot of activity regarding education as well as gender issues – including, for example, through the EFA thematic working groups – it was very difficult for the evaluation to separate the contribution of UNGEI from that of other partners, in particular when dialogue and advocacy processes are often joint.

6.12. Areas of emerging outcomes/impact in policy

It is clear that UNGEI has contributed to enhanced and sharpened dialogue around girls’ education and gender equality in the region. There is more discussion of these issues, they figure more prominently on the agenda, and certain themes for which UNGEI and other partners have been advocating – such as gender-responsive budgeting, evidence-based planning, and language – are being put forward and highlighted at the policy level.

However, it is not easy to determine UNGEI’s specific contribution, beyond an increased level of dialogue and a sharpening of policy dialogue. The case study noted that this was made even more difficult by the fact that not all of the informants who were interviewed in the case study had a clear sense of what UNGEI-EAP actually is or what it does. Informants knew of the current focal person through the various responsibilities she has and knew that the partnership has something to do with gender. They also associated UNGEI with specific publications, such as the annual calendar. However, beyond that, many informants had difficulties in associating specific activities with UNGEI.

Overall, the evaluation concludes that UNGEI-EAP has contributed to gender policy dialogue, but that in the absence of a more formal tracking/impact study it is difficult to establish a precise nature of that contribution.

6.13. Promoting good practice

The table below provides an overview of the area of good practices. Good practices in this context refer to the various initiatives (workshops, toolkits and documents on good practices) that have been initiated by UNGEI at the regional level. The text that follows describes how the situation has evolved in the EAP region.
Table 21 - UNGEI contribution to promoting good practice in the EAP region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good practices facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized (institutional frameworks are informed by knowledge and evidence).</td>
<td>Some prior circulation of good practice at the country level, and even across several countries; however, there is no clear sense that there was any mechanism for dissemination.</td>
<td>Increased activity to identify good practice and use this for advocacy in regional events. Evidence of: • Enhanced mainstreaming of gender within regional organizations; • Creation of new knowledge management systems in EAP.</td>
<td>UNGEI seems to be playing a lead role; UNESCO and other organizations continue to work on girls’ education initiatives on their own, but commissioned studies and evidence-based advocacy initiatives are developed and promoted by UNGEI.</td>
<td>Limited analysis of the overall impact of this work, although the commissioning of a follow-up study on school-to-work and involving more countries and more qualitative indicators supports the perceived value of this work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.14. The situation with respect to good practices before UNGEI

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

6.15. Subsequent progress in good practices overall (after UNGEI)

The period following the establishment of UNGEI-EAP has seen increased activity around the identification of good practices and their use for advocacy in particular, as well enhanced mainstreaming of gender issues within regional organizations. A number of events and resulting documents have contributed to providing knowledge and evidence. An example of this is the regional workshop on evidence-based advocacy in September 2010, which involved nine countries and resulted in a learning guide, ‘Evidence-based Advocacy for Gender and Education’, that serves as an example of what can be accomplished through the partnership. A number of informants highlighted the improved quality and relevance of the work in this area.

6.16. UNGEI’s focus and contribution to good practice

UNGEI-EAP has contributed to keeping gender on the agenda of various governments and in contributing to a broader and more relevant agenda. For example, UNGEI-EAP has commissioned three case studies (in Malaysia, Mongolia and Thailand) on ‘Why boys are doing poorly in school.’ This is very important because it could provide support for a revision of the UNGEI agenda in the region from a focus on girls to one on gender. As has happened with other EAP case studies, they will be disseminated throughout the region.
6.17. Areas of UNGEI emerging outcomes in good practice

The extent to which various organizations in the region incorporate the work on good practice into their planning is not clear. Although one of the objectives of the study was to attempt to examine the impact of this work, it is somewhat indirect since there are no direct links to ministries of education in the region. It is worth noting that various organizations, such as UN-Women, noted that they have used the statistical data provided in the various UNGEI studies. Also, regional representatives of various organizations, such as ILO and Save the Children, highlighted the ways in which they were able to apply the work to their own regional contexts. The school-to-work study, for example, first carried out in 2008, is now being replicated.

A policy-tracking exercise of UNGEI documentation, which drew on an Internet search, revealed that for the most part, where UNGEI was the publisher of a document, UNGEI had a substantially lower number of hits than their partners (UNICEF and UNDP in particular). However, there are a number of smaller NGOs and individuals (bloggers) showcasing UNGEI and partner-published documentation. A key challenge is the diverse way in which girls’ education and gender equality is being approached in the region, which informants felt points to the need for supporting strategy development and impact studies as a way of informing decision-making. There also appears to be room for moving from identification and reporting of good practice to advocating for and working with organizations and governments on scaling up these experiences.

6.18. Facilitating effective partnerships

Table 22 - UNGEI contribution to partnership building in the region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since establishment of UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.</td>
<td>Strong support in 2004 through SEAMEO (with UNESCO) for partnerships in education, but little indication that this work pertained to girls’ education.</td>
<td>A strong network of committed partners is in place; members identify closely with the work of UNGEI and outside organizations identify UNGEI as a key partnership for keeping girls’ issues on the agenda.</td>
<td>UNGEI has contributed to capacity building of partners over time (in taking on gender issues); UNGEI has brought greater credibility to addressing issues of girls’ education through the collective power of its members and a greater coherence to the agenda.</td>
<td>Decision-making based on credible data has been enhanced; overall impact is difficult to assess; some concern about how to measure the impact of the regional partnership within countries, although there has been some country reach through advocacy workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.19. The situation with respect to partnerships before UNGEI

Prior to UNGEI, SEAMEO provided some leadership in relation to partnerships more generally. A conference organized by SEAMEO (with UNESCO) in 2004 highlighted the significance of partnerships in education, although there is little indication that this work pertained to girls’ education (rather it was linked to inclusive education).
6.20. Subsequent progress in partnerships overall (after UNGEI)

The region has seen an increase in coordination and consultation around EFA, girls’ education and gender equality. The fact that various agencies have regional headquarters in Bangkok contributes to this. However, UNGEI continues to be the only regional partnership that focuses on girls’ education.

Interviewees spoke extensively about the nature and benefits of the UNGEI-EAP partnership. Interviewees highlighted that the strengths of UNGEI-EAP include informality, flexibility and a focus on results (through an action-oriented approach, intense discussions, a shared vision, and excellent communication through newsletters and regular minutes, and more recently, a Facebook and Twitter presence).

The partnership has increased in size over time, and the composition has also changed, with changes on the part of representatives of partner organizations. It has adopted a greater degree of formality in its proceedings in some respects. For example, for the past several years there has been an agreed-upon workplan established during the first meeting of the year. There is also more structure in relation to the newsletter, which has an editorial board. However, some informants consider the newsletter very labour-intensive, and highlighted difficulties in getting new stories. Circulation of the newsletter was also identified as an issue, as some institutions have to obtain internal clearance to get something published in the newsletter. There are also some concerns that UNGEI does not have a good sense of the audience and reach of the newsletter. In this context, one informant asked: “How far have we reached? Are we reaching the universities, or is it amongst policymakers? Are they more on Facebook or on Twitter these days; they don’t go on websites anymore.”

6.21. UNGEI’s focus and contribution to partnership

As noted by a number of interviewees, UNGEI has brought greater credibility to addressing issues of girls’ education. UNGEI has contributed to capacity building of partners over time in taking on gender issues. Various partners spoke about the contribution of this work to their organizations more broadly, noting that they might not have been as attune to issues of gender equality if they were not a member of UNGEI. As one informant noted, UNGEI-EAP is really: “An extremely successful partnership and very much based on the individuals of the network. Really incredibly strong individuals from the different organizations, and they are all very open to collaboration, they are open to the idea of sharing, and they believe in the whole notion of capacity building.”

Research and publication endeavours, as well as other collaborative efforts, have enhanced the sense of partnership between the members, and have produced synergies with member organizations working...
on activities in a coordinated and often joint manner. UNGEI-EAP has effectively produced a range of excellent resources related to research and policy input, by pooling both technical and financial resources. These joint endeavours have helped promote a collective agenda by members. UNGEI-EAP publications are seen as high quality and as focusing on pertinent issues for the region. However, a major limitation is that the impact of UNGEI-EAP publications and other joint activities is not being assessed.

6.22. Areas of UNGEI emerging outcomes/impact in partnership building

UNGEI-EAP is a well-developed partnership, with solid and technically sophisticated communication structures, coordination mechanisms and buy-in from partners. However, the partnership does not include bilateral organizations or universities. This is considered a limitation, as these constituencies potentially represent an important resource and advocacy potential for girls’ education and gender equality, and are currently not part of the UNGEI-EAP dialogue.

Those working in education and gender issues acknowledge the relevance of the work of the partnership in coordinating statistics and providing credible data for decision-making. However, it is difficult to assess the impact of the partnership except to acknowledge its ‘reach’ into the various countries in the region through the work of its partners who operate at country level. There has been no specific follow-up to assess impact of UNGEI’s work on partnership building at country level.

Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the EAP partnership

Relevance

The UNGEI-EAP has made relevant inputs into the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in the region. Members spoke enthusiastically about the work of UNGEI-EAP and its relevance to the work of their organization, and to the regional agenda.

Effectiveness

Overall, the UNGEI-EAP partnership is reported to provide an effective forum for discussion and joint work. Several attributes of the partnership contribute to the following:

- There is a structure, but it is not too formal, so there is room for new members;
- There is a strong communication structure, and the mechanisms for decision-making are transparent and democratic;
- The partnership is open to emerging agendas that can be incorporated into the workplan;
- The level of enthusiasm and commitment of members continues to be high; and
- There has been strong leadership by the current RFP and the partnership has become more structured through annual planning and reporting processes.

However, effectiveness is limited by the lack of outreach into countries in the region and the fact that some prominent partners are not very involved in the UNGEI-EAP partnership. For example, SEAMEO, a partner that seems to be less involved in UNGEI, is an obvious direct line to countries, and UN-Women,
again less involved in UNGEI at present, offers a direct line to deepening an understanding of the issues pertinent to girls and women.

The shifting regional agenda towards boys’ issues highlights that UNGEI-EAP has not been entirely effective in keeping girls on the agenda. Notwithstanding the significance of boys and their access to education, it would seem anomalous that there may be less concern about girls at a time when the global machinery for addressing women’s issues is expanding.

**Efficiency**

The partnership’s strengths and structures suggest an efficient use of human resources (especially in relation to coordination). The combined efforts of the various partners within UNGEI to bring forward particular themes and issues means that there is a unified voice. This was particularly noted in relation to joint statements regarding International Women’s Day, for example. At the same time, several informants commented on the resources of UNGEI, noting that there is a ‘grey area’ when it comes to budgeting, which affects the partnership’s capacity to work efficiently on its areas of focus.

**Sustainability**

As was the case for the country case studies, the sustainability of the results achieved through the UNGEI-EAP partnership are difficult to determine because the activities it undertakes require financial assistance from member agencies. However, members of the partnership expressed a belief that the partnership is sustainable provided one of the members continues to take on the role of focal point, as UNICEF does in this case.

**Impact**

Assessing the partnership’s impact in its outcome areas is challenging, in part because of the relatively short time frame for many of the initiatives, but also because of the absence of systems to track the impact, or the absence of clear targets for what the various initiatives are meant to accomplish. While the impact in the area of partnership is relatively easy to identify, this is more difficult in the other areas of outcome (policy dialogue and knowledge and evidence in institutional frameworks). The issues are reach, impact, and the necessary resources or structural mechanisms to put UNGEI into a position where there can be more obvious impact ("the bang for the buck," as one informant noted).

Some informants pointed out that UNGEI’s work does not reach high-level talks and therefore has limited impact on policy dialogue. Others pointed out that UNGEI could draw more on social media and video productions. Given that UNGEI at the region has high capacity to carry out strong research studies, to produce very sophisticated documents, and to access to technology, it could become the ‘flagship’ for championing (implementing and monitoring) communication through information technology (IT). The region as a whole has good access to technology. The UNGEI-EAP partnership has the potential to be the ‘communication leader’ through its use of IT in getting the message out and tracking and improving the reach of the products. To date, the technology is there, but it could be used in more effective ways to reach and communicate with countries in the region.
Summary responses to the evaluation questions

**What constitutes the partnership at the regional level in the five regions?**

The only region with a ‘true’ regional partnership is the EAP region. This partnership has terms of reference, regularly brings together regional partners, produces annual workplans, includes regular reporting to members, and collaborates on joint regional activities. The partnership is considered a valuable asset to the member organizations and to the region. The fact that most of the regional partners are based in the same ‘hub’ (Bangkok) has facilitated coordination.

Efforts have been made to put regional partnerships in place in the other regions, but these have not been very successful. In the ESA region, the regional coordination consists of FAWE and the UNGEI RFP. In the other regions, the regional mechanisms have not been sustained. Interviewees in key positions suggested that a more productive approach might be to focus on the country-level partnerships.

**What efforts have the UNGEI regional coordination mechanisms made to facilitate access to best knowledge, policies and practices?**

The available information underscores that all regions have included a focus on these three areas. This also highlights UNGEI’s common agenda across the regions and countries. The EAP region appears to have been particularly successful in its advocacy and knowledge sharing role.

**Does the regional coordination mechanism promote measuring and achieving results?**

Through the regional planning process, EAP has focused on results. In other regions, the regional planning process has been weaker, although each of the regions does produce a plan for UNGEI in the context of the UNICEF plan for the region. However, the measurement of results in the area of girls’ education and gender equality does not appear to have been a strong feature at the regional level. The adoption of the UNGEI M&E framework, which was validated through the evaluation process (see Chapter 7), should in future allow UNGEI to have a stronger basis for measuring results.

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

The regional coordination mechanism – which is supported by a full-time RFP – in the EARP has played a critical role in UNGEI’s effectiveness. In the other regions, where regional coordination has been weak, the RFPs have taken on the role of coordination. Across the regions, the RFP mechanism provides an effective linkage between the regional and global levels of UNGEI, and has provided a face and presence for UNGEI in the regions and (to a somewhat lesser degree) at country level. A stronger focus of the GAC on the country level, and a more focused agenda of work for the regions, combined with a more time allocated by each RFP to UNGEI, should allow for the RFP mechanism to have an even bigger impact.
Chapter summary

Regional-level support/oversight of UNGEI in the non-EAP regions:

The case studies highlight that the regional level played a supportive role in the establishment of UNGEI partnerships at country level. This support was considered helpful in giving legitimacy and practical advice to the establishment of the partnerships.

A wide range of activities has been implemented at these regional levels, in the three outcome areas of UNGEI, which provided a guiding frame across the regions.

The RFP mechanism is considered useful. There are good linkages between the RFP and the GAC and UNGEI Secretariat. However, the relationship between the regions and the countries needs to be strengthened in some cases, and the regions would like to see a stronger understanding and engagement by the GAC in country-level implementation of UNGEI.

In practice, there are differences in approach and focus between the regions. The GAC does not provide specific guidance in this area. Rather, the differences reflect the choices of the staff that is place (mainly the RFP and the Regional Education Adviser) and the approach of the regional office itself, as well as the interpretation of the key issues in the region.

Regional UNGEI-EAP case study:

The regional partnership in South Asia and the Pacific is seen as useful to key regional organizations and is credited with producing high-quality products. Evidence-based decision-making has been enhanced at a regional level through the partnership.

However, the impact of UNGEI-EAP partnership publications on policy and implementation in the region has not been measured, and the lack of a formal link by the partnership to the country level is seen as a significant limitation.

The table below summarizes the main findings of the evaluation for the ESA, WCA, MENA and SA regions, as well as for the UNGEI-EAP region across the three focus areas.

Table 23 – The regional level: Summary of contribution analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the regional support function</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Good practices</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESA, WCA, MENA and SA</td>
<td>Noticeable contribution in selected countries in each of the regions.</td>
<td>Noticeable contribution in selected countries.</td>
<td>Contribution in the start-up phase of UNGEI; limited contribution afterwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI-EAP</td>
<td>Considerable contribution, but difficult to assess how this is translated into policy change.</td>
<td>Considerable contribution; some evidence of uptake by other organizations but limited assessment of impact on the ground.</td>
<td>Considerable contribution, however, little direct link to the countries in the region. Impact difficult to measure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The contribution of UNGEI at global level

Chapter overview

This chapter considers how the global structure of UNGEI has contributed to the achievement of the EFA and MDG goals for girls’ education and gender equality.

- The first section of this chapter provides a brief recap of UNGEI at the global level as an introduction to the discussion around what UNGEI has achieved at the global level.

- This is followed by a discussion spread over three sections that examines the extent to which UNGEI at the global level has progressed towards its three main outcome areas, namely: the promotion of policies for girls’ education and gender equality; the promotion of good practice; and contributing to facilitating an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality. In this discussion, there is some inevitable overlap between the three outcome areas. For example, actions that aim at strengthening policy (the first outcome area) may in part have been brought about through convening of partners (third outcome area) or through the identification and dissemination of good practices (second outcome area).

- A third part of the chapter assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of UNGEI.

- The final section of the chapter responds specifically to the evaluation’s task of validating the proposed UNGEI M&E framework and highlights what was achieved in this respect.

Summary of UNGEI at the global level

A detailed discussion of UNGEI’s origins, evolution and structure was provided in Chapter 3. For ease of reference, this section summarizes the main points as these relate to the global level of UNGEI.

At the global level, UNGEI consists of the GAC, the UNGEI Secretariat based at UNICEF headquarters in New York, and two co-chairs who rotate every two years. The GAC currently has 18 members from multilateral, bilateral, intergovernmental, civil society and private sector partners. The GAC meets face-to-face once a year and holds three other virtual meetings. The main role of the GAC is to provide guidance to the efforts of UNGEI in advancing girls’ education and gender equality by making decisions on the priorities of the partnership. These decisions are then implemented by the UNGEI Secretariat.

The UNGEI Secretariat consists of a Coordinator, a part-time technical staff member, and administrative support. The relatively small size of the Secretariat (compared with other global partnerships, such as the GPE) in practice means that the bulk of the Secretariat’s responsibilities fall heavily on the shoulders of the Coordinator, who liaises with the GAC and the UNGEI working group (see below), as well as with UNGEI’s regional- and country-level efforts. The Coordinator provides periodic updates and reports to the GAC and to UNICEF, and also represents the partnership at external meetings and forums. The Coordinator of the Secretariat reports to the Head of the Education Section of UNICEF, as well as to the GAC.
To advance specific issues, the GAC is mandated in its terms of reference to establish working groups around particular events, products or outcomes on which UNGEI wants to focus. The working groups bring together volunteers from among the membership of the GAC (sometimes supported by external consultants), liaise with the Secretariat on their progress, and report back to the GAC meetings. UNGEI currently has four working groups around advocacy, knowledge management, M&E and country processes. Past working groups have helped UNGEI work towards particular meetings and events, produced guidelines and frameworks (e.g., for M&E), and examined the scope of UNGEI membership. The level of success of the groups has been variable, as will be further discussed in this chapter. Where they have not been able to achieve their goals, the Secretariat normally takes over the tasks to ensure they are completed.

The global level liaises with the regional level through the RFPs based in UNICEF regional offices. The RFPs also participate in GAC meetings and can be members of the working groups. The Secretariat plays an important role in providing technical support to the work at regional and country levels.

Funding for UNGEI (globally and at regional and country levels) comes from donor support to the education budget of UNICEF. This gives UNGEI access to a regular funding source – and a greater degree of flexibility – rather than having to rely on activity-by-activity funding or annual replenishments by donors, as is the case with some other global arrangements. UNICEF also provides the technical staff at global and regional levels to keep the partnership going. In addition to dedicated UNGEI staff, the partnership is also able to draw on inputs from other UNICEF staff – for example, in the area of communication and through support by UNICEF Officers at country level.

**UNGEI’s contribution to policy dialogue and advocacy**

Table 24 – UNGEI’s contribution to policy dialogue and advocacy globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNGEI global policy goal</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote policies for girls’ education and gender equality.</td>
<td>Girls’ education and gender equality was not a major focus of policy at the international level.</td>
<td>Growing global commitment and policy support for girls’ education and gender equality.</td>
<td>UNGEI contributed to greater attention and policy commitment to girls’ education and gender equality in selected global forums.</td>
<td>More visible attention and higher commitment to girls’ education and gender equality in policy at the international level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.1. The situation before UNGEI**

Prior to the establishment of UNGEI, a priority for the education of girls had started to be articulated by the gender movement, international organizations and donor agencies, and selected United Nations agencies. Studies conducted in the 1980s and 1990s to highlight the significant gap in terms of access and performance in education fed into a growing understanding of the issues and challenges, as did practical/regional experiences in promoting girls’ education. In this context, the Norwegian African Girls’ Education Initiative, which was implemented in a number of countries on the continent, was a concrete expression of an emerging commitment by some agencies, and also provided a practical input into the dialogue in terms of experiences with addressing the challenges of girls’ education and gender equality.
At the international level, the Jomtien Declaration on Education for All (1990), which made a strong case
for the importance of basic education, explicitly highlighted in its Article 3 that the “most urgent priority
is to ensure access to, and improve the quality of education for girls and women, and to remove every
obstacle that hampers their active participation” (UNESCO, 1990, p. 9). However, the other articles of
this declaration included very little specific attention to gender issues, and the guidelines for
implementation of the Declaration did not provide specific directives on how to address this urgent
priority, with the exception of a call for special programmes for women and girls who had missed out on
educational opportunities.

Five years later, the Beijing Platform for Action of 1995, which resulted from the Fourth World
Conference of Women and built on earlier calls for action, also included substantial reference to girls’
education, as well as a strategic objective specifically addressing equal access to education, eliminating
gender disparities and barriers for girls, and enacting policies for re-entry into schooling for young
mothers.

Nonetheless, overall policymaking at the global level in the area of girls’ education and gender equality
was substantially less explicit in its attention to girls’ education and gender equality across development
priorities than is presently the case. Prior to 2000, education policy statements and reports generally
included only a limited focus on girls’ education and/or gender equality, often in the form of specific
projects. For UNICEF, for example, the strong commitment to girls’ education became a major policy
priority in 2002, when UNICEF decided to develop a Medium-Term Strategic Plan (MTSPs) that included
girls’ education as one of five key priorities. While there was a growing recognition of gender issues,
there was not always explicit high-level commitment at the level of governments and development
agencies to girls’ education and gender equality.

### 7.2. Subsequent progress in promoting policy dialogue and advocacy at global level

As noted in Chapter 3, in the period following the establishment of UNGEI in 2000, the context changed significantly. Commitment to (and funding for) education as a key vehicle for achieving the MDGs grew considerably, although in the more recent period (and partly influenced by the financial crisis) this commitment is now levelling off and in some cases being turned back in favour of other priorities. During this period, and partially facilitated by the additional funding, there has been a growing focus on girls’ education and gender equality within

---

**Text Box 13 – The 2010 Dakar Declaration from the E4 conference**

The Dakar Declaration on Accelerating Girls’ Education and Gender Equality was made 10 years after the 2000 Dakar meeting on EFA. It explicitly calls for “urgent action in support of girls’ rights to education, gender equality and empowerment opportunities” by:

- Addressing the factors that impact on the quality of education, and on access and participation at secondary level;
- Ensuring that policy, plans, budgets and curricula are gender-responsive;
- Enforcing legislation and policies that address gender violence and ensure safe and secure learning environments for girls; and
- Putting in place protective and innovative learning opportunities for children and young women affected by HIV/AIDS and for those in armed conflict and emergency situations.
development policy in general, and in education policy specifically (especially in the second half of the
decade). Many countries have adopted policies that seek to promote basic education for all. In addition,
a considerable number of countries have adopted more specific policy measures to address educational
challenges, including those related to girls’ education and gender equality. Examples of measures
targeting pupils include the abolishment of school fees, the introduction of scholarships or other
financial/material incentives for girls and disadvantaged children (e.g., orphans), and measures aimed at
ensuring that children enrol at the recommended age (generally age 6) and therefore have a better
chance of completing at least primary education. Some countries have also introduced specific changes
in the management of their education system, for example, by establishing quotas and/or incentives
aimed at increasing the number of female teachers (in particular in rural areas). Many of these measures
have had a positive impact on the enrolment of girls and boys.

7.3. UNGEI’s contribution to policy dialogue and advocacy at the global level

The majority of interviewees who provided input for this evaluation agree that UNGEI has contributed
to global-level dialogue and advocacy around girls’ education and gender equality. This contribution
has been significant and visible in selected forums.

In this context, inputs by UNGEI include:

- Bringing together agencies, capitalizing on the comparative advantages of each, and using these
  advantages to advocate for policy change in a number of policy-advocacy settings;
- Engaging with EFA processes, especially EFA High Level Group meetings, to give
greater visibility to girls’ education and
gender equality;
- Engaging in other significant forums for
  promoting polices and budget allocation
  for gender equality in education, including
  the Commonwealth Ministerial meetings,
  the meetings of the Commission on the
  Status of Women, and engagement with
  regional bodies such as the African Union,
  SEAMEO and the Association for the
  Development of Education in Africa;
- Organizing prominent events such as the
  E4 conference in Dakar in 2010, and
  meetings of the partnership at the
  regional level (e.g., in Kathmandu in
  2008);
- Working with the GPE to highlight the need to understand and integrate gender issues in the
  GPE approach to funding of education-sector plans;

Text box 14 – Recommendations from the 2006 EFA
High Level Meeting to governments and EFA
partners:

- Implement strategies to boost girls’ participation
  and female literacy, including by removing cost
  barriers and strengthening schools as gender-
  sensitive centres of quality learning, care and
  protection, in line with the recommendations of
  the UNGEI technical meeting.
- Scale up efforts significantly to enable girls to
  attend and complete their education, including
  gender-sensitive learning content and school
  environments.
- Include in all sector plans clearly defined gender
  outcomes and targets in support of gender parity
  and equality, as well as budget lines for specific
  actions in favour of girls and women (and, in
  some countries, boys and men), including
  capacity development.
- Interacting and contributing to the EFA GMR by reviewing the report and pointing out where gender needs to be better addressed through annual gender reviews;
- Developing and providing access to tools that facilitate the mainstreaming of gender in educational policies and practices such as the 2010 'Equity and Inclusion in Education: Guidance to Support Education Sector Plan Preparation, Revision and Appraisal'; and
- Producing and providing access to studies and publications that highlight the importance and areas of good practice in girls’ education and gender equality, through the UNGEI website and through targeted distribution (for example, at global events). This includes the 2008 progress report on gender equality in education in the Asia-Pacific region, which was prepared for the Asia-Pacific regional meeting of the GAC and used as a basis for detailed discussions on solutions for the issues identified in the report.

Overall, this engagement has sought to bring about greater consideration of and attention to gender issues in the global policy discourse on education. Through its engagement with other global actors and events, UNGEI has focused on ensuring that gender issues are reviewed and considered in greater depth, and that ideas and practices are exchanged and incorporated into policy solutions.

The inputs by UNGEI have contributed to a number of changes, which were highlighted by interviewees and in the documentation. While it is difficult to attribute these only to UNGEI, the assessment of the evaluation is that in these areas of change UNGEI made a noticeable contribution/difference. The changes to which UNGEI contributed include:

- GPE guidelines for endorsement have been revised to include requirements to ensure that girls’ education and gender equality issues are integrated in country education plans. This has translated into more focused attention on gender issues in country plans and a stronger prioritization in the endorsement process of attention to gender issues. The new GPE Girls’ Education Strategy, which is in the process of being approved, includes specific reference to working with UNGEI in implementing the strategy.
- The EFA High Level Meetings have included specific agenda points and recommendations on girls’ education and gender issues that refer to the input by UNGEI. For example, the communiqué of the 2006 High Level Meeting in Beijing explicitly included a number of recommendations to government and EFA partners on actions to be taken to ensure gender parity and equality in education (see text box 14).
- Starting with the 2003/04 GMR, which had gender as its main theme, successive GMRs have more explicitly included girls’ education and gender equality in their analysis and discussion. These reports are a key reference to governments, donor agencies and other actors in their policy dialogue and decisions.

7.4. Areas of emerging outcomes/impact in policy

As noted, interviewees underscored that the advocacy role of UNGEI has contributed to greater emphasis on gender in the discussions of the EFA High Level Meeting, the adoption of a stronger gender focus in the GMR, and enhanced priorities and better planning by the EFA/GPE.
A spin-off from the direct work by UNGEI – as noted by many interviewees – is that there is greater attention at policy and decision-making levels to data on girls’ education and gender equality, and greater focus on gender in their education strategies. Overall, therefore, the evaluation concludes that UNGEI has made a substantial contribution to policy at the international level.

**UNGEI’s contribution to good practices**

The analysis on Table 25 summarizes the evolution at the global level with respect to good practices, from before UNGEI to date.

**Table 25 – UNGEI’s contribution to good practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNGEI goals –global level</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized.</td>
<td>Some good practices were being identified and documented; however, these were only inconsistently fed into policy dialogue and not being systematically institutionalized.</td>
<td>Policymaking is more systematically informed by knowledge and research. There is greater: • dissemination of good practices; • capacity and understanding of issues and constraints; • institutionalization; • systematic progress tracking.</td>
<td>UNGEI has identified selected good practices and has disseminated these. UNGEI tools are seen as useful and UNGEI is one of a growing number of partners/entities that have prioritized knowledge and good-practice dissemination.</td>
<td>There is limited analysis of the overall impact of this work, but UNGEI appears to be playing a role with other initiatives. Other partners would like to see UNGEI play a more leading role in engaging with research and in promoting a deeper and more sophisticated analysis of gender issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.5. The situation before UNGEI**

During earlier efforts for gender equality, some good practices were being identified and documented. However, interviewees highlighted that these were generally not fed into high-level policy dialogue. As a result, good practice was informing decision-making only inconsistently and to a very limited extent.

**7.6. Subsequent progress in good practices at the global level**

Since the establishment of UNGEI, interviewees highlight a much more systematic approach to good practices, with enhanced capacity and understanding of what constitutes good practice, more consistent dissemination, progress tracking, and greater institutionalization. The annual GMR, for example, much more consistently includes good practices in girls’ education and gender equality (as well as in other areas) and highlights how these may be used to inform decision-making on educational policy.

The progress in terms of identification and dissemination of good practices is also the result of the growing number of institutions working on issues related to girls’ education and gender equality. Many organizations and initiatives working on girls’ education and gender equality have sought to publish reports on good practices, and these are shared (and frequently discussed) at regional and global
meetings. There is also a much richer research environment into girls’ education and gender equality. A number of publications and products on good practice are produced through collective efforts by partners.

These developments have all led to a better understanding of the key issues that affect girls’ education and gender equality.

7.7. UNGEI’s contribution to good practice

The evaluation found that UNGEI’s inputs into good practice at the global level have focused on:

- Engagement with other networks, such as the INEE and the UNAIDS Inter-agency Task Team on Education (IATT), to encourage joint efforts in research and documentation;
- Development of toolkits and guidelines to support governments, development partners and other stakeholders. This includes, for example, a toolkit on addressing equality and inclusion in education sector plans, developed with the IATT, the Global Task Force on Child Labour and Education for All, and the EFA Flagship on the Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities;
- Development of tools to guide practice by its own members, such as the UNGEI Child Protection Code of Practice, the UNGEI M&E framework (also known as the UNGEI Results Framework) and the UNGEI communication policy, which provides guidance for the partnership on how to communicate around issues of girls’ education and gender equality;
- Setting up and populating the UNGEI website as a repository of documentation and resources for stakeholders;
- Selected publications, including those produced at regional level, for example, by the UNGEI-EAP partnership, but also collaboration with other organizations such as Plan International to support drafting of specific reports such as the ‘Because I am a Girl’ publication;
- Integrating attention to good practice in meetings and other events, including, for example, in the E4 conference in Dakar, which highlighted various good-practice examples in partnership and advocacy and also sought to identify how to contribute to further identification and dissemination of good practice;
- Support to the production of a video on girls’ education entitled ‘To Educate a Girl’; and
- Supporting UNGEI at country and regional levels in efforts to document and disseminate good practice.

These inputs have contributed to a greater availability of toolkits, guidelines, reports and other resources, which impact actions by stakeholders involved in girls’ education and gender equality.

In practice, these inputs have been brought about by the UNGEI Secretariat, with support from UNGEI working groups and inputs from the GAC. The UNGEI Secretariat is also able to draw on substantial support and inputs from UNICEF’s communication staff in this area, which has worked closely with UNGEI on the technical aspects around communication and good practice since UNGEI’s inception. A communication strategy for UNGEI, first developed in 2006, has been put in place to guide the work in this area, and is updated every two years in consultation with the GAC.
The communication section makes available one dedicated person for UNGEI who manages the UNGEI website and also provides technical support to the various communication processes and products. Annual planning by the education section of UNICEF includes support by the communication section to UNGEI’s communication-related activities.

In practice, the support by communication staff has included such areas as regularly updating and populating the UNGEI website, creating a visual identity for UNGEI, developing a newsletter, supporting e-discussions, setting up dedicated websites for specific events and meetings, producing video and print publications, and commissioning photographs and other illustrations for materials.

Communication staff members participate in the meetings of the GAC, and in other meetings organized by UNGEI. With the support of the communication staff, UNGEI has also pursued a deliberate strategy of outreach into the partnership itself to engage communication staff from other agencies. The main rationale for this is to increase the reach of the communication efforts. This has expanded the UNGEI network considerably, but it has reportedly been a challenge to get consistent engagement and commitment across the partnership.

At the global level, publications are disseminated to all UNGEI GAC members, partners and RFPs, who further disseminate them through their own outreach channels on behalf of the UNGEI partnership. Dissemination is also done directly to global partners such as Plan International and the GPE, and through strategic meetings and events such as the EFA High Level Group Meetings, the ECOSOC philanthropy events, film screenings and more. Publications are also increasingly disseminated in electronic format via the UNGEI website and social media, and UNGEI partners are encouraged to do the same.

In terms of monitoring how publications are being used, UNGEI sets targets for reach and distribution of its publications and the communication section monitors the number of downloads and web hits. The Secretariat also tracks the number of copies of UNGEI documents distributed at key events. While there has been no tracking study of the publications, the communication section reports that the targets set for distribution are surpassed every year and that it uses anecdotal feedback from partners to get a sense of the visibility and use of the communication efforts.

7.8. Areas of emerging outcomes/impact in good practice

While there has been limited analysis of the overall impact of this work, it appears that UNGEI has been one of a number of actors that has contributed to good practice, and that this role is considered valuable by stakeholders. In addition to UNGEI, a large number of other organizations have also sought to identify and disseminate good practice. This includes Plan International, the Population Council, Save the Children, Oxfam and FAWE, among others.

There was a predominant view among interviewees that they would like to see UNGEI play a leading role in the area of knowledge management and good practice, including by engaging more strongly with research and by promoting a deeper and more sophisticated analysis of gender issues. Interviewees
underscored that such a role would be invaluable in the changed environment, which requires a more refined agenda setting around girls’ education and gender equality.

UNGEI’s contribution to partnership building

In terms of partnership, UNGEI’s goal at the global level is to facilitate an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality. The table below captures the main changes with respect to this goal throughout the period of the evaluation.

**Table 26 - UNGEI’s contribution to building an effective partnership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNGEI global partnership goal</th>
<th>Situation before UNGEI</th>
<th>Changes since UNGEI</th>
<th>Assessment of UNGEI’s contribution</th>
<th>Outcomes and emerging impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality. | Few partnerships had a primary focus on girls’ education and gender equality. Some partnership activity had taken place at the regional level in Africa through AGEI, but with a weak link to the global dialogue. | Increase in the number of initiatives/partnerships that promote girls’ education and gender equality. This includes, for example:  
- SWAp processes at country level;  
- Regional initiatives such as FAWE;  
- Global efforts in advocacy through GCE;  
- The recently established United States Global Compact on Learning;  
- United Nations theme groups and UNESCO’s new Global Partnership for Girls’ and Women’s Education. | UNGEI has been one of a number of initiatives that have enhanced dialogue among key players at the global level.  
- UNGEI country- and global-level partnerships have been put in place;  
- UNGEI is seen as valuable to its members;  
- However, UNGEI carries little weight with the United Nations and is perceived as not sufficiently engaging with key players and emerging agendas. | UNGEI has contributed to better coordination among UNGEI members. This has produced enhanced and more effective advocacy by UNGEI members collectively and individually at the global level. There is also evidence of enhanced UNGEI advocacy in some regions and countries. However, the partnership is a loose arrangement, with weak linkages between the levels. |

**7.9. The situation before UNGEI**

Prior to UNGEI, there were few partnerships in place that focused on girls’ education and gender equality. As noted above, AGEI, which focused on girls’ education in Africa, was an exception. A number of interviewees highlighted that AGEI had effectively been the forerunner of UNGEI (at a regional level).

**7.10 Subsequent progress in partnership building**

Throughout the past 10 years, there has been increasing mobilization and partnership building around education generally and around girls’ education and gender equality specifically. Partnership arrangements (at country, regional and global levels among entities working for similar goals) have become more common. Table 26 highlights a number of examples of such initiatives.
The UNGEI partnership has clearly become stronger over time. It has established itself as a respected actor in the global arena, with an acknowledged role in moving forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda. This is evidenced by the fact that UNGEI engages with many of the key education forums, at high level, and that mechanisms for engagement have been established that allow it to provide regular inputs (for example, with the GPE, the GMR, and the EFA High Level Meetings).

For UNGEI members, the engagement with the partnership enhances their own work, and contributes to that of their organizations by providing a means of information-sharing and access to knowledge, and by allowing for a collective engagement in the agenda setting and implementation of priorities in girls’ education and gender equality. Non-members also emphasized the valuable role that UNGEI has played, particularly in advocacy through its inputs to the dialogue and deliberations of selected forums, and also in collecting and disseminating experience from regional and country levels as an input into these deliberations.

The UNGEI partnership was slow in getting off the ground — as noted in Chapter 3—and took a number of years to establish its current organizational structure. As noted in the case of the EAP partnership, there has been a focus in the latter period of the evaluation (2007 onward) on strengthening the structures and the manner in which the partnership functions. This has included changes in arrangements for meetings (reducing costs and increasing the frequency of interaction among members through virtual meetings), the drafting/revision of terms of reference for the various structures (the GAC and working groups), expansion of the capacity of the Secretariat with an additional part-time technical staff member, as well as the recruitment of RFPs for UNGEI and their inclusions in the global dialogue through the GAC meetings.

The mechanisms for coordination have clearly evolved in a positive manner. Coordination is more structured and streamlined, there is greater clarity on where decisions are taken, planning and feedback has improved, and there is generally satisfaction with the dialogue and consultation process within UNGEI.

7.10. UNGEI’s contribution to partnership building

The evaluation found that UNGEI’s focus and input in facilitating an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality has included:

- Strengthening its own internal structures and mechanisms to make the partnership more effective, including:
  - The establishment of the UNGEI Secretariat;
  - The establishment of the GAC;
  - The appointment of a full-time coordinator with support staff;
  - The appointment of RFPs in regions where UNGEI operates;
  - Establishing working groups around specific issues and developing technical inputs.
- Formalization of these internal structures through the adoption of terms of reference and mechanisms for planning, monitoring and reporting;
• Adopting a formal set of working groups as a mechanism to move forward priority focus areas of the partnership and having mechanisms for reviewing the progress of the groups;

• Giving UNGEI its own identity through a logo and website and other elements of its corporate identity;

• Reviewing the membership of UNGEI periodically so that it reflects the right mix of partners, which more recently has included the admission of UNGEI’s first private sector partner;

• Developing a vision and goals that reflect agreement of the members on key priorities in the area of girls’ education and gender equality;

• Articulating outcomes and putting in place a process to validate them;

• Organizing periodic meetings of coordination and alignment among member agencies and adopting/refining mechanisms for decision-making of the partnership;

• Adopting a system of rotating co-chairs for the management of the partnership;

• Establishing links to the other levels of UNGEI through the participation of the RFPs in UNGEI meetings;

• Representation in global-level forums through the UNGEI Coordinator and/or co-chairs.

In terms of outcomes, a key question that the evaluation was asked to answer is whether the global/regional coordination mechanism works in a way that has enhanced the effectiveness of the partnership. The evaluation has the following observations on the structure and functioning of UNGEI at the global level:

• The mechanisms for coordination and functioning of UNGEI have clearly evolved in a positive manner since the partnership was established. Coordination is more structured and streamlined, there is greater clarity on where decisions are taken, planning and feedback has improved, and there is generally satisfaction with the dialogue and consultation process within UNGEI, and with the outcomes that it has achieved.

• The establishment of the GAC has been a turning point for UNGEI in that it provided a clear structure for deliberation and decision-making among members.

• GAC members report that the GAC meetings are useful, and have become better structured and more effective over time. They also note the usefulness of the GAC for their own professional activity and for their agencies, in terms of providing a key forum for discussion, debate, reflection and priority setting.

• However, there appears to be room for the GAC – and this was emphasized by a large number of stakeholders – to review and reconsider how UNGEI positions itself and where it adds value in the vastly changed landscape and agenda of girls’ education and gender equality. This includes UNGEI’s engagement at country level, where the GAC is perceived by the RFP and the country partnerships as lacking sufficient understanding and engagement.

• In this context, a review of the GAC membership would help ensure that the partnership includes as members those agencies most relevant and committed to priority areas for the coming years. The ongoing organizational review of UNGEI, which will determine how the partnership moves forward and adapts to lessons learned and the shifting development
landscape, is expected to address this. External stakeholders in particular underscored the need for UNGEI to engage and include in its membership actors who are/will play a leading role in the future (i.e., some of the newer partners and initiatives that were mentioned in Chapter 3 are not part of UNGEI). They also emphasized that UNGEI needs to continue developing a stronger link with the academic community – a process that was initiated through the E4 conference.

- There is room for the GAC to be more aware of and in tune with the key issues and needs in each of the regions, to further build its understanding of country-level partnership processes, and to work more closely with the RFP in prioritizing activities that will strengthen what happens at the country level. This issue has already been identified by the GAC as a priority and was a major motivation for the establishment of a working group focusing on country processes. A number of suggestions were made during the interviews as to how this might be addressed, such as:
  - GAC members should actively identify ways to obtain a stronger engagement of their own to UNGEI. This would help ensure that support to UNGEI is part of the priorities of bilateral and multilateral agencies at regional and country levels, and would strengthen the partnerships at the country level.
  - GAC members should be invited to provide updates on their engagement with UNGEI at the global meetings (such updates are provided by the Secretariat and the RFP). This would instil a degree of accountability and also help identify further opportunities for enhancing the engagement of bilateral and multilateral members.

- GAC membership is institutional. In practice, individual engagement – through working groups, technical inputs, participation in meetings – of members has often been strong, and critically important to UNGEI. However, there appears to be a potential for strengthening the institutional engagement so that UNGEI can draw on institutional support and not just the individual commitment of members. The EAP region has successfully done this and may be able to provide insights into how this can be achieved.

- The UNGEI co-chair arrangement has provided a key means for ensuring that the UNGEI Secretariat can move forward action points from the GAC meetings through consultations with the co-chairs, rather than having to wait for the next meeting of the GAC. The effectiveness of the co-chairs themselves depends on the engagement and leadership of individual co-chairs. The recent decision to establish regular (monthly) consultations between the co-chairs and the Secretariat has made it easier for the Secretariat to move forward action points. In general, the co-chair arrangement appears to be an effective element of the partnership, although it requires a considerable and acknowledged time commitment from the co-chairs, which has not always been the case.

- The Secretariat provides the day-to-day follow-up on action points that have been identified and approved at the GAC meetings. The Secretariat implements the UNGEI workplan and liaises with external partners, enabling UNGEI to be both proactive and reactive. Feedback from the interviews suggests that the Secretariat functions very effectively, given its relatively small size.

- The fact that the Secretariat is able to draw on staff and resources from UNICEF allows it to function efficiently, as it is able to draw on experienced technical staff and the considerable
network that UNICEF has (this also happens at the regional and country levels). The joint planning with UNICEF’s education activities generates synergies that would otherwise be difficult to achieve. This also allows the partnership to operate at less cost (a UNICEF special project, for example, would be an alternative arrangement but would have much higher overhead costs) and with ‘lighter’ structures. The evaluation notes, however, that at times this contributes to UNGEI efforts being strongly associated with UNICEF or being seen as UNICEF activities, and therefore to a lesser visibility of UNGEI itself.

- The close link with UNICEF as the UNGEI hosting agency also had implications for the degree of transparency and clarity on the budget for UNGEI. The funding arrangements – as explained in Chapter 3 – are such that UNGEI activities end up being budgeted and reported as part of the overall girls’ education thematic funding, and the costs for non-activity expenses (staff, overheads) are submerged in UNICEF’s overall budget. This has meant that the GAC has little insight into the budgeting process, and this affects the extent to which the GAC feels it can have ownership and confidence in processes. It should be noted, however, that budget oversight is not strictly part of the GAC mandate (i.e., it is not part of the GAC terms of reference).

- On certain occasions the Secretariat has had to take decisions in the interest of implementing the UNGEI workplan, which to some members is seen as an overstepping of its mandate. This has happened, for example, when guidance by the GAC and/or co-chairs has been insufficient or lacking, or when a particular working group has not functioned effectively. A review of the GAC’s terms of reference and, in particular, of the Secretariat (to give it more authority to initiate work on behalf of the partnership), and of the mechanisms for decision-making between meetings would help to create greater clarity on these areas, facilitate the work of the Secretariat and enhance the implementation of the UNGEI workplan.

- The Coordinator is in practice the face of UNGEI and represents the partnership at external meetings, as well as playing an important role in the follow-up of UNGEI action points. The Coordinator has played an acknowledged and committed role in advancing UNGEI’s agenda and work, and will continue to be a key position in the partnership. The exact role and oversight of the GAC of the work of the Coordinator lacks some clarity, as the Coordinator has a dual reporting obligation – to UNICEF and to the GAC.

- The partnership has used working groups to advance specific agenda points. These have been a fixed element of UNGEI’s working arrangements since 2007, and have specific terms of reference, expected outcomes and membership, as was noted in Chapter 3. A review of the working groups with past and current members, as well as interviews with the current chairs, suggest that some groups have been more effective than others. Effective working groups appear to have the following characteristics:
  - A clear mandate and a tangible outcome (a report, a framework, a meeting);
  - A realistic goal that can be achieved with the limited resources (particularly time) that working groups typically have;
  - A clear time-bound agenda that is directly relevant to identified issues in the UNGEI workplan; and
  - Committed members, and an experienced chair.
• The working groups, even when effective, are only able to advance the UNGEI agenda to a degree, given the limited amount of time members can give to this voluntary activity, which is not always part of their terms of reference and often is in addition to a full working load. This results in tensions between the Secretariat’s responsibility for moving forward UNGEI’s agenda points and ensuring that the workplan is implemented and the overall capacity of the working groups to provide and deliver the inputs. Alternative ways of functioning – suggestions for which are made in the next chapter – may need to be considered to address this issue.

• The RFPs are considered an important feature of UNGEI, and the interaction between the GAC and the RFP has improved UNGEI’s understanding of and interaction with the regional level. Some UNGEI members expressed concerns that the RFPs do not devote their time exclusively to UNGEI. Because the RFPs are integrated into regional UNICEF offices, their work becomes part of the regional programme of UNICEF. This may limit the extent to which they can influence the country level, as their inputs are seen as advice only. On the other hand, the integration in UNICEF offices and regional planning also brings advantages in terms of opportunities for synergies and interaction with UNICEF’s programme and, as noted earlier, allows UNGEI to draw on UNICEF resources. A point for deliberation for the GAC and UNICEF might be the minimum amount of time that RFPs should devote to UNGEI, as well as a standardizing the terms of reference for RFPs to ensure some uniformity across the regions. It would appear that a 50–75 per cent time allocation to UNGEI would ensure that UNGEI is a sufficiently prominent part of the RFP’s workload, while still allowing for the synergies and interaction with other parts of UNICEF’s agenda.

Overall, the evaluation finds that UNGEI has established a viable and vibrant partnership at the global level, which has well conceived and functioning structures. As highlighted, in a number of areas of operation there is room for improvement, and recommendations are made in the next chapter to address these.

7.11. Areas of emerging outcomes/impact in partnership

External stakeholders underscore that UNGEI has contributed to a greater understanding and prioritization at the global level of girls’ education and gender equality, and has brought about coherence and collaboration between the agencies and institutions that are part of its membership. These efforts in turn support implementation of the EFA and MDG goals.

Participation in UNGEI is also perceived as bringing important benefits to its members in that UNGEI serves its purpose as a forum for coordination, exchange of experience and ideas; and for promoting better coordination and harmonization among members. The extent to which UNGEI influences the policies and programmes of the organizations that are members is reportedly variable, but in most cases it appears to make at least some contribution.

The UNGEI partnership has also influenced UNICEF. Two areas stand out in this respect. UNGEI has influenced the manner in which UNICEF relates to certain stakeholder groups, in particular civil society organizations. UNGEI is also credited with having contributed to a more upstream focus of the work of UNICEF, which has now shifted to a stronger role in policy forums.
Assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability

Relevance

Relevance is concerned with assessing whether an initiative is in line with needs and priorities. UNGEI’s areas of focus have clearly been relevant to global priorities. The choice to play an advocacy role in girls’ education and gender equality, and to promote good practice in this area, was pertinent at a time when many partners did not acknowledge this agenda as important. The establishment of a partnership on girls’ education and gender equality was also highly relevant in a context where few partners were explicitly coordinating around these issues. UNGEI also continues to be relevant today, although the evaluation has highlighted the need for reviewing UNGEI’s agenda in light of the changing development landscape and the fast-approaching MDG completion date.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is understood to refer to whether UNGEI at the global level is achieving its intended outcomes. In terms of policy and advocacy, UNGEI has effectively influenced other partners at the global level to pay greater attention to girls’ education and gender equality. It has played this role vis-à-vis a select number of partners/actors. As highlighted in the analysis, UNGEI has contributed to promoting good practices but has not been as cutting edge as external partners would like it to be. UNGEI has been effective in establishing a global level partnership that is acknowledged as being useful by its members, although there are areas of its functioning that could be improved. There are areas that – from an efficiency perspective – could be further strengthened, including decision-making within the partnership, strengthening of the technical capacity of the Secretariat to reinforce its technical role, and the manner in which the partnership moves forward its areas of interest (currently through working groups).

Efficiency

Efficiency reflects whether the inputs were translated into results in an economical manner. The hosting of UNGEI by UNICEF brings considerable efficiency to the partnership in ways that were highlighted in this and previous chapters, in particular because it allows UNGEI to draw on resources and expertise from UNICEF. There are elements of UNGEI’s functioning that have produced efficiency gains. Clearly, the establishment of the GAC and the Secretariat has made UNGEI more agile. The appointment of RFPs has contributed to an improved understanding of the regional and – to a lesser extent – country level of the partnerships. However, the efficiency gains from the inputs of the RFPs need further exploration, given the high resource outlay at this level. Finally, the working groups have been an important means of moving UNGEI areas of interest forward, at little cost to UNGEI, although they have not always functioned equally well. More clarity is needed about their role and inputs.

Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the extent to which the changes that have taken place are likely to persist. At a global level, UNGEI can only be sustainable if there is continued funding for its activities. At present, this
funding is provided directly to UNICEF through its thematic window, which represents the only option for financing. It may be prudent for UNGEI to consider whether alternative funding arrangements are possible and whether these would enhance sustainability further and perhaps attract donors who are now unable or unwilling to provide funding.

Validation of the UNGEI results framework

In 2010, the M&E working group, led by CIDA, developed a results framework for UNGEI. The tool was designed as a self-assessment tool that UNGEI partners at global, regional or national levels can use to guide their planning processes and assess their progress. It can also be used as a framework for external evaluation of progress. The results framework – a copy of which is included in Annex 3 – states the visions, goals, outcomes and outputs that UNGEI seeks to work towards, and provides indicators for measuring progress.

One of the tasks with which the formative evaluation of UNGEI was charged was to “validate the outcomes to be achieved in each country in order to move forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education.” In this context, the evaluation was specifically asked to examine whether there is “agreement among partners about the proposed UNGEI results framework” (terms of reference).

The evaluation approached this task in the following manner:

- The process of validating the results framework was initiated at the evaluation inception workshop in Egypt in January 2011. The workshop brought together education officials from the case study countries and the regional level as well as M&E officers, and provided an opportunity for discussion and reflection on the proposed results framework. A separate session of the workshop was devoted to using the proposed results framework to develop logic models (as the specific results frameworks were called) for each of the case study countries and the EAP region (outlining how each country/region expected to reach its goals and what the expected outcomes were). UNGEI country plans and the proposed overall UNGEI results framework were used as inputs into the design of the logic models.

- The process of validation of the results framework was continued when the country and regional consultants initiated the evaluation. Each consultant presented and discussed the draft overall results framework and the logic models for the countries/region to country reference groups at the outset of the evaluation. As noted earlier in this report, the country reference groups consisted of a selection of UNGEI stakeholders at country/regional levels and had the specific mandate of supporting and advising the evaluation at country/regional levels. The purpose of the discussion was to ensure that the results framework reflected the goals and outcomes that corresponded to the priorities and realities of the country level and to make the adjustments as necessary. For example, in Nigeria, two meetings were held with the reference group in the inception phase to examine in detail the evaluation design and the proposed results framework. In the other countries, one meeting was sufficient, but in each case the same discussion took place, and in each case valuable comments and suggestions were collected.
• The result of this validation was agreement in the four countries and the EAP region on the relevance and appropriateness of the global results framework as a guide for UNGEI. In addition, the validation also resulted in the approval of the suggested logic models developed for each of the countries and for the EAP region.
• In reporting on the evaluation findings, the country and regional reports used the logic model and results frameworks to report on the progress of UNGEI’s progress at the country level. As the reports were circulated to the key stakeholders at country and regional levels, this provided an additional validation of these tools.
• Finally, in the interviews with the RFPs, the evaluation specifically asked whether there was agreement on the proposed UNGEI results framework in the region. In the three regions for which interviews were conducted (in addition to the EAP region), the answer to this question was affirmative.

This process resulted in the following outcomes:

• Agreement that the generic/overall UNGEI results framework produced by the working group – with minor revisions in language made at the inception workshop – represents a common framework and key tool for the development of country/regional specific results frameworks.
• Drafting – for each of the countries and for the EAP region – of a logic model (derived from the generic results framework) that defines the visions, goals, outcomes, outputs and indicators for each of these UNGEI settings. In most settings, the three UNGEI goals related to policy, good practice and partnership building were retained. In the case of Uganda, it was found that the three outcome areas did not adequately capture the priority of addressing teen pregnancy and a specific fourth outcome area was added. The specific outputs for each country/region were adjusted to reflect the specificities of these settings. The country and regional reports discuss the validation process, and the validated results frameworks are included in the relevant reports as an annex.

In conclusion, through this process the proposed results framework was found to be a very useful common tool for assessing progress. In terms of the case study countries and the regional evaluation, adjustments to the framework were made to reflect specific points of emphasis and priority at the country level. In substantial terms, these adjustments were mainly at the output level, and not at the outcome level, with the exception of Uganda, which added an outcome area, as noted above.

The process did not result in a detailed discussion on the proposed indicators, although in each country and in the region various indicators were identified that were used in the evaluation process itself. Annex 11 presents a more detailed framework with indicators – based on the validated framework from the evaluation process. It is suggested that this evaluation framework be provided to the countries and regions as a monitoring tool for progress. The expectation would be that – to the extent possible – countries and regions collect these data on a periodic basis. This tool would allow UNGEI to have a systematic overview of progress, with indicators that allow for comparison across countries and regions.
Chapter summary

At the global level, UNGEI’s contribution has been most evident in the area of policy advocacy, pursuing a number of key entry points where it has been able to make an impact on priority setting and decision-making. To be even more effective, UNGEI is currently reviewing how it positions itself in the changing development environment and in light of the agenda for girls’ education and gender equality in the coming years.

In the area of good practices, UNGEI has been one of a number of actors that have contributed to a much more consistent identification, dissemination and use of good practices. However, external stakeholders would like to see UNGEI play a stronger role as a prime reference for girls’ education and gender equality. This would likely require a degree of re-strategizing by UNGEI, a modified results focus, a stronger emphasis on monitoring, and an enhanced engagement with global-, regional- and country-level research.

Finally, UNGEI’s contribution to partnership building has been significant and is recognized as such. As noted, UNGEI’s re-visioning/re-strategizing will be important in shaping the partnership for the next years and allowing it to be more effective.

The table below summarizes the assessment from the contribution analysis at the global level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Good practices</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible and important contribution to policy in selected forums.</td>
<td>Modest but clearly relevant contribution; stakeholders would like to see UNGEI become a stronger reference in this area.</td>
<td>Visible and considerable contribution to partnership building; however, re-strategizing of the partnership is needed to adapt to changing priorities and changing landscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Conclusions and recommendations

This final section of the report provides summary conclusions and recommendations based on the findings presented in this report. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first three sections present the conclusions and recommendations for each of the three outcome areas of UNGEI, with reference to the three levels at which UNGEI operates, where relevant. The last section presents findings and recommendations of a more overarching nature.

Outcome area 1: Conclusions and recommendations on policy and advocacy

8.1. At the global level

UNGEI has played an acknowledged and significant role in policy dialogue and advocacy at the global level around girls’ education and gender equality. The evaluation highlights that the girls’ education and gender equality agenda has shifted during the past decade, as has the overall context in development aid. Achievements, particularly in gender parity in education in many countries – to which UNGEI has contributed – have been substantial. The remaining challenges and gaps in this area, however, will likely require changes that are more complex and difficult to achieve, as well as an adjusted policy advocacy role.

UNGEI members and stakeholders are of the opinion that UNGEI should continue to play a key role in policy advocacy efforts in the immediate and medium term. In this context, the main message from stakeholders is that UNGEI will need to adapt to the changed environment and changed priorities, with a slim but targeted policy advocacy agenda on which UNGEI takes a strong and explicit position, as is required for successful advocacy.

In light of these findings, the evaluation recommends that UNGEI:

- Make policy advocacy – where it has had acknowledged success – the main priority for its future endeavours at the global level.
- Adopt a focused agenda of policy advocacy priorities for the partnership for the coming 5–10 years. The agenda should clearly identify advocacy goals, targets and strategies, as well as the means for measuring progress and outcomes.
- Commission an evidence-based external study of key priorities in policy advocacy for girls’ education and gender equality to inform its priority setting. The study should take into account lessons from advocacy successes and failures of UNGEI and other partners/initiatives, and should be sufficiently detailed to allow UNGEI to identify a small number of priority issues that UNGEI should advocate for based on its areas of comparative advantage.
- Establish an advisory/guidance panel on policy advocacy as part of its organizational structure to provide inputs into the GAC meetings and into the work of the Secretariat and relevant working groups. The role of the panel would be to monitor the environment and provide periodic advice to UNGEI on how to sharpen its policy advocacy role. The panel should bring together a small number of acknowledged experts in girls’ education and gender equality.
8.2. At the regional level

The evaluation highlights how UNGEI’s contribution to policy and advocacy has been important and valued in the EAP region. However, the partnership was found to be limited in its understanding and approach due to a lack of outreach into the countries in the region, and because of the fact that there is little evidence that it uses the member organizations themselves as a channel for reaching into countries for advocacy purposes. In light of this, the evaluation recommends that the EAP partnership should:

- Continue the focus on advocacy in the region, possibly reviewing and sharpening the focus of its advocacy in accordance with the revised priority agenda for UNGEI at global level and the findings of the evidence-based study on priorities for the coming years, should this recommendation be accepted by UNGEI.
- Develop strategies and make use of partner structures and outreach to influence policy dialogue and decision-making at country level.

The EAP partnership should also formalize an UNGEI partnership with one or several countries in the region as a way to both inform and be informed by country needs. This recommendation is listed under outcome area 3 below but is also of relevance to the policy advocacy agenda.

In the other regions, UNGEI has played only a very modest role in regional policy and advocacy, and the regional efforts have been more focused on the country level. As there appears to be little appetite for regional coordination, the evaluation is of the opinion that UNGEI should prioritize influencing policy advocacy opportunities at the country level rather than focusing on establishing regional partnerships per se. Specific recommendations in this respect are formulated in outcome area 3.

8.3. At the country level

At country level, the case studies highlight that where strong partnerships exist (e.g., Nigeria and Uganda), UNGEI has positioned itself as a valuable and strong player in policy dialogue and advocacy. In light of this, the evaluation recommends that the focus at the country level should be on capacity building and strengthening partnerships. Specific recommendations related to both areas can be found under the discussion in outcome area 3.

Outcome area 2: Conclusions and recommendations on good practice

The evaluation finds that at global, regional and country levels, UNGEI has played a role in collecting, synthesizing and disseminating good practice. The outcome of the focus on good practice is seen in the case study countries where the evaluation found evidence of good practices being implemented and shared, of capacity being built around good practice identification and reporting, and of good practices being used to inform policy development. At the regional level, the EAP region has been particularly active in producing toolkits and studies through collective efforts by the UNGEI members, and these products are considered relevant and of high quality. However, it is not clear to what extent these have informed policy and practice (at regional and country levels). At the global level, UNGEI’s work on good practices is considered valuable, although some stakeholders highlighted that they would like to see UNGEI establish itself as a leading reference on good practices in girls’ education and gender equality –
something that is not presently a goal of UNGEI. In this role, UNGEI would function as a knowledge hub of best practice, delivered for and by partner agencies; in other words, it would not necessarily imply UNGEI itself generating substantial publications.

These findings lead the evaluation team to recommend that at the global level, UNGEI should:

- **Develop a plan of priority activities and publications around good practice** that is aligned with the proposed medium-term agenda for UNGEI, and that corresponds to UNGEI’s suggested role as a knowledge hub.
- **Review and strengthen strategies for engaging with the academic community** to develop a tighter view of what is meant by good practice and allow this to inform UNGEI’s priority setting and quality-assurance function on girls’ education and gender equality literature on policy and impact.
- **Systematically define targets and track the impact of a sample of its publications/collaborative work** (including regional- and country-level publications, if considered relevant) to learn lessons about their usefulness, pertinence and impact and inform decision-making and strategizing on future endeavours. These lessons should then be used to inform UNGEI’s approach to best practices in the future and should be shared with other levels of the partnership.

In the EAP region, UNGEI should:

- Envision a much **wider and more aggressive distribution/outreach** in order to have an impact;
- **Target the products of these studies at higher-level policy events** so that the findings can more effectively influence policy dialogue and decision-making; and
- **Develop a strategy to more effectively use partner structures and outreach** for policy dialogue at the country level.

For the country level, UNGEI should:

- **Share the findings from the lessons learned in a good practice by developing a practical guideline** for country partnerships and actors to identifying, synthesizing and disseminating good practices to inform country-level efforts in this area.

Outcome area 3: Conclusions and recommendations on partnership building

*8.4. At global level*

UNGEI has successfully established a global partnership that is valued by its members, and has engaged in an effective manner with key forums that influence the global agenda on girls’ education and gender equality. UNGEI’s governance structures have been strengthened throughout the past years and have allowed the partnership to take decisions and move forward in its main areas of activity. However, operational decision-making needs clarifying and strengthening, and the technical capacity of UNGEI still falls short of what the partnership needs. There is also a need for the GAC to strengthen its understanding of the country level, for the membership and functioning of UNGEI to be examined in
light of the changing landscape in girls’ education and gender equality, and to find ways to strengthen the institutional commitment to UNGEI (as opposed to the individual commitment).

These findings translate into a number of recommendations, namely, that UNGEI should:

- **Expand the capacity of the Secretariat with an additional full-time staff member** to allow the Secretariat to effectively follow up on areas of work that are identified by the GAC but for which working groups are not an effective solution. This will also allow UNGEI to take on the priority policy advocacy agenda mentioned under outcome area 1, above.

- **Develop a strategy for reviewing the membership of the GAC with a view to identifying and adding members that play a key role** in the environment, and phasing out members in line with its revised focus and priorities. This should include the **deliberate recruitment of a small number of country-level members** to enhance the GAC’s understanding and responsiveness to country-level issues.

- **As part of the membership review, UNGEI should put in place clear institutional directives for institutions to be involved in the GAC**, which should strongly encourage institutions to take it upon themselves to revise the terms of reference of the participating staff to reflect their responsibilities as a member of UNGEI. In addition UNGEI should draw on the external expertise of an organizational expert to identify strategies for achieving greater institutional engagement with UNGEI.

- **Review the terms of reference for UNGEI structures** to ensure that the responsibilities and linkages of the Coordinator position to the GAC and the co-chairs are clearly outlined, and to revise the terms of reference of the Secretariat to provide more leeway for it to take operational decisions that relate to the implementation of action points that have been approved by the GAC. This may be done as an internal exercise, or with the support of an external consultant.

- **Review with UNICEF whether there are mechanisms that would make it possible for the GAC to have better insight into the annual budget and expenditure for UNGEI as an input into decision-making**. This might include having an indicative annual budget allocation for UNGEI, as well as ensuring that reporting mechanisms from country and regional levels provide information on the budgets allocated and spent.

**8.5. At regional level**

Members value the EAP partnership as a very useful forum for sharing information. It has an acknowledged role in the regional dialogue and has established strong structures that allow it to make decisions and move agenda points forward. However, it is not clear what impact the Asia-Pacific regional partnership has had on implementation in the countries of the region, as this has not been monitored or measured. The lack of a formal link by the partnership to the country level limits the understanding of country processes by the partnership.

Across the regions, the RFPs have facilitated a close link between UNGEI at the global level. They are also potentially valuable mechanisms/links between the country and global levels of UNGEI, although
there was clearly room for strengthening the dialogue and collaboration between RFPs and countries in certain cases.

To address these findings, the evaluation recommends that UNGEI:

- **Negotiate with UNICEF that RFPs should devote a substantial portion of their time to the RFP role.** The findings of the evaluation suggest that this should be in the range of 50–75 per cent of their time. At opportune moments (e.g., new recruitments), it would be helpful if UNGEI could be involved in reviewing the RFP’s terms of reference to ensure that they are aligned with UNGEI priorities. Given that the UNICEF Representative is responsible for the RFP’s appointment, incentives might be introduced to the management of the RFPs to ensure that the latter are supported in their function.

- **Work with the RFP to develop multi-year strategies and plans for each of the regions outlining priorities for UNGEI’s support from country and regional levels.** This should be based on an assessment of priority actions and priority countries in each of the regions and should link to a medium-term plan for each priority country. Where regional partnerships are weak, this will need to be done in consultation with whatever regional partners are active and, of course, in consultation with the country-level partnerships. This will make it clear what countries can expect from UNGEI and will also allow the GAC and UNGEI in general to engage more strongly at the country level.

- **Prioritize a focus on the country level, and in particular on strengthening country partnerships, across all of the regions, rather than the establishment of regional partnerships.** The EAP partnership should of course continue, given the added value it has in that region.

- **Put in place mechanisms for knowledge sharing and dissemination between RFPs and CFPs.** These activities should be included in regional planning and reported on annually. In addition, surveys among CFPs could be conducted to assess what mechanisms might be most effective in each context.

**8.6. At country level**

In terms of partnership building, more than half the countries that declare having UNGEI partnerships in countries do not have formalized structures that meet the set of criteria adopted by UNGEI. While RFPs have supported UNGEI countries in a range of activities, including the exchange of experience and good practice, gender audits, studies, reviews and capacity building, relatively little support has been provided to strengthening the partnership structures and mechanisms themselves after their establishment. This builds the case for the criteria that UNGEI has adopted for partnerships, but also highlights that UNGEI needs to provide the support that will allow the countries where this is not yet the case to build partnership capacity that meets these criteria. The evaluation did not perform an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the partnerships across all of the countries, but the case studies seem to indicate that countries with strong leadership, well organized partnerships with structures at various levels, clear terms of reference and a workplan, have made more progress in the UNGEI outcome areas.
The perspectives of national authorities, including of the MoEs, were explored in detail in the country case studies. In Egypt, Nigeria and Uganda there is a strong commitment and involvement of the governments in UNGEI, and this has helped to influence UNGEI’s success. Nonetheless, funding issues emerge as critical in many countries.

Several countries underscored challenges in terms of capacity at the ministerial level, but also within UNGEI itself, as well as the need for improvement in areas such as technical knowledge on gender issues and communication skills.

The country analysis underscored the need for a sound study of the factors underlying persistent disparities between girls and boys. This was considered particularly critical as a basis for decisions regarding future operations and policies, as well as essential to building the capacity of the partnerships.

The evaluation also noted that many countries have very poor or non-existent systems for monitoring and evaluating UNGEI operations and activities. The lack of institutional memory and documentation was also highlighted as a barrier to UNGEI activities.

These findings lead to the recommendation that UNGEI:

- **Undertake a separate study to identify specific strategies and mechanisms for strengthening the partnerships that are in place.** The study should identify the main areas of weakness and where and how UNGEI might prioritize strengthening of these partnerships. The focus should be on ensuring that all UNGEI partnerships meet at least the basic criteria that UNGEI has identified for a functioning partnership. In this context, UNGEI should place particular emphasis on strengthening the partnership’s structures and mechanisms for planning, reporting, monitoring and accountability, which the evaluation found to be particularly weak.

- **Develop a prioritized capacity building plan for partnerships and their members at country level, based on the separate study recommended above.** This will allow partnerships to become stronger and develop their own policy and advocacy agendas, informed by the work that UNGEI is doing at the global level.

- **Identify specific strategies for advocating and securing stronger national involvement and leadership in UNGEI.** This can be done both at country and regional levels. Doing so will contribute to national prioritization of UNGEI and to its sustainability, and ultimately to stronger partnerships. Identifying and engaging with local champions is one possible strategy – as was done in Nigeria with the wives of governors.

- **Provide technical and financial support to identified priority countries to conduct a situation analysis of the factors behind persistent disparities between girls and boys.** This could be done through a pilot study in a small number of countries. The pilot study would develop a methodology and approach that could be made available to other countries for replication.

- **Conduct a further analysis of the funding situation and options for funding country-level partnerships.** UNGEI might want to consider establishing a facility for ensuring that partnerships have a small budget that allows them to function and provide seed money for
selected activities. This could possibly be done by devolving some of the UNICEF budget within UNICEF’s thematic funding to the country level.

- **Prioritize continued work on strengthening the M&E of UNGEI’s operations**, which has been carried out by the M&E working group.
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Annex 1 – Terms of reference

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

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**

**BACKGROUND**

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

UNGEI’s vision is 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. In 2008, it adopted the following Mission Statement that expanded the partnership’s mandate to embrace gender equality:

- **UNGEI works to improve the quality and availability of girls’ education in support of the gender-related EFA goals, the second MDG to achieve universal primary education, and MDG 3 to promote gender equality and empower women.**
- **UNGEI is committed to accelerating action on girls’ education and revitalizing the broad social mobilization and high-level political action needed to ensure that every girl, as well as every boy, receives a quality education.**
- **UNGEI relies on a broad alliance of committed partners who are mobilized to provide direct support to countries and facilitate an enabling educational environment where girls and boys can flourish and unleash their untapped potential.**
- **UNGEI partners mobilize resources for targeted project interventions, country programmes and large-scale systematic interventions designed to affect the education system as a whole.**

---

This evaluation is intended to be a baseline against which progress towards achieving results can be measured in the future. However, we do realize that it may not be possible to conduct a fully fledged baseline due to shortfalls in information requirements; hence an important product of the evaluation will be to identify information needs and propose a framework and/or mechanism for collecting empirical baseline data for future evaluative work. Also, given the relative paucity of evaluations of development partnerships, we anticipate new lessons in evaluating education partnerships in terms of design and scoping, evaluation processes and the actual execution of such evaluations.
UNGEI promotes strategies that put the needs of the most disadvantaged, including girls and women, first in education policies, plans and budgets.

The UNGEI partnership works to remove barriers to learning, such as school fees and other education costs and violence in and around schools, and to support the continuation of education in emergency situations such as areas affected by armed conflict, natural disasters or external shocks, as well as in post-crisis and fragility contexts.

UNGEI advocates a cross-sectoral, holistic approach, with balanced investment in education across the life cycle, addressing early childhood education and development for children of poor families, and literacy and empowerment of women and young people.

UNGEI streamlines its efforts by strategic use of existing mechanisms such as poverty reduction strategies, sector-wide approaches, United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks and the FTI.

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

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

- **Technical outputs and capacity development** focuses on filling knowledge and information gaps by creating and sharing tools, resources and experiences, e.g., gender analysis of national sector plans endorsed under the EFA FTI, tools and guidance on equity and inclusion, publications on child protection and M&E, good practice in girls’ education, gender integration in ECD and SWAp resource packs, and gender audits.

- **Policy dialogue and advocacy.** UNGEI uses its collective voice to raise awareness of the importance of girls’ education and to influence policy discussions. Globally, UNGEI has engaged with EFA processes, including the GMR; FTI, (working group) WG and High-Level Group meetings; and other important spaces for promoting gender equality in education policies and budget allocations.

- **Coordination and alignment with aid architecture.** At all levels, UNGEI promotes greater aid alignment and enhanced and sustained aid allocations for girls’ education, as well as widens the information base of partner organizations to ensure efficiency and avoid duplication of activities. The inclusion of many multinational and bilateral organizations promotes coordination and prioritization of girls’ education.

At the national level, UNGEI applies the following standard in determining if a group is a functioning part of the network:

- Terms of reference exist, formalizing the mandate, members and governance of the national (or sub-national) partnership.

- An annual workplan is developed, monitored by the national partnership and reported to the RFP.

Note: The partnership does not have to use the acronym UNGEI in its name to be considered as part of the network.
UNGEI RFPs in East Asia and the Pacific, Eastern and Southern Africa, the Middle East and North Africa, South Asia, and West and Central Africa based in UNICEF regional offices facilitate the coordination of girls’ education strategies and interventions at regional (in some cases) and country levels. Country-level partnerships operate in more than 40 countries.  

The UNGEI Global Advisory Committee consists of key organizations that share planning, decision-making, guidance and accountability for the entire partnership. Two partners co-chair the committee on a rotational basis (current co-chairs are SIDA and ASPBAE), with UNICEF serving as the lead agency and Secretariat.

The most recent evaluation work involving UNGEI was its selection as a case study in the UNICEF evaluation of its involvement in global programme partnerships in 2008. This evaluation found UNGEI to be a vibrant partnership that is contributing to more effective and focused policy reform, scaling up of activities, and technical support to countries. The UNGEI partnership provides UNICEF with a mechanism to influence changes in respect of gender and other disparities in the education sector. However, as in the case of other global partnerships, the UNICEF evaluation revealed weaknesses in translating strategies into action at the country level.

The following countries were selected to participate in the present evaluation: Côte d’Ivoire, Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria and Uganda. Given the need to include at least one regional partnership and the fact that most countries in the EAP region do not have traditional partnerships, the regional partnership in that region was selected. The following criteria apply to all partnerships participating in the evaluation:

- at least one country per region where the partnership is active, i.e., EAP, ESA, MENA, SA and WCA;
- one French-speaking country;
- one regional partnership;
- a mature partnership is present that has functioned for at least three years; and
- the willingness and capacity of the UNICEF country/regional office to host the evaluation, i.e., availability of education and M&E staff, and ability to absorb most in-country costs in the country programme budget.

A. OBJECTIVES OF THE BASELINE EVALUATION AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS/CRITERIA

---

32 Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, the Central African Republic, China, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Guinea, India, Kenya, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, the Sudan, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen and Zambia.

33 Current partners at the global level include: AED (Academy for Educational Development), ANCEFA (African Network Campaign on Education for All), ASPBAE (Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education), Camfed (Campaign for Female Education), CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency), Cisco Systems, Inc., The Commonwealth Secretariat, Danida (Danish International Development Agency), DFID (The UK Department for International Development), FAWE (The Forum for African Women Educationalists), ILO (International Labour Organization), Norad (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation), SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), UNESCO, UNFPA, UNICEF, USAID (U.S. Agency for International Development), World Food Programme, World Bank and World Vision International.
As UNGEI evolved over a period of years from a loose advocacy network to a more formal global partnership using more defined strategies, a baseline was not established in 2000. Therefore, this self-evaluation will be formative in nature and will serve as a baseline against which future evaluative work can be done.

The evaluation’s objectives are to explore the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership. The evaluation will be anchored on the proposed M&E framework, which highlights the following outcomes:34

1. policies that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
2. best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized; and
3. UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

The formative evaluation will help UNGEI to:

• define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls’ education;
• validate outcomes to be achieved in each country in order to move forward the girls’ education and gender-equality agenda in education;
• collect empirical baseline data in the countries and regional partnerships; participate in the evaluation, against which progress in future evaluative work can be measured;
• map the status of UNGEI partnerships in all countries (currently estimated at more than 40) and regions (currently five); and
• map the governance structure and administrative components of the UNGEI partnership at the global level.

Indicative evaluations questions follow below. These will be discussed and finalized at the orientation and planning workshop, held at global level for the entire evaluation, and will be answered during the evaluation.

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

**Country partnerships:**

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

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

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

---

34 One of the objectives of this evaluation is to validate the outcomes. Hence the understanding is that they will remain in draft form until they are finalized at the conclusion of the evaluation.
d. What constitutes the full UNGEI country-level partnership? This macro-level mapping of the partnership will ask the following questions for the national partnerships not participating in the exercise: Is there a formalized partnership with terms of reference? Is there an agreed annual workplan? If so, (a) describe the partnership’s main activities and (b) are the annual workplan results reported annually to the UNGEI RFP?

Regional and global partnership:

e. What are some indicative activities and/or results that have been achieved to influence the development of policies that promote girls’ education and gender equality in each country?

f. What constitutes the partnership at regional level in the five regions (EAP, SA, MENA, ESA and WCA) where the UNGEI operates?

g. Is there agreement among regional and country-level partners about the proposed UNGEI results framework?

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

Country partnerships:

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

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

Regional and global partnership:

c. What effort has the UNGEI regional and global coordination mechanism made to facilitate access to best knowledge, policies and practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality?

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

Country partnerships:

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

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

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

Regional and global partnership:

d. Does the regional/global coordination mechanism promote measuring and achieving results?

e. Does the regional/global coordination mechanism (e.g., UNGEI Secretariat, GAC, WGs, RFPs, etc.) work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?

B. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION
This exercise is a self-evaluation\textsuperscript{35} to be executed in up to six countries (including at least one French-speaking country), spanning four regions, one regional partnership and the global partnership. The evaluation will cover how effective the institutional engagement of key UNGEI partners has been at the country, regional and global levels. We anticipate using a common framework and methodology in each location in order to acquire a shared understanding of ways to strengthen the partnerships within a country or regional setting. We also hope that lessons from the sample countries/region, including the methodology and processes to undertake a good baseline evaluation study, will be relevant to the majority of countries and regions with UNGEI partnerships.

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

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

**C. METHODOLOGY**

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

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

- **Formal desk review:** The desk review will be used as an important tool to assemble evidence of activities or outputs, as well as to determine if the necessary record-keeping and documentation

\textsuperscript{35}This is an evaluation that it is intended for the purpose of learning, rather than accountability. Secondly, the evaluation management arrangements do not aim for a high level of independence at the country level. Ideally, the M&E officer will be the primary manager, but the situation in the country may be such that the programme officer (education) is the only person available to manage the consultant.
is being carried out. UNGEI focal points in each country will avail key documents for a systematic desk review. These will include UNGEI programme documents, gender audits of sector plans, gender curriculum and/or textbook reviews, presentations and reports of capacity-building workshops, and instructional manuals. In addition, the UNICEF Evaluation Office will provide the consultants with a copy of the UNGEI desk review from a recent evaluation of UNICEF global programme partnership.

- **Data Collection:** Primary data – to be collected through interviews and focus groups, self-administered surveys, and direct observations – will add to the existing knowledge about the activities, and will be used to gauge perceptions of stakeholders of their interactions with the partnership and the utility of the interventions. This will include a mapping exercise that will cover all country and regional partnerships in the UNGEI network and will detail their members, mechanisms and activities, etc., as well as the role of the RFPs.

**D. EVALUATION RESPONSIBILITIES AND MANAGEMENT**

The UNGEI global evaluation will be supported by:

- a national consultant in each participating country and regional location;
- An international consultant at the global level, supervised from the UNICEF Evaluation Office in New York; and
- reference groups at all levels.

**Reference group:** A reference group for the UNGEI evaluation will be established in each participating partnership, comprising up to seven members each. The global reference group will be made up of a representative of the UNICEF Evaluation Office, members of the UNGEI GAC’s M&E WG and the head of the UNGEI Secretariat. Participating national and regional partnerships will determine the composition of their respective reference groups, ensuring appropriate representation from the partnership’s constituencies.

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

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

**National/regional consultant** in each participating country/region (for participating regional partnership only) will be responsible for the professional conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the terms of reference, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation\(^\text{36}\) and the

UNEg Code of Conduct for Evaluation. Each consultant will be contracted by the respective UNICEF office to perform the following tasks:

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

Countries and regions will support the self-evaluation with the financial resources stipulated in Section G of the present terms of reference, and provide support to arrange for meetings, write letters of introduction and/or accompany consultants to meetings where necessary. The evaluation will be managed by the M&E officer in the UNICEF country/regional office, who will provide overall guidance and contribute directly to its quality assurance activities.

The international lead evaluator, contracted by the UNICEF Evaluation Office, will be responsible for leading the evaluation efforts from a global perspective. Specifically, he/she will be responsible for:

- facilitating the orientation and planning workshop for national consultants and participating CFS;
- reviewing data collection tools, including questionnaires, interview questions and protocols used at the country level;
- undertaking up to two quality-assurance missions during data collection in up to two participating countries;
- reviewing country reports – draft and final reports;
- collecting additional data at the regional level and ensuring that regional and global perspectives are represented in the global report; and
- ensuring that the evaluation manager (Evaluation Specialist in New York) is regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation, possible causes of delay and issues to resolve.

The Evaluation Specialist (Education) in the UNICEF Evaluation Office in New York will manage the work of the international consultant, provide overall guidance to the evaluation and contribute directly to its quality assurance activities.

The proposed UNGEI Results Framework is attached.

E. EVALUATION PROCESSES AND PRODUCTS

Evaluation consultants, national/regional consultants (N/RCs) and the international lead evaluator (ILE) are each responsible for the following activities and productions:

- Materials for the orientation and planning workshop and facilitating the workshop (ILE)

• Overall inception report, including finding and synthesis of the desk review, revised evaluation methodology, outline for the evaluation report, and revised evaluation workplan (ILE)
• Country inception reports, including revised evaluation methodology for their country, outline for the evaluation report, revised evaluation workplan (N/RCs)
• Draft evaluation reports, both country reports and the overall synthesis report (ILE and N/RCs)
• Dissemination workshop to consider initial evaluation results (ILE and N/RCs)
• PowerPoint files for the presentation of final reports (ILE and N/RCs)
• Final Evaluation Reports, according to the UNICEF House Style and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports (ILE and N/RCs)

Evaluation planning workshop: An orientation and planning workshop will be convened to develop a common and agreed approach to the evaluation. Workshop participants will include the following:
• national consultants (evaluators from the participating countries);
• UNGEI focal points from each country;
• country M&E experts, where possible;
• the international lead evaluator; and
• GAC representatives (members of the M&E WG) and the evaluation manager.

The planning workshop is expected to agree on the methodology, including the sampling frame for each country, a set of evaluation tools with necessary customization to each country, a template for training country evaluation teams, and a tentative workplan that reflects all evaluation activities for country teams and for the international lead evaluator.

Inception report: The Inception report, detailing evaluation activities for each country and global level activities, will be used to confirm a common understanding between the evaluation commissioners and consultants, of the purpose, objectives, scope, methodology and timeline of the evaluation. The inception report will present preliminary findings from the desk review and present the revised terms of reference, work and travel plans, methodology, proposed interview lists, visits to and within each country, and structure for the final report. The inception report will be 15–20 pages, including the terms of reference and workplan, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the in-country reference group or global reference group.

Evaluation report: The final evaluation report will include:

1. Concrete examples of how national policies promote girls’ education and gender equality as a result of UNGEI inputs;
2. Examples of best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality and proposals of how they can be popularized and institutionalized;
3. An assessment of how UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality in participating countries/region;
4. The revised and validated draft of the M&E framework, with documentation of activities undertaken in each country to validate it; and
5. Clear, evidence-based conclusions and recommendations to be considered by the GAC.

The evaluation report will not exceed 80 pages, including the executive summary and appendices. Appendices will include the terms of reference, description of methodology, list of background materials.
used, list of people interviewed, PowerPoint presentations, and workshop materials.

At the conclusion of the evaluation, the GAC will examine the recommendations and issue a management response that will commit UNGEI to the stipulated actions, the results of which will be used to strengthen the partnership and enhance engagement of partners at all levels. The report will be a public document. It will be disseminated to all partners and all UNICEF country programmes that have a girls’ education component, and also be available on the UNGEI website.

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

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

The international lead evaluator must have experience in working cross-culturally in development, and demonstrated capacity in managing evaluation teams.
## Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

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

- What policies to promote girls’ education and gender equality were in place?
- What were the key capacity issues of the system with respect to policy change and decision-making?
- To what extent was there awareness at policy level of girls’ education and gender equality issues?
- What knowledge and information was available about girls’ education and gender equality? To what extent was this sufficient for decision-making?
- Were monitoring systems being used to inform decision-making around education policies, and around girls’ education and gender equality specifically?

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

1. What does the UNGEI partnership at the country level look like?
2. When was it established? Who is part of the partnership? What roles do different members play?
3. Does the partnership have a terms of reference?
4. Does it have an annual workplan? How is it drafted? How is it disseminated? What are the priorities/areas of focus of the plan?
5. How are partnership activities monitored?
6. Does the partnership have a communication strategy?
   - What overall policy changes have taken place in the education sector since the UNGEI partnership was established? What evidence is there that these are girl and gender sensitive?
   - What specific girl and gender-equity policy changes have taken place in the period since the UNGEI partnership was established?
   - Are future policy changes in the making that will have an impact on girls’ education and gender equality?
   - What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at country level provide in the policy context?
   - What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to the policy dialogue/reforms?
   - What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were ongoing and how did these influence the policy decisions?
   - What specific inputs were provided by others into policy dialogue and decision-making?

### Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global and country partnership relevant? Was the design appropriate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes; intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery.)</th>
<th>Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to making sector policies sensitive to girls’ education and gender equality?</th>
<th>Efficiency – How economically was UNGEI support translated into</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were the objectives of UNGEI support from the country partnership relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country? Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?</td>
<td>• Has education policy improved and become more strategic? &lt;br&gt;• Has knowledge and information about girls’ education and gender equality in education increased? &lt;br&gt;• Are policies being informed by this knowledge and information? &lt;br&gt;• Are national systems monitoring girls’ education and gender equality in education regularly resulting in evidence-based policy making? &lt;br&gt;• What was UNGEI’s contribution to each of the above?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transaction costs) relate to improvements in the sector policies and knowledge and information?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes: What has been the effect on the participation of girls in education?

What effect has UNGEI had on:

- Financial incentives targeted at reducing barriers to girls’ education
- Measures promoting safety for girls at school and travelling to school
- Measures against sexual harassment and violence
- Proportion of schools with separate toilets for boys and girls
- Number and quality of gender-responsive learning materials, curricula and teaching guides
- Number of teachers and school managers trained in gender equality
- Programmes supporting girls’ re-entry to school after pregnancy
- Publications promoting good practices in girls’ education and gender equality
- Availability of primary education and movement towards the UPC target
- Positive effects on access and equity and in addressing key cross-cutting issues
- Positive effects on learning outcomes
- Sustainability of primary-education provision and its quality

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

- How durable are the improvements?
- What are the main risks to sustainability?

### Outcome 2: Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality known and institutionalized

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

- What was known about girls’ education and gender prior to the UNGEI partnership? What were the best practices at the time?
- Were best practices being identified and documented? In what areas?
- Were best practices being used to inform design of programmes and interventions?
- Were best practices being used to inform decision-making around policies?

**Inputs:** What did the UNGEI partnership do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What other inputs and processes took place throughout the same period?
### Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

**What inputs were provided?**
- What key inputs (information, knowledge sharing, technical support, advocacy, etc.) did the UNGEI partnership at country level provide in facilitating best practices?
- What key inputs did the UNGEI partnership globally provide to the identification and dissemination of best practices? How widely are these known?
- What other (non-UNGEI) processes and inputs were ongoing? How did these influence the policy decisions and priority setting?

**What changed?**
- What are key best practices in girls’ education and gender equality are in evidence today in the country? (e.g., financial incentives, measures promoting safety in schools, gender-responsive learning materials, etc.)
- What progress has been made in documenting and disseminating best practices in girls’ education and gender equality? Which audiences are being targeted?
- To what extent are best practices being used to inform decision-making around policies and programming? What specific best practices have been most influential in informing policies/priority setting?

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

Are policies and programmes being informed by knowledge and information on best practices, such as those related to:
- Financial incentives targeted at reducing barriers to girls’ education
- Measures promoting safety for girls at school and travelling to school
- Measures against sexual harassment and violence
- Separate toilets for boys and girls
- Use of gender-responsive learning materials, curricula and teaching guides
- Training of teachers and school managers in gender equality
- Programmes supporting girls’ re-entry to school after pregnancy

### Relevance – Were the objectives of UNGEI’s support from the global, regional and country partnership relevant? Was the design appropriate?

### Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes in terms of effectiveness and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes; intermediate outcomes refer to changes in the use of best practices.)

#### Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to dissemination and institutionalization of best practices in girls’ education and gender equality?

- Are best practices being identified?
- Are best practices being documented and disseminated?
- Has knowledge and information about best practices in girls’ education and gender equality in education increased?
- What was UNGEI’s contribution from country, regional and global levels to each of the above?

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

- How does the volume of UNGEI inputs (time, transaction costs) relate to the outcomes in terms of the use of best practices in policy and programming?

### Sustainability: Are the changes that took place in terms of knowledge and institutionalization of best practices likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?
### Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality
- How durable are the improvements?
- What are the main risks to sustainability?

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

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

- Were there coordination efforts around girls’ education and gender equality at the country level? How did this function? How effective was it?
- Was coordination around girls’ education and gender equality at the country level taking place in the context of other more general education groups? How did this function? How effective was it?
- Were the main capacity constraints with respect to girls’ education and gender equality? Were there any systems/efforts in place to address these?

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

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

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

What effect has UNGEI had on:
- The number of member organizations that are engaged in UNGEI’s activities?
- The degree of satisfaction of member organizations?

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

**Sustainability:** Are the changes that took in terms of knowledge and institutionalization of best practices likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?
### Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

- How durable are the improvements?
- What are the main risks to sustainability?
Annex 3 – Logic model for UNGEI

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

Goal: UNGEI contributes to the achievement of the Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDG) for gender equality and girls’ education through a strong partnership at the global, regional and country levels

Outcome 1: Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

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

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

Results

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

Criteria for M&E Outcome 1:
- Number of UNGEI countries with national policy frameworks that support GE
- Budgets allocated to girls’ education

Criteria for M&E Outcome 2:
- Policy change delivered by UNGEI advocacy efforts at national, regional and international levels
- Knowledge and information about girls’ education and gender equality in education strengthened by UNGEI-related communication
- National systems monitor girls’ education and gender equality in education regularly and support evidence-based policymaking
- Good practices are documented and disseminated by UNGEI

Criteria for M&E Outcome 3:
- Development efforts targeting girls’ education and gender equality are coordinated and enhanced
- Participation of member organizations actively engaging in UNGEI activities
- Degree of satisfaction of member organizations
Annex 4 – Stakeholder maps
Annex 5 – Interview guide global level

Questions on personal involvement:

1. What has been the nature of your involvement with UNGEI?

Questions on overall context:

2. What are, in your opinion, key challenges to gender and equality in education?
3. What have been the biggest achievements in the field to date?
4. What important challenges remain? Why have these been difficult to address?
5. What role can UNGEI play in addressing these challenges?

Questions on the mandate and achievements UNGEI:

6. What have, in your opinion, been the main achievements of UNGEI?
7. Where has the contribution been weakest?
8. Technical outputs and capacity development
9. Policy dialogue and advocacy
10. Coordination and alignment with the aid architecture
11. What are the reasons for these weaknesses and how can they be addressed?
12. Specifically on knowledge, policies and practices, how successful has UNGEI been/what efforts has UNGEI made to facilitate access to these? How successful has it been?
13. How do results get monitored and measured at the global level?
14. What lessons can be drawn from UNGEI’s achievements so far?

Questions on the functioning of UNGEI:

15. How effective has the global/regional coordination mechanism of UNGEI been?
16. UNGEI Secretariat
17. GAC
18. Working Groups
19. Regional Focal Points
20. What have been the challenges?
21. What changes could make the functioning more effective?
22. How effective has the governance of UNGEI been?

Questions on the future of UNGEI:

23. How do you see UNGEI evolving in the future?
24. What recommendations do you have for improving UNGEI’s effectiveness?
25. Do you have any other observations or comments you would like to add?
## Annex 6 – Detailed schedule and workplan for the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Output/Tasks</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Undertake initial document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Workshop preparation, including development of selected draft evaluation tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Facilitate consultation workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Complete documentation review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Conduct initial set of interviews by phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Drafting of inception report incl. desk review findings, evaluation tools and workplan, and outline of overall report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Presentation of inception report at country and global level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Prepare workshop report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Liaise with national and regional consultants on field work planning and logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Pilot country study conducted and lessons learned for other studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Review and comment on data collection tools for country and regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Provide support to preparation of country and regional inception reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Nigeria country study primary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Egypt country study primary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Nepal country study primary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Regional level primary data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Provide overall support and supervision to the country and regional data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Conduct supervisory visits to two field work countries, as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Provide support to and regional data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Carry out data collection at global level (interviews, survey, additional docs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Review/comment on emerging findings from country and regional study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Workshop for Consultants to discuss findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Mapping of UNGEI in 40 countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Provide periodic updates to Evaluation Specialist/Reference Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Oversee the timely drafting of the country and regional reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Facilitate dissemination workshop on initial evaluation results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Provide feedback to country and regional reports to ensure consistency &amp; quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Ensure draft reports are circulated for comments from relevant stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Prepare the evaluation synthesis report based on country and regional findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Share preliminary findings of overall analysis with ref. group and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Final country and regional reports are available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Conduct debriefing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Finalize synthesis report based on comments received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase 1: Documentary review, workshop and inception report

1.1 Undertake initial document review
1.2 Workshop preparation, including development of selected draft evaluation tools
1.3 Facilitate consultation workshop
1.4 Complete documentation review
1.5 Conduct initial set of interviews by phone
1.6 Drafting of inception report incl. desk review findings, evaluation tools and workplan, and outline of overall report
1.7 Presentation of inception report at country and global level
1.8 Prepare workshop report

### Phase 2: Field work and global data collection

2.1 Liaise with national and regional consultants on field work planning and logistics
2.2 Pilot country study conducted and lessons learned for other studies
2.3 Review and comment on data collection tools for country and regional level
2.4 Provide support to preparation of country and regional inception reports
2.5 Nigeria country study primary data collection
2.6 Egypt country study primary data collection
2.7 Nepal country study primary data collection
2.8 Regional level primary data collection
2.9 Provide overall support and supervision to the country and regional data
2.10 Conduct supervisory visits to two field work countries, as required
2.11 Provide support to regional data collection
2.12 Carry out data collection at global level (interviews, survey, additional docs)
2.13 Review/comment on emerging findings from country and regional study
2.14 Workshop for Consultants to discuss findings
2.15 Mapping of UNGEI in 40 countries
2.16 Provide periodic updates to Evaluation Specialist/Reference Group

### Phase 3: Report drafting and finalization

3.1 Oversee the timely drafting of the country and regional reports
3.2 Facilitate dissemination workshop on initial evaluation results
3.3 Provide feedback to country and regional reports to ensure consistency & quality
3.4 Ensure draft reports are circulated for comments from relevant stakeholders
3.5 Prepare the evaluation synthesis report based on country and regional findings
3.6 Share preliminary findings of overall analysis with ref. group and Evaluation
3.7 Final country and regional reports are available
3.8 Conduct debriefing
3.9 Finalize synthesis report based on comments received
## Phase 1: Documentary review, workshop and inception report

1.1 Undertake initial document review
1.2 Workshop preparation, including development of selected draft evaluation tools
1.3 Facilitate consultation workshop
1.4 Complete documentation review
1.5 Conduct initial set of interviews by phone
1.6 Drafting of inception report incl. desk review findings, evaluation tools and workplan, and outline of overall report
1.7 Presentation of inception report at country and global level
1.8 Prepare workshop report

## Phase 2: Field work and global data collection

2.1 Liaise with national and regional consultants on field work planning and logistics
2.2 Pilot country study conducted and lessons learned for other studies
2.3 Review and comment on data collection tools for country and regional level
2.4 Provide support to preparation of country and regional inception reports
2.5 Nigeria country study primary data collection
2.6 Egypt country study primary data collection
2.7 Nepal country study primary data collection
2.8 Regional level primary data collection
2.9 Provide overall support and supervision to the country and regional data
2.10 Conduct supervisory visits to two field work countries, as required
2.11 Provide support to and regional data collection
2.12 Carry out data collection at global level (interviews, survey, additional docs)
2.13 Review/comment on emerging findings from country and regional study
2.14 Workshop for Consultants to discuss findings
2.15 Mapping of UNGEI in 40 countries
2.16 Provide periodic updates to Evaluation Specialist/Reference Group

## Phase 3: Report drafting and finalization

3.1 Oversee the timely drafting of the country and regional reports
3.2 Facilitate dissemination workshop on initial evaluation results
3.3 Provide feedback to country and regional reports to ensure consistency & quality
3.4 Ensure draft reports are circulated for comments from relevant stakeholders
3.5 Prepare the evaluation synthesis report based on country and regional findings
3.6 Share preliminary findings of overall analysis with ref. group and Evaluation
3.7 Final country and regional reports are available
3.8 Conduct debriefing
3.9 Finalize synthesis report based on comments received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Output/Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Undertake initial document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Workshop preparation, including development of selected draft evaluation tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Facilitate consultation workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Complete documentation review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Conduct initial set of interviews by phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Drafting of inception report incl. desk review findings, evaluation tools and workplan, and outline of overall report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Presentation of inception report at country and global level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Prepare workshop report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Liaise with national and regional consultants on field work planning and logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Pilot country study conducted and lessons learned for other studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Review and comment on data collection tools for country and regional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Provide support to preparation of country and regional inception reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Nigeria country study primary data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Egypt country study primary data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Nepal country study primary data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Regional level primary data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Provide overall support and supervision to the country and regional data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Conduct supervisory visits to two field work countries, as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Provide support to and regional data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Carry out data collection at global level (interviews, survey, additional docs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Review/comment on emerging findings from country and regional study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Workshop for Consultants to discuss findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Mapping of UNGEI in 40 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Provide periodic updates to Evaluation Specialist/Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Oversee the timely drafting of the country and regional reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Facilitate dissemination workshop on initial evaluation results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Provide feedback to country and regional reports to ensure consistency &amp; quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Ensure draft reports are circulated for comments from relevant stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Prepare the evaluation synthesis report based on country and regional findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Share preliminary findings of overall analysis with ref. group and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Final country and regional reports are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Conduct debriefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Finalize synthesis report based on comments received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 7 – Persons interviewed for the Global Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function/organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide Sosseh</td>
<td>Chairperson, Gambia EFA Coalition, ANCEFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aster Haregot</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Heen</td>
<td>Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Gregory Faye</td>
<td>Head of UNGEI Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Bellamy</td>
<td>Board Chair, EFA Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Lloyd</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wiking</td>
<td>Team Director, Knowledge, Education and ICT, SIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Unterhalter</td>
<td>Professor, Institute of Education, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon F. Kapp</td>
<td>Director, DevInfo Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyotsna Jha</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khadijah Fancy</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oley Dibba-Wadda</td>
<td>Executive Director, FAWE Forum for African Women Educationists (FAWE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maki Hayashikawa</td>
<td>UNGEI Regional Focal Point, East Asia Pacific Regional Office (EAPRO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malin Elisson</td>
<td>Lead Policy Specialist Education, SIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Reuge</td>
<td>UNGEI Regional Focal Point, West and Central Africa (WCARO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitya Rao</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer, ASPBAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Fyles</td>
<td>Senior Adviser, Education, CIDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjan Kroon</td>
<td>Basic Education Expert, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Joy Pigozzi</td>
<td>Senior Vice President, AED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May A. Rihani</td>
<td>Senior Vice President and Director, Global Learning Group, AED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Prouty</td>
<td>Head of EFA Fast Track Initiative Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raka Rashid</td>
<td>UNGEI Regional Focal Point, South Asia (ROSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rima Salah</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Prouty</td>
<td>Head of EFA Fast Track Initiative Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Gear</td>
<td>DFID, Adviser, Gender &amp; Education Adviser, DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Barton</td>
<td>EFA Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Yeo</td>
<td>Communication Specialist, UNICEF New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Durston</td>
<td>UNICEF Associate Director of Education, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Hendriks</td>
<td>Global Gender Adviser, Plan International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanya Berrouet</td>
<td>Independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolande Tiendrebeogo</td>
<td>Programme Officer Education, and Country Focal Point for UNGEI, UNICEF, Burkina Faso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumiko Yokozeki</td>
<td>Regional Education Adviser, WCARO, Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malak Zaalouk</td>
<td>The American University in Cairo, Professor of Practice at the Graduate school School of education Education, The American University in Cairo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 8 – Country and regional mapping exercise questionnaire

Instructions:
- Kindly complete all of the questions that apply to your partnership.
- To write in the grey boxes, simply position the cursor on the box and start typing; the box will expand as you include more information.

Personal information:
Name:
Position:
Institution:
Country:

PART A – ACTIVE PARTNERSHIP

1 What is the status of the UNGEI or the ‘girls’ education’ partnership in your country/region? □ □ □
If ACTIVE, continue to answer questions 2 through 12 and don’t respond to Part B (p. 3).
If NON-ACTIVE, continue to Part B (p. 3) and start with question 13.

2 Tick all that applies about the identity of the partnership (tick all boxes that apply)
   a) The name of the partnership is UNGEI □
   b) The partnership has a different name, but goals are same/similar to UNGEI □
   c) The partnership has a different name; goals are significantly different from UNGEI □

3 What month and year was it established?

4 Who are the members of the partnership? (tick all boxes that apply)
   a) UNICEF □
   b) Other members of the United Nations family. How many? □

8. What have been the main areas of activity of the partnership to date? (You may use additional sheets of paper if necessary to answer this question.) □

9. Who have been the MAIN beneficiaries of the activities? (Tick all boxes that apply)
11. What are the main challenges facing the partnership?
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 

12. Finally, kindly submit the following documents separately (if available), and tick off which documents have been attached:
   a) A detailed list of partnership members and their affiliation
   b) A copy of the Partnership’s terms of reference
   c) Copies of the Partnership’s Annual Workplan(s)
   d) Other relevant reports about how the partnership has functioned

Many thanks again for your collaboration!

   c) Ministry of Education
   d) Other government ministries
   e) International non-governmental organizations (INGO)
   f) National NGOs
   g) Local and/or community-based organizations
   h) Private sector organizations
   i) Others organizations, please provide details:
   j) Individuals/champions, please provide details:

5 At what level is the partnership operational? (Tick all boxes that apply)
   a) National
   b) Sub-national (region, province, district, Woreda, etc.)
   a) Local (city, town, village, community, etc.)

6 Are there formal terms of reference (TORs) for the partnership? 
   Yes  No

7 Is there an agreed Annual Workplan (AWP) for the partnership for 2011? 
   If yes, has it been shared with the UNGEI Secretariat (NY) or Regional Focal Point? 
   Yes  No

PART B – NON-ACTIVE PARTNERSHIP

Please only complete these questions if the UNGEI partnership is NO LONGER ACTIVE

13 Tick all that applies about the identity of the non-active partnership (Tick all boxes that apply)
   a) The name of the partnership was UNGEI
b) The partnership had a different name, but goals were same/similar to UNGEI

c) The partnership had a different name; goals were significantly different from UNGEI

14 What month and year did the partnership cease to be active?

15 Who were the members of the partnership? (tick all boxes that apply)
   a) UNICEF
   b) Other members of the United Nations family. How many?
   c) Ministry of Education
   d) Other government ministries
   e) International non-governmental organizations (INGO)
   f) National NGOs
   g) Local and/or community-based organizations
   h) Private sector organizations
   i) Others organizations, please provide details:
   j) Individuals/champions, please provide details:

16 At what level was the partnership operational? (Tick all boxes that apply)
   a) National
   b) Sub-national (region, province, district, Woreda, etc.)
   c) Local (city, town, village, community, etc.)

17 Did the partnership have formal terms of reference (TORs)?

18 Identify two main reasons why the partnership is no longer active. (Tick only two reasons)
   a) The goals of the partnership were no longer relevant to the country context
   b) The goals of the partnership were no longer relevant to mandates of partners
   c) There was too much disagreement about the agenda of the partnership
   d) The most active people from different organizations moved on to other jobs
   e) Other, (please provide details):

 Many thanks again for your collaboration!
Annex 9 – Activities by country as reported in the mapping survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy/strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination/best practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy/sensitization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building/teacher training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/training/workshops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-level activities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support/grants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth registration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender budgeting/mainstreaming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 10 – Timeline of key events in girls’ education and gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General developments on international arena in development aid and education</th>
<th>Gender events</th>
<th>UNGEI-specific events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>In March 1990, the World Conference on Education for All, in Jomtien, Thailand, adopts the World Declaration on Education for All, which states that all have a right to education. The conference recognizes the setbacks experienced in the 1980s by many countries in the South and makes a commitment to meeting the basic learning needs of every citizen.</td>
<td>African Girls’ Education Initiative (AGEI) established with substantial funding from Norway, expanded to 34 countries throughout the course of the 1990s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td><strong>Education For All (EFA) Assessment 1999–2000</strong>, involving six regional conferences, reveals that the EFA agenda has been neglected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td><strong>United Nations Millennium Summit in 2000</strong>: 189 world leaders sign up to try to end poverty by 2015 when they agree to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The MDGs recognize the centrality of gender equality as a goal in itself (Goal 3) as well as the importance of the gender dimensions of each of the other goals. <strong>World Education Forum</strong>: 164 governments adopt the Dakar Framework for Action, in which they promise to commit the necessary resources and effort to create a comprehensive and inclusive education system for all.</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325 is the first resolution specifically addressing the impacts of conflict on women and girls. It calls upon all parties to armed conflict to respect provisions in international law as it applies to women and girls, to respect the civilian and humanitarian charter of refugee camps and to take special measures to protect women and girls from gender-based violence and other forms of violence. It calls upon States to put an end to impunity for those responsible for committing sexual violence against women and girls and to integrate the particular needs of women and girls into the design of refugee camps.</td>
<td>UNGEI is launched in Dakar, Senegal, by the United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. The mandate of UNGEI is to narrow the gender gap in primary and secondary education by 2005 and to ensure that, by 2015, all children are able to complete primary schooling, with equal access to all levels of education for girls and boys. Establishment of the UNGEI Secretariat with UNICEF Senior Advisers at headquarters covering UNGEI in addition to other assignments (the advisers included Mary Joy Pigozzi, Elaine Furniss and Ellen van Kalmthout).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td><strong>UNGASS issues a Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS</strong> that includes important language on addressing the gender dimensions of the pandemic. “Stressing that gender equality and the empowerment of women are fundamental elements in the reduction of the vulnerability of women and girls to HIV/AIDS.”</td>
<td>The Girls’ Education Movement (GEM) is launched in Kampala, Uganda in August 2001.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments on international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>The G8 in Washington, D.C., approves the EFA Action Plan and the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) amid overwhelming support from the international community. Developing countries and their external partners agree at a Dutch-World Bank sponsored conference on Education for All (EFA) in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, April 2002, to broad principles for scaling up EFA efforts; the Netherlands commits €135 million to set the process in motion. Agreement to significantly increase bilateral assistance for the achievement of EFA and to work with bilateral and multilateral agencies to ensure implementation of the FTI is reached at the G8 summit in Kananaskis, Canada, June 2002: EFA Global Monitoring Report established to monitor progress towards the six EFA goals. The International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, Mexico is the first major attempt by the United Nations and the international community to integrate trade, monetary and financial matters into a consolidated framework for achieving development results.</td>
<td>Two optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) – ratified by 120 states – enter into force in 2002. The first restricts the involvement of children in military conflicts, and the second prohibits the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. Both of these protocols are extremely important for advancing the protection of girls from exploitation and abuse.</td>
<td>The regional UNGEI partnership for East Asia and the Pacific is launched in May 2002.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>In February 2003, with the Rome Declaration on the harmonization of aid, the development community commits to work towards aligning its assistance around country development priorities and to harmonize donor policies and priorities around country systems. FTI Donors Meeting – Paris, March 2003: Donors agree on modus operandi for the FTI that is country-driven, secure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments on international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>funding for the seven countries, and agree on an operating framework for the FTI. The FTI Catalytic Fund is established; it aims to provide transitional grants over a maximum of 2–3 years to enable countries lacking resources at country level but with FTI-endorsed education-sector plans to scale up the implementation of their plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The UNGEI Global Advisory Committee (GAC) is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>The Education Programme Development Fund is established in November 2004 as a funding window under the FTI to support low-income countries in improving the quality and sustainability of their education-sector planning and programme development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI formally adopts a two-pronged strategy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Expanding its network at the global and regional levels by opening membership to a wider range of organizations; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Making concerted efforts for more formal platforms at the national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Regional focal points (RFPs) are put in place in four UNICEF regional offices (WCA, ESA, SA and EAP). An informal arrangement was put in place with MENA, which opted not to establish an RFP post but rather have the Regional Education Adviser cover UNGEI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>In March 2005, the Paris Declaration is endorsed by more than 100 ministers, heads of agencies and other senior officials, who commit their countries and organizations to continue to increase efforts in the harmonization, alignment and management of aid for results with a set of actions and indicators that can be monitored.</td>
<td></td>
<td>UNGEI undertakes a study on gender and the EFA FTI, titled 'Integrating Gender into Education for All Fast Track Initiative Processes and National Education Plans'. The study assessed the gender responsiveness of FTI processes and education sector plans and formulated recommendations to strengthen processes, tools and partnership mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>United Nations World Summit New York, September 2005: Delegates accused of producing a 'watered-down' outcome document, which merely reiterates existing pledges. However, it referred to the centrality of gender equality to human security and human development and affirmed that achieving gender-equality goals depends on the full implementation of the Beijing Platform and its five-year review, and led to the adoption of additional targets and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>General developments on international arena in development aid and education</td>
<td>Gender events</td>
<td>UNGEI-specific events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child (41st session), Geneva, Switzerland.</td>
<td>UN Action is established as the coordination body that unites the work of 12 United Nations entities in the goal of ending sexual violence in conflict.</td>
<td>In April 2006, UNGEI is established in West and Central Africa at the regional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ECOSOC Resolution 2006/36</strong> calls for, “Mainstreaming a gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the United Nations system.”</td>
<td><strong>UNGEI is formally launched in Nigeria.</strong></td>
<td>UNGEI Secretariat gets a <strong>full-time Head</strong> (Sabah Knani).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child (45th Session), Keeping our Promises on Education, takes place in May 2007, Brussels, organized by the European Commission, the United Kingdom and the World Bank. The meeting seeks concrete proposals and commitments for action to deliver on the promise to give all the world’s children a full primary education by 2015.</td>
<td>The United Nations General Assembly adopts resolution 61/143, calling upon Member States and the United Nations system to intensify their efforts to eliminate all forms of violence against women.</td>
<td>UNGEI organizes a Regional UNGEI Gender in Education Round Table in July 2007 in Bangkok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cheryl Gregory Faye is appointed Head of the UNGEI Secretariat</strong>, replacing Sabah Knani.</td>
<td><strong>UNGEI GAC, the main policymaking body, formally adopts a Vision and Mission Statement</strong> to clarify its purpose and goals.</td>
<td><strong>UNGEI is formally launched in Nepal, although activities had been ongoing since 2004.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>September 2008, Accra summit on aid effectiveness:</strong> Donor countries agree to end the fragmentation of aid. Donors agree to donate half of aid directly to governments of low-income countries, rather than to individual projects. Donors also agree to coordinate aid better.</td>
<td><strong>UNGEI organizes its first regional meeting in Kathmandu, Nepal.</strong></td>
<td>UNGEI holds a global conference on ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality’ (E4) in Dakar, Senegal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Her Majesty Queen Rania Al-Abdullah of Jordan, becomes Honorary Global Chair of UNGEI.</strong></td>
<td><strong>UNGEI organizes its first regional meeting in Kathmandu, Nepal.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The first private sector member – CISCO – joins the</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2009 | <strong>A new United Nations entity for gender equality and the empowerment of women (UN-Women), is established with the mandate to:</strong> | <strong>UNGEI holds a global conference on ‘Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality’ (E4) in Dakar, Senegal.</strong> | <strong>The first private sector member – CISCO – joins the</strong> |
| 2010 | <strong>Support intergovernmental bodies in their formulation of policies, global standards and</strong> | <strong>The first private sector member – CISCO – joins the</strong> | <strong>The first private sector member – CISCO – joins the</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>General developments on international arena in development aid and education</th>
<th>Gender events</th>
<th>UNGEI-specific events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>norms.</td>
<td>GAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Help countries implement these standards, providing technical and financial support to those countries that request it, and to forge effective partnerships with civil society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hold the United Nations system accountable for its own commitments on gender equality, including regular monitoring of system-wide progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 11 – Suggestions to complement UNGEI’s framework for monitoring and evaluation

A – Outcomes

I – Outcomes as identified in the monitoring framework

1. The integration of gender equality issues is improved through effective advocacy at country, regional and global levels.
2. Improved coordination mechanisms are developed and used; duplication is significantly reduced.
3. Knowledge management and research is enhanced.
4. Partnership is strengthened to become a dynamic and efficient performance centre at the global level.

II – Other outcomes inferred from the terms of reference of UNGEI evaluation

5. Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are identified, shared and institutionalized.
6. Policy reforms promote girls’ education.

III – Suggestion of outcomes

1. Policies are promoting girls’ education and gender equality.
2. Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized.
3. UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

B – Outcomes, indicators and qualitative markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Policies are promoting girls’ education and gender equality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators and qualitative markers</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Existence of gender action plans</td>
<td>Ministry of Education: self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(multi-country, national or district level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Implementation of action plans included in manager’s performance targets</td>
<td>Ministry of Education: self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Percent of budget allocated to girls’ education in each country</td>
<td>Ministry of Education – statistics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF child info database;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNESCO Institute for Statistics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United Nations statistical division MDG reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Number of out-of-school girls in each country</td>
<td>Ministry of Education – statistics;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Primary completion rate by age and gender in each country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Laws or administrative rules promoting gender equality in education in each country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Perceptions of member organizations on opportunities and challenges for policy change in their country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### Indicators and qualitative markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Evidence of measures encouraging girls to go to school</td>
<td>Key informant interviews; School boards and Ministry of Education: self-assessment questionnaire; Focus group discussions with school management committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Evidence of measures for safe transportation to school</td>
<td>Key informant interviews; School boards and Ministry of Education: self-assessment questionnaire; Focus group discussions with girls and youth organizations; Focus group discussions with school management committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Existence of measures against sexual harassment and violence</td>
<td>Key informant interviews; School boards and Ministry of Education self-assessment questionnaire; Focus group discussions with girls and youth organizations; Focus group discussions with teachers and school administrators; Focus group discussions with school management committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Number of schools with separate toilets for boys and girls</td>
<td>School boards and Ministry of Education self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Number of new gender-responsive learning materials, curriculum and teaching guides</td>
<td>Ministry of Education self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Number of teachers and school managers trained in gender equality</td>
<td>Ministry of Education self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Number of girls re-admitted to school after pregnancy</td>
<td>School boards and Ministry of Education self-assessment questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Evidence of changes in schools related to gender equality</td>
<td>Key informant interviews; Focus group discussions with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators and qualitative markers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Number of member organizations actively engaged in UNGEI activities</td>
<td>UNGEI member organizations self-assessment questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Number of youth organizations involved</td>
<td>UNGEI member organizations self-assessment questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Degree of satisfaction of member organizations</td>
<td>UNGEI member organizations self-assessment questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Value of participating in UNGEI</td>
<td>UNGEI member organizations self-assessment questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C – Monitoring instruments and suggestions of questions

I – Data collection in each country

1. What is the per cent of national budget allocated to girls’ education?
2. What is the number of out-of-school girls (primary and secondary levels)?
3. What is the primary completion rate by age and gender?

II – Self-assessment questionnaire: Ministry of Education

1. What laws or administrative rules promote gender equality in education?
2. Is there a gender action plan (multi-country, national, district or schools board levels)?
3. Are there mechanisms in place to monitor the implementation of the gender action plan?
4. How many gender-responsive learning materials, curriculum and teaching guides have been produced in the past three years?
5. How many teachers and school managers have been trained in gender equality?

III – Self-assessment questionnaire: School boards and Ministry of Education
1. Are there any measures in place encouraging girls to go to school?
2. What measures are taken to ensure safety of girls on their way to school or back to their home?
3. What measures are taken to prevent sexual harassment and violence in school?
4. How many schools have separate toilets for boys and girls?
5. What is the number of girls re-admitted to school after pregnancy?

IV – Self-assessment questionnaire: UNGEI member organizations

1. What are the opportunities and challenges for policy change in promoting gender equality in education in your country?
2. On a scale on 1 to 10, 10 being the highest mark, how would you rate your degree of satisfaction in participating in UNGEI?
3. Why?
4. How does participating in UNGEI support your mandate and the achievements of your objectives?

V – Key informant interviews

1. Are there measures in place encouraging girls to go to school?
2. What measures are taken to ensure safety of girls on their way to school or back to their home?
3. What are the measures in place to prevent sexual harassment and violence in school?
4. What changes related to gender equality have you observed in school?
   - Student enrolment, attendance and survival
   - Student performance and completion
   - Classroom practices, attitudes of boys, of girls and of teachers
   - School leadership and management
   - Other?

V I – Focus group discussion with teachers and school administrators

1. What changes related to gender equality have you observed in school?
   - Student enrolment, attendance and survival
   - Student performance and completion
   - Classroom practices, attitudes of boys, of girls and of teachers
   - School leadership and management
   - Other?
2. What changes have you observed regarding your attitudes to gender equality in school?
3. What are the biggest problems faced by teachers in addressing gender equality issues in class and in school life?
4. What are the biggest problems faced by girls in their education and school life?
5. Are the members of staff sensitized to issues of sexual harassment and violence?
6. Are there any measures in place to regulate these issues: staff, boys and girls aware of complaints procedures, systems in place for confidentiality and protection of complainants and witnesses in place?

VII – Focus group discussion with school management committee

1. What problems do girls face in school?
2. What problems do they face regarding their education?
3. What measures should be taken to resolve these issues?
4. What positive changes did you observe in your school, regarding girls’ safety and equality between boys and girls?
5. Are there any measures in place to prevent sexual harassment?
6. Are there any measures in place to prevent violence?
7. Are there any measures in place to ensure girls’ safety while going to school or back home?
8. Are they any measures in place to entice and support poor families to send girls to school?
9. What measures should be put in place at the community and family level to support girls’ education?

VIII – Focus group discussion with girls and youth organizations

1. What problems do you face in school?
2. What problems do you face regarding your education?
3. What measures should be taken to resolve these issues?
4. What positive changes did you observe in your school, regarding your own safety and equality between boys and girls?
5. Are there any measures in place to prevent sexual harassment?
6. Are there any measures in place to prevent violence?
7. Are there any measures in place to ensure your safety while going to school or back home?
8. Do you have the time and the support that you need in order to devote your time to your education?
Annex 12 – Global Advisory Committee

1. African Network Campaign on Education for All (ANCEFA)
2. Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE)
3. Campaign for Female Education (Camfed)
4. Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)
5. Cisco
6. The Commonwealth Secretariat
7. Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE)
8. International Labour Organization (ILO)
9. Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad)
10. Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation (Sida)
11. United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
15. United Nations World Food Programme (WFP)
16. United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
17. The World Bank
18. World Vision International