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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEF</td>
<td>Civil Society Education Fund, also referred to in this report as the CSEF programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOZI</td>
<td>Education Coalition Of Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Expected Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOZI</td>
<td>Education Programme Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDH-IPN</td>
<td>The Forum on Education and Human Development of the Initiative for Nicaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMA or RFMA</td>
<td>Financial Management Agency (also known as Regional Financial Management Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>Global Campaign for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOC</td>
<td>Global Oversight Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPG</td>
<td>International Partners Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>Local Education Group (LEGs have different names in some countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFA</td>
<td>Log Frame Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LME</td>
<td>Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOU</strong></td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEC</strong></td>
<td>National Education Coalition – see above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEP</strong></td>
<td>National Education Partnership (Cambodia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCSEF</strong></td>
<td>National Civil Society Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGO</strong></td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OECD DAC</strong></td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OSISA</strong></td>
<td>Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCA</strong></td>
<td>Risk and Control Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFC</strong></td>
<td>Regional Funding Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RS</strong></td>
<td>Regional Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SE</strong></td>
<td>Supervising Entity (UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VAEFA</strong></td>
<td>Vietnam Association for Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DESCRIPTION OF CSEF

The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a global initiative to secure more international support to sustain civil society advocacy for education. Coordinated by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) and through regional agencies, CSEF supports civil society coalitions to engage citizens in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

CSEF has established four objectives:

- **Objective 1 – Policy Participation:** Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized.
- **Objective 2 – Public awareness and coalition-building:** National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate.
- **Objective 3 – Quality research, monitoring and analysis:** Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals.
- **Objective 4 – Cross-country learning and networks for change:** The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes.

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation was to support reflection on achieved effectiveness (and the challenges involved) of the approaches adopted in the CSEF programme and to provide evidence of the impact of CSEF’s work to support further access to funding and other forms of programme buy-in and support. The evaluation is both summative and formative, with a strong emphasis on drawing together lessons and recommendations to inform improvements and structural changes for the future of CSEF from 2016-2018. As such, the evaluation is intended both as an accountability tool and a learning opportunity.

The evaluation methodology was built around the five OECD DAC evaluation criteria: *relevance*, *efficiency*, *effectiveness*, *impact* and *sustainability*. The evaluation used three main sources of data: i) people; ii) documents, files, publications and relevant literature; and iii) observations during field work in the seven countries selected for case studies. The evaluation was carried out in four phases: inception and document review, fieldwork, surveys and analysis/reporting.
KEY FINDINGS

Relevance

There is alignment of programme design and objectives with the needs and priorities of national coalitions and their members and with the demands for reforms of systems of Education For All. Civil society participation, in the form of lobbying and organizing through effective coalitions, plays an important role in the education sector in countries. CSEF supports national education coalition capacity building and organisational development, contributing to the quality of their work and inclusion in policy making in the area of education. This is a strength of the programme, but it also creates a challenge to ensure that available resources are not spread too thinly. There are three specific aspects of an effective relationship with government that come up consistently in discussions about effective coalitions: Partnership – working with government and international organizations as an equal; Engagement – building a quality relationship that is not combative and that emphasizes objective information and shared priorities; and Professionalism – demonstrating the ability to represent coalition members, and at times represent with coalition members.

Effectiveness

Based on analysis of the CSEF results framework and data collected during the programme evaluation, the evaluation team articulated a conceptual theory of change to develop a better understanding of the causal linkages of how the programme objectives contribute to the desired change.

The CSEF programme has demonstrated a considerable level of effectiveness in strengthening civil society participation in education sector policy development, implementation and monitoring, and coalitions are increasingly recognized by their respective governments for their credibility, demonstrated capacity, and effectiveness in contributing to evidence-based advocacy. CSEF provides grants that are used to support increasing the evidence base generated by coalitions, strengthening their role as knowledgeable and valuable advisors and advocates to government. Through regional networks, CSEF offers additional regional knowledge sharing and stronger support for coalitions in their dealings with government. Finally, because of participation by coalition representatives in events organized within the networks of GCE and GPE, coalitions gain direct contacts, strengthened networks, and stronger support for their participation in decision-making on education policy. Coalitions differ in their strengths, profiles and levels of inclusion within the decision-making process.

Objective 1: Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized.

CSEF has been effective during the programme period in enabling engagement of civil society in education sector policy and review processes. Visibility and credibility are recognized by
Objective 2: National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate.

The role of coalitions as actors in policy-making processes, as well as the role of members of coalitions as contributors to the governance and unified voice of the coalition, has improved. Evidence collected during case study work demonstrates that the grants provided by the CSEF are effective in terms of strengthening the internal linkages and democratic governance of the coalitions and of the advocacy work they carry out. Coalitions are being demonstrably successful in ensuring that the voice of civil society is being heard, both with government and with the wider public.

Objective 3: Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals.

Supporting coalitions to undertake or to support research has been a key tool that has provided coalitions with a way to bring substantive contributions into the policy arena. For many coalitions, this process has become the cornerstone of their evidence-based advocacy approach, and many examples exist across CSEF of this approach and its outputs and outcomes, as is discussed in the seven case studies produced for this evaluation and in examples provided throughout this report. These inputs open the door to more substantial exchange with government counterparts and ensure more active participation in policy making.

Objective 4: The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes.

The CSEF programme has provided opportunities for coalitions to participate in learning processes, share systems, and to undertake joint strategizing and partner development. A number of the collaborative processes / tools used within CSEF have brought positive effects on the overall quality of the work, networking and sharing of coalitions. Efforts addressing cross-country shared learning approaches are recognized as important to development of knowledge and skills.

Efficiency

Global programme management comprises a team established under the supervision of the GCE in close consultation with UNESCO. The programme team is responsible for providing
expertise and ensuring efficiency in the operational management of the programme. The implementation approach is highly inclusive and culturally sensitive. The programme has focused on the strengthening of coalitions, with regional structures to provide the necessary technical and financial support and oversight. This approach underestimates the amount of work required at global and regional levels to provide the necessary support and capacity building. The CSEF Global Secretariat and Regional Secretariats are described in field interviews as ‘lean’ and ‘very lean’.

There are significant and on-going issues with the functioning of the grants programme, particularly in the lack of a timely implementation of the process of calling for proposals, approving proposals and funding grants. As a result of the grant process not happening in a timely fashion, and because of delays in the actual process of funding releases, grantee organisations (coalitions) often go months without funds, a situation that is inappropriate for the programme and that causes significant issues with grantees and national stakeholders.

Monitoring and reporting systems and requirements are complex, and while improvements are constantly being made, they are still inefficient. The structure of the programme creates an unnecessary complexity in monitoring and reporting requirements, systems and outputs. There is insufficient staffing within the GCE structure dedicated to the monitoring processes.

Analysis of perceptions of cost-effectiveness points to positive cost-effectiveness of the CSEF. There is a perception, widely held, that at the coalition level the programme is extremely cost effective, as coalitions have been able to emerge as strong campaigners and entities in their countries. The programme is seen as strengthening and as improving the quality of civil society engagement with government and international NGOs in national education sector policy and implementation, and in doing this in a wide geography with a relatively small budget and clearly small structures at the global and regional levels.

**Impact**

Coalitions are having a policy influence, finding ‘a seat at the table’ of policy discussions, monitoring processes and particularly in representing the views of civil society. As their skills, knowledge and abilities in advocacy and engagement grow, coalitions are becoming more sophisticated in their approaches to government and are finding ways to engage without losing their independence. Coalitions are also becoming skilled in using research for evidence-based advocacy. At the same time, engagement and networking of civil society at the regional and global level contributes to increasing credibility of the civil society sector in educational policies. There is a high likelihood that local advocacy and policy-making inputs of civil society will contribute to positive social impact on children, their families, youth, and adults in the programme target countries.
Sustainability

Sustainability is, and will remain a critical issue, but as coalitions become more established they gain the confidence of government, of other coalitions and of international partners. Sustainability, though, is not only about funding, but also the work of the coalition and its ability to manage effectively, to advocate effectively and to build a profile in civil society and with government and the wider society. CSEF has provided vital resources that allow coalitions to organize themselves and has provided core funding to support advocacy. These resources have helped to sustain coalitions and provide a platform for them to represent a diverse group of people and build trust with policy makers.

Gender and Human Rights Focus

Although there is no integrated framework within the programme for human rights and gender mainstreaming, there is some programmatic focus on human rights and gender equality. Human rights principles of universal access, non-discrimination, equality, inclusion, progressive realisation of human rights were embedded in the evidence based advocacy work supported by the CSEF and implemented by coalitions. The evidence gathered through the evaluation process showed evidence of a particularly important contribution to the implementation of the principle of progressive realisation of the rights of children and adult learners, which was also part of the monitoring of human rights principles in general. Gender equality is a thematic priority for GCE. Coalitions have strong input on putting this issue on the agenda of governments through research into education and the girl child and advocacy initiatives undertaken, including campaigns against violence. Parity in the gender composition of coalition structures is a CSEF priority, and this is acknowledged by coalitions who conscientiously work towards addressing gender equality institutionally.

RECOMMENDATIONS

CSEF Results Framework and Theory of Change

A well-designed theory of change will help illustrate the programme’s contribution to expected or unexpected results, and give insight into where the causal links may not hold true. Identification of areas of improvement based on causal factors allows for more efficient changes that ultimately lead to more effective programmes.

Strategic Programming (SP) Recommendations

SP1: Rethink And Realign The CSEF Structure To Better Integrate Its Two Key Functions

Programmatic Function

It is recommended that the programmatic function focus solely on activities which are delivered directly to coalitions and regional bodies, in the context of the intended aims of the
CSEF programme. These include all aspects of the development and capacity-building of national education coalitions and civil society organizations in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring.

**Grant-making Function**

It is recommended that GCE break out its CSEF grant-making function into a defined structure (unit or team, in line with the current set-up for monitoring and finance), with its own management, budget and performance indicators.

**SP2: Refine Learning Goals**

The programme’s approach to delivering on its stated learning goals has been inconsistent across the stated ten goals – i.e., strong outputs/outcomes are visible and/or are developing in relation to a number of the learning goals, but there are a number of areas where focus or implementation requires further strengthening. It is recommended that the number of goals be reduced.

**SP3: Assist Coalitions In Developing Longer Term Funding Strategies**

It is recommended that CSEF provide targeted support to national coalitions that will encourage development of partnerships with other donors/international agencies so their funding base and their longer-term prospects for sustainable funding are enhanced. It is important to put this approach clearly in the public arena, as a conscious, stated strategic policy, and to integrate this requirement in critical processes, from funding applications to reporting.

**SP4: Develop the Strategy for Gender Focus**

It is recommended that CSEF conduct an institutional gender assessment or gender audit. The assessment/audit would focus on all levels of the programme (global, regional, national), and based on this assessment develop a gender strategy, laying out a road map for gender integration both at the institutional and programming level.

**SP5: Enhance Use of Evidence-based Advocacy**

Research, and related evidence-based advocacy, is deemed a real programme strength. It is recommended that the programme develop a stronger focus on building the impact of this research and evidence-based advocacy.
Operational Recommendations

O1: Adjust Staffing for Management, Support and Oversight

It is recommended that additional financial staff and additional LME staff be assigned to relevant regional bodies. These staff would play a role, along with the Global Secretariat, in financial and programme monitoring, ensuring compliance and reporting from the regions.

O2: Adopt a Programme Management Information System

It is recommended that the programme establish and maintain a robust management information system at the GCE level that is able to collect, transmit, process, and store data and programmatic resources systematically at three different levels: national, regional and global. The system should be based on the programme result’s framework and should allow for online data reporting, automatic aggregation and analysis and simple accomplishment reporting by key programmatic indicators.

O3: Increase Cross-Country Communications And Shared Learning

It is recommended that the programme provide a particular focus on development of capacity for gathering, archiving and sharing of the experiences and learning from coalitions in the coming funded period. Emphasis is needed on research that contributes to content development as well as on the sharing of activities, methodologies and approaches.
THE GCE MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND (CSEF) PROGRAMME 2013-2015

The Global Campaign for Education (GCE) formally acknowledges and welcomes the report of the Independent Evaluation Team (IET) on the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) programme for the period 2013-2015 and its valuable contribution to future CSEF planning. GCE appreciates the hard work and open manner in which members of the IET engaged with respondents during the evaluation, and the team’s willingness to receive feedback before finalising the Report. The IET’s reflections and recommendations on the CSEF programme will prove very helpful in informing the implementation of the programme moving forward.

Findings

We are pleased to note that the IET Report lists numerous areas of progress and achievement in the CSEF programme for the period of 2013-2015 in relation to the OECD DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The programme’s relevance has been confirmed as strong, with the challenge to ensure that available resources are not spread too thinly.

The programme was also evaluated as effective in achieving its four objectives. The Report notes:

‘CSEF has demonstrated a considerable level of effectiveness in strengthening civil society participation in education sector policy development, implementation and monitoring, and coalitions are increasingly recognized by their respective governments for their credibility, demonstrated capacity, and effectiveness in contributing to evidence-based advocacy.’

In relation to efficiency, GCE notes the Report considers the programme at the coalition level to be cost effective given that it ‘operates in a wide geography with a relatively small budget and clearly small structures at the global and regional levels’. At the same time, the ‘leaness’ of the global and regional secretariats is presented as a challenge in relation to the work they need to undertake. GCE recognises this, and also acknowledges the challenges identified in ensuring the timely and efficient disbursal of funds, and the need to continue to strengthen monitoring and reporting systems, including by ensuring additional staffing for this work. Plans to address these challenges are being put into place in the next phase of the programme, as seen in the proposal for CSEF 2016-2018.

GCE is pleased to observe that the CSEF programme is assessed as making a noticeable impact in terms policy influence, monitoring processes and representing the views of civil society. GCE agrees that sustainability is an ongoing critical issue and that the funds provided through CSEF have significantly helped to sustain national coalitions.
Recommendations

Some of the IET Report’s recommendations are in accord with GCE’s own internal reflections and lessons among CSEF partners, and these will be taken into account and be fed into the current preparatory processes for the next phase of CSEF. The Report recognises that some of its recommendations are contingent on GCE and the coalitions accessing additional resources.

Strategic Programming Recommendations

CSEF Results Framework and Theory of Change

In preparation for the 2016-2018 proposal, and at the recommendation of the GPE Country Grants and Performance Committee (CGPC), GCE has already further developed and refined the CSEF results framework and theory of change and the revised results framework and theory of change address the observations provided under this recommendation in the IET’s Report.

CSEF Structure

Regarding the Report’s recommendation to rethink and realign the CSEF structure to better integrate its two key functions, GCE has made significant adjustments since the previous independent evaluation of CSEF to ensure a sound balance between the programmatic and grant making functions. The establishment of the Global Oversight Committee and the clear separation of functions at the regional level between programme coordination carried out by Regional Secretariats and financial and fiduciary grant distribution and control function carried out by the Regional Financial Management Agencies have resulted in significant improvements in governance and transparency. While ongoing monitoring of how these functions interact and complement each other will remain important, following reflection and discussion of the Global Secretariat and the Global Oversight Committee, GCE is not convinced that the present structural arrangement requires any further separation of these components.

Learning Goals

GCE notes the recommendation to strengthen its approach to delivering on its stated learning goals. In the 2016-2018 CSEF proposal GCE has ensured that learning outcomes are better integrated throughout the programme. The number of learning goals in the present CSEF (deemed as too high and therefore untenable) have not been maintained in the new CSEF programme, but have been integrated into the overall purpose, theory of change and results framework of the programme.
Assist Coalitions in Developing Longer Term Funding Strategies

GCE recognises the ongoing need to explore long term funding strategies to assist coalitions in securing further resources. However the Report does not give sufficient acknowledgement to the work that GCE and its partners have already done in this area, nor does it sufficiently recognise the difficulty in the current global and national financial environments of finding secure, reliable long term resources for national coalitions. Many of the likely potential donors already contribute to GPE.

The Report also does not give due credit to the immense value, efficiency and effectiveness of the current global model of funding from the GPE as a bedrock and springboard to enable coalitions to mobilize supplementary resources moving forward. Nonetheless GCE will continue to work with its regional partners and coalitions to ensure that they develop and diversify their partnerships with donors and international agencies and explore additional funding opportunities. We note that this is something that CGPC is keen to track and we will ensure that we continue to collect data on this.

Develop the Gender Focus Strategy

The Report acknowledges that ‘gender equality is a thematic priority for GCE’, that ‘parity in the gender composition of coalition structures is a CSEF priority’, and that coalitions ‘conscientiously work towards addressing gender equality institutionally’. GCE and its regional partners have a deep commitment to and long experience in mainstreaming gender equality into its programmes and structures, as well as advocacy on gender equality, and will consider the recommendation that CSEF (subject to funding being secured for this) conduct an institutional gender assessment or gender audit provided that funding for this action can be secured.

Enhance Use of Evidence-based Advocacy

The Report identifies research, and related evidence-based advocacy, as a ‘real programme strength’ of CSEF. GCE is conscious of the ongoing need to build the impact of this research and evidence-based advocacy, and notes the Report’s recommendation to continue doing so. We welcome and take on board the recommendation to scale up the emphasis on quality of research, which has been incorporated as a key element in the objectives and results framework of the next phase of CSEF, and to further explore collaboration with universities.

Operational Recommendations

Adjust Staffing for Management, Support and Oversight

GCE recognises the importance of ensuring sufficient financial staff and additional LME staff and the 2016-2018 proposal envisages significant increases in capacity. Past funding constraints
limited the possibilities for additional resources at the regional level. GCE reiterates the recommendations made in the CARDNO\textsuperscript{1} report supporting GCE’s readiness to take on the role of Managing Entity and its strategies for strengthening its management, support and oversight capacities. All recommendations from the CARDNO report 2014 and a later Grant Level Assessment Report (April 2015) have been addressed and factored into the 2016-18 proposal.

**Adopt a Programme Management Information System**

GCE agrees with, and has already developed, plans to improve its CSEF Management Information System based on the programme’s revised result’s framework for 2016-18. We are also exploring the development of an online data capturing, analysis and reporting mechanism for the 2016-2018 CSEF phase.

**Increase Cross-Country Communications and Shared Learning**

GCE agrees with the Report’s recommendation to further develop the programme’s capacity for gathering, archiving and sharing the experiences and learning from coalitions in the coming funded period.

GCE once again would like to thank the Independent Evaluation Team for its work and its final Report, as a valuable contribution to future CSEF programme planning. We will look to incorporate many of the Report’s findings into the CSEF programme for the next phase.

Sincerely,

Monique Fouilhoux
GCE Chairperson

---

\textsuperscript{1} CARDNO emerging markets was contracted by GPE to do a Quality Assessment of the systems and structures of GCE and recommended a number of improvements to the finance and administration. Institutional Capacity Assessment 30 September 2014.
INTRODUCTION

In April 2015, following a competitive selection process, the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) contracted Institute for Development Impact (I4DI) to conduct the evaluation of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) programme 2013-2015. A draft version of this report has been revised based on feedback from the Evaluation Reference Group. This final evaluation report summarizes key evaluation findings, conclusions, and forward-looking recommendations derived from the evaluation.

1.1 Background of the CSEF Programme

In 2009, GCE conceived CSEF as a major global civil society initiative to secure more international support to sustain civil society advocacy for education. In total US$14.5 million was made available for the 2009-2011 period by Fast Track Initiative’s (FTI - now the Global Partnership for Education - GPE) Education Programme Development Fund (EPDF) Committee to ‘provide support to the core work of National Education Coalitions —so that they can fully engage in the development of education sector programmes with government and donors, and track the progress of national governments and local donor groups working towards the Education For All (EFA) goals’. Further AU$5 million was thereafter provided by the Australian government for 2012, before the current phase of CSEF (2013-2015) was set up through a grant of US$19.5 million from GPE.

1.2 The Global Partnership for Education (GPE)

The following information is found at the website of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE):

‘The Global Partnership for Education is the only multilateral partnership devoted to getting all [these] children into school for a quality education.

Established in 2002, the Global Partnership for Education is comprised of 60 developing countries, donor governments, international organizations, the private sector, teachers, and civil society/NGO groups.

Our partnership has fundamentally transformed international cooperation in education.

We help our developing country partners develop and implement sound education plans. Members of the Partnership mobilize and coordinate resources to support the achievement of the plans’ goals to enrol more children in school for a better education.

By promoting dialogue among our partners around shared objectives, we foster mutual accountability, increase our shared knowledge about best practices, and encourage transparency at all levels. Our support strengthens the growth of the entire education system in developing countries while ensuring that external education funding is tracked and coordinated.’
Further information can be found at the GPE website: http://www.globalpartnership.org/about-GPE.

1.3 The Global Campaign for Education (GCE)

The following information is found at the website of the Global Campaign for Education:

‘The Global Campaign for Education (GCE) is a civil society movement that aims to end the global education crisis. Education is a basic human right, and our mission is to make sure that governments act now to deliver the right of everyone to a free, quality, public education.

Our membership is comprised of a huge variety of national, regional and international civil society organizations, teachers’ unions and child rights campaigners. Together, we hold governments to account for their promises repeatedly made to provide Education for All.

Nationally, there are over 80 education coalitions which have their own memberships comprised of teachers’ unions, NGOs and other civil society organizations committed to education.

These national coalitions work to effect positive change in their education systems, monitor commitments made by their governments and represent their countries on the international political stage.

GCE was established in 1999 and delivered a united civil society voice during the World Education Forum in Dakar in 2000, influencing the six Education for All goals. Since then GCE has continued to grow and some important progress has been made, including 40 million more children in school. However, far more still needs to be done to realise the right to quality education for all. Close to a billion people right now are being denied the education that would change their lives. GCE campaigns throughout the year, mobilising pressure from all sectors and holding governments and international institutions to account.’

Further information can be found at the GCE website: http://www.campaignforeducation.org/en/.

1.4 The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) ²

In 2009, the Global Partnership for Education agreed to support the Global Campaign for Education to scale up support to national civil society education coalitions in GPE-eligible countries. The Civil Society Education Fund was born.

From 2009 to 2011 the Global Partnership for Education provided $17.6 million to the CSEF, coordinated by the GCE at the global level.

Three regional CSEFs were set up in Latin America, Africa, and Asia Pacific to provide grants to national education coalitions with action plans aligned to the objectives and goals of the CSEF.

National education coalitions in 45 countries received grants from the regional CSEFs: 28 in Africa, 4 in Latin America, and 13 in Asia Pacific. Additionally, the GCE provided a capacity support programme through the CSEF aimed at building the capacities of national education coalitions to perform as effective partners at the national level.

For the period 2013-2014, the GPE Board approved an allocation of $14.5 million to the CSEF programme.

The following information is found at the website of the Civil Society Education Fund:

‘The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a unique and ambitious global programme that supports citizen engagement in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring. It is founded on a shared understanding among key stakeholders that strong, broad-based and locally-driven civil society participation in these processes is crucial to delivering on Education For All and other national and international education goals.

CSEF was set up by the Global Campaign for Education in 2009 to support the core work of national education coalitions so that civil society can fully engage with and track the progress of national governments and donor groups working towards the EFA goals. The CSEF programme was developed and is managed by the Global Campaign for Education, in close collaboration with regional implementing partners. Coordinated through regional agencies that provide programmatic support to coalitions, CSEF works with the following networks in these regions:

- Arab Coalition for Education for All (ACEA).
- Africa Network Campaign For Education For All (ANCEFA).
- Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE).

In addition three Financial Management Agencies (FMAs) are responsible for fund management and technical capacity building:

- Oxfam GB West Africa (for CSEF Africa).
- ActionAid Americas (for CSEF Latin America and the Caribbean).
- Education International (for CSEF Asia and the Pacific).

In addition, the GCE Secretariat acts as an interim FMA for the Middle East, North Africa and Europe region.

GCE and its partners believe civil society has a distinct and crucial role to play to hold governments and donors accountable, and ensure relevance and equity within education
plans, programmes and budgets. This requires broad-based and informed participation of citizens, and this participation is dependent on effective and coordinated civil society formations to facilitate engagement. CSEF therefore focuses its support on national civil society coalitions, with nationally driven agendas. Since its initiation CSEF has supported 54 national civil society education coalitions across Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

The CSEF is primarily funded by the Global Partnership for Education, a multilateral partnership devoted to getting all children in the world’s poorest countries into school and learning by bringing together partners to help developing countries access critical technical and financial resources, and global and local expertise, to achieve their education goals. Complementary funding for CSEF has also been provided by the Australian government, the ‘German BACKUP Initiative – Education in Africa’, and through AECID support for non-GPE partner countries in Latin America, managed directly by CLADE. CSEF is currently supervised by UNESCO.\(^3\)

In the ‘CSEF Programme Document 2013-2014 Final’, the following is referred to as the CSEF organizational structure, and further information can be found at the CSEF website: http://www.campaignforeducation.org/en/civil-society-education-fund.

Figure 1. CSEF Organizational structure

### 1.5 Implementation of the CSEF Programme

In accordance with the Terms of Reference for this evaluation: “The CSEF 2013-2015 phase is funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) through a grant of US$14.5 million, and UNESCO fulfils the role of Supervising Entity and hence holds overall accountability to

\(^3\) http://www.campaignforeducation.org/en/civil-society-education-fund
the GPE for the CSEF grant. In keeping with the planned phased programme approach, the 2013-2015 phase of the programme commenced in April 2013 with a three-months planning period, implementation from July 2013 and, following an agreed no-cost extension period, national coalition activities will be implemented until the end of December 2015.

A previous phase of CSEF (2009-2012) was implemented by the Global Campaign for Education and partners, and funded through the Fast Track Initiative Education Programme Development Fund (FTI EPDF). During 2012, bridge funding for continuation of CSEF activities was provided by AusAid, while the initial phase of CSEF was evaluated, and a further funding proposal for the present programme cycle was prepared. The evaluation report for the initial phase is available for review” ⁴ (see section 10 for a list of relevant documents).

As mentioned, the first phase was the object of a final evaluation, and a series of recommendations were made. These recommendations were focused on:

- **Strategy**—Align global and national strategies, strengthen a bottom-up approach within the GCE, promote regional advocacy, strengthen programme management structure, open CSEF opportunities to non-GPE members, and expand the funding cycle to allow for predictability, better planning and institutional learning.
- **National funds**—The NCSEF has the potential to promote the adoption and development of more sustainable advocacy strategies in the context of NECs. However, NCSEF should be independent and separate from the NECs, to avoid coalitions becoming fund managers and allow for a mechanism that successfully supports civil society and meets the challenges of resource mobilization.
- **Institutional Setting**—Create new bodies and committees, as well as roles and functions, within the CSEF architecture. Simplify the monitoring and evaluation (LME) system and incorporate internal learning and external reporting.
- **Human resources management**—Strengthen Human Resource (HR) planning, address turnover, and include organizational assessment and technical assistance in grant management.
- **Gender approach**—Adopt a systematic gender-mainstreaming approach.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation**—Utilize more flexible LME tools to promote internal learning, develop an LME platform linked to financial management, plan LME solutions in advance to overcome accountability issues, and provide more intensive training in procedures, implementation, and transparency in reporting.
- **Learning**—Link knowledge acquisition to LME, and link LME to external and internal learning.
- **Supervising entity and the role of the GPE**—Find a new supervising entity to relieve GPE and assist with programme development and grant difficulties or delays.

---

⁴ Independent Evaluation of the Civil Society Education Fund Programme 2013-2015 - Terms of Reference (ToR) (reissue - Final 16/01/15)
• **Processes at the country level**—Support the strategies of coalitions instead of requiring coalitions to design to CSEF requirements, take steps to increase sustainability of National Education Coalitions, strengthen research capacity, encourage and empower coalitions to engage in education policy debates, and engage in debates of alternative forms of education funding.

In its 2013-2014 proposal, GCE / CSEF addressed many of the evaluation’s recommendations. ‘[It] used the evaluation findings for reflection and adaptation at the national, regional, and global level […] implementing changes to management structures and project performance system.’ Within this framework, the following bodies were created or revived and a new governance structure was put in place for this second phase:

- UNESCO as new Supervisory Entity
- Global Oversight Committee
- Regional Financial Management Agencies
- Regional Funding Committees
- International Advisory Group (subsequently changed to International Partners Group).

In addition, the new CSEF programme proposed to ‘enhance focus on communications, learning and knowledge sharing in CSEF’.

Following GPE’s expedited review of the proposal in December 2012, CSEF actors implemented most of the GPE’s requirements immediately (detailed budget, detailed implementation plan, human resources plan, supervising entity in place, governance approach, guidelines for funding allocation to coalitions, approach on capacity support, and South-South learning and collaboration).

Despite initial delays in funds being released for implementation, 2013-2014 Progress Reports to UNESCO submitted by the Global Campaign for Education (April to June 2013, July to December 2013, January to June 2014, July to December 2014, and January to June 2015) indicate satisfaction with progress and achievements made at the local, regional, and global level. By the end of 2013, 51 out of 54 national coalitions had submitted proposals, of which 46 were approved, and the LME framework and system was finalised in April 2014. By the end of June 2014, all of the 48 coalitions currently implementing CSEF-supported activities had identified policy objectives and activities that responded to their national contexts, and the number of coalitions’ member organizations rose from 3,274 in April 2013, to 4,216 in June 2014. In October 2014, the decision was made to extend the CSEF programme by 8 months, which resulted in the development of a US$5 million cost-extension proposal for May – December 2015. The 2015 budget level of the proposal was deemed warranted as ‘CSEF has provided crucial financial and technical support for civil society participation in education sector policy and planning at national level.’

### 1.6 Programme Objectives

As per the CSEF’s Final Programme Document (Civil Society Education Fund 2013-2014: Strengthening civil society participation in education policy dialogue and monitoring
Programme Document May 2013), ‘[t]he overall aim of the CSEF programme is: to contribute to the achievement of national education goals and Education for All by ensuring the effective participation of civil society organizations and citizens in education debates and sector planning and review.

The four CSEF 2013-2015 objectives are listed below. Objectives 1-3 largely take place at the country level through the activities of civil society coalitions; objective 4 engages CSEF bodies at global, regional and national levels. The programme description identifies expected results and illustrative activities for each objective. Specific activities are identified in national civil society coalition proposals, funded through this programme, and are aligned with CSEF objectives, country context, and coalition priorities and capacities.

**Objective 1 – Policy Participation:** Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized.

**Objective 2 – Public awareness and coalition-building:** National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate.

**Objective 3 – Quality research, monitoring and analysis:** Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals.

**Objective 4 – Cross-country learning and networks for change:** The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes.

**1.7 CSEF Approach: Global goals, varied contexts, negotiated activities**

National coalitions operate in a variety of political, social and economic contexts. In some countries, ministry and government powers operate in a spirit of collaboration and shared learning with civil society. In others, this is not the case. Similarly, some countries have a long history of grassroots activism and democratic participation, while this has not been the experience of a number of other countries. The above programme objectives and themes offer a framework for designing coalition activities directed at achieving the CSEF overall goal, however the varied country contexts require that priorities, activities and engagement be negotiated on a country-by-country basis.

This mode of operation aligns with the spirit of the Global Campaign for Education, which seeks to ‘champion local insight and initiative and provide space for the participation of
genuine, alternative voices in national dialogues and collaborative activities at global and regional levels.\(^5\)

The Programme Document defines 12 CSEF programme Expected Results (ER), as stated below:

| ER 1.1 | Civil society participation in policy forums and dialogue such as Local Education Groups (LEGs), Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and other political and policy spaces increases. Civil society participation in such dialogues becomes increasingly recognized and more influential. |
| ER 1.2 | Civil society involvement in policy dialogue and in parliamentary processes relating to education and engagement of parliamentarians on education issues increases. |
| ER 1.3 | CSEF Regional and Global structures draw on national coalition activities to inform regional and global advocacy (cross-cutting with Objective 4). |
| ER 2.1 | There is an overall increase in membership in and participation of grass-roots based civil society actors in CSEF-funded civil society education coalitions. There is an increase in the number of member organizations representing historically disadvantaged groups (so as to strengthen the representative function of coalitions). |
| ER 2.2 | All coalitions develop civil society policy proposals through inclusive and participatory consultations with broad constituencies. Major coalition outputs (e.g. research, position papers, advocacy briefs) pass through an “inclusion audit” to ensure member perspectives (including perspectives from historically marginalized groups) are included. |
| ER 2.3 | All coalitions build and sustain public awareness on critical education issues through debates, events, media work and campaigns. Issues identified may include education rights, EFA goals and/or education policy and spending. |
| ER 3.1 | All civil society education coalitions complete research or monitoring exercises in one of the following areas (i) budget, finance, expenditure, (ii) governance, transparency, social accountability, or (iii) a self-selected EFA related policy or implementation issue. Monitoring exercises may track expenditure, policy implementation, or some other aspect of education service delivery, such as equity or quality. |
| ER 3.2 | Evidence from ER 3.1 is used for coalition advocacy, policy participation and mobilisation. National coalitions effect specific changes in policy, legislation or practice through evidence-based advocacy and monitoring activities. |

ER 4.1 Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat ensure national coalitions’ knowledge and experiences are collected, documented and shared across the coalition, e.g. CSEF will track progress toward “learning goals” and disseminate findings semi-annually.

ER 4.2 Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat ensure national coalitions receive technical and management support, based on expressed and assessed needs. NB: Coalitions will express interests in proposal applications submitted to Regional Secretariats.

ER 4.3 Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat ensure all coalitions contribute to and have the chance to participate in regional and global advocacy that builds on grassroots and national priorities.

ER 4.4 Regional Secretariats’ and Global Secretariat’s contribution to global policy dialogue on education (through GPE, UNESCO or other bodies/frameworks) results in the inclusion of civil society priorities or perspectives (e.g. specific language) of global policies, strategies, agenda-setting documents.

1.8 Learning Goals

The Programme Document also defines 10 learning goals for the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>CSEF members learn (from each other) effective strategies for strengthening “policy participation,” and “influencing” policy and planning dialogue at the national level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 2</td>
<td>CSEF members learn (from each other) the issues on which Objective 1 activities have had the most influence (e.g. education rights, financing, social accountability) at the national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 3</td>
<td>National Education Coalitions and regions track experiences of effective strategies for expanding coalition membership and increasing participation and voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 4</td>
<td>Civil society coalitions identify “historically-marginalized groups,” learn which strategies work best to support their participation in the coalition and elicit their voices and perspectives on education issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 5</td>
<td>National Education Coalitions and regions track evidence of “effectiveness” of public awareness and mobilization activities, including which “EFA themes” elicit and energize the participation of key constituencies and are evidenced in “civil society policy proposals”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 6</td>
<td>CSEF learns about in which EFA/national education areas coalition research, monitoring and advocacy activities have been most influential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 7</td>
<td>CSEF learns which coalition research methods and ways of communicating research findings have been most effective in influencing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 8</td>
<td>CSEF assesses the extent to which national coalitions’ products, knowledge and experience are being effectively shared and contributing to organizational learning and which learning modalities / activities are working.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Goal 9  
CSEF learns which coalition technical and management capacities are being strengthened and which capacity-building modalities works best (e.g. face-to-face; remote support; mentoring; communities of practice).

Learning Goal 10  
CSEF learns which issues have global civil society consensus and show possibility for further mobilization and influence.

1.9 CSEF Programme Results Framework and Theory of Change

In order to gain a better understanding of the programme logic, the evaluation team designed a graphical representation of the CSEF programme’s Results Framework. The programme’s intervention logic uses four objectives supported by four distinct sets of activities all leading to one aim. Figure 2 illustrates how activities lead to the expected results that make up each objective.

Figure 2. CSEF Programme activities and expected results

The stated goal of the CSEF programme is to advance the achievement of education goals by ensuring the effective participation of civil society in education reforms and sector planning and review. As seen in Figure 3, the expected results form the four Programme Objectives, leading to the Programme Goal.
2 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to support reflection on achieved effectiveness (and the challenges involved) of the approaches adopted in the programme and to provide evidence of the impact of CSEF’s work to support further access to funding and other forms of programme buy-in and support. The evaluation is both summative and formative, with a strong emphasis on drawing together lessons and recommendations to inform improvements and structural changes for the future of CSEF from 2016-2018. As such, the evaluation is intended both as an accountability tool and a learning opportunity.

Specifically, as per its Terms of Reference (ToR) (included in Annex 1), the evaluation focuses on the following areas of inquiry:

1. Identify the extent to which the CSEF programme as a whole has achieved its objectives and learning goals.
2. Assess whether and how the programme has contributed to and/or brought about the intended (or unintended) results and whether this is contributing (or has contributed) to the desired impact (or other unintended impacts).
3. Assess the extent to which the CSEF partners and stakeholders have learned from programme experiences, and shared and used that learning.
4. Measure the CSEF programme’s impact on the role and influence of National Education Coalitions in national education policy processes and in the GPE country level processes where applicable.
5. Assess capacity in terms of human resources of the CSEF programme, as well as the synergy and collaboration achieved with and between the partners of the CSEF programme.

6. **Assess organizational performance** – in relation to the relevance and effectiveness of the CSEF programme strategies on capacity building, participation, partnership, methodology, management, learning, monitoring and evaluation.

7. **Review the effectiveness of structures and management of the programme** including the role of Regional Secretariats (RSs), the Financial Management Agencies (FMAs), the Regional Funding Committees (RFCs), the GCE, the Global Oversight Committee (GOC).

8. **Assess the cost effectiveness** of the CSEF programme, including an assessment of the added value of the CSEF programme for regional partners and national education coalitions.

9. **Provide recommendations and guidance to inform future programme phases**, particularly in terms of refining the theory of change or intervention logic underlying the programme in order to support establishing causal links between the intervention and the expected results.

As well as these specific aspects described in the ToR, the below areas of enquiry provided additional focus during field work:

- The role, function and capacity of Regional Secretariats.
- The use of monitoring and evaluation systems in programme planning and the learning associated with this for the CSEF Secretariat as well as national coalitions. Subsequently, the adaptability of implementation to the information it provides.
- The role and function of UNESCO as the Supervising Entity, including the extent and quality of the provided oversight and how it contributes to programme planning, implementation and learning.
- The level and quality of participation of member organizations.
- Gender aspects in programme approaches/implementation.
- The definition of sustainability for the programme’s future.

The evaluation covers the time period from 27 April 2013 to the 31 March 2015. The intended primary users of the evaluation are CSEF, GCE, and GPE structures, as well as UNESCO as Supervisory Entity; current and potential donors, as well as programme stakeholders in targeted countries, regionally and globally.
3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 Evaluation Design and Evaluation Phases

According to the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD DAC) Evaluation Quality Standards, selection and application of adequate evaluation methodology is crucial to produce reliable data that allow for valid evaluative judgments that are useful for learning and making decisions.

Upon analysis of the programme logic, the needs and expectations from the evaluation by CSEF and the Evaluation Reference Group\(^6\), this evaluation applied “mixed” methods to optimise the potential of the analysis and to reach sound evaluation. In line with that, the methodology applied for this evaluation included use of qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments, such as surveys, focus groups and interviews (in person, by skype or phone), as well as a document review and meetings with programme staff.

The evaluation methodology is based on the five OECD DAC established evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

3.2 Data sources and methods of data collection

The evaluation used three main sources of data: i) people; ii) documents, files, publications and relevant literature; and iii) observations during field work to sample countries for case studies. In addition, the evaluation team conducted two surveys. All individual and group interviews followed interview protocols that were approved by the CSEF global secretariat and UNESCO, and that had been tailored to the respective stakeholder group and aligned with the overall evaluation framework. In total, 212 individuals were consulted as part of the evaluation. An example of an interview protocol is included as Annex 3.

To ensure validity of data, and as part of the process of synthesizing information derived from different data sources and through different means of data collection, the evaluation team used triangulation (comparing data generated from different data sources to identify trends and/or variations); and complementarity (using data generated through one method of data collection to elaborate on information generated through another, e.g. the use of stakeholder consultations to explore reasons for strengths or shortcomings indicated in existing documents).

The evaluation was carried out in four phases:

1. Inception phase and document review - The document review and the analysis of the programme intervention were used for the development of the evaluation methodology

\(^6\) Evaluation Reference Group refers to a group of key stakeholders who were involved in planning and management of this evaluation, including: CSEF staff, GCE, UNESCO and representatives from CSEF Regional Structures.
and design of the research methods to be applied in the main assessment stage. This process also clarified the approach and the sample of countries/National Education Coalitions to be visited within the fieldwork, as well as the sample of partners, and stakeholders to be included in the phone/skype interviews and in the online survey (See the list of documents reviewed, and online survey in the Annexes 4 and 5).

2. **Fieldwork phase** - The fieldwork phase comprised the field visits to the target countries for the evaluation, the launch of a web survey, and interviews (in person, by skype or by phone). The purpose of the fieldwork phase for this Evaluation was to systematically collect information required to support formulation of conclusions and answers to the evaluation questions. The fieldwork included coordination with the CSEF team, contacts with stakeholders and users, and applying various data collection methods. The main data collection methods applied within this phase were interviews with stakeholders, focus groups, visits to seven (7) countries (Nicaragua, Senegal, Moldova, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Vietnam and Cambodia), online surveys (for National Education Coalitions Secretariats and Board Members and for National Education Coalition Members), and follow up interviews with CSEF and relevant partners (See Annex 2 for the List of interviewed persons). Detailed and in-depth questioning in face-to-face discussions/interviews with representatives of the CSEF Global Secretariat in Johannesburg (as well as previous and subsequent discussions over Skype/phone) were also conducted. The evaluation team invited 64 interlocutors from GPE, GCE, partner and donor agencies, and international partner agencies in person, via phone or skype. The response rate to the invitation for interview was 74.5% or 49 respondents, whereby some of the respondents declined the invitation, or did not respond to the repeated invitation for an interview. The five-day missions to partner coalitions within the framework of case studies allowed for greater depth of enquiry that aided the evaluation process both in gaining a clearer picture of critical questions and providing more context-specific examples of the responses heard across all stakeholders. A total of 163 representatives of national and local institutions, coalition members and other stakeholders were interviewed during the visits to target countries for the evaluation (See Tables 1 and 2 below). During fieldwork, both during case study visits and other interview processes, evaluators conducted interviews, focus group discussions, document reviews and observations of coalition work to gain insight about the work of coalitions and support provided by the CSEF programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Skype/phone interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affiliation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEF Global Secretariat Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE Board and CSEF Oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Partners Group (IPG) Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEF Fund Supervising Entity (UNESCO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership for Education (GPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Case study country interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Country</th>
<th># of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>163</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Surveys** - Two online surveys were developed as an important tool to complement narrative data collected during the field visit and interviews. The surveys were carefully designed in order to allow respondents to provide information, share views and opinions while remaining anonymous. Two sets of questionnaires (one for National Education Coalitions Secretariats and Board Members and one for Coalition Members) were developed for the purpose of this evaluation (See the online Survey Questionnaires in Annex 5. The surveys were translated into the main CSEF languages (English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Arabic) and were administered using the online survey platform SurveyMonkey. The surveys included mainly multiple-choice questions that allowed each of these stakeholders to address areas of enquiry in a quantitative way. In addition, there was an option for respondents to provide qualitative comments. The survey was administered to the entire sample of coalition members and Boards provided from the CSEF global secretariat database. Reminders to participate in the survey were sent two times by the Evaluation team and additionally, once by the CSEF global secretariat team.

Table 3 below provides an overview of received responses to online survey by partners/grantees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>No. of invited persons</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Education Coalitions Secretariats and Board Members</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey for National Educational Coalition Members</td>
<td>2,867</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of survey respondents shows that, for the survey with coalition boards of 80% of responses, 20.6% of Board chairpersons participated (See Table 4 below). The survey
response rate for coalition members was extremely low, so the survey was not taken as input for analytical work on the evaluation.

Table 4. Overview of survey responses for National Education Coalition secretariats and Board members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Education Coalition role</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Chairperson</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Advisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building Officer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)²</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESPONDENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Analysis and report writing phase - Information and facts collected during the first three phases were analysed and integrated in this evaluation report, in line with the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. The OECD/DAC criteria set in the ToR were endorsed by the evaluation team for the following reasons:

- they are sufficient to provide a sound assessment of the quality, value and significance of the programme intervention, and they are all necessary and equally important;
- they are fully appropriate for the evaluation purpose, based on careful examination of the programme’s strategy and Theory of Change;
- they are in line with internationally recognised best practices for a formative evaluation of a project and also consistent with recommended methodologies for evaluation of external assistance.

More specifically, the standard evaluation criteria were approached as follows:

a) Relevance: The assessment of programme relevance was based on the analysis of the national education case study countries coupled with the global and regional context discussed with relevant stakeholders. The assessment included challenges for strengthening policy making and civil society participation in the educational sector and the needs and priorities of various stakeholders.

² The two other options were: National Moderator and the Board Vice Chairman.
b) **Effectiveness**: Using the programme’s Theory of Change (logical framework/results framework) the evaluation team analysed the extent to which the results obtained from the implementation of activities have contributed to the attainment of the planned objectives and learning goals.

c) **Impact**: The evaluation team examined to what extent the programme increased the capacity within coalitions to enable their access to, and participation in, national educational policy discussions/implementation, and the effect of this participation on policy formulation and engagement with government.

d) **Sustainability**: The evaluation team reviewed sustainability factors for programme design, processes and implementation.

e) **Efficiency**: The evaluation team analysed how well the programme is able to deliver its work with regard to managerial and budget efficiency.

The analysis and report-writing phase took place from August through September 2015. This phase was marked by two main points of consultation: the fieldwork virtual validation and de-briefing meeting with the CSEF team and Evaluation Reference Group and comments on the preliminary draft report, prior to submission of the Final Evaluation report. Formulation of conclusions and recommendations was based on collected documentation and its review, and responses to the online surveys, discussions and interviews with a broad range of stakeholders. The draft evaluation report was submitted on September 22, 2015. The feedback received from CSEF partners has been incorporated in this final evaluation report.

### 3.3 Ethical considerations related to the evaluation design

During data collection, attention was paid to ensuring that the evaluation process was ethical and that participants in the process could openly express their opinions, protecting the confidentiality of their responses. Overall, international standards and codes of conduct for evaluations were strictly respected, notably independence of judgement, impartiality, honesty and integrity, accountability, respect and protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, confidentiality, avoidance of risks, harm to and burdens on those participating in the evaluation, accuracy, completeness and reliability of report, and transparency. The evaluators were sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and acted with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders, ensured that their contacts with individuals were characterized by respect, protected the anonymity and confidentiality of individual information.

The process of recruiting stakeholders from different institutional levels followed a standard procedure in order to ensure an informed consent to participate in the evaluation (list of potential interviewees and survey participants were provided by CSEF global secretariat staff, while the CSEF team introduced the evaluation presenting the evaluation process, protection of privacy and information confidentiality, followed up by the evaluation team through written/verbal communication regarding the interview/focus group/discussion group details). Participation in the evaluation was voluntary and opinions are presented in the report in an anonymous manner.
Interviews, focus groups and discussion groups were used not only for data collection and qualitative insights, but also for checking the perceived priorities for the continuation of educational reforms by the key stakeholders.

**Involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation**

Involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation was of utmost importance for the collection of vital data and critical insights, but also for validating findings and conclusions and checking the feasibility of recommendations while ensuring buy-in.

The evaluation was so designed to ensure the involvement of stakeholders at three levels: **information, participation and consultation**, depending on the nature of each stakeholder and engagement in the programme. Interviews, focus groups and discussion groups were used for:

1. **Informing the evaluation** - primary data collection to cover gaps and add multiple informant perspectives;
2. **Enabling participation of stakeholders in the evaluation** - collection of qualitative, critical insights from stakeholders; direct participation of stakeholders in the analysis and evaluation of the programme results and impact, also via self-evaluation;
3. **Engaging stakeholders in consultation on the future of the CSEF** - checking the perceived priorities for the continuation of the programme by the key stakeholders and the role each of them could play in the future. In this respect, specific questions were included in the Interview Guides to capture the various perspectives of a large range of stakeholders.

This was very useful for informing the recommendations of the evaluation based on an open and participatory process initiated during the Field Phase.

**3.4 Evaluation Limitations**

There were several limitations inherent to the design and implementation of this evaluation.

- It is in the nature of the CSEF programme to work with national coalitions, which implement a multitude of initiatives at the national level. Therefore, as with advocacy programmes generally, it can be difficult to isolate the work and impact of CSEF supported work from other national coalition initiatives.
- Given the multitude of actors working to enact policy change, it is difficult to attribute that policy change to one such actor. Therefore, this evaluation cannot attribute impact, but has sought to identify the contribution of CSEF to policy discussions and engagement with government.
- The evaluation is both far-reaching in scope and in geography. Thirty-five (35) days were spent in the seven countries where case studies took place, with a further 20 days for all other enquiry, almost all of which was by Skype or telephone. Of note here is the lack of extensive enquiry with regional bodies (RS, FMA) given the critical role they play in implementation. While regional and global bodies were well
included in the field enquiry, it is noted that the case study approach places significant emphasis on the perspective of national coalitions.

- The cost efficiency analysis cannot objectively address, as indicated in the Terms of Reference, the ‘cost effectiveness of the CSEF programme, including an assessment of the added value of the CSEF programme for regional partners and national education coalitions’. There is no comparable data for such an assessment. Early in the assessment process, there was a realisation that a full-fledged cost-effectiveness study could not be conducted, primarily due to the fact that due to the limited time frame of the assignment and the scope of duties to conduct the assessment of the overall programme, the evaluation team could not conduct the budgetary review and assessment of entire costs. A full-fledged cost-effectiveness study should take into account all budgetary items related to the programme (CSEF team, national, regional and global staff/partner costs and contributions, costs of offices, material costs; other administrative staff and time/costs of external experts, etc.) Such a full-fledged analysis should be a separate assignment, resulting in a budgetary and time resource review for the programme. Therefore, focus of the enquiry and analysis in this area was on managerial and budget efficiency, the use of resources, and performance management in organizational systems including a discussion of the added value of the CSEF programme.

- As some informants declined to participate (17, or 25.5%), there is a possibility of selection bias, i.e. the attitudes and perceptions of those respondents who chose to participate might differ from those who did not. This applies to face-to-face interviews, focus group discussions as well as surveys.

- A number of questions dealt with issues that took place in the past or changes that have taken place since the programme began, and therefore recall bias cannot be excluded. Some respondents may find it difficult to accurately compare organizational arrangements/capacity three or more years ago to the current situation.

- The evaluation team invited a total of 2,867 coalition members to complete the online survey, which was designed to provide a quantitative framework for and assist in triangulation of the evaluation’s qualitative processes. Only 201 coalition members (7%) responded to requests to complete the survey. The evaluation team was not in a position to ascertain why the response rate was so small, so no judgement has been made in this regard. However, the limited number of respondents lessens confidence in the usefulness of the survey responses. Therefore, the Evaluation team produced a brief analytical overview of survey responses included in Annex 6.

- There is a known tendency among respondents to under-report socially undesirable answers and alter their responses to approximate what they perceive as the social norm (halo bias). The extent to which respondents will be prepared to reveal their true opinions may also vary for some questions that call upon the respondents to assess the performance of their colleagues or people on whom they depend for the provision of services.

To mitigate the above affects for qualitative data, where much of the evidence may be anecdotal or inferred, the team used triangulation to identify inconsistencies and reduce the “response bias” in which respondents tend to tell the evaluators what they want to hear. Use of layered triangulation across different methods/sources of information for this
evaluation has the potential to reduce uncertainty in this regard. To mitigate the halo bias, I4DI provided respondents with confidentiality and anonymity guarantees that are embedded in data collection instruments as opening statements, and, where possible, conducted interviews in settings where respondents felt comfortable and worked to establish rapport between the interviewer and the respondent.
4 KEY FINDINGS

4.1 Relevance of CSEF

The relevance of the CSEF programme has been assessed using available data, facts and statistics related to the programme implementation timeframe, as well as relevant strategic documents of the GCE. Interviews with key stakeholders and country visits were also used to triangulate findings. The evaluation has found evidence, through desk research and the field phase, that there is alignment of programme design and objectives with the needs and priorities of national coalitions and their members and with the demands for reforms of systems for education for all. Civil society participation, in the form of lobbying and organising through effective coalitions, plays an important role in the education sector in countries. The case of COSYDEP in Senegal or the NGO Alliance in Moldova is particularly illustrative of the strong dialogue between government and coalitions. This engagement allows the government to hear grassroots concerns and benefit from outsourced research provided by the coalition. At the same time, the coalition is able to have a strong presence within the Local Education Group (LEG) and advocate for civil society positions on various aspects of the education system. In another case example in Nicaragua, CSEF is particularly relevant as it provides a lifeline to civil society voices in a difficult operating environment.

CSEF applies a broad approach and scope in supporting civil society through national education coalitions by supporting their capacity building and organizational development (through trainings, exchanges and grant support), contributing to the quality of their work, and contributing to their inclusion in policy making in the area of education (through facilitating connections between the coalitions and decision makers, etc.). This is a strength of the programme, but it also creates a challenge to ensure that available resources are not spread too thinly. For example, in Malawi, the Civil Society Education Coalition of Malawi (CSEC) and international organizations focused on education in that country agree that the education sector generally would benefit from a closer relationship between, and better coordination of, international organizations and the coalition. The continuing effectiveness and relevance of content and approach for both the coalition and international groups would be strengthened with a closer partnership. For instance, while recently made a formal member of the LEG, CSEC has yet to fully establish itself in terms of quality and regularity of participation.

Education for All (EFA) was initiated in Jomtien in 1990, but the strongest civil society expansion happened after the World Education Forum (WEF) in Dakar in 2000, when many national and regional coalitions were set up. The GCE was born around the same time as the WEF 2000. Following Dakar, there was also the setting up of the EFA Fast-Track Initiative in 2002 (known as GPE since 2011-12). The CSEF precedent Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) supported civil society from 2002-2008, and the GPE funded CSEF since 2009 (with a gap in 2012). The initiation of the EFA movement was an especially important moment for civil society and education. EFA gave impetus to civil society in education and saw the establishment of many civil society organizations (CSOs), networks and coalitions whose aims were to support educational development, whether as local or international CSOs. Work was undertaken individually and in coalitions. In Zimbabwe, for example, the Education Coalition of Zimbabwe (ECOZI) demonstrates relevance to the education sector
through a framework focused on EFA goals at the policy level, in civil society involvement with government, and in building a strong base of commitment from member organizations. Institutional representatives noted a shift in the government’s relationship with civil society, particularly ECOZI, based on the visible focus on positive strategies for engagement with government. ECOZI is now a formal member of the Education Consultative Group (ECG). Partnership is an appropriate word to describe the relationship between ECOZI and the government on the ECG. ECOZI is recognised for its ability to bring people (civil society and government departments) together and to play a mediating role. The ECOZI profile is more pronounced, and its focus on engagement with government has assisted in the development of a solid relationship with government and the expressed confidence of government representatives in the professionalism of the relationship. ECOZI is known both as ECOZI and by the different organizations they represent, and it is well known that ECOZI has a focus on representing its members and on representing with its members.

Effective coalitions play a very important role in the education sectors in their countries, informing debate, leading discussions and responses to government, lobbying and organising. Some are more entrepreneurial in their approach to activities and funding, while maintaining a focus on sectoral needs and priorities. Some are comprised of solely local NGOs and community-based organizations, while others include international NGOs as well. There are three specific aspects of an effective relationship with government that came up consistently in discussions about effective coalitions:

- **Partnership** – working with government and international organizations as an equal.
- **Engagement** – building a quality relationship that is not combative but that emphasizes objective information and shared priorities.
- **Professionalism** – there is a demonstrated level in the relationship that gives confidence that the coalition is representing its members, and at times representing with its members.

The CSEF programme has been supporting the growth of these coalitions, particularly through building:

- **Local ownership** - Linkages are forged between coalition objectives and CSEF objectives, which enables both local relevance and local ownership. It is understood within CSEF that the four stated programme objectives are a synthesis of collaboration, drawing upon national programme objectives, although it is also understood that a range of contextual variation comes into play. Literature reviewed by the evaluation also points to a strong emphasis on local ownership from proposal development to reporting and implementation requirements. Regional and national implementation plans, albeit broad, clearly seek to respond to CSEF’s four objectives, with a focus on coalition capacity building, regional support, and learning.
- **Civil society involvement** – CSEF’s efforts to enhance skills and capacities of coalitions to adequately participate in the work of LEGs, or their equivalent as well as in other forums relevant for their advocacy work, are a relevant and ever-needed contribution to GPE’s work on this process. This is particularly important as LEGs must ensure the involvement of civil society organizations dealing with educational issues, and this
civil society participation cannot be just at the edge of education policy development and implementation.

- **Watchdog role** – The GPE focus extends beyond involvement in policy development and implementation to involvement in oversight and civil society’s role as a watchdog. It is worth noting that the watchdog role extends not just to national government activities and policies, etc., but also to the large international agencies and donors. The role of the CSEF programme to support the research and analytical work of coalitions has been relevant to fulfil the needs of the coalitions in this regard.

The CSEF programme responds to the need for continuous capacity building of coalitions and their members in order to **build the capacity of civil society to apply and organise quality inputs and contributions to policy debate**. While the status of civil society inclusion varies in different countries of CSEF focus, some coalitions have a number of qualified/trained staff and professionals to conduct quality research and advocacy for EFA policy debates. By providing opportunities for networking and knowledge sharing, the programme has extended professional networks in the area of EFA at national, regional and global levels. By providing training to professionals and ensuring funds are available for hiring additional staff of experts to conduct research, advocacy and communication, **the programme has supported the implementation of stronger advocacy and evidence-based policy inputs through research studies conducted in countries as part of CSEF-funded projects**. According to feedback received from interviews and focus groups with professionals in sample countries, this type of support of the programme was useful and relevant for their needs. Support from regional structures, mentoring, engagement of additional staff and experts, training, exchanges and knowledge-sharing events were particularly useful for the coalitions. ECOZI members comment on coalition learning systems, including the travel of members to forums or workshops and how they share what they have learned with other members when they return. ECOZI demonstrates useful systems for ensuring stakeholder involvement at all levels of the work of the coalition. The first step in this is funding proposals, a process which is described by ECOZI members as participatory. The focus is not on addressing specific member priorities, but on understanding national issues and priorities and where different member organizations fit in developing strategies and actions for addressing these issues. However, the perception that the extent of regional support and exchanges is insufficient in some regions was noted by evaluators in Moldova, Zimbabwe, Malawi and Cambodia. In Nicaragua, some frustration was shared by stakeholders regarding the lack of acknowledgement of the coalition by visiting GPE delegations. In an environment where autonomous civil society was marginalized, this recognition of funding institutions of coalitions and their work is seen as important and much needed reinforcement.

When successful, the CSEF programme **addressed the lack of awareness and motivation of governments** to actively engage civil society in policy-making processes, which has been an important challenge in educational policy development. The programme and GPE have addressed this challenge by raising the awareness of governments of the value of inclusion of civil society in policy-making. Feedback provided through the evaluation indicated there were efforts to equip the weakest coalitions with the knowledge and abilities to cope with their duties in this process and to be able to contribute, as active partners, to the improvement of the relevance and quality of EFA. The programme, through its regional and global structures, **provided strong support for coalitions when dealing with governmental**
counterparts. Civil society organizations and coalitions face significant challenges in some countries in approaching, and getting involved in, decision-making processes in the area of education. Being part of a global movement, and particularly being involved in GCE and CSEF, was confirmed to be very beneficial for civil society. Joint events gathering government and civil society bring benefits to coalitions by providing them with space to present their inputs, raise their profile, and meet government counterparts in person. The programme is in line with national goals at the country level and the need to expand EFA, supporting civil society through coalitions to contribute to reforms of legal and policy provisions, in particular those related to EFA. It also addresses the need for the strengthened capacity of local stakeholders for a multidisciplinary, integrated approach to EFA. This developing approach is exemplified in Malawi, where CSEC is comprised of local and international NGOs, as well as local civil society and community-based organizations, and is described in the field as ‘a true network’. There is a general agreement across coalition members, as well as within the secretariat, that the approach of ‘engagement’ with government demonstrates best practice. Engagement is best understood as an approach that involves serious dialogue, based on data, on objective information, with a non-conflict ethos, emphasising the shared priorities while recognising divergent constituents and needs. This is a conscious strategy, based on consideration of options, and is strengthened through the related approach of ‘evidence-based advocacy’.

A specific focus of CSEF collaborative practice is learning, within and across coalitions, and particular strategies have been developed and are being implemented in this area, where there is a focus on learning from other people, from interactions and from networks. If good practice is being demonstrated by a coalition, and another coalition is struggling in exactly that area, the Regional Secretariat (RS) will assist in the sharing of this practice across coalitions. Physical visits are not always possible, for funding reasons, but other methods are used by the RS. RS’s also use in-country international NGOs in mentoring roles with coalitions. The Learning Goals discussed earlier are indicative of this focus on collaborative learning – it is noted that Learning Goals 1 and 2 are both specifically about coalitions learning from each other. There is further emphasis on learning effective strategies and activities and coalition management practice. The Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation (LME) system includes reporting related to these Learning Goals, and coalitions report in each of these areas. CSEF learning practices include policy and learning meetings at regional levels, regional and cross-regional exchanges and networking initiatives including story sharing. There is a view that the programme could improve its storytelling and develop methods for gathering and sharing the stories it needs to tell about its work. It is a complex process, as story gathering and storytelling are complex processes themselves, and within the CSEF context, with limited staffing at coalition secretariats, language differences and technical difficulties, developing the capacity and output across the programme is problematic. The evaluation found that the collaborative capacity of the CSEF programme is a particular strength in building coalition capacity to impact national education policy. The architecture of CSEF is designed to promote shared learning, within and between regional structures and through coalition learning exchanges, but resourcing issues are consistently mentioned as having a negative impact on networking and shared learning, i.e., there is a regularly expressed view that there is not enough support for visits from RS and FMA staff on learning or mentoring processes nor for formal and informal exchanges, networking or learning events between coalitions.
4.2 CSEF Programme Effectiveness

Based on analysis of the results framework and data collected during the CSEF programme evaluation, the evaluation team articulated a conceptual theory of change to develop a better understanding of the causal linkages as to how the programme objectives contribute to the desired change. This theory of change is then used to assess the relationship between the intervention and the expected results and their compounding effect on the overall impact. Along with the OECD/DAC criteria, the findings of this report are rooted in this articulation of the theory of change.

Conceptual Theory of Change

In analysing the CSEF Programme’s Results Framework, and translating that framework into a theory of change, the evaluation team found several challenges to using this structure to analyse results. Flat theories of change, such as the one illustrated in Figure 2 do not sufficiently articulate cause and effect or contribution of intervention components to programme objectives. To further enhance the results framework and programme’s theory of change so that it can be used as a tool for design, monitoring and evaluation, the hierarchy of objectives needs to be illustrated showing relationship between objectives that are not overlapping in content.8

The evaluation team sees two distinct programmatic approaches, leading to the four interrelated objectives that advance education goals at the national, regional and global levels.

1. The CSEF programme supports coalitions in mobilizing national resources to strengthen grassroots capacity, conduct and utilize monitoring and research to identify and prioritize needs, and engage in dialogue with policymakers. The programme aims to support and build capacity of the national coalitions in expanding and managing their member base, especially at grassroots level, and ensuring robust evidence gathering that can be used to prioritize actions and advocate for the advancement of education goals that include diverse perspectives. (Objectives 1, 2 and 3)

2. CSEF supports coalitions in knowledge sharing across the coalition and acts as a platform to facilitate the involvement of coalitions in regional and global dialogues. The programme aims to offer direct assistance in collecting, documenting and sharing experiences of coalitions across coalitions and offers technical and management support based on coalitions’ expressed and assessed needs (Objective 4).

8 The Conceptual Theory of Change detailed in Figures 2 and 3 give an example of how a theory of change could be constructed for the CSEF Programme, however this is purely for the sake of example as it only incorporates expected results included in the Results Framework. A well-designed theory of change is created through a collaborative process that encompasses the perspectives of relevant stakeholders. This ensures that the theory of change is useful for design, communication, monitoring and learning.
The capacity built at the national level is reinforced through knowledge sharing across the coalitions and catalyzed by coalitions’ participation in education sector policy dialogue and review processes, and engagement with policy-makers to advocate for the right to quality education for all and the advancement of six EFA goals nationally as well as regionally and globally. (Objectives 1-4).

This layered intervention is designed to enable national coalitions to effectively mobilize and strengthen the capacity of civil society stakeholders to participate in education reforms and influence national, regional and global education policy based on evidence of needs and priorities.

To further illustrate how programme components would fit into a hierarchical theory of change, we transferred the results framework as seen in Figure 3 into a new structure seen in Figure 5.  

---

9 The Expected Results have been summarized for ease of reading.

10 Figure 5 illustrates, using the CSEF’s Expected Results, how a theory of change could be crafted, however expected results will first need to be analysed and revised to make a comprehensive theory of change that can be used as a tool for design, communication and evaluation purposes (see Recommendations section for more information).
This Conceptual Theory of Change lays out a hierarchical view of the CSEF Programme while also illustrating weaknesses in the CSEF Programme Results Framework. Illustrating these weaknesses will help the CSEF Programme to build a more comprehensive theory of change in the future.

Specifically, in analysing the results framework, the evaluation team found that there are missing or misplaced logical elements. For example, the results framework details that research or monitoring activities (ER 3.1) will inform policy, legislation and practice changes (ER 3.2), but are not connected to technical and management support based on expressed or assessed needs (ER 4.2). Similarly, although all of the objectives incorporate some type of advocacy, the results framework does not detail capacity building for advocacy work. Further to that example, objectives should not overlap in content but build toward other objectives or the programme goal collectively, with directionality clearly defined with arrows or graphically. In this case, coalitions may build their advocacy skills (used for advocacy at all levels) instead of building advocacy skills and increasing participation at multiple levels expressed in multiple objectives. Finally, the results from the CSEF programme’s creation of a platform for sharing knowledge should be better detailed to show how that both contributes to advocacy efforts at the regional and global levels, as well as has a reinforcing effect on the effectiveness of national coalitions.

The evaluation team recognized as well that the Results Framework does not make mention of the grant-making arm of the CSEF programme. Grant making is an important activity to express in the theory of change, as it is a stage where CSEF has some influence over the direction of the National Education Coalitions and their work toward the given objectives.
Programme Effectiveness Findings

The assessment of programme effectiveness has been conducted in relation to the results framework set forth for the programme, stated programme objectives and the conceptual theory of change detailed in Figure 5.11.

The structure of objectives defined below, and for which GCE is ostensibly responsible to donors for delivering, is a programme over which GCE has only some control. This is because, while coalitions are funded based on their contribution in their funded programmes to at least one of CSEF’s four objectives, they are not required to build a programme for all objectives. This is deemed completely appropriate in the context of a programme that funds grassroots civil society organizations, but it exposes the programme to potential ‘shortcomings’ if it does not contribute to stated objectives. While coalitions are not explicitly required to work on all objectives, objectives were defined based on consultation with coalitions, and in dialogue with regional partners. In this sense, objectives were developed in line with stated coalition priorities and activities. There is, however, no direct correlation of all coalitions with each objective of the CSEF programme, although all coalitions contribute to CSEF programme outcomes.

Nevertheless, analysis of data gathered from the desk review, interviews and field observations is that, notwithstanding national and regional variations, CSEF has demonstrated a considerable level of effectiveness in strengthening civil society participation in education sector policy development, implementation and monitoring. The overall aim of the CSEF in 2013-2015 was “to advance the achievement of education goals by ensuring the effective participation of civil society in education reforms and sector planning and review”. The data collected from different sources points to coalitions being increasingly recognized by their respective governments for their credibility, based on their global links as well as their own demonstrated capacity and effectiveness in contributing to evidence-based advocacy. The work of COSYDEP in Senegal illustrates the dialogue and engagement that the coalition has been able to develop with the government through the production of targeted research and proposals such as the “Livre Blanc,” a participatory compendium of the aspirations of civil society for the education system, or the coalition’s Compendium on Inclusive Education. COSYDEP’s effectiveness to engage with the government was confirmed by government representatives, coalition members, and RS and FMA interview respondents. In Moldova, the Moldovan Alliance has become a strong and recognised partner of the Ministry of Education and across the education sector, which includes the Alliance representatives in its working groups and Consultative Council for Inclusive Education (the government body composed of Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Social Protection, among others.) The research and advocacy efforts of

11 Findings will be measured against the conceptual theory of change in the first part of this section only. As the stated objectives of the CSEF Programme have been divided and reorganized in the conceptual theory of change, the evaluation team will write about the achievement of each in relation to the given results framework only. The Recommendations Section of this Report will detail further recommendations for theory of change design.
the Alliance brought important evidence into the policy process of the government, which was useful and appreciated by the interviewed government counterparts. Interviews also revealed positive examples of increased inclusion in Yemen or Sudan, where CSEF helped build the coalitions which, despite complex political systems, succeeded in bringing the cases of focus for their work on the government agenda.

CSEF provides grants that increase the evidence base used by coalitions, as well as the quality of their inputs to policy-making, strengthening their role as knowledgeable and valuable advisors and advocates to government. For example, the Moldovan Alliance used the grant to conduct an in-depth assessment of the models for inclusive education services devised and implemented in the country since the deinstitutionalisation reforms were initiated. The research study took stock of these services and their achievements, as well as gaps in service provision resulting in a set of recommendations. The findings of the research were a very important evidence base for the EFA measures and strong policy input for the government. The research also facilitated the consultation process among the CSOs (holders of different models) to come up with one aligned model for inclusive education services to be implemented based on the assessment, thus ensuring that NGOs standardise their work with inclusive education. The research recommendations were further elaborated through another inclusive consultative process, whereby all relevant government institutions, CSOs and international partners gathered and discussed each recommendation, creating action points to respond to the recommendations. In the case of both COSYDEP and The Moldovan Alliance, programmatic successes align to the causal linkages of the conceptual theory of change. Embedding inclusive practices and advocacy in their work (ER 2.2, ER 2.3), and basing policy in research and evidence (ER 3.1, ER 3.2) both National Education Coalitions have been able to engage more effectively with the political dialogue and parliamentary processes (ER 1.1, ER 1.2). In the case of The Moldovan Alliance, this also led to global advocacy (ER 1.3).

In Malawi, CSEC plays a formal and non-formal role in its work on policy formulation in the education sector and contributes as a coalition and in support of coalition member organizations. CSEC’s advocacy focus is in a number of important areas of Malawi’s education system, and its evidence-based approach strengthens its ability to effectively ‘engage’ with government in indicating the importance of issues and to elicit potentially beneficial responses to these issues. CSEC also carries out a review of the budget for the education sector during each budget cycle. The review is highly anticipated within civil society, in the public, and with Parliamentarians, for whom it is a useful resource, particularly with its gap analysis. As well as a general analysis of the whole education sector budget, the analysis also provides a specific gender-responsiveness analysis.

Through regional networks, CSEF offers regional knowledge sharing and stronger support for coalitions in their dealings with government. Because of participation by coalition representatives in events organised within the networks of GCE and GPE (especially the global and regional EFA processes and events (in particular, the regional ministerial meetings/conferences, the global meetings of the Collective Consultation of CSOs on EFA (CCNGO/EFA) and the World Education Forum 2015 and its CSO Forum) facilitated by UNESCO as the global EFA coordinator), coalitions gain direct contacts, strengthened networks, and stronger support for their participation in decision-making on education
policy. Coalitions differ in their strengths, profiles and levels of inclusion within the decision-making process across the board of CSEF, but all coalitions benefit from support to their participation and benefit from the regional and global events bringing better results both at the level of their work but also within the CSEF framework. Despite the relative effectiveness of coalitions in expanding their membership and participation in the policy arena over the course of the CSEF programme, the evaluation feedback indicates that civil society participation and the quality of that participation is not consistent across the programme. Causal links detailed in the conceptual theory of change indicate that focus on facilitating knowledge sharing across the coalitions (ER 4.1) leads to coalitions contributing to and participating in regional and global events (ER 4.3) and consequently inclusion of coalition perspectives in the global dialogue (ER 4.4).

The following sections present an analysis of the achievement of the four CSEF objectives.

Objective 1: Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized.

CSEF has been effective during the programme period in enabling engagement of civil society in education sector policy and review processes. Coalitions are increasingly recognized by their respective governments for their credibility, based on their global links as well as their own more local connections, and for their demonstrated capacity and effectiveness in contributing to evidence-based advocacy. Visibility and credibility are directly commented on by government, with reference to coalition contributions to reviews, technical working groups and in-sector working groups, and in some countries this involvement has been described as significant. An illustrative example of such contributions is the Moldovan Alliance which is included in relevant working groups and consultative bodies of the government in the education sector. This indeed is one key driver in the programme – its structure allows international NGOs to support national coalitions more strategically. Specific reference is made to coalition representation on and participation in LEGs. Findings from the field, however, indicate that participation, and quality of participation, as well as the recognition of coalitions by their government counterparts, is not consistent across the CSEF programme. This is only natural as there are different levels of recognition of the role of civil society in policy making processes, different political contexts and drivers for enabling/disabling such participation. In Vietnam, for example, there is a perception that the coalition has only token participation in the Education Sector Group. In Cambodia, responses to the evaluation indicated that the coalition is succeeding in terms of activism and mobilization of civil society, but is making slower progress in positioning itself as an advocate with the Ministry of Education. On a positive note, ECOZI, with ANCEFA’s assistance, has emerged in developing a strong relationship between the Ministry and civil society, which, until 2-3 years ago, was ‘troubled’. As recently as 2012, NGOs participating in a meeting of the Education Coordination Group (ECG) were often asked to leave the meeting at a certain point as they were not welcome to stay. Institutional representatives noted a shift in the government’s relationship with civil society, particularly ECOZI, based to a certain extent on the more visible focus on positive strategies for engagement with government. NGOs are no longer asked to leave the ECG at certain points, and ECOZI is now a formal member of this group. The change in style and quality of contribution is also recognised, and
particular reference is made to ECOZI’s ability to bring civil society and government departments together and to play a mediatory role. The ECOZI profile is more pronounced, and its focus on engagement with government has assisted in the development of the solid relationship with government, a relationship that is visible in concrete roles (ECOZI’s contribution to the EFA global monitoring report) and the expressed confidence of government representatives in the professionalism of the relationship.

A CSEF strength in this regard is the ability to have a somewhat individualized approach with national coalitions, in order to respond to their recognized needs. The role of the regional bodies is then to offer further support in areas where such support can be relevant. Some Regional Secretariats cover huge geographical areas with different needs and contexts, and it has been hard to cover all needs promptly and with the same quality. Still, important achievements have been made, particularly through strengthening research and evidence-based policy inputs, whose value is increasingly recognized by government counterparts. In Cambodia, the evaluation team learned that the coalition NEP was recognised by MoEYS as a prominent partner. The government in Cambodia has proposed and implemented changes to government education policy based on NEP research and advocacy, and the Minister of Education was noted to quote NEP research in his speaking notes to members of parliament. In Malawi, one of CSEC’s strongest functions, and an area in which it has existing impact, is the work it does with evidence-based advocacy. One particular example was the implementation of the new Education Act (2013), a proposed change that would be the first change in the Act since 1962 (including independence in 1992). Government was not prepared to implement the Act, saying they did not have sufficient resources. CSEC undertook research, and was able to provide evidence to Parliament that indeed the resources to implement the new Act existed in the budget. The evidence was presented to Parliament, using learners to present the data, and the same week Parliament debated and then passed the new Act. Other examples of CSEC’s use of evidence-based advocacy include:

- The national education budget – CSEC provides a detailed analysis of the education budget during each budget cycle that is used by civil society and Parliamentarians.
- Girl-focused education – the government’s Re-admission Policy.
- Early Childhood Development (ECD) – priorities being addressed in ECD include funding increases, access of children to ECD services and improvements to the quality of ECD services.
- School development grants – CSEC is monitoring the budgets and related expenditure of school development grants.

The role of coalitions, as well as the role of members of coalitions, in building and sustaining public awareness on critical education issues, using evidence-based advocacy and monitoring for policy, legislation or practice changes, and contributing to national, regional and global advocacy has improved. While a level of ‘tokenism’ remains, support from donor agencies and international NGOs is adding strength to outcomes in this area. It is recognised by coalitions and CSEF, however, that simply being ‘at the table’ is not enough – real involvement in discussions and decision-making is necessary. In Vietnam, most of the members of the Vietnam Association for Education (VAEFA) came from small organizations that did not have many resources. Members expressed during the evaluation that greater effort needed to be placed on recruiting more dynamic participation in the steering board of
the coalition. Since legal status had recently been granted, future plans included an intention to extend outreach to the south in an effort to strengthen the grass roots foundation of the coalition. In Zimbabwe, the coalition is aware that development of the government’s understanding of ECOZI’s advocacy role is critical, as it has been seen too much as a service provider. Membership of the ECG has been important in this regard, as ECOZI’s role on the ECG is at the policy/strategy level. Gaining ECG membership has been a key outcome, and is an example of best practice.

It is important to note the recognition from government of the quality and importance of coalition participation in education sector development. This recognition has come about because of external encouragement coming from GCE/GPE and the activities undertaken by coalitions themselves. Thanks to these inputs, coalition credibility has improved (e.g. Moldovan Alliance has increased its already strong credibility with its evidence based advocacy and engagement in policy making), and is further supported by coalition leadership of Global Action Week (GAW). In Cambodia, NEP coordinated GAW and World Teachers Day in October 2014 with coalition members from 22 provinces throughout the country. According to stakeholders, each year the profile and sophistication have increased the impact of the campaign. The formation of campaign committees for GAW and World Teachers day were directly funded by CSEF but more notably also included financial contributions from NEP members. In 2015 members agreed on one overall campaign message that was brought forth in media campaigns in several different areas. This component of support – external encouragement from international agencies and donors - is mentioned as a tool for credibility and visibility for national coalitions, and for CSEF more generally. ECOZI acknowledges in this same discussion and context that it has learned and is learning new ways of engaging with government, and that as a result government now provides civil society with a platform, with space, to express views and commentary, as well as welcoming civil society representatives to policy and programme launches. In Malawi, CSEC visibility and credibility are directly commented on by government, with particular reference to CSEC’s positive contributions to joint sector reviews, technical working groups and in-sector working groups, where CSEC is invited specifically because it is an umbrella body. The perspective of international organizations is somewhat mixed. On the one hand, CSEC is recognised as an important champion of education advocacy in Malawi, as an effective coalition, and for its formation of district networks. On the other hand, there is a view among the ‘development partners’ that CSEC is not visible enough in international forums. While CSEC has been formally invited to participate in the LEG, its participation is not seen as consistent enough, nor strong enough, which impacts both visibility and credibility.

In Zimbabwe, ECOZI participation in the ECG is marked by an approach that does not avoid controversy or seek it. There is an expressed view, from government, international partners and from coalition members that ECOZI’s contribution to policy discussion and development ‘has been significant’, and that the organization is recognised for its ability to bring people on board and contribute to progress. ECOZI is also a participant in a number of technical working groups of the Ministry – the Technical Working Group for the Sector Plan and the Technical Working Group for Care and Support for Teaching and Learning. An important aspect of ECOZI’s effectiveness is its use of member organizations to lead its advocacy work. The point was made strongly that the Secretariat works for members and members work
with the Secretariat. ECOZI activities are done for the benefit of member organizations, who set priorities annually.

Objective 2: National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate.

The role of coalitions as actors in policy-making processes, as well as the role of members of coalitions as contributors to the governance and ensuring unified voice of the coalition, has improved. The CSEF approach to supporting the coalitions is adequate in terms of ensuring that coalitions are membership-based and that the provided grant enables country/coalition level cooperation and teamwork. Evidence collected during case study work in-country demonstrates that the grants provided by the CSEF are effective in terms of strengthening the internal linkages and democratic governance of the coalitions and of the advocacy work they carry out. Supporting the coalition secretariats (through core funding covering Secretariat’s work in terms of human and other resources) to assist their members and facilitate exchanges, discussions and decision-making has brought new values into coalition dynamics. Coalitions are being demonstrably successful in ensuring that the voice of civil society, coalition members, is being heard, both with government and with the wider public. Examples of this include the Cambodian National Education Partnership (NEP) and the Moldovan Alliance, whose members have succeeded in providing a unified voice in policy and advocacy work. Also, Yemen and Sudan were mentioned by some interlocutors as positive examples. There are examples of increased proactive engagement of coalition members and information-sharing with beneficiaries, the general public, and government (local and national) as evidenced by field observation in Moldova. Meanwhile, ECOZI is implementing a membership strategy, which is built on strong communication within the coalition and a focus on the six EFA goals that are fundamental to both ECOZI and ANCEFA. When a group applies to be a member of the coalition their applications are screened to see how their priorities correlate with these goals. Coalition members subscribe to the EFA goals, and ECOZI coordinated meetings provide a platform where members discuss what they are doing in terms of EFA and how this can apply to ECOZI actions. Thanks to ensured funds for advocacy activities, coalition members have more opportunity to build capacities and take the lead in organising and running awareness-raising and advocacy activities, which are prepared based on evidence collected in the field through research and the testing of new models (e.g. the Moldova case). This is an example of growth in both capacity and sophistication, as there is a greater focus now on (evidence-based) advocacy and policy change, as described above, compared to a focus in earlier years on awareness-raising campaigns.12

The development of ‘sub-national’ levels is another area initiated by some coalitions within the framework of CSEF support. There are good examples of effectiveness of approach at this level. NEP in Cambodia and ECOZI in Zimbabwe have both begun developing provincial level structures in districts outside of the capitals. The chapters are an important strategy for assisting members in remote areas to participate in both actions and in planning. In the case of Senegal, regional branches composed of member representatives focus on local priorities that are brought up to the national level. This structure ensures an active participation of member organizations at the local level and not simply participation of head offices (for greater detail, see Senegal Case Study section 4.1.2 Synergies for Member Priorities and Mechanisms for Ensuring Stakeholder Involvement in Planning and Implementation). One specific development of CSEC in Malawi, in terms of network development, is the establishment of the District Education Network (DEN). The DEN is CSEC’s local face, and an effective mechanism for implementation of policy initiatives, advocacy and monitoring at the district level. Another example is Kenya, where there are 39 counties. The Coalition has an office in each of these counties.

Objective 3: Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals.

Data collected and analysed points to the finding that supporting research with capacity building and financial resources is one of the major contributions of the CSEF programme. Supporting coalitions to undertake or to support research has been a key tool that has provided coalitions with a way to bring substantive contributions into the policy arena. For many coalitions, this process has become the cornerstone of their evidence-based advocacy approach, and many examples exist across CSEF of this approach and its outputs and outcomes, as is discussed in more detail in the seven case studies produced within the framework of this evaluation and examples provided throughout the report. Of note, coalitions have produced important baselines studies and situational analyses that offer fresh insight into the status, needs and constraints of target groups and duty bearers. These inputs open the door to more substantial exchange with government counterparts and ensure more active participation in policy-making. For example, a research study by the coalition in Moldova brought in fresh analysis of models for inclusive education (and de-institutionalization) that brought the coalition to the forefront of decision-making, as experts with evidence on models that should be replicated across the country. In Zimbabwe, research was used as a base for lobbying for education to be considered a basic right in the Bill of Rights in the new Constitution, development of Teacher Professional Standards, participation in the Curriculum Review process, etc. In Malawi, the coalition’s annual detailed analysis of the national education budget ensures monitoring budgets and related expenditure, while a position paper on Malawi special needs education provided assistance with adopting an agenda and subsequently a special needs education policy (See Case studies for more detailed analysis of relevant gains in each case country).

However, data derived from the document/literature review, and stakeholder consultations point to a concern about the quality of the programme’s gathering, archiving and sharing of a) the research done by coalitions and others that contributes to policy change, b) documents or other sources that evidence this policy change and c) links to and/ or
availability on the CSEF website. This is a relevant concern, taking into account the importance of maintaining institutional knowledge and evidence nationally, regionally and globally. While archiving is not centralised, some documentation can be found on coalitions’ and regions’ websites. Work has started to systematize CSEF archives despite limited resources in the global and regional secretariats. Meanwhile, an interim arrangement for sharing has been coordinated, and a more robust system is planned for next year.

**Objective 4:** The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes.

The CSEF programme has provided opportunities for coalitions to participate in learning processes, sharing systems, undertake joint strategizing and partner development. The programme has learning processes which include specific line items for collaborative events. The participation of ‘CSEF coalitions’ in regional ministerial conferences has been notable for participants as it provides a space for coalitions to show that they are organised, united and well prepared in their advocacy processes. A number of the collaborative processes/ tools used within CSEF have brought positive effects on the overall quality of the work, networking and sharing of coalitions. The following specific approaches and strategies in this area are worth mentioning, as they are approaches that have a specific and positive impact on coalition development and effectiveness.

- Planning Matters, a handbook for civil society participation in national education sector activities and processes\(^{13}\) – an example of a shared approach.
- Thematic Groups – Some coalitions operate through thematic groups, with leadership of a thematic group provided from within the coalition, but not the Secretariat, spreading load and expertise.
- District-level and sub-national relationships (described above) are both an area of concern and focus. This ‘chapter-type’ approach are an effective way of reaching all parts of the country – of reaching people who are usually not heard from, of developing outreach across the whole country and of gaining access to research and inputs from a wide group of interested groups and individuals. However, findings of the evaluation point to the fact that a focused approach on the sub-national level is not developed well enough yet across the programme.
- Listservs – There are two operational listservs, for sharing on GPE discussions and one developed by GCE which is a five-language discussion forum on a range of topics.
- Emerging trends in the use of technology for mobilisation, raising awareness and outreach.
  o Community radio – it is quite difficult in many places where CSEF works to, for example, send emails, but people listen to radio. A developing practice is for a coalition to have a phone-in programme.

---

\(^{13}\) [http://www.campaignforeducation.org/docs/csef/Planning%20Matters%20In%20Education_WEB_EN.pdf](http://www.campaignforeducation.org/docs/csef/Planning%20Matters%20In%20Education_WEB_EN.pdf)
- Text messages are another effective tool, improving communication processes by using the readily available mobile network.
- WhatsApp is an even more interesting tool on the mobile network, and is widely used by coalitions as it provides for an effective group/community discussion of issues, events, etc, and as an advocacy tool.

Cross-country shared learning approaches are recognised as important to development of knowledge and skills, particularly for smaller, younger coalitions. There are important and effective examples of cross-country shared learning, such as the facilitation by CLADE, Regional Secretariat for Latin America, of shared learning between coalitions in Nicaragua and Dominican Republic. In this case, The Forum on Education and Human Development of the Initiative for Nicaragua (FEDH-IPN) was able to learn from and gain insight on the strategy used by its Dominican peer to monitor the education sector budgeting by the government. It was noted in interviews in Zimbabwe that ANCEFA, GCE and Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA) all assist with mobilisation and advocacy development, and all assist the coalition to develop its capacity in these areas. Where training and exchange programmes take place, coalition policy is that members participate according to the focus of their work in a given thematic area – e.g., ECD-focused members participated in an ECD programme in South Africa. Further, ANCEFA ensures that the coalition participates in regional meetings and education-related forums, and also prepares platforms where coalitions in different countries share things they have learned and success stories - Lesotho has visited Zimbabwe and ECOZI visited Malawi. In Malawi, a noted aspect of ANCEFA’s role is the technical support it provides to the coalition. This technical support covers the whole range of training/capacity-building requirements of CSEC in management and administration as well as the policy analysis and development needs of the coalition. CSEC acknowledges a focus in ANCEFA on learning, including learning that is built on networking with other coalitions. The network-based sharing is important in demonstrating new approaches to advocacy, new possibilities for types of advocacy initiatives and new policy priorities for addressing with government. In Vietnam, VAFFA described its role in this context as supporting members to have access to international experience to bring back to share locally and inform member activities in Vietnam. Member organizations saw this ‘internationalism’ as an added benefit for which they relied on VAFFA. Toward this aim, VAFFA facilitated several member organizations to participate in regional training events and study tours. A learning visit to Mongolia planned for a coalition member to visit a school for the deaf, facilitated with the support of ASPBAE, the Asia and Pacific Regional Secretariat, was seen by members as a valuable learning experience. Despite these efforts, the CSEF programme has not been perceived as ensuring enough South-South collaboration. Energy and resources dedicated to this area are not deemed sufficient, as indicated by interviewees to the evaluation team during field work. While South-South collaboration is a stated objective of the programme, it is not being pursued, as priorities for existing funding, and for the time and energy of current, limited human resources, are directed in other areas, making it difficult for the CSEF programme to provide impetus to this priority.
## Summary Analysis of Expected Results

The following table provides a summary analysis of the expected results of the CSEF programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 1.1.</strong> Civil society participation in policy forums and dialogue such as Local Education Groups (LEGs), Technical Working Groups (TWGs) and other political and policy spaces increases. Civil society participation in such dialogues becomes increasingly recognized and more influential</td>
<td>This is the area of greatest visibility of the work of coalitions, including with their support from the CSEF programme. As is seen throughout this report, there are many examples of civil society participation in policy forums and in development of and/or impact on policy formulation/implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 1.2.</strong> Civil society involvement in policy dialogue and in parliamentary processes relating to education and engagement of parliamentarians on education issues increases</td>
<td>The CSEF programme contributed to increasing civil society involvement and participation in policy dialogue and in parliamentary processes relating to education and engagement of parliamentarians on education issues. There are many examples throughout this report and in individual case study reports of national coalitions’ involvement in policy dialogue and parliamentary processes related to education, which resulted in policy change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 1.3.</strong> CSEF Regional and Global structures draw on national coalition activities to inform regional and global advocacy (cross-cutting with Objective 4)</td>
<td>The CSEF programme’s support to research activities at national levels was one of the key avenues for achievement of this result. There are examples in all CSEF regions where evidence generated through programme supported research activities is used to inform national, regional and global advocacy actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 2.1.</strong> There is an overall increase in membership in and participation of grass-roots based civil society actors in CSEF-funded civil society education coalitions. There is an increase in number of member organizations representing historically disadvantaged groups (so as to strengthen the representative function of coalitions)</td>
<td>There is a visible increase in coalition membership, as well as a more effective participation of members in coalition activities. Coalitions also demonstrate a greater diversity of membership, including of marginalised groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 2.2.</strong></td>
<td>All coalitions develop civil society policy proposals through inclusive and participatory consultations with broad constituencies. Major coalition outputs (e.g. research, position papers, advocacy briefs) pass through an “inclusion audit” to ensure member perspectives (including perspectives from historically marginalized groups) are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 2.3.</strong></td>
<td>All coalitions build and sustain public awareness on critical education issues through debates, events, media work and campaigns. Issues identified may include education rights, EFA goals and/or education policy and spending. While advocacy has become a more significant focus of coalitions, maintenance of public awareness approaches remains a focus, with coalitions (their secretariats and their membership) participating in forums, debates, media campaigns, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 3.1.</strong></td>
<td>All civil society education coalitions complete research or monitoring exercises in one of the following areas (i) budget, finance, expenditure, (ii) governance, transparency, social accountability, or (iii) a self-selected EFA related policy or implementation issue. Monitoring exercises may track expenditure, policy implementation, or some other aspect of education service delivery, such as equity or quality. There is a visible focus of coalitions (noted in the evaluation’s Case Studies, which did not look beyond 7 countries) on the use of research in development of evidence-based advocacy processes. Coalitions have used this evidence-based approach in relation to budgets, policy-frameworks, policy implementation and priority setting within the education sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ER 3.2.</strong></td>
<td>Evidence from ER 3.1 is used for coalition advocacy, policy participation and mobilisation. National coalitions effect specific changes in policy, legislation or practice through evidence-based advocacy and monitoring activities. See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER 4.1.</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat ensure national coalitions’ knowledge and experiences are collected, documented and shared across the coalition, e.g. CSEF will track progress toward “learning goals” and disseminate findings semi-annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER 4.2.</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat ensure national coalitions receive technical and management support, based on expressed and assessed needs. NB: Coalitions will express interests in proposal application submitted to Regional Secretariats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER 4.3.</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat ensure all coalitions contribute to and have the chance to participate in regional and global advocacy that builds on grassroots and national priorities. Regional Secretariats and Global Secretariat work on creating and identifying opportunities for coalitions to contribute to and participate in regional and global advocacy events and represent their member organizations, their interest and good practice examples from their countries. In addition, these regional events enable national coalitions to share with their members and governments examples of successful policies from other countries and regions that can inform their advocacy efforts and decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER 4.4.</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats’ and Global Secretariat’s contribution to global policy dialogue on education (through GPE, UNESCO or other bodies/frameworks) results in the inclusion of civil society priorities or perspectives (e.g. specific language) of global policies, strategies, agenda-setting documents. The evaluation did not get sufficient feedback on results and the inclusion of civil society priorities or perspectives (e.g. specific language) of global policies, strategies, agenda-setting documents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Analysis of Learning Goals

The following table provides a summary analysis of the learning goals of the CSEF programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Goal 1</strong></td>
<td>The programme demonstrates a learning intent, and has effectively implemented specific strategies that enable coalitions to learn from each other, particularly in terms of policy participation and influence. Coalitions describe the effectiveness of their direct interactions with other coalitions, in their own country or at regional gatherings. Stated objectives of South-South learning are not being addressed sufficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Goal 2</strong></td>
<td>As above, the programme demonstrates a learning intent, and has effectively implemented specific strategies that enable coalitions to learn from each other. While emphasis is greater on methodologies and approaches, content is also shared in cross-country learning activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Goal 3</strong></td>
<td>The programme has been quite successful in supporting coalitions in strengthening outreach and membership. At the regional level, experiences are tracked and matched for the country level (e.g. Nicaragua and Dominican Republic on education budget monitoring), although this approach is more visible in some regions than in others. As with other areas of the learning goals, development and sharing of effective strategies are an area of stronger output/outcome than the actual tracking of experiences/strategies in a structured way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Goal 4</strong></td>
<td>Through strong grassroots involvement and research, coalitions are learning to identify issues pertaining to marginalised groups and to work with them to bring their perspectives to the fore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 5</td>
<td>Coalitions and regions track evidence of “effectiveness” of public awareness and mobilization activities, including which “EFA themes” elicit and energize the participation of key constituencies and are evidenced in “civil society policy proposals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 6</td>
<td>CSEF learns about in which EFA/national education areas coalition research, monitoring and advocacy activities been most influential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 7</td>
<td>CSEF learns which coalition research methods and ways of communicating research findings have been most effective in influencing policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 8</td>
<td>CSEF assesses the extent to which national coalitions’ products, knowledge and experience are being effectively shared and contributing to organizational learning and which learning modalities/activities are working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Goal 9</td>
<td>CSEF learns which coalition technical and management capacities are being strengthened and which capacity-building modalities works best (e.g. face-to-face; remote support; mentoring; communities of practice).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning Goal 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSEF learns which issues have global civil society consensus and show possibility for further mobilization and influence.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The programme’s processes of monitoring are not focused effectively at this learning level, and are not sufficiently directed at gathering global lessons learned and developing a consensus in these areas with coalitions (and the CSEF programme generally). There are a number of efforts being undertaken in this area, which focus on issues of global civil society consensus, which coalitions engage in. However, systems of sharing and learning need to become more effective specifically in terms of this learning area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Influencing Effectiveness

The programme implementation and achievement of results have been influenced by a number of factors, and this section analyses different drivers and hampering factors.

Drivers

The programme concept, approach and strategies for achievement of results are supported and moved forward by relevant governance bodies, the GCE and the GPE. This is important especially from the perspective of the support provided by the CSEF programme, and particularly to coalitions that are, at the moment, underdeveloped, ineffective and not strong enough to be more recognized partners of government and international organizations.

Data derived from document and literature review, and stakeholder consultations, provides evidence of the strong interest, dedication and commitment of coalitions, RS, FMA, etc and of GCE (the Global Secretariat). General agreement among stakeholders participating in interviews is that CSEF has been a valuable and positive experience to parties and brought positive value, particularly at the national level. The role of ANCEFA in the provision of technical support - capacity-building in management, administration and policy analysis and network-based sharing is important for CSEC in developing and implementing advocacy initiatives and new policy priorities. In Zimbabwe, planning processes include involving members in a way that incorporates discussions of national priorities, coalition priorities and member priorities in the internal coalition thinking/ talking/ planning. This planning approach is attributed by ECOZI to training provided through the CSEF programme.

Effectiveness has been driven at regional level by a conscientious effort to maximize and prioritize interventions with available resources. The dedication of both FMA and Regional Secretariat personnel to respond to specific needs and tailor their support in a consultative manner to coalitions has provided the basis for their effective implementation of the programme. The separation of financial and technical duties between Secretariats and FMAs
has also freed the former from any potential conflicts of interest, or perception thereof, among their membership.

Hampering factors

There is an expressed view from field work that human resource levels, organizational structure and implementation approaches of GCE, in the delivery of the CSEF programme, are not appropriate to the effective and efficient delivery of the programme. Specifically, the expressed view is that CSEF is conceived of as both a programme and a grant-making mechanism, and that the structure of management of the programme is inappropriate for delivery of both of these functions/ priorities/ activities/ results areas. The concern is expressed that within the current structure, and with current levels of resourcing (at the Global Secretariat and within RS), efficient and effective delivery of the grant programme, and effective development of both regional structures and coalitions, cannot be achieved to desired levels. A number of examples are discussed related to these concerns, chiefly related to the inefficient implementation of the grant programme detailed below, as well as in relation to technical support to and development of coalition capacities and programmes. A number of interviewees, from the coalition level, regional agencies, and representatives of global organizations, expressed views indicating an understanding that expectations from the programme are not being met, and they attribute this to these areas of resourcing and programme design.

Regional structures are also under-resourced, which affects their capacity building efforts, as well as the other roles they are expected to play (further discussion of this is found in the Efficiency section below). There is limited RS/ FMA interactions with national coalitions in some countries due to funding and capacity constraints, reducing support to a small number of trips to countries and providing support mostly by email and phone. As is discussed above, GCE, RS and coalitions are achieving outcomes, and address their activities and intended results with professionalism, but are hampered in their efforts by this lack of resourcing.

Further discussion of this issue is found in the Efficiency, Conclusions and Recommendations sections.

4.3 Efficiency

Efficiency is a measurement of project management performance with regard to achieving the goals by using available resources. The ToR requires analysis of cost-effectiveness of the programme, and in response to the ToR, only a limited cost-effectiveness analysis has been conducted, due to time and resource constraints for this evaluation.

The programme has been managed in an inclusive and culturally sensitive manner. The global programme management was strengthened by a team established under the supervision of the GCE and in close consultation with UNESCO as Supervising Entity. The programme team is responsible for providing expertise and ensuring efficiency in the operational management of the programme, i.e. day-to-day technical and financial management of the programme, monitoring and reporting, quality assurance of outputs and outcomes, advocacy and communication. There have been some discontinuities in the
programme management function, which at times affected the timeliness of some activities. This includes, particularly, the issue with staffing allocations within the Global Secretariat which was exacerbated early in the funding period when a number of positions were not filled, meaning that not only were there not enough positions in any case, those that were allocated were not filled. This left the programme starting off slowly, inefficiently and ineffectively. However, once the programme picked up pace, it managed to ensure a generally relatively smooth implementation process. The feedback from stakeholders confirms that activities and management of the programme were conducted with attention to ensuring an implementation approach, which is highly inclusive and culturally sensitive. GCE is perceived as a respected partner, and coalitions as well as other stakeholders are grateful for the support provided so far.

The complex management and supervision structure of the CSEF programme was instrumental to its fine-tuning and strategic orientation as it allowed the SE to provide feedback on and input to the strategic decision making. However, it also created obstacles to the programme’s optimal functioning because of the delays that occurred. The participatory strategy used by the programme worked well for ownership but affected the efficiency of support in the short term. The programme used an approach which ensured the involvement of the different partners in each stage of the process, which meant that the original timeframe for some activities was too ambitious and required rescheduling. Additionally, delays at the level of GPE with regards to decision-making and release of funds impacted negatively on the implementation timeframe. This risk was not anticipated ahead of time.

Besides UNESCO’s financial risk assessment, no other programmatic risk assessment was done and the programme documentation does not include a specific mitigation strategy.

The global CSEF Secretariat is under-resourced, which has been one impediment to the programme. During evaluation interviews/discussions about the CSEF programme, the role and function of the group of people that manage CSEF, and that sit in Johannesburg and London, is referred to as CSEF Secretariat, Global Secretariat and GCE, interchangeably, and depending to a certain extent on geography. This is illuminating in the context of this evaluation. GCE is more than the Civil Society Education Fund (Global Action Week being the best example of work done by GCE that is beyond CSEF). The Civil Society Education Fund is more than the CSEF Secretariat (RS, FMAs, GOC, RFCs, coalitions, IPG). The CSEF Secretariat has offices in Johannesburg, responsible for overall management (one senior staff), financial management (one financial manager and a small team) and monitoring and evaluation (one senior staff) and in London, responsible for communication and learning approaches/systems (one senior and one support staff). The GCE secretariat itself is also based in Johannesburg. It is understood that donors have pushed hard for the CSEF Secretariat not to become heavily staffed, and for financing to be focused on ‘programme’, not administration and management. The programme has focused, in theory, on the strengthening of coalitions, with regional structures to provide the necessary technical and financial support and oversight needed by coalitions. There is a view in the field, expressed during field work, that this approach underestimates the amount of work required at both global and regional
levels to provide the necessary support and capacity-building. The CSEF Secretariat was described in field interviews as ‘lean’, and ‘very lean’.14

**GPE’s funding guidance has affected the efficiency of the programme.** During the initial stages of the programme, GPE established funding guidance15 for the various levels of the CSEF structure (CSEF Secretariat, regional structures, and coalitions), which was later established as a benchmark, that a maximum of 40% of funding can go to ‘administration’ while 60% minimum must go to ‘programme’. There are expressed issues with this criteria - all staffing is considered part of the administration component, irrespective of the role of a particular person, the best example being programme officers at Regional Secretariats (RS) who provide technical support and capacity building to coalitions. There is a consistent, widespread call for a revision to the above benchmark, which is perceived as a funding ‘principle’, with greater detailing of what is ‘programme’ and what is ‘administration’. This is accompanied with an acknowledgement of the type of programme that is being implemented, i.e., a large, geographically dispersed, complicated programme heavily focused on building of capacity and the development of grassroots coalitions, with the related requirement of inputs that can actually do this development work.

Regional Secretariats add value to and increase effectiveness of the programme, but there are constraints in the extent to which they can maintain efficient support. Three of the four RS consistently function well, with good levels of coordination with coalitions as well as with FMAs and GCE. However, a consistently expressed view is that RS are under-resourced for the role they play. Expressions heard in the field include ‘lean’, ‘need more bandwidth’, ‘heavy structure to deal with the technical approach’, and that programme officers are not in a position to offer a more qualitative approach to the building of coalition capacity due to resourcing constraints. Coalitions are generally supportive of the role of RS and their contributions to management, growth, networking and reporting, but this varies between regions. In Senegal, stakeholders expressed that COSYDEP was supported by ANCEFA in quality control, programme development, and technical assistance, and had received increased support from the Regional Secretariat. Although there was overall satisfaction with the M&E framework and regional support from ANCEFA, additional technical support, in the form of trainings and field visits was desired. In Cambodia, NEP staff noted that it would be helpful if regional staff had more time to allocate to supporting the coalition. This was attributed to the fact that the regional secretariat had one program officer responsible for supporting five countries. Ongoing and potentially additional support from the regional structure was requested in the future in the area of strategic direction of advocacy, facilitating regional networking, exchange and cross-fertilization, and reporting. While communication is central to the role of RS, there is a desire for more face-to-face interaction between RS and coalitions, as, generally, there is not enough resourcing for this interaction. It is one key role of the RS to provide the technical inputs and capacity building interventions required by the coalitions, and the limited face-to-face support does not contribute to

14 The Institutional Capacity Assessment conducted by CARDNO Emerging Markets USA, Ltd recognizes this issue: ‘How are you doing your job with so few staff?’
15 Sometimes referred to as “funding principle” by the evaluation respondents.
coalition growth. While some regions are conducive to ‘lean’ and responsive RS, others face difficulty in responding to requests and providing hands-on support. The value of Regional Secretariats is demonstrated in Zimbabwe, where ECOZI comments on being supported in its development, and its planning, implementation and reporting processes by ANCEFA – ‘they are able to push us when our policies or practice are not up to scratch’. ECOZI also welcomes being affiliated with a large, pan-African NGO. In Malawi, the role played by ANCEFA is strongly supported by CSEC, particularly their understanding of what is happening on the ground, and the provision by ANCEFA of peer learning, shared learning and collaboration processes.

RS are funded directly from GCE, and the Global Secretariat works with them in the same way as with FMAs. The cooperation is through an annual grant, which is based on a cycle agreement, although there is a view that delays at the level of GPE decision-making and release of funds impacts negatively on the work of RS. RS provide bi-annual financial reports. RS reports are consolidated into the global CSEF financial reports, together with information from coalitions, FMAs and the Global Secretariat. RS vary considerably in their structure and functionality. The role of the FMAs in monitoring is changing/developing currently. ALL relationships in terms of finances were historically between GCE and each region – i.e. financial oversight was solely at the regional level. Now coalition material is visible to the Global Secretariat. No review of this additional level is undertaken by the Global Secretariat – this is the role of each FMA – but it is visible. In Africa, this information is visible on-line, and coalitions do their financial management on-line. FMAs work with coalitions, i.e., their contact with coalitions is direct, and FMAs provide coalitions with annual grants based on a cycle agreement. The coalitions’ view of FMAs is generally supportive, specifically in terms of assistance in financial management and in building organizational capacity by improving the working systems, and specifically in developing capacity for internal audit. The use of the standard template enables consistent, consolidated reporting. It was specifically mentioned that improvements in financial management contribute to the quality of programmatic outcomes. However, FMA’s work with coalitions in budget formulation is seen by some coalitions as rigid and heavily focused on funding, not programme, i.e., that coalitions would benefit from a greater emphasis on/assistance with focusing budget discussions on their programme, and its requirements, rather than on funding constraints. There is a related view that future programmes, and specifically the defined role of FMAs, would benefit from a clearer balance between finance and programme in budget development. Finally, some rethinking and clarifying of the roles and responsibilities related to financial management would benefit coalitions. The ECOZI view is that Oxfam’s control systems are clear and effective, but that they could demonstrate greater focus on the provision of resources to the coalition in developing skills and experience. While ECOZI staff have participated in regional financial management workshops, no visits have been made by the FMA, and ECOZI is of the view that even annual visits would assist financial officers in development of a more detailed understanding of financial management systems, and to address detailed questions to FMA representatives.

Coalitions report quarterly on their grant, making use of the standard template, and these coalition reports are consolidated into a quarterly regional financial report. Coalitions do, however, recognise deficiencies in the structure of coordination between FMAs and RSs that impact negatively on CSEF processes. For example, while CSEC in Malawi commented on the
quality of inputs, they also mention inefficiencies in the structure of coordination between ANCEFA and Oxfam West Africa that impact CSEC’s processes, including a process whereby CSEC receives ANCEFA comments on its reports, addresses the comments and then has these reports sent to Oxfam for further comments, raising the question as to why one aggregated set of comments is not provided to the coalition.

RFCs are viewed as an excellent feature of CSEF design/implementation. As per the Terms of Reference for the Regional Funding Committees (RFC), they are charged with evaluating national education coalition proposals, deciding on proposal approval and level of funding, and making recommendations on capacity-building support. They ensure that the decisions are free of conflicts of interest. The RFC follow CSEF guidelines on proposal evaluation and fund allocation to national education coalitions, developed by the Regional Secretariats and the Global Secretariat and approved by the CSEF Global Oversight Committee. Funding decisions are made transparently. Review of proposals and final decisions are made during face-to-face or online/teleconferencing meetings on whether or not to fund specific proposals and on the level of funding based on CSEF guidance discussed above. There is a general consensus that RFCs are a cost effective mechanism that ensures a fair and transparent funding allocation. RFC require coalitions to demonstrate the ability to engage stakeholders, gain civil society support, align with CSEF objectives, and include activities related to education in fragile states, girls’ education, teaching, and education funding. The work of the RFCs includes an important feedback loop based on this assessment, providing coalitions and Regional Secretariats with assessment of capacity-building needs and recommendations for strengthening applications. The evaluation respondents particularly highlight this feature as an important additional contribution of RFC to strengthening the outcomes of the CSEF programme.

The Global Oversight Committee (GOC) is a functional driver of the programme. As with the RFC, there is very strong support, globally, for the role, function and composition of the GOC. The GOC is noted for being knowledgeable, and for its capability to address conflicts and to make hard decisions. Given the composition of the GCE Board, including participation from organizations that receive funding, it was important to develop a structure that avoided conflicts of interest. The GOC has done this, smoothing decision-making processes and releasing the CSEF from decisions that were difficult to take, given the organizational structures. For example, with GOC’s initial approval of a regional budget, a complexity in administrative and governance processes is removed that facilitates all processes moving forward.

UNESCO has played an important role in strengthening the CSEF programme’s accountability and has contributed to strengthening the management practices and quality of reporting outputs of the CSEF programme. In its Supervising Entity role, UNESCO

---

provided significant technical support to the CSEF Global Secretariat by providing input and expert advice into the design of the CSEF programme and its evaluation. As such, UNESCO contributed to strengthening the programmatic component of the CSEF programme.

UNESCO supported GCE’s management role by providing regular and thorough reviews of implementation plans for each project component against activity and financial reports. This quality control role significantly contributed to ensuring rigor and overall quality of reporting outputs of the CSEF programme and its ability to share results. UNESCO also contributed to improving the knowledge management and deriving learning from programme implementation by providing technical advice and encouraging management structures of the programme to establish a more robust filing system and platforms for collecting and sharing learning across countries, regions and globally.

Another important area of UNESCO’s contribution is in strengthening the research component of the CSEF programme. UNESCO was a strong advocate for inclusion of research activities for all CSEF supported coalitions, which became compulsory upon consultations with GCE in 2013.

UNESCO additionally leveraged efforts of the CSEF programme by facilitating linkages to regional and global EFA processes for many CSEF supported coalitions and their members.

The process of establishing the role of UNESCO as Supervising Entity was inefficient and resulted in delays. The process of establishing the Supervising Entity (SE) was cumbersome and slow at the onset, creating delays in the fulfilment of the role during implementation. GCE developed a proposal for the CSEF programme continuation, which was assessed through an expedited review carried out by GPE. Following the approval of the funding, the GPE initiated tripartite discussions (GPE-GCE-UNESCO) from Jan-May 2013 - on the SE role and the programme to be supervised. The funding period had already begun before the SE was established by the GPE in early 2013, following its initial appointment of UNESCO as a Management Entity in December 2012 and a consequent reversal of that decision. The process of defining the SE role and delineating it from the role of the management entity required a review and discussion of GPE’s standard rules and regulations, which were designed for a standard government grant and not easily applicable to a complex, multi-level programme such as CSEF. This triggered a series of tripartite consultations between GPE, GCE and UNESCO that took several months to complete, resulting in implementation delays. These consultations also included the review and revisions of the CSEF programme design based on the outcomes of the evaluation from the previous implementation phase and UNESCO’s technical input. On appointment of the SE and to facilitate the uptake of that role, a financial and administrative risk assessment of the programme was completed. Consequently, additional revisions to the project document were made to address key concerns. It was only at this stage that the final shape of the SE’s role was determined to include fiduciary responsibilities for the global, not national level. Supervision of the national level funds was not part of the SE role.

All of these processes meant the final design of the programme for the funding period was not completed until a number of months into implementation, and as a result the process of funding of coalitions did not begin until May 2013, five months after organizations would
have expected their first releases. The funding delays, which persisted throughout the implementation process continued to impact on the ability of coalitions and regional structures to ensure timely implementation of their work. This process put a strain on relationships between the SE and CSEF management structures who question the role, function and approach of UNESCO in their role as SE, which continued throughout implementation. A number of factors are discussed relating to this effect:

- Funded organizations hold ‘the UNESCO bureaucracy’ responsible for the initial and subsequent delays in funding releases. UNESCO is seen as overly-bureaucratic generally, which is of particular significance in terms of its impact on activities and outputs in a complex, civil society focused programme. As an SE, UNESCO was responsible for supervising the programme against the expected results, however, due to the limitations of its role and removed position from implementation processes, it had to rely on completeness and accuracy of programmatic and financial reports coming from the CSEF management structures on which to base its verification processes. This often resulted in repeated requests for more detailed reports, clarification and revisions to submitted reports. While UNESCO’s quality assurance and verification contributed to improved overall quality and accuracy of CSEF programme reporting, these requests were perceived by CSEF management structures as adding an unnecessary burden to coalitions, RS and the Global Secretariat.

- While UNESCOs role as SE is compliance-based\(^{17}\), there is a perception among the management structures of the CSEF programme that this is too narrow a focus and that UNESCO should have been more capacity building oriented.

- There is disappointment that, per the UNESCO/ GCE contract, financial systems and reporting are UNESCO’s, not the previously established, and internally used, CSEF systems. The stated view is reports from coalitions/ RS/ FMA are handled within the CSEF system and then all data is transferred into the UNESCO system. The UNESCO system also has less detail than the CSEF system. However, the process and timing of establishing the SE’s role impacted on these decisions. While it can be argued that use of UNESCO’s systems was not the best decision, it was a decision taken by GPE, during the delayed process of appointment.

It is understood that the GPE Board has approved a recommendation that GCE become the CSEF’s Managing Entity (ME). In this process, GCE will take over the role of supervisor from the SE. The principle of such an approach has strong but not universal support, including the CARDNO reviews, although there are concerns about the capacity of the GCE Secretariat to fulfil the obligations of being an ME given the current, and previously discussed issues with resourcing/ capacity in the on-going programme. It will be extremely important to ensure

\(^{17}\) Based on the Terms of Reference for UNESCO’s role as Supervising Entity, April 2013.
the establishment of systems and structures, and the filling of all designated positions, early in the process if GCE is to be successful in performing this function. It will also be critical to ensure that the roles, responsibilities and functions inherent to being an ME are defined well before the beginning of the new funding period.

Efficiency of cooperation with coalitions has been uneven. The cooperation of coalitions and their members has been affected by the level of development of the coalition itself, regional support and the level of effort of the CSEF team in providing support to coalitions individually. Coalitions develop programmes with their members and receive grants from CSEF. Grants range from about US$50,000 to US$200,000 annually, depending somewhat on the level of coalition capacity and on the size of the country. Coalition financial reports go to the FMAs, are consolidated and are provided to the Global Secretariat. Implementation is also driven by coalitions, which has programmatic implications, particularly in terms of defining the role of ‘members’, ‘the secretariat’, and ‘coalitions’. Due to different levels of capacity of coalitions, but also levels of effort invested in them (depending on the regional and global levels), some coalitions feel left on their own. Monitoring reports, interviews and field observations with different levels confirm that some coalitions are active, creative and energetic, while others need to be seriously ‘pushed’ to deliver the outputs and results according to agreements, and to respect deadlines, attend coordination meetings, complete administrative and programmatic tasks, and meaningfully involve their members in decisions. As a result, performance at the level of coalitions and also regions has been unequal, depending on the interest, time allocation and commitment of coalitions, as well as of regional agencies delivering support to these coalitions.

The grant-making component of the programme is not efficient. There are significant and on-going issues with the functioning of the grants programme, particularly in the lack of a timely implementation of the process of calling for proposals, approving proposals and funding grants. There are a number of examples of delays that impact negatively on the programme, globally. The delays include decision making delays at the GPE Board level, timing of calls for proposals, delays in the approval process, delays in the release of funds from the Supervising Entity, and delays in grant disbursements. The delays have a cascading effect down the line. While there was shared responsibility between GPE, GCE and UNESCO for the initial delay, subsequent delays in fund disbursements were mostly due to the late submission of deliverables to UNESCO. As a result of the grant process not happening in a timely fashion, and because of delays in the actual process of funding releases, grantee organizations (coalitions) often go months without funds, a situation that is inappropriate for the programme and that causes significant issues with grantees and national stakeholders. Interviews with coalitions confirm the delays and their negative impact on the national processes, primarily in terms of efficiency and effectiveness of the work of coalitions. This particularly affects smaller coalitions, which do not have core funds that would enable them to operate with delayed funding. Obviously, while the most immediate impact is on coalitions, this impact extends much more widely across the programme and with partners/stakeholders, who also comment on the delays and their impact. A consistent feedback from the field is that there is a fundamental issue within CSEF systems of how a grant programme must function in order to fulfil the needs of funded organizations. In Malawi, the CSEC experience is that no disbursement of CSEF funds has been provided on time, and yet regardless of the delays in disbursements, the coalition is expected to complete its activities.
on time, negatively impacting the quality of activities and outputs. It is noted that this lack of timeliness is noted beyond CSEC itself, with international partners in Malawi commenting on the time-bound nature of the activities of the coalition and the significance of funding delays. In Zimbabwe, the vast majority of ECOZI financial support comes from CSEF. The coalition is currently not sustainable, financially, without this support, which creates problems as the coalition has experienced regular and significant delays in grant disbursements. As well as an inability to pay salaries and other expenses, the coalition is negatively affected in its credibility with national and district government, and with civil society stakeholders, when activities cannot be completed when funds do not arrive.

Monitoring and Reporting systems and requirements are complex and while improvements are constantly being made, they are still inefficient. The structure of the programme creates an unnecessary complexity in monitoring and reporting requirements, systems and outputs. First, reporting processes and requirements for coalitions are burdensome, as they are required to report on finances quarterly, while CSEF narrative reporting is done bi-annually. As well as being a burden on coalitions, this additional reporting does not add value to the programme’s understanding of its outputs and outcomes as it is predominantly activity-based. Reporting templates have continued to evolve during the funding period. While the changes to the templates have not been structural and were mainly driven by feedback from coalitions and based on lessons learned about what has worked well to generate useful information, the fact that the changes were being made was not always received as positive. These changes while well intended, increased complexity for coalitions and impacted negatively on their ability to learn effective monitoring and reporting processes, and to effectively store and use information and report. Information gathered from the field by the evaluation team found that reporting mechanisms established by the CSEF programme were regarded as having become increasingly complicated and time consuming. The national coalition in Cambodia expressed concerns with the MS Excel forms used for financial reporting. In addition to this there were regular delays in funding from the regional funding committee that disrupted coalition functioning and activities that required bridge funding. In Senegal it was suggested that more emphasis should be placed on the needs and priorities of the coalitions, and that the CSEF programme structure should be more flexible and responsive to the national level. Coalitions could not include activities that were not cited as part of their quarterly plans. ECOZI in Zimbabwe noted the systems complexity and time-consuming nature. This was referred to as very cumbersome, as the reporting templates and components are provided in different formats (MS Word and MS Excel), and manual transfer of information across multiple formats is tedious, time consuming and leaves space for error as confirmed by review of formats and through interviews with coalitions and other partners. GCE itself takes coalition reports and from these reports prepares the required narrative reporting on the whole of the programme. This process is inefficient and ineffective, and it also side-lines the RS, whose designated role is intended to include support for monitoring and reporting. The disconnect between national-regional and national-global reporting, while also driven by limited resources at the regional and global levels, does not contribute to an effective understanding of the programme and its results.

There is insufficient staffing within the GCE structure dedicated to the monitoring processes. The monitoring structure as a whole is under-resourced, including staffing at the GCE office, but more so within the RS. The system has helped in terms of drawing numbers
out of the programme – coalitions, membership, LEG participation, etc., and has made it easier to provide those figures and to capture these figures related to the results framework. It does not however contribute significantly to an understanding of programmatic results. The system does not contribute to story-telling – to developing a qualitative approach by coalitions for them to express their work, successes and learning, in a well-developed and strong narrative that can be widely shared.

There is insufficient knowledge and skills in coalitions to use the monitoring system effectively for the benefit of the coalition and for effective use by CSEF in programme reporting. The role of RSs in training, oversight, aggregation and contribution to global reporting is seen as not significant enough – given resourcing issues discussed above. As with earlier discussions on financial management, the question was raised as to why there is not a regional focus, aggregation and reporting up to the global level. As indicated above, regional M&E resourcing and capacity would need to be strengthened. GCE has a huge task to provide oversight, but results are difficult to trace and reporting cannot be guaranteed to be of consistent quality. Another hindering factor was that the results framework was not available to coalitions while they developed their funding proposals – it came later. As a result, as well as due to the on-going issues related to resourcing, there has not been any significant training in the system across the whole of the CSEF programme’s funded coalitions (although there are examples of training in this component in Asia).

Financial Management and Reporting is improving. There is a standard financial reporting template, developed and updated by the Global Secretarial. This template is used by coalitions, RSs, FMAs and the Global Secretariat. The use of the standard template enables consistent, consolidated reporting. The template has been revised over time, and continues to be improved regularly. The reporting reflects the whole of the financial recording and reporting system – it is designed to be ‘simple’, to be consistent and to provide local and global information on budgets and expenditure. A Guideline is provided by the Global Secretariat to go with the template and systems. Reports are submitted to the Global Secretariat from all four regions quarterly. The Secretariat reviews them, and then raises questions as necessary with each region. Once reports are finalised, they are consolidated into a single CSEF report and sent to the Supervising Entity. The content of the reports is regularly queried by the SE.

There are issues with financial reporting formats used for CSEF and for UNESCO. Reporting to UNESCO is not done using CSEF reporting templates. The processes undertaken to appoint UNESCO as SE included agreement that UNESCO financial systems would be used. However, the CSEF reporting template is maintained up to the global consolidation, and then this information is transferred into the UNESCO reporting template.

Limited analysis of cost-effectiveness points to positive cost-effectiveness of the CSEF. The evaluation included enquiry into perceptions of cost-effectiveness of the CSEF. The focus was on perceptions, as there is no objective way of assessing cost-effectiveness: there are no cost baselines; there are no objective criteria already established for the different levels of the programme, for comparison; it is extremely difficult to assess costs and benefits of capacity-building approaches; it is extremely difficult to compare activities and outputs/outcomes across a programme with the diversity of geographical, cultural and political
diversity of CSEF. The desk review, interviews and site observations in target countries point that there is a clear, and consistent view that the CSEF is not expensive, and that it leverages a large amount from its networks to support the broader impact of the programme. Indeed, the general view is that too much is expected of the CSEF Secretariat and RSs for the level of staffing/ funding they have. There is a perception, widely held among evaluation respondents, that at the coalition level the programme is extremely cost effective, as coalitions have been able to emerge as strong campaigners and entities in their countries. The programme is seen as strengthening, and as improving the quality of civil society engagement with government and international NGOs in national education sector policy and implementation, and in doing this in a wide geography with a relatively small budget and clearly small structures at the global and regional levels.

The CSEF programme is not visible. Concerns were expressed about the lack of visibility of the CSEF programme (as opposed to a noticeable growth in visibility/ credibility of funded coalitions), globally, regionally and within countries supported by the programme. The feedback from interviews points to the view that people do not recognise the programme or its contribution to the education sector; that national actors and stakeholders, and even coalition members, do not know it. There is an alternative perspective, that the programme per se does not require visibility, but that the focus should remain on coalitions, and ensuring that coalitions are informing relevant stakeholders (Ministries, local development partners and local education groups) about CSEF-supported activities and thereby increasing visibility of coalitions and their programme-funded activities - sharing publically what is taking place as a way of increasing transparency and accountability.

The principle of enabling resources in different languages is a time-consuming but positive practice. There are issues addressing the language differences found in the programme, particularly where there are significant delays in translation of documents, media, etc. from the original language into other programme languages. This causes delays but is seen as a good practice as it enables better inclusion of partners.

4.4 Impact

According to the OECD/ DAC, impact is the ‘positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. This involves the main impacts and effects resulting from the activity on the local social, economic, environmental and other development indicators.’¹⁸ The DAC considers it useful to address the following questions in this area:

- What has happened as a result of the programme or project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?

• How many people have been affected?

Formally, impact (and sustainability) can only be fully assessed after the end of the programme since, as a development measure, assessing impact is an attempt to give a judgement on the positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, either directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Impact measures the effect of the programme in meeting its overall objective. The programme is designed to improve participation, develop capacity, and assist in advocacy processes towards improving the quality of civil society engagement with government and international agencies in education sector policy. Each of these is inherently difficult to measure in terms of impact.

This evaluation presents limited impact analysis of the programme at this point in time primarily due to the fact that substantial impact assessment of such programme would entail different resources in terms of time, finances and scope to grasp the impacts the programme has had as per its overall objective. Impact assessment takes into account a range of factors and contributions from various actors, and attribution of changes to one programme is difficult without strong evidence. Further, the funding framework and associated monitoring framework are too limited to expect impact. Nevertheless, the data derived from the desk review, interviews, surveys and field missions to the case study countries brings important findings also about impact prospects of the programme of this scope. Presentation of these is provided in this section.

Coalitions supported by the CSEF programme are having increasing policy influence. Coalitions are becoming more able to engage/advocate with government as a respected partner representing civil society, and finding ways to engage without losing their independence. This is thanks to the increased capacities of coalitions coming from their involvement in and development as a result of the CSEF programme, whereby they become better at what they do, as their skills and approaches, knowledge and abilities in advocacy and engagement grow in effectiveness and sophistication. Advocacy is also increasingly based on evidence, thanks to investment in increasing research skills and resources. Some detailed discussion of this influence has been provided in the Effectiveness section above – examples include:

• CSEC’s influence on Malawi’s national education budget; on girl-focused education; on early childhood development priority and policy; on school development grants and on special needs education.
• ECOZI’s effective involvement in the Education Coordination Group; influence on Zimbabwe’s education sector review; early childhood education; teacher professional standards; education sector monitoring; curriculum advocacy; advocacy for the education of girls in farming communities.
• ECOZI is also a participant in a number of technical working groups of the Ministry – the Technical Working Group for the Sector Plan and the Technical Working Group for Care and Support for Teaching and Learning.

Engagement and networking of civil society at regional and global level contributes to increasing credibility of the civil society sector in educational policies. CSEF and partners
have invested enormous efforts in creating links and networks among coalitions (and their members) at regional and global levels. While this evaluation found some weaknesses in this approach as discussed in different sections of this report, there is an overall positive change of perception of civil society in the education sector, which is evidenced through increased participation in the LEGs and more voice in global meetings.

There is a high likelihood that local advocacy and policy-making inputs of civil society will contribute to positive social impact on children, their families, youth, and adults in the programme target countries. Investment in coalitions and promotion of their work and inputs bring results in improved and more evidence-based policies. Implementation of these policies may have positive impact on education provision and on learners. For instance, the work done by COSYDEP in Senegal on inclusive schools has already started to transform the parameters of what is feasible to include and educate children with disabilities in general schools. In this instance, school management, teaching staff, and community members have transformed the school learning environment for all children and providing learning opportunities to pupils who would otherwise be out of school (see Senegal Case Study for more details). This is especially relevant regarding gender equality, which was an important investment of coalitions in many target countries and regions.

Much more work is needed – the process being encouraged by CSEF is only at an early stage, and both the depth and breadth of skills, knowledge and abilities noted above require improvement, across all CSEF countries. A number of approaches by the programme are indicated that have the possibility of strengthening impact over time. These include a greater emphasis on the research activities of coalitions with a view to cross-country sharing and learning, a greater emphasis on the research activities of coalitions with a view to meta-studies and reviews, a greater emphasis on sharing evidence-based policy briefs across the programme and a greater emphasis per se on research and evidence-based policy advocacy, i.e., consideration of inclusion of this component of the programme as compulsory for funded organizations.

4.5 Sustainability

Sustainability is, and will remain a critical issue, but as coalitions become more established they gain the confidence of government, of other coalitions and of international partners. Sustainability, though, is not only about funding, but also the work of the coalition and its ability to manage effectively, to advocate effectively and to build a profile in civil society and with government and the wider society. Coalitions must be able to develop a proposal, implement a project, report on a project, spend and report effectively on the money and close out a project. From its beginning, CSEF had to consider these issues and chose coalitions based on potential. Many of these coalitions have further developed their skills and credibility and have a range of donors, a number of staff and many possibilities for engagement. CSEF has provided vital resources that has allowed coalitions to organize themselves and has provided core funding, supporting advocacy. This has helped to sustain coalitions and provide a platform for them to work, as a collective, to represent a diverse group of people. CSEF also provides legitimacy, which has opened the door for these groups to have a ‘seat at the table’, as CSEF provides funding to the coalition and the coalition must adhere to certain standards, allowing for trust to build with policy makers.
Sustainability prospects of the measures for support to coalitions are satisfactory. Programme investment in strengthening coalitions and their members through a range of support measures and grants has been commendable. The insistence on improving the quality of evidence-based advocacy and provision of quality inputs for decision-making has brought a range of positive changes at the local level, as discussed in the section on Effectiveness. However, strengthening the role and influence of civil society in policy-making is a process which depends on a range of external factors (e.g. political and socio-economic potential for local elite/state capture, etc.) and longer-term committed support continues to be necessary. The importance of providing opportunities to coalitions to “learn by doing”, by implementing activities while at the same time insisting on and strengthening their capacities and skills already makes a difference.

External funding sources are critical to the survival of coalitions. Many coalitions will/would not survive without CSEF funding; their impact is just beginning to be visible as they are finally developing a momentum, and the capacity to be effective over time. It takes a long time to build a coalition, and its effectiveness, and the simple reality is that civil society will always be dependent on funding, whether this is international or national. While some non-grant resources are available to CSOs, they are either limited, or are based on a service-delivery model, neither of which is conducive to independence and effectiveness in a framework of advocacy and engagement with government. However, the fact that the grants are short-term (one year usually), and with no secured follow-up support, diminishes the potential for sustaining results. The Moldovan coalition is a good example: while it had dedicated research and communication teams when resources were available, upon finalization of its CSEF-funded activity, due to lack of funds to sustain the positions, the staff left.

The focus though cannot be solely on CSEF – coalitions must have longer term strategies that do not depend on a single programme. The expressed view is that CSEF should, as part of its programme, assist coalitions in developing partnerships with other donors/international agencies, to broaden their work, their funding base and their longer-term prospects for sustainable funding and monitor and report on the initiatives and effectiveness of each coalition in broadening their funding base, potentially as part of their funding agreement.

The CSEF programme and other supporting structures do not have a devised sustainability strategy or an exit strategy. While there are examples of coalition level efforts towards resource mobilisation resulting in diversification of their funding base, there was no concentrated, programme level effort on the part of the CSEF programme to support the sustainability of coalitions. This is an area where additional improvements can be made. The funding reality in many countries in which the CSEF programme is implemented is such that funding for coalition effort is either scarce or non-existent. Where donor support is available, it is usually short-term and project based, and does not provide resources for membership support and overhead costs for coalitions. Hence, a funding model of a globally centralised grant mechanism such as the CSEF programme from GPE is sometimes the only source of support for national coalition activities, which enable civil society to play an effective role in education advocacy. However, the lack of a sustainability plan which articulates and explains how these efforts will be maintained in the long run at all levels creates difficulties in understanding and aligning the longer-term perspectives of the
programme. This lack of alignment poses a management risk as some programme achievements have long-term perspective and may not be sustained or taken over by local actors upon the programme’s ultimate finalization.

To better utilize available funding, advocate for and mobilize ongoing resources locally, national coalitions need capacity building and technical advice to maximize fundraising efforts to complement the CSEF funding and reduce reliance on its support.

4.6 Gender and Human Rights Focus

Although there is no coordinated and integrated framework within the programme for human rights and gender mainstreaming, there is some programmatic focus on human rights and gender equality (and for many coalitions, on girls’ education initiatives in particular).

Gender equality is a thematic priority for GCE. In the context of EFA this makes complete sense, with gender equality being a, or the, specific focus of Goals 2, 4 and 5 – particularly 5. CSEF, coalitions and RSs all focus in these areas, and advocate strongly in relation to these priorities. For example, across Africa, the involvement of FAWE (Forum for African Women Educationalists) in CSEF coalitions and activities gives a greater specific focus on gender equality in programming, and there are networks focused on ‘the girl child’ that are a network within the larger coalition. The focus is very appropriate, as degrees of success vary and numbers of girls in schools have still not reached equality in a number of countries. Coalitions have strong input on putting this issue on the agenda of governments through research into education and the girl child and advocacy initiatives undertaken, including campaigns against violence.

Parity in the gender composition of coalition structures is a CSEF priority, and this is acknowledged by coalitions who conscientiously work towards addressing gender equality institutionally, in the composition of their teams and in the language of their programmes. CSEF consistently raises the profile of gender sensitivity, particularly in communication material, and coalitions are reminded, and asked to be mindful of the issue. Gender equality, as a priority is visible in programme indicators. At this stage, governance across coalitions is approximately 60% male and 40% female.

Achieving the actual function of gender equality within coalition governance is still an area for further focus. There is an expressed view in coalitions and across stakeholders that there is too much focus on numbers, and not enough focus on a genuinely equitable approach. This is the more difficult area – the question of how the gender aspect and gender policy impacts on the governance aspects of coalitions. While gender equality is visible in programme indicators, and programme communications, expressed view in the field is that it is not systematic – that there is a lot still to be done, and that while gender equality is visible in programme design and in indicators, actually addressing gender equality in coalitions themselves, as well as in national education sectors is lacking.

Human rights principles of universal access, non-discrimination, equality, inclusion, progressive realisation of human rights were embedded in the evidence based advocacy work supported by the CSEF and implemented by coalitions. The evidence gathered
through the evaluation process showed evidence of a particularly important contribution to the implementation of the principle of progressive realisation of the rights of children and adult learners, which was also part of the monitoring of human rights principles in general. It did so through: promoting children’s rights in policy making in the countries; analytical work to provide evidence on the impact of inclusive education upon the development of children; improving the practices; opening access for rights holders; developing the understanding of duty-bearers, on their role in providing quality education services in line with quality standards for service provision; raising awareness of decision-makers on the need to invest in EFA through the provision of advocacy material.

There is evidence of coalition activities and advocacy materials produced by national coalitions and used in advocacy actions that were well structured and provided plenty of useful findings and recommendations for corrective actions towards realization of rights to education of rights holders. One such example is the work of the Vietnamese national coalition – Vietnam Association for Education for All (VAEFA), which has supported multiple programmes for improving access to education for children and adults with hearing impairments.

4.7 Other Areas of Interest to GPE

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation sought additional consideration in a number of areas that ‘go beyond the original objectives of the programme, but where GCE and partners are keen to evaluate the potential impact of the programme’. The table below specifies the specific areas of interest and directs the reader to the appropriate section of the report, where appropriate, in order to not repeat detailed discussions found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest</th>
<th>Feedback from the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to GPE strategic objectives in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates vis the development and implementation of education plans in fragile and conflict affected states.</td>
<td>The evaluation did not give specific focus to ‘fragile and conflict-affected states per se’. The selection of Case Study countries, jointly done by GCE and the evaluation team, included a range of criteria which did not specifically focus in this area. No specific analysis is possible in relation to this criteria, although there is a range of feedback on coalition involvement in the development and implementation of education policy and plans in the countries visited as part of the evaluation. Further detail can be found in the Relevance and Findings sections above, and in the Case Study reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to GPE strategic objectives in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates vis access, transition and completion of basic education for girls.</td>
<td>The evaluation heard a range of comment/feedback on education for girls, including at the policy development and policy implementation levels. The CSEF programme has a close correlation with GPE strategic objectives in this area, and coalitions demonstrate engagement with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to GPE strategic objectives in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates vis increases in the number of children learning and demonstrating basic literacy and numeracy by Grade 3.</td>
<td>The evaluation did not receive any specific feedback on the number of children learning and demonstrating basic literacy and numeracy by Grade 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to GPE strategic objectives in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates vis improved teacher effectiveness and quality of education.</td>
<td>The evaluation heard a level feedback and commentary on coalition involvement with government in policy development and policy implementation in teacher development. The extent and significance of work in this area cannot be commented on, from the level/quantity of feedback, beyond an acknowledgement that in coalition engagement with government, one focus is on the quality and effectiveness of teacher skills and approaches. Further detail can be found in the Relevance and Findings sections above, and in the Case Study reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to GPE strategic objectives in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates vis changes in the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic financing and support to education.</td>
<td>A wide range of feedback was received in this area. Coalition engagement with governments on budget development and, possibly more significantly, actual expenditure on education is a significant focus of coalitions. The evaluation describes coalition efforts in evidence-based advocacy in budget development and evidence-based monitoring of national expenditure on education. Further detail can be found in the Relevance and Findings sections above, and in the Case Study reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The contribution to (i) national policy change (ii) the Local Education Groups, Education Sector Working Groups and Joint Sector Review processes of the relevant Ministries of Education, (iii) the development, monitoring and evaluation of Education Sector Plans, (iv) A wide range of feedback was received in this area, and is commented on in the Findings section of the evaluation. The CSEF programme has a focus on and has been particularly effective in assisting coalitions to engage in LEGs, sector working groups and monitoring processes of both policy and budget development and expenditure of resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
influencing national resource investment to the sector and, (v) promoting more efficient, transparent and accountable use of sector resources.

Further detail can be found in the Relevance and Findings sections above, and in the Case Study reports.

Programme impact on political and financial sustainability of coalitions.

The evaluation heard a range of feedback on sustainability (political and financial) and analyses this feedback in the Finding and Sustainability sections, and in the Case Study reports.

The degree to which CSEF has addressed gender equality and human rights in programme implementation and, as far as possible, the contribution of the CSEF in impacting on gender equality and human rights.

The evaluation addresses these areas – specifically gender – and more details can be found in the Findings section above.

5 LESSONS LEARNED

Programme implementation thus far has generated important lessons learned that are relevant for the next phase of implementation. These lessons include:

- Programme implementation demonstrates the relevance of this type of intervention. The programme fits well within the global strategic directions set by international organizations. At country and regional levels, the programme responds to developmental contexts and challenges in given countries and regions.
- Monitoring and audits of all projects has been a useful (governance) practice. It ensured important accountability of utilization of funds. At the same time, it proved to create some difficulties for coalitions due to evolving formats and delays.
- There is a big difference between coalitions and regions. To date, the programme did not sufficiently differentiate the support to various coalitions and regions, which has potentially impacted on its ability to develop deeper support for some coalitions that were ready for such support. Enhanced effectiveness may be achieved if more resources are allocated at the regional level to ensure an individual/mentor-based approach is applied by sequencing assistance to prepare coalitions for tailor-made activities.
- The CSEF programme demonstrates that a national education coalition is a successful model for engaging civil society actors in dialogue with governments through representation of a uniform society perspective, which is generated through facilitated discussion and wide participation of relevant local and international members.
- Discontinuity in funding to coalitions is the major threat to sustainability of the programme. The changes desired to be achieved by the programme take long-term
investments and time. Programmes like CSEF need to enable long-term, tailor-made support to activists and coalitions in order to enable true achievement of results.

- Coalitions are only as strong as their members - coalitions are not the secretariat. Coalitions that engage members in defining priorities and approaches, and in implementation, are much stronger and more resilient than coalitions that depend on secretariats for implementation.

- As well as the current national focus, clustering of coalitions in sectoral areas (thematic areas) would provide a relevant and effective theoretical framework for these coalitions, a framework in which they can share these issues, approaches, activities, outputs and outcomes. One good example of this at the global level is the CSEF’s online multi-lingual forum and at the national level the work done by CSEC in Malawi, on national education budgeting. Another example of regional support in the LAC region is the sharing of successful advocacy strategies for raising the domestic education budget, explaining challenges and lessons learned in El Salvador between Brazil and the Dominican Republic. These examples show that a thematic area of Education Sector Budgeting is possible to be established in a more formal way and existing efforts could be further strengthened, taking advantage of what other coalitions have done and learned.

- The scope and scale of the CSEF programme is such that communication at all levels is crucial. In essence, all gears of this engine must be constantly oiled with open, frank, and supportive communication to thwart off misunderstanding, misconceptions, and unproductive work relationships. As the very nature of this work demands, voices at all levels must be heard and respected so that coalitions, and to a lesser extent regional structures, feel fully engaged as partners rather than beneficiaries. This also includes the prompt translation of resources into all programme languages.

6 CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Relevance

The programme is relevant for global, regional and national objectives aimed at improving education for all, as supported national coalitions address important gaps and challenges of the current measures and policies for education. Civil society faces serious obstacles in participating in policy making processes in the area of education due to national political contexts and weaknesses in democratic environments, lack of skills and lack of resources to speak in one voice and present systematic and evidence-based input in decision making processes. The programme has been highly relevant for the needs of coalitions and their members, but through improving evidence-based inputs it has also encouraged governments to create and implement quality and inclusive education policies. Further investment is still needed to reach a critical mass of civil society organizations and their coalitions in the system and better coverage of countries and coalitions who lag behind, as well as to better respond to civil society needs for empowerment and meaningful participation in the reforms of education. The multi-pronged approach (including working on policies, developing
methodologies and tools, capacity building, support and representation) used by GCE and its partners to implement the programme was appropriate in view of the results framework set forth for the programme.

6.2 Effectiveness

Based on the assessment of results, the programme has been effective in strengthening civil society participation in education sector policy development, implementation and monitoring. National education coalitions are engaging strongly with government and the international community, participating well in national forums, impacting on both policy formulation and in monitoring/watchdog processes, are being demonstrably successful in ensuring the voice of civil society is being heard by government and the wider public, are using research as a key tool to bring something substantive ‘to the table’, and a cornerstone to their evidence-based advocacy approach and are using the CSEF programme’s learning processes, are sharing systems, are developing joint strategies and are engaged in partner development, engaging in a number of the collaborative processes/tools used within CSEF.

The CSEF programme has achieved this by contributing to the reduction of the distance between civil society and government, increasing government awareness of the importance of inclusion of civil society in reforms of education and opening access to civil society in forums and events where policies are discussed. CSEF improved the capacity of coalitions and their members to produce and use quality research for their advocacy aims, contributing to raising the credibility and profile of the coalitions. Evidence-based policy options submitted to relevant authorities are expected to inform future policies in support of EFA.

Greater effectiveness would have been attained with more systematic and needs-based cross-country shared learning and South-South collaboration activities, leading to a critical mass of networked and capacitated professionals throughout the regions.

Research and Evidence-based Advocacy

Research, and related evidence-based advocacy, is deemed a real programme strength. Evidence-based advocacy is mentioned by coalitions, as well as governments, as a notable component of the work of coalitions, and the most important aspect of their developing credibility with decision-makers. However, the programme lacks a sufficient focus on building the impact of this research and evidence-based advocacy. Particularly, more emphasis needs to be given to the global gathering together of coalition approaches, analysis of these processes into a coherent and summarised set of ‘successful approaches’, gathering together of related resources, tools, methods, provision of global access to this material in an on-line form, sharing of approaches in regional and coalition-to-coalition shared learning events, strengthening the rigour and specific outputs of the research, as well as improved definition of research topics, through the involvement of external resources/partners such as universities and the use of media to share the research outcomes with the general public, and approach used effectively in a number of coalitions, but not extensively across the programme.

It is recognised that the programme does not have the resources available at this point to undertake this activity, notwithstanding it is a focus of outcomes and shared learning.
RS-Driven Learning and Capacity-Building

There is a clear focus in design, and in intent, for shared learning in the programme. Indeed, there is a very large focus in the actual work of the programme on sharing and shared learning processes, including the development of a set of effective tools, methodologies of face-to-face sharing between coalitions and regional events. What is missing in the programme, as a result of insufficient resources, is a sufficient number and quality of face-to-face processes between programme officers in Regional Secretariats (RS) and the coalitions for which they are responsible. There are not enough opportunities for programme officers to visit coalitions, and the processes of capacity-building inherent to these face-to-face visits are not well enough defined nor implemented.

There are two key relationships in the programme that can and should improve the capacities and effectiveness of coalitions: coalition-to-coalition and RS-to-coalition. Coalition-to-coalition processes appear to work well, and are effective, this cannot be said of all RS-to-coalition relationships and interactions. Three things are missing:

- More resourcing for this approach that would ensure programme officers visit each coalition a minimum number of times annually, for a minimum number of days.
- A defined programme for the content of these exchanges, focused on the defined needs of coalitions.
- A process for ensuring programme officers themselves have the necessary knowledge and skills to pass on to coalitions.

6.3 Efficiency

The implementation of the programme to the cut-off date of the evaluation is assessed as moderately efficient. The programme has been managed in an inclusive and culturally sensitive manner. The participatory strategy used by the programme worked well for ownership, but affected efficiency of support. At the country level, performance was unequal, depending on the capacities of the coalitions and engagement of regional support systems. There have been many delays in the implementation of activities, particularly in terms of setting up the SE, and of organising systematic and quality monitoring and reporting systems. Overall management of the grant process, and particularly fund disbursements were inefficient, causing delays that have impacted at the coalition level.

Some specific conclusions on programme efficiency are elaborated further below.

Programme Design and Timing and the Applications and Grant Management Process

The process of ‘calls for proposals’, applications, decisions and provision of funding does not work efficiently or effectively, and as a result causes (sometimes serious) issues with the organizations the CSEF programme was established to support. There are two critical issues to be addressed, throughout the process:

- Programme Design and Timing, and Grant Applications – the work done by the CSEF Global Secretariat (and all related organizations in the process) in determining the
priorities and content of a programme, and the instructions provided to coalitions for applying for funds, is not done in a timely fashion. The process of programme design, as well as the administrative processes of calling for proposals, receiving proposals, assessing proposals, seeking revisions and approving proposals requires rethinking in order that the whole process is completed at least six weeks to two months prior to the beginning of a funding period.

- **Grant Disbursements** – It is inappropriate that grant disbursements, on which in many cases coalitions are completely dependent, are delayed. In the context of a civil society support programme, focused on building sustainability, capacity and impact, there is no room for delays in funding. The burden of receipt of grant funds should not fall on funded organizations – this is an obligation of the funding body. The three most fundamental issues with these delays are:
  - Existential, where small coalitions are completely dependent on the grant funds.
  - Credibility, where coalitions are exposed when they are simply not able to do the activities they have said they would do, for lack of funding.
  - Practical, where coalitions are ‘obliged’ to complete activities scheduled for a certain time at a completely different time, or need to have a full year of activities in a very short time frame, simply because grant funds are not provided in a timely fashion.

The critical nature of this requirement does not appear to be structured well enough into the programme. The capacity of GCE to deliver the whole of the grants process in a timely fashion cannot be underemphasised.

**Strengthening the Role of the CSEF Global Secretariat**

‘Strengthening’ does not necessarily mean more staff. It is the role. When it comes to strengthening the CSEF Global Secretariat, a more direct link with and influence on regional processes is required. This may involve staffing that is ‘nominally’ Global CSEF Secretariat working within regional structures, as a way of strengthening the regional structure and the link back to the Global CSEF Secretariat (see the Recommendations section below).

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

There are not enough human resources in the programme dedicated to monitoring. While it can be argued that significant resourcing has gone to supervision, in the form of the SE, internal programme resources for LME are far below programme requirements. At the very least, the programme requires a team of specialists, both at GCE and in the RS. Currently, RS programme officers are unable to contribute significantly to development of coalition capacity in this critical area.

Three things are missing:

- **Sufficient resourcing globally for overall development and management of the system.**
• Sufficient, professional monitoring resources within RS for management of the LME system, under Global Secretariat direction.
• Sufficient resourcing for development of coalition capacity for monitoring, both in terms of system usage and more generally, from the perspective of building their inherent capacities in monitoring.

6.4 Impact

Based on a limited study of impact under this evaluation, the evidence gathered points to a conclusion that, considering its rather limited resources, the programme has **good impact** prospects, and has the potential to make an important contribution to achievement of education for all. The programme has directly contributed to significant improvement in coalitions/civil society competencies and capabilities. There is a general trend of increase in civil society inclusion in policy-making processes in the countries where the programme has been active.

6.5 Sustainability

Based on achievements to the cut-off date of the evaluation, effects and outcomes of the programme are **moderately sustainable**. Even though coalitions are stronger thanks to the programme, most are dependent on CSEF’s funding or the support of other donors, and there is a low level of additional donor funding support. External long-term support of the CSEF programme is crucial for increasing the access of coalitions in policy processes until solid foundations of practices and procedures are built and capacities are in place to ensure that policy processes and systems run effectively.

6.6 Gender mainstreaming

“Gender mainstreaming is a comprehensive strategy aimed at achieving greater gender equality. This is attained by integrating a gender perspective into existing mainstream institutions and all programmatic areas or sector [...].”

The design of the programme, and specifically the design of both capacity-building with coalitions and RS and the parameters of the grant programme, now require a new level of approach to addressing gender equality as a cross-cutting, as well as a focus issue. Indeed, it makes sense at this point for a more detailed analysis of the full range of key cross-cutting issues that will be considered at all times by partners and coalitions.

The view of the evaluation is that current resources in GCE do not have the necessary background and training, nor the available time, to analyse the current situation and approach and to develop, in detail, an appropriate approach and set of methodologies for

---

use at all levels of the programme in order to deal effectively with a full range of cross-cutting issues, and to develop focused methodological approaches in some areas such as gender equality. See the Recommendations section for further discussion of this area.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

The level of assessment being done by the programme is less directed currently at ‘contribution to organizational learning and learning modalities’ and more directed at ‘effectiveness of approach’. While this focus is not deemed to be inappropriate, in the context of this learning goal it indicates where future emphasis will be required.

The evaluation team sets out a series of recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the CSEF programme in reaching its stated objectives and goal. These recommendations take the form of a revision of the CSEF Results Framework into a more effective theory of change, strategic programming recommendations, and operational recommendations. The recommendations are based on the findings and conclusions of the evaluation, as well as on consultation with all key stakeholders that were interviewed during the field phase and based on the validation workshop held on 28 August 2015. The Operational Recommendations are aimed to inform the implementation of the programme, while the Strategic and Programming Recommendations are aimed to be used in policy making by the programme donors and GCE and in prioritising and programming of future donor support.

7.1 CSEF Results Framework and Theory of Change

A well-designed theory of change will help illustrate the programme’s contribution to expected or unexpected results and will give insight into where the causal links may not hold true or where elements are weak. This can be seen in the illustrative examples used in Section 4.2 of this report. Identification of areas of improvement based on causal factors allows for more efficient changes that ultimately lead to more effective programmes. The CSEF programme would benefit from a collaboratively built theory of change for use in design, monitoring, communication and learning.

7.2 Strategic Programming Recommendations

The following are the Strategic Programming (SP) recommendations:

SP1: Rethink And Realign The CSEF Structure To Better Integrate Its Two Key Functions

The evaluation team has listened carefully to the feedback from the evaluation respondents and conducted thorough analysis from fieldwork, and subsequent internal and stakeholder feedback on initial conclusions regarding what were characterised, in field discussions, as significant issues with efficiency in grant-making that impact negatively on the intended programmatic outcomes of the CSEF. These issues are raised in the Findings section, as they are significant inputs from field enquiry. They are also discussed in the Conclusions section, as they required specific analysis in order to develop recommendations. Subsequent to
preparation of the Draft Evaluation Report, further revisions were made to this analysis, and how it is expressed, and in the drafting of this recommendation.

The structure of the analysis of the CSEF for the purpose of this recommendation describes the CSEF programme as having two key functions, within a more complex framework:

- A programme function at building civil society capacity and impact, focused on the education sector in the context of EFA goals.
- A grant-making function, where the grants focus on enabling the achievement of the programme’s goals with civil society.

The evaluation team received a wide range of commentary, analysis and feedback on these functions, and on the relative effectiveness of the CSEF programme and GCE in delivering these functions. It is noted that some of this feedback included the view that CSEF should be just a grant-making organization – a view to which the evaluation team does not subscribe.

As will be seen below, the linked set of recommendations do not fundamentally alter the nature of CSEF, nor GCE, but is intended to change how it is structured/managed, in order to ensure a) a more effective focus on the two key functions and b) a more effective delivery of outputs and outcomes from funding provided by GPE. The set of recommendations is an attempt to address the expressed concerns and analysis, and to provide GCE with a more effective framework for the structure of the CSEF programme.

**Programmatic Function**

It is recommended that the programmatic function focus solely on activities which are delivered directly to coalitions and regional bodies, in the context of the intended aims of the CSEF programme. These include all aspects of the development and capacity-building of national education coalitions and civil society organizations in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring. These include:

- Strengthening of civil society in its roles and functions in advocacy.
- The role of civil society in national education sector policy.
- Growth in capacity (knowledge, skills, abilities) in regional structures and national coalitions.
- Learning – emphasising the defined Learning Goals.
- Networking, including the defined emphasis on cross-country and south-south learning.
- Growth in general and financial management capacity – with a direct link into the financial management structure of CSEF.

Key aspects of this would be:

- The programmatic function would be the direct responsibility of the CSEF global manager. As well as providing overall direction to/management of the programme, the CSEF global manager would be directly responsible for the programmatic function.
- Relevant staff at RSs would have a direct relationship with the programme management at the global CSEF secretariat. All of these people would work closely together in development and delivery of the programme, including activity planning, budgeting, implementation and reporting.
- The results framework for the programmatic function would be ‘constrained’ to the specific activities delivered within this function – as an Output area of the overall CSEF programme, with a set of activities that deliver the defined Output and contribute to the overall defined CSEF Outcomes.

**Grant-making Function**

It is recommended that GCE ‘break out’ its grant-making function into a defined structure (unit or team, in line with the current set-up for monitoring and finance) within the CSEF, with its own management, budget and performance indicators. Conceptually, it is imagined to have the grant programme as an Output area of the overall CSEF programme, with a set of activities that deliver the defined Output and contribute to the overall defined CSEF Outcomes.

Key aspects of this would be:

- A grants manager.
- A grants team, which will address, under the direction of the grants manager, the administrative requirements of the grants programme.
- A grant application form and process.
  - A framework for the anticipated content of grant applications. This is a critical component, as this is where the content of the funded work of coalitions directly links back to the programmatic outcomes of the CSEF. It is not imagined however that grants would necessarily fulfil, on a one-to-one correlation, any specific intended outputs/ outcomes of the CSEF overall, only that they would be required to respond directly to defined grant criteria, which would be defined by GCE in order that they contribute to CSEF intended outcomes.
  - It is proposed that certain aspects of the content be defined as required and other aspects either optional, or from a ‘drop-down menu’ of options. While it would be up to CSEF to define these, within its own defined priorities, it is likely that evidence-based advocacy, policy engagement and EFA goals would all form key components of funding criteria.
- A grant programme/ timeframe, including advertising dates, proposal submission dates, grant assessment dates, grant award dates, reporting dates throughout the grant period. Each of these components is seen as critical, as is the capacity of the grants manager (and team) to deliver on the timing. Further, the content and structure of the reports of grantee organizations is critical, as they must contribute to CSEF’s understanding of its own outcomes, and contribution to CSEF programme impact.
- In conjunction with CSEF’s current financial management system, ensuring that systems address all necessary financial management and risk management
requirements while facilitating the activities and outputs of the grantee organizations.

- It is understood that there are cost implications to GCE (and therefore to GPE) with this arrangement. The view of the evaluation is that the status quo is not sustainable, in terms of the current, on-going negative impacts on coalitions due to existing inefficiencies as detailed in the Findings and Conclusions sections.

**Overall Management Structure**

In order to be clear about the intended management structure associated with this set of recommendations, it is proposed that within the CSEF programme at GCE there be four areas of activity/output, each of which contributes to overall CSEF outcomes, and within which results planning is undertaken, specifically within the overall CSEF results framework: programme, grants, monitoring and finance, and three staff engaged in the management of these areas. Further staffing detail is not defined here.

**SP2: Refine Learning Goals**

The programme’s approach to delivering on its stated learning goals has been inconsistent across the stated ten goals – i.e., strong outputs/outcomes are visible and/or are developing in relation to a number of the learning goals, but there are a number of areas where focus or implementation requires further strengthening. It is recommended that:

- The number of learning goals be refined and reduced (5-6 is considered optimum) so that they are more easily remembered and able to be a focus of thinking/planning.
- Designated learning goals be brought more to the front of the thinking of all levels of the programme. This is possible through making the learning goals a cross-cutting focus of coalition grant applications and of the Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (LMEF).

**SP3: Assist Coalitions In Developing Longer Term Funding Strategies**

It is recommended that CSEF provide targeted support to national coalitions that will encourage development of partnerships with other donors/international agencies, so their funding base and their longer-term prospects for sustainable funding are enhanced. It is important to put this approach clearly in the public arena, as a conscious, stated strategic policy, and to integrate this requirement in critical processes, from funding applications to reporting. Coalitions require a broader funding base and to be carefully developing the relationships and networks that will both assist them with longer-term funding and will allow their current programme focus to be more strongly developed, beyond a dependence on CSEF.

This approach will need to be supported by on-going monitoring and reporting on the initiatives and effectiveness of each coalition in broadening their funding base, potentially as part of their funding agreement.
**SP4: Develop the Strategy for Gender Focus**

Echoing the recommendations of the previous phase’s final evaluation, this evaluation proposes that a coordinated and systemised focus on gender mainstreaming would benefit the programme. Considering the well-documented importance of gender equality in education, from the direct effect on girls and women’s contribution to society, to the multiplier effect to future generations, the capacity of civil society to monitor and inform the integration of equality considerations in education sector policy formulation should be of paramount importance. To this end, CSEF programme implementers should be equipped with the skills and tools to strategically understand the perspectives of government and governmental institutions in addressing gender equality, and have acquired the capacity to systematically include questions pertaining to the implications for girls and women in their advocacy and engagement efforts. Gender mainstreaming implies that gender equality is not considered as an add-on, but rather a transversal lens with which to apprehend one’s work and efforts.

Thus, gender mainstreaming would include the identification of clear directions for programme implementation, with corresponding effects, outcomes, and gender sensitive indicators. Such strategy would provide concerted networking and capacity building opportunities, and respond more directly to EFA objectives targeting gender equality and girls’ education. For instance, and in practical terms, developing the skills of coalitions, with or through regional structures, in Gender Responsive Budgeting would assist them in conducting a more comprehensive monitoring of education sector budget formulation and contribute to sector dialogue with a well-developed position that would include the application of a gender lens.

It is recommended that CSEF implementers conduct an institutional gender assessment or gender audit. The assessment/ audit would focus on all levels of the programme (global, regional, national), and based on this assessment develop a gender strategy, laying out a road map for gender integration both at the institutional and programming level. The assessment and strategy-development process must be participatory, i.e., must involve coalitions and regional bodies, as well as GCE staff, and will require a global/ regional framework as well as coalition-specific agenda – i.e., each coalition will be required to develop their own strategies, activities and timeframes for implementation of the developed/ agreed strategy.

Implementation of the strategy requires tracking, within programme LME frameworks/ systems.

**SP5: Enhance Use of Evidence-based Advocacy**

Research, and related evidence-based advocacy, is deemed a real programme strength. Evidence-based advocacy is mentioned by coalitions, as well as governments, as a notable component of the work of coalitions, and the most important aspect of their developing credibility with decision-makers.
It is recommended that the programme develop a much stronger focus on building the impact of this research and evidence-based advocacy. Particularly, more emphasis can be given to:

- Strengthening the rigour and specific outputs of the research, as well as improved definition of research topics, through the involvement of external resources/partners such as universities.
- The global gathering and sharing of coalition approaches, experiences and learning from research and evidence-based advocacy. This could be done through a wider implementation globally of regional and coalition-to-coalition shared learning events.
- Analysis of these processes into a coherent and summarised set of ‘successful approaches’.
- Compiling and consolidating related resources, tools, methods.
- Provision of global access to this material in an on-line form.
- Strategic use of media to share the research outcomes with the general public, an approach used effectively in a number of coalitions, but not extensively across the programme.

### 7.3 Operational Recommendations

The following are the Operational recommendations:

**O1: Adjust Staffing for Management, Support and Oversight**

The view of the evaluation is that the systems of support and oversight provided through the CSEF Global Secretariat are too lean to provide the necessary services and the necessary learning processes that are, and should be fundamental to a programme focused on development of civil society capacity. Critical to all of these discussions is how to balance an increase in activity and responsibility with a quite limited growth in staffing numbers at the CSEF Global Secretariat. This last part is key, as the view of the evaluation is that a growth in oversight functions and positions is critical. The most obvious solution is to locate those positions in the regions.

It is recommended that additional financial staff and additional LME staff be assigned to relevant regional bodies. Each of these staff would play a role with the Global Secretariat, in financial and programme monitoring, but will perform these roles in the regions, focused on the regions, ensuring compliance and reporting from the regions.

Such an approach requires a re-working of the contractual relationship between the CSEF Global Secretariat and the RS and FMA in each region. The new arrangement will define in detail:

- The new control/oversight functions of the regional body (the financial aspects for FMA and the programmatic monitoring aspects for RS).
- The control/oversight function of the CSEF Secretariat in relation to the regional body, and the detailed, functional relationships of each new position in relation to the regional body and GCE.
• The fundamentals of learning/capacity growth for each stakeholder (coalition, regional body, CSEF Global Secretariat) in the new arrangement.

**O2: Adopt a Programme Management Information System**

It is recommended that the programme establish and maintain a robust management information system at the GCE level that is able to collect, transmit, process, and store data and programmatic resources systematically at three different levels: national, regional and global. The system should be based in the programme results framework and should allow for online data reporting, automatic aggregation and analysis and simple accomplishment reporting by key programmatic indicators. This system should be accompanied by appropriate management processes to ensure that the reflection conversion on reported data is taking place and that the consequent learning is translated into management information for use by decision-makers within the CSEF programme for a timely course correction.

**O3: Increase Cross-Country Communications And Shared Learning**

Of critical importance to programme development is a structured and structural improvement in the programme’s gathering, archiving and sharing of the experiences and learning from coalitions and others as related to policy change and sources of evidence of these contributions on the CSEF website and other communication materials. There are significant gains to be made from these cross-country and inter-regional coalition-to-coalition learning processes, particularly in how they impact on both the content and methodology of coalition initiatives.

It is recommended that the programme provide a particular focus to development of this capacity in the coming funded period. As indicated above, emphasis is needed on research that contributes to content development as well as on the sharing of activities, methodologies and approaches.

Further, two other evaluation specific, communication-related developments are recommended:

• For immediate action, it is recommended CSEF provide a debriefing meeting with coalitions on the evaluation processes, and share the evaluation report and case study reports with coalitions.
• Over the course of the programme, it is critical that CSEF ensures adequate resources are in place to provide timely translation of programme material into all five programme languages.
Appendices

Terms of Reference (ToR)

This is a reissue of a Call for Proposals, originally disseminated in mid-November 2014. The ToR has been slightly revised. Previous applicants are eligible and encouraged to review and resubmit their proposals.

1. Introduction: The Civil Society Education Fund and the Global Campaign for Education

The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a unique global programme that supports civil society engagement in education sector policy, planning and monitoring, through the collaboration of national, regional and international civil society partners. The programme is founded on a shared understanding among key stakeholders that strong, broad-based and locally-driven civil society participation – in education sector planning and policy development, monitoring of implementation and budgets, and promoting awareness and engagement of citizens in national education debates – is crucial to delivering on Education for All (EFA) and other national education goals.

The CSEF was initiated and is managed by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) in close collaboration with regional partners (Arab Campaign for Education for All - ACEA, Africa Network Campaign for Education For All - ANCEFA, the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education - ASPBAE, the Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education - CLADE, ActionAid Americas, Education International Asia Pacific and Oxfam GB West Africa).

The CSEF 2013-2015 phase is funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) through a grant of US$ 14.5m, and UNESCO fulfils the role of Supervising Entity and hence holds overall accountability to the GPE for the CSEF grant. In keeping with the planned phased programme approach, the 2013-2015 phase of the programme commenced in April 2013 with a three-months planning period, implementation from July 2013 and, following an agreed no-cost extension period, national coalition activities will be implemented until the end of March 2015.

A previous phase of CSEF (2009-2012) was implemented by the Global Campaign for Education and partners, and funded through the Fast Track Initiative Education Program Development Fund (FTI EPDF). During 2012, bridge funding for continuation of CSEF activities was provided by AusAid, while the initial phase of CSEF was evaluated, and a further funding proposal for the present programme cycle was prepared. The evaluation report for the initial phase is available for review (see section 10 for a list of relevant documents).
2. Aim and Objectives of the CSEF Programme

The overall aim of the CSEF programme is to “contribute to the achievement of national education goals and Education for All by ensuring the effective participation of civil society organisations and citizens in education debates and sector planning and review”.

To achieve this aim, the CSEF provides core financing, technical assistance and capacity support, and opportunities for cross-country learning to civil society coalitions focused on education in developing countries across Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. As of October 2014, civil society structures in 54 countries had engaged in CSEF activities during this phase.

Through this support, the CSEF aims to build stronger, more consistent and more effective civil society engagement in education sector processes, with the following four programme objectives:

1. **Policy participation:** Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognised;

2. **Public awareness and coalition-building:** National education coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge, skills and opening opportunities to participate;

3. **Quality research, monitoring and analysis:** Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals, and;

4. **Cross-country learning and networks for change:** The CSEF programme builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global processes.

It should be noted that in addition to the above, each of the coalitions have defined national level expected results that contribute to the global programme objectives and expected results.

3. Purpose and Use of the Independent CSEF Programme Evaluation

Programme evaluation is an integral part of the CSEF programme plan and learning, monitoring and evaluation framework (LMEF), and is considered an important tool for enhancing accountability, strategic management and learning. In this regard, the proposal of GCE to GPE in December 2012 spelt out clearly that an end of project evaluation will be carried out at project closing based on a TOR agreed between GCE and UNESCO.

As the current phase of the CSEF programme comes to its end, it is required that it is finalised with an independent evaluation in order to maximise learning from the programme and to find out and document to what extent the programme objectives, expected results and learning goals have been achieved.

As such, the emphasis of the evaluation is equally divided between the assessment dimension and the learning dimension. It is intended that this evaluation will influence and strengthen programme design of an anticipated next phase of the CSEF programme (2016-2018), directions of which have already started emerging in discussions between GPE, UNESCO and UNESCO.

---

21 Of the 54 countries, 28 are in the Africa region, 15 in Asia Pacific, five in Latin America and the Caribbean, and six in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.
and GCE. The evaluation shall provide evidence of the emerging impact of CSEF to support further access to funding and other forms of programme buy-in and support.

In addition, it is anticipated that the evaluation will:

3.1 Support reflection on achieved effectiveness (and the challenges involved) of the approaches adopted in the programme.

3.2 Provide evidence of the impact of our work to support further access to funding and other forms of programme buy-in and support.

3.3 Be both summative and formative, with a strong emphasis on drawing together lessons and recommendations to inform improvements and structural changes for a future CSEF 2016-2018. Thus, whilst being an end of programme summative evaluation, the drawn out lessons learnt, considerations and recommendations will inform future CSEF programme practice in a formative manner.

GCE is therefore seeking applications from suitably qualified and experienced consultants, consulting firms, or a consortium of consultants to form the evaluation team.

4. Scope of Work

4.1 Scope

To undertake a comprehensive and robust evaluation of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) programme and its results encompassing the period of the approved CSEF 2013-2015 programme and therefore to cover the period from 27th April 2013 to the 31st of March 2015\(^\text{22}\).

The evaluation should:

4.1.1 Identify the extent to which the CSEF programme as a whole has achieved its objectives and learning goals;

4.1.2 With reference to the programme logic / theory of change, assess whether and how the programme has contributed to and/or brought about the intended (or unintended) results and whether this is contributing (or has contributed) to the desired impact (or other unintended impacts);

4.1.3 Assess the extent to which the CSEF partners and stakeholders have learned from programme experiences, and shared and used that learning;

4.1.4 Measure the CSEF programme’s impact on the role and influence of National Education Coalitions in national education policy processes and in the GPE country level processes where applicable;

4.1.5 Assess capacity in terms of human resources of the CSEF programme, as well as the synergy and collaboration achieved with and between the partners of the CSEF programme;

4.1.6 Assess organisational performance – in relation to the relevance and effectiveness of the CSEF programme strategies on capacity building, participation, partnership, methodology, management, learning, monitoring and evaluation;

4.1.7 Review the effectiveness of structures and management of the programme including the role of Regional Secretariats (RSs), the Financial Management Agencies (FMAs), the Regional Funding Committees (RFCs), the GCE, the Global Oversight Committee (GOC);

\(^{22}\) It is important to note that a proposal for a costed extension of the CSEF programme until December 2015 is currently in process, the outcomes of which will be known end February 2015.
4.1.8 Assess the cost effectiveness of the CSEF programme, including an assessment of the added value of the CSEF programme for regional partners and national education coalitions;

4.1.9 Provide recommendations and guidance to inform future programme phases, particularly in terms of refining the theory of change or intervention logic underlying the programme in order to support establishing causal links between the intervention and the expected results.

In geographical terms, activities of up to 60 civil society coalitions covered by the current programme phase will be included in the evaluation.

4.2 Key Areas of Learning Interest for the Evaluation

The evaluation should include but will not be limited to the following key research areas. More specific evaluation questions will be elaborated during the inception phase. The core areas to cover are:

4.2.1 Measuring achievements of Expected Results and Learning Goals according to the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of CSEF;

4.2.2 Relevance, value addition and impact of the programme on the capacity of national coalitions, including an assessment of the appropriateness of funding levels;

4.2.3 A review of the programme structure and management, including relationships between different levels and implementing partners – what has worked and what has not, why and what improvements could be made and how?

4.2.4 The effectiveness of strategies of communication, learning and networking, mobilization, advocacy and policy change;

4.2.5 Exploring the sustainability of the programme results and outcomes – and the extent to which these are pointing towards long-term impact;

In addition, the evaluation should also consider the following areas, which go beyond the original objectives of the Programme, but where GCE and partners are keen to evaluate the potential impact of the programme:

4.2.6 The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to GPE strategic objectives in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates, vis:

- the development and implementation of education plans in fragile and conflict affected states;
- access, transition and completion of basic education for girls;
- increases in the number of children learning and demonstrating basic literacy and numeracy by Grade 3;
- improved teacher effectiveness and quality of education, and;
- changes in the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic financing and support to education.

4.2.7 The contribution to (i) national policy change (ii) the Local Education Groups, Education Sector Working Groups and Joint Sector Review processes of the relevant Ministries of Education, (iii) the development, monitoring and evaluation of Education Sector Plans, (iv) influencing national resource investment to the sector and, (v) promoting more efficient, transparent and accountable use of sector resources;

4.2.8 Programme impact on political and financial sustainability of coalitions, and;

4.2.9 The degree to which CSEF has addressed gender equality and human rights in programme implementation and, as far as possible, the contribution of the CSEF in impacting on gender equality and human rights.
5. Methodology

The evaluation will draw information from various sources. This will include a review of existing relevant documents, including but not limited to programme and coalition plans, as well as monitoring and assessment reports. A combination of participatory approaches including both external and internal assessments is considered appropriate – interviews and observation, surveys, case studies, collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data - involving partners, their constituencies, relevant stakeholders and programme staff.

The following schedule of methods is proposed as a minimum to ensure satisfactory involvement of all key stakeholders and a comprehensive synthesis of external reflections and insights from staff and partners involved in the programme. However, applicants are expected to present a detailed methodology with suggestions on effective methods to add value to the evaluation, together with a clear justification for the proposed sampling.

5.1 Anticipated methods:

5.1.1 A thorough document review of existing secondary sources including the full range of progress reports published over the years as well as key programme documents and key meeting/workshop reports and minutes etc. available at global, regional and national levels.

5.1.2 Questionnaire/survey administered to all coalitions to gather both qualitative and quantitative data.

5.1.3 Approximately 100 telephone/Skype and/or face-to-face interviews to be arranged to include:

- Members of the GCE Board including members of the GOC, members of the CSEF Regional Funding Committees
- GCE staff and staff of the CSEF Regional Secretariats and Financial Management Agencies and CSEF funded national coalitions
- Funders (GPE), Donors on the board of GPE
- Supervising Entity (UNESCO)
- Other Constituencies, Education International (EI), International Partners’ Group (IPG)
- Decision Makers (amongst them the LEG conveners, the GPE contracted Supervising and/or managing Entities, Ministries of Education, country offices of EFA convening agencies, as well as other external stakeholders to be proposed by the evaluation team)
- A selection of campaigners working with similar mechanisms to the CSEF

5.1.4 A comprehensive case study evaluation of a representative sample of at least 8 countries (4 from Africa, 2 from Asia and the Pacific, 1 from Latin America and 1 from the Middle East) through country visits and interviews with national stakeholders; leading to a minimum 8 extended National Evaluation case studies illustrating the added value of the national coalitions in education planning, implementation and tracking embedded in a framework of social accountability.

5.1.5 Face to face meetings with the Global CSEF Secretariat to be undertaken, thus at least 1 trip should be budgeted to Johannesburg where GCE and the Global CSEF Secretariat is based.

Whilst GCE will arrange translation of the final report – the evaluation team must arrange for translation/interpretation for survey responses and for telephone/Skype and face-to-face interviews. The CSEF programme currently works in French, Spanish, Portuguese, English and Arabic.

To support proposal preparations, an initial list of targeted Interview Partners, Survey Participants, Focus Group Participants is provided in the Annex A.
6. Expected Deliverables

6.1 Initial Inception Report: including proposed sampling and sampling rationale, a detailed work plan showing relevant activities, outline of proposed evaluation tools/instruments, limitations if any, description of outputs and indicators, as well as responsible persons and timeframes.

6.2 Final Inception Report: final methodology, sampling and tools/instruments following review of feedback on the initial report.

6.3 A Participatory Debriefing and Validation Workshop Plan, and Presentation (PPT): on the preliminary findings and recommendations of the evaluation.

6.4 Draft Evaluation Report: with Executive Summary, description of methodology and limitations, evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

6.5 Final Evaluation Report: incorporating valid feedback and including relevant appendices and submission of data sets, pictures/graphics, audio/visual recordings and any other relevant materials from the evaluation.

7. Timeline and Dissemination Plan

Contracting of external consultants for the evaluation is expected to be concluded by 31st March 2015. The entire evaluation process is anticipated to be concluded between early April and early October 2015, with an indicative total of 90 productive consultant person days.

The starting date of the contract will be no more than ten (10) working days after the date (email, post office, or courier stamped date) the Contracting Organisation has sent the signed contract to the selected services provider.

The actual evaluation fieldwork mission activities should be carried out from mid-May to mid-July 2015, in accordance with the following indicative schedule:

---

23 90 days is estimated. The total number of consultant days should align with the methodology proposed by bidders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>REPOSTING OF CALLS FOR SUBMISSION TO POTENTIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS WITH SUBMISSION DEADLINE 16.02.2015</td>
<td>GCE and partners</td>
<td>2015/01/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SELECTION PANEL REVIEWS ALL INCOMING SUBMISSIONS AND DECIDES ON SHORTLIST</td>
<td>Selection Panel</td>
<td>2015/02/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SHORTLISTED CANDIDATES CONTACTED TO SCHEDULE INTERVIEW</td>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>2015/03/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHORTLISTED POTENTIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>Selection Panel</td>
<td>2015/03/04 to 2015/03/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CONTRACT WITH SUCCESSFUL BIDDER IS SIGNED</td>
<td>GCE Chair</td>
<td>2015/03/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DOCUMENTS REVIEW/DESK STUDY AND PRODUCTION OF INITIAL INCEPTION REPORT</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/04/01 to 2015/04/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DELIBERABLE 1**

Initial inception report submitted by 17 April 2015

| 7  | FEEDBACK ON INITIAL INCEPTION REPORT                                    | Selection Panel   | 2015/05/04               |
| 8  | PRODUCTION OF FINAL INCEPTION REPORT                                   | Evaluation Team    | 2015/05/15               |

**DELIBERABLE 2**

Final inception report submitted by 15 May 2015

<p>| 9  | EVALUATION DATA GATHERING                                              | Evaluation Team    | 2015/05/18 to 2015/07/12 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10</th>
<th>DATA ANALYSIS FINALISATION</th>
<th>Evaluation Team</th>
<th>2015/07/13 to 2015/07/31</th>
<th>July 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PRODUCTION OF PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOP PLAN AND PRESENTATION</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/08/03 to 2015/08/07</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DELIVERABLE 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participatory debriefing and validation workshop plan and presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14th August 2015 (date TBC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WRITING FIRST DRAFT OF EVALUATION REPORT</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/08/17 to 2015/08/31</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DELIVERABLE 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft evaluation report submitted by 31 August 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FEEDBACK ON DRAFT REPORT GATHERED FROM GCE, UNESCO AND GPE AND SUBMITTED TO EVALUATION TEAM</td>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>2015/09/01 to 2015/09/21</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WRITING FINAL EVALUATION REPORT INCORPORATING VALID FEEDBACK</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/09/22 to 2015/10/05</td>
<td>September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DELIVERABLE 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final evaluation report and submission of evaluation data sets and materials by no later than 05 October 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FINAL FULL VERSION OF REPORT IN ENGLISH IS SUBMITTED TO UNESCO/GPE AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS/ PARTNERS</td>
<td>GCE/ CSEF Programme Manager</td>
<td>2015/10/06 to 2015/10/12</td>
<td>October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Profile of the evaluation team

It is anticipated that the evaluation will be conducted by three to four consultants, one of them being the lead and taking ultimate responsibility for all outputs and deliverables. The successful bidder(s) should adhere to the following key principles:

8.1 An evaluation team combining demonstrable and complementary skills and experiences in results-based monitoring and evaluation, including in measuring advocacy and campaign impact, community accountability and empowerment, theory of change, complex, multi-country programme and finance management.

8.2 Have a strong track record in working with civil society and in promoting quality education for all in development contexts, including in fragile and/or conflict-affected states.
8.3 Gender and geographic balance to be respected in the evaluation team, which may not include any members with previous involvement in any of the activities under review.

8.4 Capacity to manage the evaluation process in the CSEF programme languages.

8.5 Before a contract is awarded the successful tenderer (and/or any subcontractors/partners) will be required to provide a current tax clearance certificate valid for contract purposes.

8.6 The lead consultant is expected to have the following (mandatory):

- A strong and proven track record in conducting multi-country evaluations and in leading a team(s) of evaluators to conduct large programme evaluations which demand both quantitative and qualitative research skills.
- An advanced university degree, minimum Masters degree, desirable Doctorate level in the area of Education Policy, Education Financing and/or Education Planning and Evaluation or similar.
- Excellent knowledge of Education For All goals and priorities and post 2015 education agendas in the global context.
- Proficient knowledge of advocacy and campaign work with civil society, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies.
- Excellent planning, team leading, and supervisory research skills.
- Ability to research, analyse and present complex information.

In addition, the following attributes of the lead consultant are highly desirable:

- Substantial international experience in undertaking evaluations of quality education campaigns and programmes in collaboration with civil society movements, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies.
- Proven ability to deal with politically sensitive issues.
- Cultural awareness and sensitivity.
- High level of interpersonal and communication skills.
- Ability to establish and maintain strong and effective working relationships.

8.7 The support team shall collectively demonstrate the following knowledge/skills/experience:

Mandatory:

- Gender, language and geographic representation balance
- Expertise in qualitative and/or quantitative research processes
- Education expertise
- Gender and human rights expertise
- Policy and advocacy expertise
- Strong data synthesis and reporting skills
- Strong communication skills – both oral and written

Desirable:

- Participatory workshop/consultative meetings facilitation and organisation skills/experience.

9. Roles and Responsibilities

9.1 The consultants commissioned to undertake this evaluation will:

1. Conduct a desk based comprehensive documents review.
2. Develop and design the evaluation instruments and tools, including arranging translation as relevant.
3. Organise and conduct field visits (to the 8 case study countries across 4 regions) and virtual interviews to gather data.
4. Transcribe, translate and analyse qualitative and quantitative data.

5. Make presentations of findings and recommendations to GCE, UNESCO, GPE and CSEF staff and partners and gather feedback.

6. Develop and provide a draft evaluation report, including an executive summary, evaluation findings and tangible recommendations.

7. Based on feedback (in 6 above), provide and submit the final detailed report of no more than 70 pages.

8. Organise and submit data sets, pictures/graphics, audio/visual recordings and any other relevant materials generated and/or developed through the evaluation.

9.2 GCE will:

1. Provide background literature including programme documents, reports and other relevant data.

2. Provide a database of programme partners and stakeholders with contact details.

3. Pay consultancy fees and disbursements as per agreed payment schedule according to deliverables and output dates.

4. Monitor evaluation progress and quality as the evaluation process progresses.

9.3 Management of the process

The GCE Global Coordinator has ultimate responsibility for oversight of the evaluation mission. The day-to-day management of the evaluation will be the responsibility of the CSEF Global Programme Manager with the support of the CSEF global secretariat.

The lead consultant will have direct oversight of the evaluation team members.

10 Relevant documents available

In order to inform the potential evaluation consultants about developments of the CSEF programme, relevant documentation will be shared taking into account previous programme phases and comparing differences of impact and attribution over time to frame a bigger picture. The following initial list of documents are available:

http://www.campaignforeducation.org/en/resources
https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B9V5kYlpWlaCM2FsMGPHZnlYlTVU&usp=sharing

For more information on CSEF and GCE please visit the website www.campaignforeducation.org

11 Proposal Submission and Assessment Process

11.1 Proposal Submissions

Proposals should be submitted electronically in English with the subject line “Proposal: CSEF Evaluation 2013-2015 (your company/consortium or lead consultant’s name)”. Proposals should comprise two separate parts:

24 The first phase of the CSEF programme 2011-2013 was evaluated independently. The evaluation report should be taken into account in the design of the forthcoming evaluation.
### 1. PART A: Technical and Administrative Proposal

1. A Methodology demonstrating your understanding and analysis of the TOR and proposing how you intend to proceed to implement the services (including suggested sampling strategy and time table) (maximum 15 pages);

2. A brief biography of the team leader and each of the proposed evaluation team members, that clearly demonstrates their experience for the assignment and the competencies outlined in the Terms of Reference (maximum 4 pages);

3. The up-to-date Curricula Vitae (CV) for each of the expert(s) proposed to work on this assignment;

4. Personnel inputs (including productive working person days without any reference to fees);

5. A signed Statement of Availability (Annex B) – signed by each of the expert(s) proposed;

6. Three recently completed evaluation reports as examples of previous work, at least two of which must be the consultant team leader’s previous work.

### 2. PART B: Financial Proposal

PART B must contain:

1. A signed and initialed detailed Price Schedule which includes all fees and identified expenses.


3. The submissions must reach the following address by **23:00 GMT on 16th February 2015:**

   - consultants@campaignforeducation.org
   - and copied to louise@campaignforeducation.org

Late proposal tenders will not be accepted in any circumstances and will not be assessed. Timely delivery of submissions is the responsibility of tenderers and the Global Campaign for Education will not in any circumstances accept liability for late or unsuccessful delivery of proposal submissions.

#### 11.2 Proposal enquiries

Requests for clarification should be made in writing and sent to: the CSEF M&E Officer, Louise Knight, Email: louise@campaignforeducation.org and copied to wolfgang@campaignforeducation.org

The **deadline for requests for clarification is 10 days before the deadline for submission of tenders.** The deadline for replies to queries by candidates is 5 days before the deadline for submission of tenders.

#### 11.3 Proposal Assessments

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION**

Submitted tenders will be assessed in a closed session, not open to the public, by a Selection Panel technically qualified to evaluate the type of services concerned. The submissions will first be reviewed to verify the administrative compliance, and be assessed technically to be ranked against the Evaluation Criteria (see section 12). The acceptability threshold for technical proposals is set at a minimum score of 70 points out of 100 points. Technical proposals which do not reach this minimum score will not be considered for financial evaluation.

**FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

After establishing the technical scores, the Financial Proposals of technically qualified Candidates will be reviewed. The Financial Proposals will be evaluated on a maximum score of 100 points in the following manner:

\[
\text{Financial score} = \frac{(100 \times \text{lowest financial proposal})}{\text{financial proposal to be evaluated}}
\]
SHORTLISTING

Thereafter, a final score will be established for each technically qualified tender submissions by using the following weighting:

70/30, where the technical proposal = 70 and the financial proposal = 30.

Thereafter Candidates with the top 10 scores will be contacted for (virtual) interview and a maximum score of 25 points will be applied to the interview process.

Interviews will be held between 4th and 6th March 2015. Candidates selected for interview will be contacted on 2nd March 2015 to arrange the interview date and time.

CONTRACT AWARD

The Contract will be awarded to the Candidate(s) whose tender submission plus interview score has obtained the highest final score, thus representing the most advantageous offer.
## 12 Technical Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation and Methodology</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Interpretation of the terms of reference</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology and proposed approach for the evaluation</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Presentation of methodology and sequence of activities is clear and the planning is logical</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Proposal reflects a feasible and sound methodology, considering the limitations and risks of each proposed tool/method</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Quality of samples of previous evaluation work relate to the subject of the current evaluation and align with methodology requirements as set in the TOR</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable of activities is realistic and promises efficient / on time submission of deliverables</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score for organisation and methods** 60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experts Team Skills, Experience and Qualifications</th>
<th>(40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Leader</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 8 years’ experience conducting multi-country evaluations and in leading a team(s) of evaluators to conduct large programme evaluations of a similar scale and scope</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced university degree in the area of Education Policy, Education Financing and/or Education Planning and Evaluation or similar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent knowledge of quality education for all, including relevant policy related issues, and post 2015 education agendas in the global context</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient knowledge of advocacy and campaign work with civil society, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, team leading, supervisory research and analysis skills for complex information.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Team Members (complementary skills and experience)** 20

| Gender, language and geographic representation balance | 5 |
| At least 10 years’ (combined) experience in conducting evaluations of a similar scale, with expertise in qualitative and/or quantitative processes | 4 |
| Education, gender and human rights expertise | 3 |
| Policy and advocacy expertise | 3 |
| Data synthesis and report writing experience and skills | 2 |
| Strong oral and written communication skills | 2 |
| Workshop /consultative meetings facilitation and organisation skills and experience | 1 |

**Total score for experts team** 40

**Overall total score** 100

**NOTE:** The acceptability threshold for technical proposals is set at a minimum score of 70 points out of 100 points. Technical proposals which do not reach this minimum score will not be considered for financial evaluation.
### Administrative Selection Criteria

#### Technical and administrative proposal

**PART A**

1. Tender submission cover letter
2. Methodology (including suggested sampling and time table) *
3. Profiles/biographies of evaluation team members and their curricula vitae *
4. Schedule of personnel inputs (including productive working person days without any reference to fees) *
5. Declarations of availability (signed by each expert) *
6. Three samples of recent evaluation reports (at least two by the consultant team lead) *

**Financial proposal**

**PART B**

1. Breakdown of prices (Price Schedule) (including all fees and identified expenses), signed by tenderer Lead *
2. Signed Disclosure Declaration *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Documents requested</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical and administrative proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tender submission cover letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Methodology (including suggested sampling and time table)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Profiles/biographies of evaluation team members and their curricula vitae</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Schedule of personnel inputs (including productive working person days without any reference to fees)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Declarations of availability (signed by each expert)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Three samples of recent evaluation reports (at least two by the consultant team lead)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Breakdown of prices (Price Schedule) (including all fees and identified expenses), signed by tenderer Lead</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Signed Disclosure Declaration</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tender submissions which fail to include the above relevant documents assigned with a * will be administratively non-compliant and will be automatically rejected.
Annex A – Indicative list of targeted Interview Partners, Survey Participants, Focus Group Participants (to be reviewed and finalised in the inception phase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of empirical evidence collection tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Includes which countries</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>GCE Board members</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Structured Skype/telephonic Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats, Regional Finance Management Agencies and Selected National Coalitions</td>
<td>All 4 regions</td>
<td>Face to Face in 4 Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with National Education Coalitions (NEC)</td>
<td>NECs (field visits)</td>
<td>List: Africa 4, Asia 2, Latin America 1, ME and EE 1</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Visits to Interview NECs, LEG representatives of the SE/ME, government reps</td>
<td>Separate Interviews, structured meetings</td>
<td>List: Africa 4, Asia 2, Latin America 1, ME and EE 1</td>
<td>Face to Face, Group sessions, LEG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with National Education Coalitions</td>
<td>NECs (virtual engagements)</td>
<td>Representative sample</td>
<td>Structured Skype/telephonic Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>NECs</td>
<td>All 54</td>
<td>Survey Monkey or similar Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Regional and Global Structures, IPG</td>
<td>RS, RFMA, GCE-GOC, IPG, RFC, GPE</td>
<td>In total up to 14 structures</td>
<td>Survey Monkey or similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of national, regional and global reports; Audited FS; and other relevant documents</td>
<td>National coalitions; regional and global secretariats</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Desk Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews / FGD</td>
<td>GCE Global Management Team (with inclusion of Board members?)</td>
<td>Up to 8 interview partners in London/Johannesburg</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>GPE and UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skype/telephonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex B: Statement of Eligibility

For the attention of:  
Global Campaign for Education
1st Floor, Block N
25 Sturdee Avenue
Rosebank, 2132
Johannesburg
South Africa


I/We, the undersigned, [insert name/s]…………………………………………………………………………………., hereby state that the proposed named expert(s) listed below is/are available to carry out the services relating to the Terms of Reference mentioned above as from [insert start date]……………… for the period initially envisaged in the proposal submitted.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of expert(s)</th>
<th>Title of post/position for this evaluation</th>
<th>Duration (work days/months)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I/We understand that failure to make the named expert(s) listed above available for the performance of the services may lead to cancellation of the Contract.

Name, date and signature of representative of the Company

---

25 When the Tenderer is a firm or a consultancy, the signatory must be a duly authorised representative of the firm or consultancy.
Annex C: Disclosure Declaration

THIS DECLARATION MUST BE SUBMITTED BY ALL TENDERERS. WHERE THE TENDERER IS A CORPORATION OR CONSORTIUM OR PARTNERSHIP THE DECLARATION MUST BE COMPLETED BY A DULY AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE.

Name of Tenderer: ...............................................................

Address: ...........................................................................

..........................................................................................

I, [ insert name ], solemnly declare that I have been duly authorised to make this declaration by the Tenderer and I hereby certify as follows:

(1) The Tenderer has not been convicted of fraud, money laundering, corruption, or of being a member of a criminal organisation.

(2) The Tenderer is not bankrupt or subject to bankruptcy or analogous proceedings, or being wound up, its affairs are not being administered by a court, it has not entered into an arrangement with its creditors, it has not suspended its business activities nor is it in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure under national laws and regulations.

(3) Neither the Tenderer, nor any of its directors or partners, has been convicted of an offence concerning professional conduct by a judgement which has the force of res judicata or been guilty of grave professional misconduct (proven by any means which the Contracting Organisation can demonstrate) in the course of its or their business.

(4) The Tenderer has fulfilled its obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions in its country of establishment or any other State in which the Tenderer is located.

(5) The Tenderer has not been guilty of serious misrepresentation or omission in providing information to a public buying agency, including the Contracting Organisation.

I further declare that the information provided above is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I understand that the provision of inaccurate or misleading information in this declaration may lead to the Tenderer being excluded from participation in this or future tenders.

This declaration is made for the benefit of the Global Campaign for Education, Johannesburg, South Africa.

SIGNATURE: .......................................................... DATE: _______________________

NAME (PRINT): ................................................ TEL: _______________________

POSITION: ........................................................................
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ANNEX 2: LIST OF SKYPE AND PHONE INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

**GCE Board and CSEF Oversight (9)**

- Camilla Croso, GCE President & CLADE Regional Coordinator, CLADE (Brazil)
- Monique Fouilhoux, GCE Chairperson and member of the CSEF Global Oversight Committee (GOC), GCE (France)
- Refaat Sabbah, GCE Vice Chair and ACEA President
- Rasheda Choudhury, GCE Vice President & Executive Director of CAMPE (Bangladesh Education Coalition), CAMPE (Bangladesh)
- Helle Gudmandsen, GCE Board Member and member of the CSEF Global Oversight Committee (GOC)
- David Archer, GCE Board Member and GPE Board Member (Civil Society Representative from CSO1) and member of the CSEF Global Oversight Committee (GOC), Action Aid International (UK)
- Alassane Aboubabrine, GCE Board Member & President of ASO-EPT Niger (national education coalition), ASO-EPT Niger
- Nafisa Baboo, GCE Board Member, Light for the World (South Africa)
- Maria Khan, GCE Board Member

**International Partners Group (5)**

- Vernor Munoz, IPG - Global Advisor on Education Plan International (Costa Rica)
- Anne Marie Sørensen, IPG - Programme Manager, Education (Africa & Latin America), IBIS
- Purna Shrestha, IPG - Lead Advisor on Education, Voluntary Services Overseas (UK)
- Tanvir Muntasim, IPG - International Policy Manager, Education - Action Aid International
- Tony Baker, IPG - EFA Campaign Manager - RESULTS Educational Fund

**Supervising Entity – UNESCO (3)**

- Jordan Naidoo, Director of EFA and Global Agenda Coordination Team and former UNICEF Senior Expert in charge of Education Post-2015, UNESCO
- Sabine Dietzel, Programme Specialist, EFA & Global Agenda Coordination Team - Education Sector, UNESCO (CSEF supervising entity main contact point), UNESCO (France)
- Heidi Kivekas, Project Officer, CSEF Fund (CSEF supervising entity main M&E /reporting contact), UNESCO (France)
**GPE (6)**

- Sarah Beardmore, Senior Strategy and Policy Specialist and CSEF lead in GPE secretariat, GPE (USA)
- Karen Mundy, Chief Technical Officer, GPE (USA)
- Joseph O'Reilly, Senior Education Advisor (Asia), Save the Children & Chair of the GPE Strategy and Policy Committee and member of the GPE Coordinating Committee, Save the Children UK (Thailand)
- Chris Tinning, Director for Education, Child Protection and Gender Equality of the Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD), Australia and Member of the GPE Governance, Ethics, Risk and Finance (GERF) Committee, DFATD (Australia)
- Charles Tapp, Manager Partnerships and External Relations, GPE (USA)
- Padraig Power, Senior Finance Officer, GPE (USA)

**Regional Partners (15)**

- Limbani Nsapato, ANCEFA Regional Coordinator, ANCEFA (Zambia)
- Solange Akpo, Capacity Building Manager, ANCEFA (Togo)
- Aissatou Lo Ndiaye, Programme Officer Francophone coalitions, ANCEFA (Senegal)
- Boaz Waruku, CSEF Regional Coordinator for Africa, ANCEFA (Kenya)
- Matildah Mwamba, Programme Officer Southern Africa, ANCEFA (Zambia)
- Kobia David Simon, Programme Officer Eastern Africa, ANCEFA (Kenya)
- Rose Diouf, CSEF Regional Accountant (Africa FMA), Oxfam (Senegal)
- Samira Daoud, Regional Essential Services Campaign Coordinator (oversees CSEF FMA role in Africa), Oxfam (Senegal)
- Laura Giannecchini, CSEF Regional Coordinator Latin America, CLADE
- Fabiana Araujo, Accountant and Finance Advisor (Latin America FMA), ActionAid Americas
- Bernie Lovegrove, CSEF Regional Coordinator for Asia and the Pacific, ASPBAE
- Helen Dabu, Capacity Development and Advocacy Support Officer, ASPBAE
- Cecelia (Thea) Soriano, Capacity Development and Advocacy Support Officer, ASPBAE
- Hayley McQuire, Capacity Development and Advocacy Support Officer, ASPBAE
- Aloysius Matthews, CSEF Fund Manager (Asia & Pacific FMA), Education International

**CSEF Global Secretariat (6)**

- Caroline Pearce, GCE Global Coordinator
- Wolfgang Leumer, CSEF Global Manager
- Kjersti Mowé, Networks and Learning Manager
- Grant Zichepe Kasowanjete, CSEF Finance Manager & Middle East and Eastern
• Louise Knight, CSEF Programme Officer, Monitoring & Evaluation
• Jean Paul Brice Affana Affana, CSEF Programme Officer, Networks & Learning

Others (5)

• Caroline Schmidt, Former GPE, GIZ
• Muyatwa Sitali, Recently conducted a review of Oxfam's role as an FMA and involvement in CSEF
• Min Bahadur Bista, UNESCO Asia (Bangkok)
• Malisa Santigul, UNESCO Asia (Bangkok)
• Jorge Sequeira, Director, UNESCO Office in Santiago and Regional Bureau for Education
ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED DURING CASE STUDIES

CASE STUDY CAMBODIA (26)

National Education Partnership (NEP) Secretariat (3)

- Sra Kim – Program Officer, NEP
- Veasna – Executive Director, NEP
- Nipu – Campaign and Advocacy Coordinator, NEP

NEP members (17)

- Ung Pola - Executive Director, Cambodian Organization for Children and Development
- Bou Noeun – Program Officer – Education, Health and Social Development, European Union
- Kim Dara – World Education
- Ket Chanto – Plan International
- Keo Sarath – Save the Children
- Sem Sansamkosal - Mithsamlahan
- Oung Raksmey – Action Aid Cambodia
- Darong Chour - Executive Assistant/Public Relation Officer, Kruosar Thmey
- Hor Sokhak – Literacy Director, Room to Read
- Bouy Phallin - Bandoskomar
- Vorn Samphors – Aide et Action
- Oung Raksmey – Action Aid
- Hun Boramey – Action Aid
- Hun Touch – Rabbit School
- Robin McNaughton – This Life Cambodia
- Sen Se – This Life Cambodia
- Jan Noorlander – CARE International

Officials (1)

- H.E. Dr. Hang Choun Naron, Minister of Education Youth and Sport

Development Partners (5)

- Santosh Khatri - Education Program Specialist, UNESCO
- Sra Kim – Program Officer, UNESCO
• Lay Vutha – National Education Officer, UNESCO
• Chea Huot – UNICEF
• Chea Vantha – VSO

CASE STUDY MALAWI (24)

CSEC Secretariat (4)

• Benedicto Kondowe, Director, CSEC Malawi
• Kisa Kumwenda, Research and M and E Officer
• Alice Kayanula, Finance and Administration Officer
• Julie Juma, Chair of CESC Board; Education and Youth Manager, ActionAid,

CSEC Members (4)

• Joseph Patel, Independent
• Schools Association of Malawi (ISAMA), President
• Mtende Msindama, Link For Education Governance (LEG), Exec Director
• Chifundo Fukiza, Forum for African Women Educationalists in Malwai (FAWEMA) – Project Officer

Officials (4)

• Francis R.W. Chalamanda, National Coordinator for Early Childhood Development, Ministry of Gender, Children and Community Development
• Grace Milner – Planning Directorate, Policy and Programmes, Ministry Of Education
• Mughandira Wathando – Planning Directorate, Policy and Programmes, Ministry Of Education
• Dr Rodrick Nthengwe, Deputy Director of Basic Education, Ministry of Education

Development Partners (12)

• Kersten Henke, German Embassy
• Judith Ohirwa, EU Delegation
• Milena Rottoe, GIZ
• Lamulo Nsanya, KFW
• Heike Franz Lange, GIZ
• Hildegunn Tobiassen, Norwegian Embassy
• Emma Grimley, DfID
• Ramsey Sosola, USAID
• Lena Veierskov, Education and Capacity Building Social Sectors and Infrastructure Section, EU
• Estela Vidal, Programme Manager, Trocaire
• George Maduka, Programme Officer (monitoring of partners in education), IM (SOIR)
• Grace Banda, Technical Advisor, Basic Education, GIZ

CASE STUDY MOLDOVA (19)

NGO Alliance (3)

• Liliana Rotaru, CCF Director; NGO Alliance Director, CCF/NGO Alliance
• Stela Veluian, NGO Alliance President, NGO Alliance
• Daniela David, Communications Officer, NGO Alliance

NGO Alliance Members (8)

• Zincov Ana, Director, ASCHF, Peresecina village
• Victoria Secu, Director, FCPS, Criuleni village
• Lilia Nahaba, Project Coordinator, CE Pro – Didactica
• Teodora Rebeja, Project Coordinator, Terre des hommes
• Ana Levinte, Director, AO Verbina
• Cornelia Cincilei, Director, Step by step Educational Programme, Moldova
• Ludmila Malcoci, Executive Director, KEYSTONE, Human Services International / Moldova
• Mariana Ianachevici, CEO and President of Regional Coalition Child Pact, Association for Child and Family Empowerment Regional Coalition Child Pact

Officials (2)

• Valentina Chicu, Head of the Department for Pre-University Education, Ministry of Education of the Republic of Moldova
• Svetlana Kirilov, Deputy Director of CRAP, Republican Psycho-pedagogical Services (CRAP)

Development Partners (6)

• Ann Larrow, Volunteer, Peace Corps
• Larisa Moscalenco, Advocacy Coordinator, FCPS
• Silvia Apostol, Country Director. SOIR
• Iuliana Samburschi, Officer, SOIR
• Mihail Păiu, Teacher of physics and technical sciences, State university
• Liudmila Lefter, Education Programme Coordinator, UNICEF
CASE STUDY NICARAGUA (24)

FEDH-IPN Secretariat and Board (6)
- Jorge Mendoza Vásquez, Coordinator, Foro de Educacion y Desarrollo Humano
- Arlen Maria Mendoza, Equipo Técnico FEDHIPN
- Edgar Palacios Ortiz, Equipo Técnico FEDHIPN
- Zochil Colomer Sánchez, Foro de Educación y Desarrollo Humano
- Ruth Danelia Fletes Fonseca, Junta Directiva FEDHIPN
- Mario Fulvio Espinoza, Junta Directiva FEDHIPN

Officials (3)
- Carlos Emilio Lopez, Diputado FSLN, Asamblea Nacional
- Miguel De Castilla Urbina, Ministro Asesor en asuntos de Educación (UNESCO)
- Jocsan Moreno, Concejal La Trinidad, Estelí

Coalition members (12)
- Ceferina Fuentes, MCN, La Trinidad, Estelí
- Henry Sanchez Castro, ANIDE, Matagalpa
- Rosalina Robleto, Mesa Educativa Camoapa
- Francisco Salazar, Mesa Educativa Camoapa
- Karla Perez, EDUCO
- Mauricio Castillo, EDUCO
- Federico Rostran, Director, EDUCO
- Briceyda Traña, MCN
- Douglas, MCN
- Amanda Flores Guevara, Asociación de Scout de Nicaragua
- Irma Quintanilla Franco, Mesa Nacional de Riesgo, Revista el País Azul
- Magda Garcia, Grupo Focal Medios de comunicación

Partners / media (3)
- Mario Fulvio Espinoza, Radio Sandino
- Teatino Santana, Canal 12
- Yelsin Espinoza, Radio 580
CASE STUDY SENEGAL (32)

COSYDEP Secretariat (5)
- Cheikh MBOW, National Coordinator
- Mariama SECK, Finance and Administration Officer
- Marie Elisabeth MASSALY, M&E Officer
- Kader NDIAYE, Program Officer
- Fatou Diene MBAYE, Administration and Finance Assistant

COSYDEP Board and Executive Committee (11)
- Coumba LOUM, Chargée Genre & Education des filles, CEN
- Baye DIONGUE, Chargé Education inclusive, CEN
- Amy SYLLA SARR, Chargée Protection et Education de la Petite Enfance, CEN
- Abdou Aziz SALL, Chargé Alphabétisation, non formel et Form. Prof., CEN
- Aldiouma SAGNA, Chargé Dialogue social et partenariat, CEN
- Moussa MBAYE, Président, CNEAP
- Banda DIEYE, Secrétaire Exécutif, ANHMS
- Omar, SOW, Responsable champagne, GCAP
- Awa WADE, Secrétaire Général, UDEN
- Amadou DIAOUNE, Secrétaire Général, SUDES
- Mariéme Dansokho SAKHO, Secrétaire Général, SYPROS

Coalition members (5)
- Mor DIAKHATE, Directeur exécutif, ALPHADEV
- Ndongo SARR, Secrétaire Général adjoint, CUSEMS
- Abdoulaye FATY, Secrétaire Général, SELS/A
- Gougna NIANG, Secrétaire Général, UES
- Oumar NDIAYE, Journaliste, REJEF

Officials (2)
- Djibril Ndiaye DIOUF Directeur de la Planification et de la Réforme, Ministère Education Nationale
- Moustaphe SOW, Directeur Centre National de Documentation Scientifique et Technique, Ministère Enseignement Supérieur
**Financial Management Agency (4)**

- Kalil MAIGA Senior Finance Officer CSEF, OXFAM
- Robert BADJI, CSEF Admin Finance Officer, OXFAM
- Awa TRAORE, Stagiaire Admin Finance Officer CSEF, OXFAM
- Doriane ORLYSE TCHAMANBE, Chargée de programme CSEF, OXFAM

**Regional Secretariat (1)**

- Stanford NSEFU, Responsable Administratif et financier, ANCEFA

**Development Partners (4)**

- Macaty FALL, Spécialiste Education, UNICEF
- Haleinta THIAM, Spécialiste développement de la petite enfance, UNICEF
- Hamidou SOUKOUNA Responsable programme, Aide et Action
- Directeur, Ecole élémentaire Pikine 7 A

**CASE STUDY VIETNAM (19)**

**Coalition Secretariat and Board (2)**

- Kim Anh – National Coordinator VAEFA
- Than Hang – Program/Finance Officer VAEFA

**Coalition members (10)**

- Tran Xuan Nhi – Vietnam Association for Promoting Education (VAPE)
- Son, Expert – IPD
- Duong Thi Van, Vice President – Hanoi Association of People with Disabilities (DP Hanoi)
- Vuong Thi Hanh, Director – CEPEW (Centre for Education Promotion and Empowerment for Women)
- Nguyen Tuan Linh, Chairman – Hanoi Association for the Deaf
- Tuan, Director – Center for Supporting and Job Orientation for Autistic Children
- Vice Director – Thanh Xuan Continuing Education Center (Thanh Xuan CEC)
- Nguyen Thi Kim Ngan, Chair Woman – Thanh Xuan District Association of People with Disabilities
- Tac – Expert Center for Special Education Research (VNIES)
- Hong – Chair Woman Gia Lam Women’s Union
Officials (3)

- Dong Van Binh – continuing education expert Department of Continuing Education
- Mai Chai, Vice Director - IPD (Institute for Human Potential of Education Development Research)
- Pham Thi Ngoc Hai – literacy expert Department of Continuing Education, MOET

Regional Secretariat (1)

- Helen Dabu – Deputy Regional Coordinator ASPBAE

Development partners (3)

- Sun Lei – Education Program Coordinator UNESCO
- Nhung – Education Sector Manager Child Fund
- Nga – Government Relations and Advocacy Officer World Vision

CASE STUDY ZIMBABWE (19)

Secretariat of the Education Coalition Of Zimbabwe (3)

- Lydia Madyirapanze, Chairperson of the ECOZI Board, as well as National Coordinator of the Forum For African Women Educationalists Zimbabwe Chapter (FAWEZI), an ECOZI member organisation.
- Maxwell Rafomoyo, National Coordinator.
- Nomatter Kuhwehwe, Finance Officer.

Ministry Of Education (5)

- Kwadzanai Nyanungo, Principal Director, Department of Infant Education, Learner Welfare, School Psychological Services and Special Needs Education.
- S Sithole, Deputy Director, School Psychological Services and Special Needs Education.
- Dr Makanda, Director, Curriculum Development And Technical Services.
- Peter Muzawazi, Director for Planning, Policy, Research and Development.
- Stella Kakono, Programme Officer for Education, Zimbabwe National Commission for UNESCO.

Other National Partners (3)

- Dr Nikhat Shameem, Manager, Global Partnership For Education, UNICEF.
- Rosalina Maponga, National Programme Officer For Education, UNESCO.
• Dr Abdoul Wahab Coulibaly, Education Programme Specialist, UNESCO.

**Member Organisations Of ECOZI (8)**

• Stella Moyo, Shingirirai Trust.
• Sister Annah Theresa Nyadombo, HLMC – Zimbabwe Catholic Bishop’s Conference (ZCBC).
• Vernon Chikwaya, Nhaka Foundation.
• Daphne Mawunge, Chiedza Child Care Centre.
• Jane Chimene, National Education Union of Zimbabwe (NEUZ).
• Martha Damu, The Foundations Project (TFPT).
• Stella Satiya, Child Resource Institute in Zimbabwe (CRIZ).
ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW/ FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS GUIDE FOR CSEF PROGRAMME EVALUATION

May - July 2015

Date and place of interview:
Interviewee name, position, institution:

Instruction Note To The Evaluation Team

This is an interview guide. Therefore,

1. Not all questions will be able to be answered by all interviewees. Be sensitive to the specific knowledge and experience of interviewees.

2. We are seeking inputs from interviewees in relation to the full range of enquiry visible in the Guide, but drawing out greater details and analysis for interviewees in the areas in which they have specific knowledge, skills and interest is of particular value to our work.

3. Be aware of and sensitive to your use of technical words and names – an interviewee might not know what a ‘regional secretariat’ is, but would be fully conversant for example with the role and work of ANCEFA.

4. The Guide is designed so you can type responses from interviewees directly into the appropriate cell as the interview progresses. This is an effective method for getting good quality notes while not having to transcribe later, and ensures your typed notes are available to the whole team on the Dropbox. If you hand write or record your interviews, please ensure you transcribe your notes as soon as possible.

Introduction

(please provide this introductory material to interviewees).

The overall aim of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) Programme is to ‘contribute to the achievement of national education goals and Education for All (EFA) by ensuring the effective participation of civil society organisations and citizens in education debates and sector planning and review’. The CSEF Programme provides:

- Core financing.
- Technical assistance and capacity support.
- Opportunities for cross-country learning to civil society coalitions focused on education in developing countries across Africa, Asia, the pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle-East, and Eastern Europe.
The Global Campaign For Education (GCE) has commissioned an evaluation into the CSEF Programme. The evaluation is intended to:

- Support reflection on achieved effectiveness of the approaches adopted by the Programme.
- Provide evidence of the impact of the work of the Programme.
- Have a strong emphasis on drawing together lessons and recommendations to inform improvements and structural changes for a future CSEF 2016-2018.

The evaluation includes:

- Case studies with 7 funded coalitions, representing each of the 4 CSEF regions, based on field visits by the Evaluation Team.
- Skype and telephone conversations with representatives of global, regional and national stakeholders of the CSEF Programme.
- A detailed quantitative survey with each of the funded coalitions, seeking responses from both the secretariat and the Board of each coalition, meaning up to 108 survey responses.
- A quantitative survey with each of the member organisations of each coalition, seeking responses from up to 3,000 organisations.

I would like to thank you for participating in this (face-to-face interview/ focus group meeting/ Skype interview).

Confidentiality

I will make notes during the interview, but I note for you that your responses are completely confidential, and will remain so. Your comments will contribute to an overall assessment of the CSEF Programme. It is possible that your specific words will be used in the Evaluation Report, but if so they will not be attributed, nor will there be any identifying information provided with the quotation.
**Introductory details from the Interviewee**

Ask the interviewee to describe their knowledge of and involvement in the CSEF Programme.

---

**RELEVANCE**

**Relevance Of Design And Theory Of Change**

Guiding evaluation question for the Evaluation Team (not to be addressed to interviewees):

Comparatively analyse the programme implementation processes and its achievements across different country and regional contexts to identify context-dependent factors affecting implementation. This will help identify and derive principles for scaling and replication.

**Adaptive Systems/ Fidelity – Collaborative Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview and/ or Focus Group Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1. Please describe how the CSEF project’s strategies of communication, learning, networking and mobilization contribute to civil society participation, advocacy and policy change. To what extent did these strategies contribute to civil society participation, advocacy and policy change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How partners/ coalition members describe quality assurance systems and communication, learning and networking strategies (both general comments on and the specifics examples).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The specific perspectives of the programme team on their focus on ensuring quality assurance systems and communication, learning and networking strategies (both general comments on and specific examples).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Determinants/ Receptivity – Local Ownership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview and/ or Focus Group Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 2. Could you please describe who the stakeholders are and how they are identified? Alternative: Could you please describe individuals and/or entities who collaborate in implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3. What mechanisms does the CSEF project have in place for stakeholders to provide input into implementation planning and delivery? Consider interactions with all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
groups throughout the partnership cycle:

- How do you work together?
- How often interaction occurs and in what manner (in person, by phone etc.).
- Why do they happen? Who or what serves as a catalyst for these interactions?
- Who sets the agenda for these interactions/events?
- Who participates in these interactions?
- How are actions documented, communicated and followed up on?
- How do you decide on who contributes what? (i.e. financial, human and material resources)
- Who is involved in those discussions?
- How are final decisions reached and communicated?
- How are decisions translated into actions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4. To what extent are the objectives of CSEF conducive to coalitions’ own objectives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Content - Learning and Best Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview and/ or Focus Group Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Question 5. To what extent did the CSEF partners and stakeholders learn from programme experiences, how are these learnings shared and how did they use that learning?**  
Consider:  
- Cross-country learning  
- South-South collaboration. |
| **Question 6. What key lessons have been learned from implementation?**  
Consider:  
- How partners/ coalition members view learning and best practices  
- The specific perspectives of the programme team on their learning and relevance of their intervention content. |
Question 7. Are there emerging best practices that can be shared nationally, regionally and globally? If so, what they are?

**EFFECTIVENESS**

**Effectiveness Of Implementation and Intervention Content**

*Guiding evaluation question for the Evaluation Team (not to be addressed to interviewees):*

To what extent the results obtained from the implementation of activities have contributed to the attainment of the planned objectives?

**Intervention Content/ Effectiveness – Benchmarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview and/ or Focus Group Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 8.</strong> How effective were implementation strategies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• for strengthening policy making in the educational sector?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• for strengthening civil society participation in the educational sector?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• gaining traction in terms of coalitions’ identity, visibility, recognition/ credibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in addressing the needs and priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries (e.g. CSOs, capacity building, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in advancing coalitions’ theory of change? In what ways and why/ why not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the above question consider why/ why not and in what ways this resulted in the contribution to:

• national policy change.
• the Local Education Groups, Education Sector Working Groups and Joint Sector Review processes of the relevant Ministries of Education.
• the development, monitoring and evaluation of Education Sector Plans.
• influencing national resource investment in the sector.
• promoting more efficient, transparent and accountable use of sector resources.

**Question 9.** To what extent does the CSEF project address gender equality and human rights in programme implementation?
SUSTAINABILITY

SUSTAINABILITY AND IMPACT OF INTERVENTION

Guiding evaluation question for the Evaluation Team (not to be addressed to interviewees):

1. To what extent the programme increased local capacities in a way which contributes to their better access and participation as measured by beneficiaries’ increased skills, abilities and knowledge.

2. Extent to which the CSEF programme as a whole has achieved its long-term objectives and learning goals.

Intervention Effect/ Sustainability – Long-term Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview and/ or Focus Group Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 10. What is the extent of the CSEF project’s impact on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the role and influence of National Education Coalitions in national education policy processes and in the GPE country level processes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• on political and financial sustainability of coalitions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the added value (and impact) of the programme on the capacity of national coalitions, including an assessment of the appropriateness of funding levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have coalitions felt any political or financial sustainability as a direct result of CSEF?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential for Impact

| Question 11. What is the likelihood that CSEF results and outcomes will be sustained to achieve long-term impact? |

EFFICIENCY

Guiding evaluation question for the Evaluation Team (not to be addressed to interviewees):

How well are financial, human and material resources managed and maintained for optimal use?

Organisational Systems/ Economy (Resource Use)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview and/ or Focus Group Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 12. In your view, how cost-effective is the CSEF programme relative to added value to regional partners and national education coalitions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner/ national coalition perceptions of programme expenditure (ie, their sense that financial resources are used efficiently).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Partner/ national coalition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perspectives on how the programme adds value to their work and outcomes.

- The specific perspectives of the programme team on their focus on how the programme adds value to their work and outcomes.

**Organisational Systems/ Productivity – Performance Management**

**Interview and/or Focus Group Questions**

**Question 13.** How effective are the management structures of the programme? Ask, one-by-one, about the following:

- Regional Secretariats (RSs)
- Financial Management Agencies (FMAs)
- Regional Funding Committees
- GCE
- The Global Oversight Committee (GOC).

Consider:

- How partners/coalition members describe their role in programme implementation and management (both general comments on ‘involvement’ and the specifics of their participation.)
- The specific perspectives of the programme team on their focus on engaging stakeholders in program implementation and management decision-making.

**Question 14.** How effective has the CSEF project been in providing support to National Coalitions?

**Question 15a.** Could you describe the systems that the CSEF program uses for implementation monitoring and management?

**15b.** How effective are these systems – do they clearly contribute of efficient operations and effective outcomes?

**15c.** How well do NECs and Regional Secretariats understand and implement the principles and practice of the LME System Guidelines?

**15d.** From a learning perspective, has the LME System contributed to the project management approaches and skills of NECs and Regional Secretariats? How?
ANNEX 5: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. **CSEF 2013-14 Proposal to GPE and Implementation Plan**

   CSEF Revised proposal 2013-2014 for GPE BoD FINAL
   CSEF Revised proposal - Cover Note EN
   CSEF Revised Proposal - Budget EN_FR
   CSEF Revised Proposal - Note on Budget
   CSEF Revised Proposal - Implementation Plan 2013-2014
   CSEF Revised Proposal - Supplementary Appendices 4 to 7 EN

2. **CSEF 2015 Extension Period Documents**

   CSEF 2015 Extension Budget GPE Format EN_FR Final
   Annex 3 Detailed Implementation plan 2015 - GCE Submission 25 March
   CSEF 2015 Costed Extension Proposal GPE Final
   Themes and Type of Activities in Extension Proposals

3. **CSEF Global Report July-Dec 2014**

   CSEF Progress Reports 2012 - 2015 (Various documents: Progress Reports 1 through 6_SCEF Highlights )
   Annex 1 - CSEF Implementation Status Update_Dec
   Annex 2 - CSEF Support Visits July to December 2014
   Annex 3 - CSEF Funded Regional and Global Workshops_Seminars
   Annex 4 - Publications List Regional and Global Full Period until Dec 2015
   Annex 5 - List of CSEF Supported National Coalitions
   Annex 6 - Full List of National Coalitions Publications and Resources
   Annex 8 - National Coalitions Research & Analysis Exercises July - Dec 2014
   Annex 9 - Full List of Submissions July - Dec 2014
   Annex 10 - Full List of New Forums Joined July - Dec 2014
ASPBAE_Bulletin_August_2014
CSEF ACEA Newsletter 2
Ed-lines - December 2014 - Special Edition
SINTESIS_12_Marzo_2015
GCE CSEF Report to UNESCO - Full Narrative Report Revised

4. CSEF Programme Documents

CSEF Programme Document 2013-2014 FINAL
CSEF National Coalition Proposal Template_EN_Final
CSEF - HR Plan_Final
CSEF - Governance Approach_Final
CSEF - Capacity Support, Learning & Collaboration_Final
Checklist for Coalition Assessments
CSEF 2013-2014_Budget Template_GCE_Final
CSEF - Guidelines for Funding Allocations_Final
CSEF - Sector Engagement_Final
CSEF Eligibility Guidelines - Existing and New Coalitions_Final
CSEF Financial Management Procedures
CSEF RFC ToR and Evaluation Guidelines
Principles for Engagement between INGOs and National Coalitions
Programme Overview and National Coalition Proposal Guidelines EN_Final
CSEF - Original Implementation Program Agreement (IPA)
CSEF Africa MOU Signed GCE-ANCEFA-Oxfam
CSEF IPA Amendment GCE Signed
5. **CSEF Reporting Templates**

*July-Dec 2013*

- CSEF National Coalition Reporting Template Final_2014-Update
- CSEF Secretariat Reporting Template Final-Revised
- CSEF FMA Reporting Template Final-Revised 23April14

*July-Dec 2014*

- CSEF Regional FMA Reporting Template 12-2014
- CSEF Regional Secretariat Reporting Template 12-2014
- CSEF National Coalition ReportingTemplate 3rd Bi-annual Report_July-Dec 2014-Final_PT
- CSEF National Coalition Reporting Template - July-Dec 2014_Eng

*Jan - June 2014*

- Jan-Jun2014_CSEF Regional FMA Reporting Template 06-2014

6. **Region Implementation Plans**

- Asia Pacific CSEF Regional Implementation Plan - Aug 2013
- Country Objectives 2
- Final Detailed Plan 2013-2014
- Final_Implementation Plan 2013-2014
- Full CSEF Implementation Plan_April 2013
- Implementation Plan 2013-2014 with ANCEFA Ingreen MAY 2013
- Status of Countries with Year 2 Reports in English
- Year 1 Plans
7. Miscellaneous

CSEF Final Master Sheet with all Coalitions & all Feedback Captured

CSEF Output - Global v13-Revised Histogram

CSEF 2013-2014 Policy Dialogue and Monitoring

Role of Civil Society in the EFA Movement 2000-2015

Malawi Draft EFA Report_Consolidation

May 2015 Letter by GOC TO RFC Africa


GCE Feedback on CSEF 3rd Semester Reporting

Annex 3 - UNESCO's Role as Supervising Entity – 9 April 2013


Malawi Civil Society Education Coalition CSEF 2015 Programme Extension Proposal for April – December 2015


The CSEC Rural Primary School Teachers Basic Needs Basket. CSEC Malawi. May 2014.


Livret de Capitalisation de Bonnes Pratiques en Matière d’Education Inclusive, COSYDEP, juin 2014

COSYDEP application proposal to CSEF Programme 2013-2014

COSYDEP Plan D’Intervention Stratégique, 2011

COSYDEP Articles of Incorporation.

Rapport sur la gouvernance de la COSYDEP (Report on COSYDEP Governance), ANCEFA, Bureau de Lomé, août 2014

Rapport Mission de Suivi (M&E Report), ANCEFA, Bureau de Lomé, juin 2014
Understanding Populism and Political Participation: The Case of Nicaragua, Woodrow Wilson Center Update on the Americas, Number 4, June 2009


Cambodia National Coalition Proposal to CSEF

Cambodia National Education Partnership Strategic Directions 2014-2018

Cambodia National Education Partnership Charter of Operation Principles and Practices

NEP CSEF 4th Bi-Annual Report January to June 2015

Cambodia Education for All 2015 National Review, UNESCO

VCEFA general Introduction (English)

VAEFA organizational Structure

Vietnam Education for All 2015 National Review,


Government of Moldova (2007); Deinstitutionalization (DI) National Strategy for Moldova’s Child protection system

UNDP (2014); Human Development Report 2014

UNDP (2012); Human Development Report 2012

NEC Proposal and Project reports and Project Implementation Plan 2014/2015

Research Study summary (in English)

8. Reports

1st UNESCO CSEF Progress Report - April- August 2013

2nd UNESCO CSEF Progress Report

Financial Risk Assessment CSEF

IOS RCM Follow-up Education Sector CSEF (Feb2015)

9. **Coalition Websites**

BENIN [www.cbo-ept.org](http://www.cbo-ept.org)

TOGO [www.cnepftogo.org](http://www.cnepftogo.org)

DRC [www.coneprdc.org](http://www.coneprdc.org)

BURUNDI [WWW.Bafashebige.org](http://WWW.Bafashebige.org)

BURKINA FASO [www.cnptbf.org](http://www.cnptbf.org)

CAMEROON [www.efa-cameroon.net](http://www.efa-cameroon.net)

CAPE VERDE [www.rncept-cv.org](http://www.rncept-cv.org)

IVORY COAST [www.ripept.org](http://www.ripept.org)

MAURITANIA [www.comeduc.net](http://www.comeduc.net)

NIGER [www.asoeptniger.org](http://www.asoeptniger.org)

RWANDA [www.refacrwanda.org](http://www.refacrwanda.org)

SENEGAL [www.cosydep.org](http://www.cosydep.org)

ETHIOPIA [www.benethiopia.org.et](http://www.benethiopia.org.et)

GAMBIA [www.efanet.gm](http://www.efanet.gm)

GHANA [www.gneccgh.org](http://www.gneccgh.org)

KENYA [www.elimuyetu.net](http://www.elimuyetu.net)

MALAWI [www.csec.org](http://www.csec.org)
MOZAMBIQUE  www.mept.org.mz
NIGERIA  www.csacefa.org
SIERRA LEONE  www.efasierraleone.org
TANZANIA  www.tenmet.org
ZAMBIA  www.zanec.org
ZIMBABWE  www.ecozi.co.zw
BANGLADESH  www.campebd.org
CAMBODIA  www.nepcambodia.org
INDIA  www.nceindia.org
INDONESIA  http://new-indonesia.org
MONGOLIA  www.all4education.mn
NEPAL  www.ncenepal.org.np
PAKISTAN  www.pcepak.org
TIMOR LESTE  www.tlce.tl
VIETNAM  www.vcefa.org.vn
BOLIVIA  www.campanaderechoeducacion.edu.bo
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC  www.forosocioeducativo.org.do
HONDURAS  www.forodakarhonduras.org
NICARAGUA  www.fedh-ipn.org
ALBANIA  http://www.acce.crca.al
GEORGIA  www.efageorgia.ge
MOLDOVA  www.Aliantacf.md
SOMALIA  www.efasom.org
SUDAN  www.scfa.org
YEMEN  www.yemencea.org
ANNEX 6: SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

Survey With 54 National Education Coalitions

Relevance

How well aligned is the CSEF program with (Scale of 1-5):

- participant needs?
- local priorities?
- donor/ funder strategies?

How relevant is the CSEF programme to

- your national context? (Scale of 1-5)
- the regional context? (Scale of 1-5)
- the global context? (Scale of 1-5)

Effectiveness

Overall, how would you assess your cooperation with CSEF? (Scale of 1-5)

In your opinion, what is the extent to which the CSEF has contributed to the achievement of national education goals and Education for All in your country? (Scale of 1-5)

How important is the contribution of CSEF to strengthening the role of the civil society in overall educational reforms? (Scale of 1-5)

In your view, how good is CSEF in adding value to the work of your organisation? (Scale of 1-5):

To what extent does CSEF ensure local ownership of activities? (Scale of 1-5)

How effective has the programme been in (Scale of 1-5):

- addressing gender equality and human rights?
- involving you in programme implementation?

Please assess the changes in your Coalition/ Network in the period that you were supported by CSEF. Please assess each question on the provided scale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes, definitely</th>
<th>Yes, a little</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>No, it is worse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are more focussed on what we want to achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a better strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have more professional expertise in our institution thanks to the training we attended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational programmes are now better designed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our key messages regarding education are more concise and objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have skills to conduct better research on a topic of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a better understanding of the priorities and interests of the target audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have better leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have more clients/supporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have more funding sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have more moral support from the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a better relationship with authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We receive more funding from authorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have better cooperation with other organisations in the Coalition/ Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are more well-known and respected in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our mission and vision are more clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have better capacities for strategic planning and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We improved our internal monitoring protocols and systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have improved our human resources protocols and systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a better coverage of gender issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have improved our reporting (narrative and financial) capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Efficiency

Has your coalition received a grant from CSEF?

- Yes
- No

If yes, how many grants have you received?

- One
- Two
- Three

Generally speaking, how was your experience of the grant process? (Positive to negative on a scale of 1-5).

In your view, how efficiently are financial resources used in the delivery of the programme? (Scale of 1-5):

How efficient are management structures of the programme? (Each structure to be rated on a scale of 1-5):

- Regional Secretariats
- Financial Management Agencies
- Regional Funding Committees
- GCE
- Global Oversight Committee

To what extent has the CSEF program involved you in programme management? (Scale of 1-5).

How responsive are programme personnel to your requests/ needs? (Scale of 1-5)

In general, how satisfied are you with (Scale of 1-5):

- the support provided by CSEF program?
- how the programme collaborates with you?

Sustainability/ Impact

How likely is it that programme results will be sustained and will achieve long-term impact? (Scale of 1-5)

How committed would you describe yourself as being towards carrying out the CSEF supported activities beyond the programme timeframe? (Scale of 1-5)
Background

What CSEF country programme are you actively working on?
(list all that apply)

What is your role in your organisation:
- Director
- Manager
- Coordinator

How long have you been the part of the Coalition/Network?
- 6 months
- 6 months to 1 year
- 1 year to 3 years
- Longer than 3 years

What is the gender balance of the staff in your organisation?
- Number of women ______
- Number of men ______

Survey With A Range Of Regional And Global Structures

To be issued to these group:
- GCE’s Global Oversight Committee.
- Regional Secretariats.
- Regional Financial Management Agencies.
- International Partners’ Group.
- The Global Partnership For Education.
- Regional Funding Committees.

Relevance

How well aligned is the CSEF program with (Scale of 1-5):
- participant needs?
- local priorities?
- donor/ funder strategies?
How relevant is the CSEF programme to (Scale of 1-5):

- your national contexts?
- the regional context?
- the global context?

**Effectiveness**

Overall, how would you assess your cooperation with CSEF? (Scale of 1-5)

In your opinion, what is the extent to which the CSEF has contributed to the achievement of national education goals and Education for All in your region? (Scale of 1-5)

How important is the contribution of CSEF to strengthening the role of the civil society in overall educational reforms? (Scale of 1-5)

To what extent does CSEF ensure local ownership of activities? (Scale of 1-5)

How effective has the programme been in (Scale of 1-5):

- addressing gender equality and human rights?
- involving you in programme implementation?

**Efficiency**

In your view, how efficiently are financial resources used in the delivery of the programme? (Scale of 1-5):

How efficient are management structures of the programme? (Each structure to be rated on a scale of 1-5).

- Regional Secretariats
- Financial Management Agencies
- Regional Funding Committees
- GCE
- Global Oversight Committee

To what extent has the CSEF program involved you in programme management? (Scale of 1-5).

How responsive are programme personnel to your requests/ needs? (Scale of 1-5)

In general, how satisfied are you with (Scale of 1-5):

- the support provided by CSEF program?
- how the programme collaborates with you?
Sustainability/ Impact

How likely is it that programme results will be sustained and will achieve long-term impact? (Scale of 1-5)

How committed would you describe yourself as being towards carrying out the CSEF supported activities beyond the programme timeframe? (Scale of 1-5)

Background

What type of regional or global structure do you represent?

GCE’s Global Oversight Committee.

- Regional Secretariats.
- Regional Financial Management Agencies.
- International Partners’ Group.
- The Global Partnership For Education.
- Regional Funding Committees.

What is your role in your organisation:

- Director
- Manager
- Coordinator
ANNEX 7: SURVEY SUMMARY ANALYSIS

Two online surveys were developed to complement the qualitative data collected during the field visit and interviews. Surveys were carefully designed to allow respondents to provide information and to share views and opinions while remaining anonymous. The two questionnaires (one for Coalitions Secretariats and Board Members and one for Coalition Members) were developed specifically for this evaluation. The surveys were translated into the main CSEF languages and were administered using SurveyMonkey. The surveys included multiple choice questions that allowed each respondent to address areas of enquiry in a quantitative way. The quantitative focus allowed the evaluation team to draw a picture of overall perspectives on important questions. Qualitative components in the surveys, together with the content of interviews and focus group discussions add depth to and assist in triangulation of data.

Coalition Members Report

This report was created by combining and analysing the data from a survey that was provided to five different groups of coalition members (in five different languages). The raw responses were not available, only frequency tables of the responses from each survey—so these tables were summed together across the different surveys where possible.

Two of the groups, French and English, had samples of 50 and 130 while the other three groups had sample sizes of less than 10. Thus, directly comparing the distributions of the responses across the language groups is not informative outside of the French and English groups. However, comparisons of these two groups demonstrates quite similar distributions of responses to the different questions—indicating that French and English speakers answered the questions in broadly the same way.

After combining all the datasets together, a few features clearly stuck out. Most respondents work at national organizations that have been in existence for over 5 years, and have themselves been working at the organization for at least 3 years. Large majorities praised the National Education Coalition and agreed on its importance to their organization, although a significant portion of respondents felt that activities funded by the CSEF programme were not particularly helpful to the coalition in achieving its goals. In addition, while the majority of respondents felt the coalition would exist without the CSEF programme, an outlier were the Portuguese respondents, where 5 out of 6 responded in the negative.

Board Members Report

This report was created by combining and analysing the data from a survey that was given to five different groups (in five different languages), but to Board members rather than coalition members. The raw responses were not available, only frequency tables of the responses from each survey—so these tables were summed together across the different surveys where possible.

For this group, only the English survey had a large sample size (n = 39) with the rest having samples close to 10 or even less. Thus, for the Board surveys, comparisons across the surveys are not informative due to the small sample sizes in many of the languages.
Instead, it is only appropriate to draw conclusions from the combined data. The respondents, by strong majorities, responded in a positive manner when asked to rate the effectiveness of the programme. They felt that the CSEF objectives were well aligned and that CSEF strengthened the role of civil society in education policy making. In general, they supported the CSEF’s role and believe it adds value to their organization. When presented with a list of attributes that their coalition may have improved on in the past few years, they almost always felt that there was some positive change—though a large minority did note that they felt that the coalition had not generated more funding sources or more external clients/supporters.

Respondents also indicated that they had a positive experience with the grant process, and that the financial resources of the programme were being efficiently used. They felt that the programme was able to respond to their coalition’s needs relatively well, and overall seemed happy with the current working situation.

Summary Graphs

To illustrate the range of the frequencies of responses and how they related to response options, the following graphs are included. These graphs respond to survey questions that had multiple answer choices.

**Q5: How important within CSEF is addressing gender equality?**

- **within coalition structures**
- **within the education sector**

![Graph showing frequency of responses to Q5](image)
Q6: How important are the following?

- Addressing human rights
- Involving Board members in plan/implementation
- Involving coalitions in plan/implementation

Q7: How aligned are CSEF funded activities with the following?

- Donor/funder strategies
- National Education Priorities
Q11: Cooperation Between Coalition and GCE

Q13: Experience with Grant Process
Q14: Efficiency of financial management

Q15: Efficiency of management structures
Q16: Efficiency of management structures

Q17: Responsiveness to needs
Q18: Satisfaction with the Collaboration of the following entities

frequency


- FMAs
- GCE structures (global level)
- GOC structures (global level)
- regional secretariats
- RFCs
- CSEF program