



# PARTNERSHIPS IN PRACTICE

## From AGEI to UNGEI

Summary Report of a Workshop on Girls' Education  
17-20 November 2003

For every child  
Health, Education, Equality, Protection  
ADVANCE HUMANITY

unicef 

**MAKING THE TRANSITION  
FROM THE AFRICAN GIRLS' EDUCATION INITIATIVE (AGEI)  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS GIRLS' EDUCATION INITIATIVE  
(UNGEI)**

An EFA/MDG Workshop

**17-20 November 2003  
Bamako, Mali**

**SUMMARY REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**



## **CONTENTS**

<b>I.</b>	<b>AGEI: BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE FOR UNICEF</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>REGIONAL REFLECTIONS ON AGEI</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>AN EVALUATION OF AGEI: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>MAKING THE TRANSITION FROM AGEI TO UNGEI</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>BUILDING ON AGEI</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>FIELD VISIT TO MOPTI</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>A HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROGRAMMING</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>RIGHTS-BASED PROGRAMMING: CONCEPT AND THEORY</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>APPLYING A RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROGRAMMING IN EDUCATION</b>	<b>16</b>
 <b>ANNEX</b>		
<b>1.</b>	<b>List Participants</b>	<b>21</b>



## DAY ONE

### I. THE AFRICAN GIRLS' EDUCATION INITIATIVE: BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE FOR UNICEF

The African Girls' Education Initiative (AGEI) was motivated by UNICEF's concern for the well-being of children and women. Large gender disparities in education and other areas of society provided the main rationale for donors to get involved. The initial design was simple but open-ended: the goal was getting more girls into school in order to derive *benefits* and overcome *constraints* in girls' education. The 14 guiding principles underlying the design reflected the divergent thinking needed to 'learn by doing'. They included national attention to policies, creating partnerships, community-building, gender sensitivity, advocacy and many other areas. A 'living initiative', it involved a flexible approach for a national strategy with local action and multi-country coordination.

The lessons were used to formulate a more strategic design for phase II, which placed greater attention on quality, results and sustainability. A conceptual shift was also made to use girls' education as a lever for gains in education overall, with greater emphasis on macro and intersectoral issues. Though the number of countries participating in the programme grew, the funding remained the same. It was suggested that this might be one reason why the programme was "too hooked on experimenting," and "perhaps not willing to look at the wider impact."

Nevertheless, the programme did contribute to a number of innovative strategies in girls' education. Twenty strategies were mentioned, including ways to reach out-of-school girls, support a 'right start' through early childhood care and development, community and 'child-friendly' schools, life skills and HIV/AIDS education.

UNICEF is now moving from the experimental phase to more holistic solutions, having girls' education influence and contribute to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and to Education for All (EFA). These include engaging in partnerships that support learning by doing; investing in targeted and thematic interventions; and promoting sector-wide and systemic reform. Partnerships involve work with families, communities and civil society organizations; teachers, managers, and planners; private sector parties regionally, nationally, and internationally; governments (central and local); and bilateral and multilateral aid organizations. There will be a move toward mainstreaming and scaling up.

As the African Initiative draws to a close, it will continue to live on through a broader partnership – the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI). "Girls' education is not a destination, it is a journey."

### II. REGIONAL REFLECTIONS ON AGEI

#### West and Central Africa

**Dina Craissati, UNICEF Regional Education Adviser for West and Central Africa**, reported that in the region AGEI is "small but beautiful—and contagious." It grew from 10 countries in phase I to 16 countries in phase II and affected programming in all 24 countries in the region. Six of the eight countries included in the UNICEF acceleration strategy participated.

The programme achieved its successes through:

- national outreach (for example, it created favourable policy environments for girls' education and introduced specific measures to reach out-of-school girls)
- embedding girls' education in EFA by advancing policies for girls' education, mainstreaming the vision of child-friendly schools, and attracting donor funding
- developing promising partnerships (for example, with ministries and school feeding programmes) and supporting child-friendly schools
- initiating a tradition of reporting (for example, six countries have completed gender reviews and three are in the process; in addition, community-based monitoring has been introduced)
- introducing a culture of quality (child-friendly schools in particular have provided the basis for quality education).

Access to education in zones where AGEI is operating has made a leap forward, although assessing progress it is difficult since interventions are focused on some schools, not on all. Repetition and dropout rates have stagnated or regressed since the beginning of the Initiative, as they have at national levels. This is due to several factors: AGEI zones are in the poorest areas and suffer most from systemic shortcomings; the length of the intervention has been relatively short; and there is a paucity of data. Nevertheless, internal efficiency is still a grave concern.

## **Eastern and Southern Africa**

**Changu Mannathoko, UNICEF Regional Education Adviser for Eastern and Southern Africa**, reported that the region focuses on gender parity as well as gender equality. The region examined these goals from a human rights perspective and identified that a gender analysis was a critical component of this perspective. AGEI began in eight countries in the region and expanded to 18 countries in phase II. As with the West and Central Africa region, the work began with a focus on access and shifted to quality; countries used AGEI to address these issues through education policies. This paid off in terms of increased policy dialogue, community development and social mobilization. Other countries not involved in the programme also benefited from its presence in the region. Some countries, for example, completed AGEI Yearly Technical Reports in order to monitor their programmes.

Since 2000, the interlinkages between access and quality became clear in non-formal as well as formal education. With regard to gender parity, countries learned that broader learning environments were critical, particularly the need to link schools with the local community. In countries hard hit by HIV/AIDS, a number of questions were asked: "How do you ensure that learning environments attract orphans? Is there a method of linking up with partners to ensure that schooling for orphans is funded and that teachers are able to cope with students orphaned by AIDS? One positive example is Swaziland's EFA community grant scheme, which ensures that communities have centres to provide care and support for these children. In the end, linking HIV/AIDS with child protection and other issues forces an intersectoral approach.

With regard to partnerships, advocacy and networking, the region has learned the importance of involving girls and young people in education. Through the Girls' Education Movement (GEM) and anti-AIDS clubs, girls' education has moved from issues of access to empowerment. In the realm of policy, AGEI and girls' education have put gender on the agenda when policymakers

meet to discuss sector-wide approaches and sector investment programmes. Lesotho's gender audit is one example.

The importance of a comprehensive approach is one of the remaining challenges. For example, developing parental education that stresses early childhood care and development from a gender perspective requires educating fathers as well as mothers. Modules and materials being developed in life skills are another example. The issues around girls' education and AGEI are pushing us to look beyond education alone to look at human development more comprehensively.

### **Response from the Government of Norway**

The Norwegian Government is intensifying its commitment to education and aims to increase its funding to 15 per cent of its total development cooperation by 2005.

In 2003, Norway launched a new strategy on education. The country is already actively involved in girls' education, but introduced the new strategy to strengthen its commitment to education in general in developing countries, with special focus on the poorest.

Girls' education has been embedded in EFA. However, as the EFA High Level Group Meeting in New Delhi noted recently, unless policies change, even reaching gender parity by 2015 will run a serious challenge for 40 per cent of the world's countries. Consequently, evaluation becomes extremely important for continued work in this field. What is working and what is not working need be seriously discussed.

## **III. AN EVALUATION OF AGEI: PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

**Lucien Back** introduced this session, with findings presented by evaluators **David Chapman** and **Karen Hickson**. Back noted that UNICEF seeks views of its programmes from both 'insiders' and 'outsiders': through consultants, for example, and by seeking as many sources of information as possible. The main purpose of the AGEI evaluation was to identify lessons learned. AGEI is nearly completed, and will lead to a new programme, so the logical question being asked is, "Where do we need to improve and change?" The education sector has been eager to answer this question and the evaluation has been an important opportunity to offer insights. The evaluation report is not quite finished, so the discussion about the evaluation from this meeting will feed into that final report.

The three purposes of the evaluation were (1) to improve the design and implementation of girls' education programmes across Africa and other regions of the world; (2) to strengthen the capacity of UNICEF to engage in implementation and assessment of girls' education initiatives; and (3) to contribute to the achievement of EFA and the Millennium Development Goals. Multiple methods were used: a document review, interviews with key staff and partners, and field visits with case studies that represented a mixture of successes and challenges for AGEI in both regions. Utilizing these various methods, the evaluation team has drawn the tentative conclusions outlined below.

## Preliminary Findings

1. Context: Many countries are caught in changing contexts, such as conflict, drought and other crises. *Since in some cases remarkable forces are working against girls' education; to maintain the status quo was viewed as progress.*
2. The role of AGEI: The African Girls' Education Initiative has played a useful role in raising the performance of girls' education in the countries in which it operates. It has helped to raise the level of discussion about girls' education within these countries. It also has contributed to the fact that UNICEF is becoming the lead agency for UNGEI and that girls' education is becoming a mid-term strategic priority for all of UNICEF. However, AGEI has not necessarily played a determining role in raising the performance of girls' education within countries. Due to multiple development partners, multiple donor initiatives and complex environmental factors, there is rarely a direct causal relationship between AGEI and performance in girls' education.
3. Design: There is wide agreement on the constraints and issues affecting girls' education. There is less agreement on effective and appropriate solutions – which is what prompted the development of AGEI in the first place. Therefore, a wide variety of strategies were tried across countries.
4. Focus: AGEI focused on: trends in girls' education; outputs and processes, with less attention to programme outcomes and attributable impact; and proposing a wide variety of discrete, not necessarily interrelated, activities.

Moving from phase I to phase II resulted in a shift in focus to: more realistic objectives (in phase I, results were frequently over-promised and not cast in SMART objectives or logical frameworks, such as the goal of improving gross enrolment ratios by 30 per cent over three years); broader geographic focus; and some refocusing of activities, especially in countries dealing with HIV/AIDS.

5. Effectiveness: (1) AGEI helped raise the prominence of girls' education as a policy issue. National policies are the result of many influences, and there is some ambiguity in the understanding of girls' education issues. However, UNICEF has become a player in policy development in girls' education. (2) AGEI contributed to bridging the gender gap in basic education. (3) AGEI contributed added value in terms of the quality of basic education for girls and boys through the girls' education approach. (4) Attempts to develop gender analytic frameworks (for example, gender audits in 12 countries) were increasingly important.

Results have been advanced in terms of: (1) commitment by stakeholders; (2) processes such as community participation at the investment stage; and (3) direct project outputs such as girls' and boys' access and retention. Less attention has been given to outcomes such as community participation at the operational stage, the deployment of teachers trained through AGEI programmes, and the effects of training on actual teaching practices. For example, outputs were monitored in terms of the numbers of teachers trained, but outcomes—how girls experience school differently as a result of teachers' training—were not assessed.

Major efforts were made to collect data on girls' education. The data on trends (often national and zonal, rather than school level, as noted above) do not necessarily reflect programme impact. Strong beliefs in the programme's effectiveness are not always

supported by strong objective evidence, which would encourage others to adopt the measures.

AGEI lessons have reinforced the wisdom of international development practice gained through the years. Some successful models travel well and others do not, due to the position of women in society, the importance of local leadership and ownership, and social, political, economic and other factors. For example, the non-formal education COPE model was adapted successfully as COBET in the United Republic of Tanzania. The Girls' Education Movement in Uganda is an excellent model for girls' empowerment, but GEM in Botswana has not worked as well to date. This illustrates that good project or programme design is important, but successful implementation depends on local leadership and other factors.

6. Efficiency. Analysing the cost benefit ratio has not been a priority for AGEI, with some exceptions, including the Breakthrough to Literacy programme in Uganda and ChildSCOPE in Ghana. For most of AGEI, a great deal of information is available on programme expenditures. However, in order to address efficiency, one also needs to differentiate between investment (buildings, for example) and recurrent costs (such as building maintenance), and between direct contributions (from families, communities, governments, etc.) and indirect contributions, or 'opportunity' costs.

The Breakthrough to Literacy programme in Uganda has excellent documentation demonstrating its effectiveness and could make an important contribution to improving the quality of basic education were it to be adopted more widely. Despite its effectiveness, it may not be sustained and scaled up due to competing government plans and initiatives. This highlights the complexity of sustainability. ChildSCOPE in Ghana also had excellent evaluation data, including a cost analysis, which showed that the intervention was extremely expensive relative to the increased access achieved. It is unlikely that the Government of Ghana will be able to sustain the intervention without external support.

7. Sustainability: The evaluation found the following: (1) As with ChildSCOPE, a number of interventions were developed that may be effective, but they are expensive and are not likely to be sustained by communities or governments without further external support. (2) Expecting communities to invest in schooling is not always realistic, since the selected communities are often among the poorest in the country. (3) Stakeholder involvement does not always predict sustainability.

## **Discussion**

From the perspective of West and Central Africa, Dina Craissati urged that it is important to look at the AGEI evaluation within the broader context of: (1) educational processes nationally, regionally, and internationally; (2) development processes and the structural issues faced by each country and in Africa (for example, poverty and weak governance have a clear impact at the local level and on AGEI interventions); (3) donor investments in girls' education; and (4) women's and community empowerment.

Craissati agreed that an evidence-based approach is necessary but argued that it is often difficult to quantify desirable outcomes based on costs. It is necessary to define what we mean when we say that "a community is dynamic" or "women are empowered" through a particular approach. When girls learn to say "no" to sexual harassment and early marriage, or when mothers and women engage with local authorities, this demonstrates empowerment, but this is

not part of a system that can function with precise measurements. She argued that AGEI should be looked at as a social movement that changes attitudes and addresses issues for social change, and that successes should be seen in the existence of the movement itself.

Another participant made the comment that it will cost more to bring a disadvantaged child into the mainstream, but this cost must also be compared to not educating that child. Studies in Uganda, for example, show that it costs more to keep an orphaned child in school, but the cost to society is greater if the child does not receive an education.

Changu Mannathoko requested further elaboration from the final evaluation report on lessons learned. For example, life skills have emerged as fundamental to fighting HIV/AIDS. More feedback would be appreciated on the lessons emerging from the region in this area, as well as suggestions on how to move forward. Similarly, with gender equity or parity and gender equality we have learned that we cannot deal with access alone but with access and quality together. What types of interventions will have an impact? We need more guidance on this issue. At the same time, we should recognize that through girls' education and a strong gender perspective we are improving education in a way that also improves prospects for boys who otherwise might fall by the wayside.

Cream Wright clarified that what the evaluation team has labelled gender 'equity' should really be called gender 'parity' and paired with gender equality. These are fundamental concepts and not restricted to the education sector. Gender parity promotes gender equality, but gender equality is much more than parity.

Wright added that if we are waiting for 'perfect evidence' before proceeding we might not go anywhere. There is a fundamental tension between efficiency and equity and we cannot always balance the two, so we must decide what results we are looking for. Attending to cost is tricky: since we are taking a human rights approach, we maintain that all children have the right to a quality education, no matter what the cost.

This raises questions for governments that are struggling with the issues of mainstreaming and sustainability. If the government can take over a project or programme, fine; if not, we have a new challenge. AGEI has provided us with new information: some good interventions are also very expensive. If governments are to mainstream these interventions, evidence on outcomes is needed to persuade them to sustain the interventions.

Representatives from Norway raised questions regarding effectiveness. National policy is shaped by many groups, among which UNICEF is a significant actor. Will the evaluation report be able to answer how UNICEF is cooperating with national governments and in national development strategies? Has AGEI already been reflected in UNICEF's overall policies (for example, its medium-term strategic plan and UNGEI), or are significant changes needed to harmonize the two?

Other questions were raised regarding sustainability and the replication of programmes. How was the project conceptualized and communicated at the country and community levels? Norway believes that including all stakeholders, even at the lowest levels, is very important. The role of the Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) in addressing gender equity and gender equality is also important.

Finally, what were the criteria for success? Was it the development of a 'best practice' intervention? If so, what makes an intervention a 'best practice'?

In view of the generalized results, the representative from the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) asked how the evaluators coped with the differences in different countries. With regard to results, since UNICEF is now working within a framework of results-based management, it is interesting that the evaluators raise the question of impact and outcome. She asked whether the evaluators could come up with recommendations that would help UNICEF to work more in this direction.

In considering the transition from AGEI to UNGEI, participants raised other questions, including how monitoring and evaluation can be improved; how initiatives can be embedded in national policy where budgets to date have not adequately provided funding for girls' education; how coordinated donor efforts at the country level might result in improved efforts; to what extent countries took ownership for the initiative and viewed AGEI as their own rather than a UNICEF initiative.

## **Response**

The evaluators responded to certain questions and noted that others would be dealt with in the presentation on lessons learned.

With regard to specific interventions, the evaluators tried to collect any information that had been assembled through evaluations commissioned by governments and country offices. However, the findings and conclusions are limited to what can be gleaned from the data. Individuals on the front lines (country offices and affiliated NGOs) have extensive information about the workings, successes, and challenges of projects and programmes, but this is private knowledge. What donors are looking for is public knowledge on which to base decisions, so this private knowledge needs to be documented and published. Country and regional offices may be convinced that particular interventions or groups of interventions are successful, but donors want to examine the documentation and evaluation data that support these beliefs. The evaluation will attempt to deal with this tension between personal knowledge and private knowledge in the AGEI evaluation.

With regard to the importance of local-level involvement in the development of the AGEI, one finding from the study was that stakeholder involvement does not always predict sustainability.

Evaluators observed that even though activities at the national level might be going well, as were community-level activities, there was often little communication between the two levels. Sometimes national girls' education policies were formulated in the ministry of education, but no one told the ministry of finance, so specific funding was not set aside. This is an internal government issue, not a UNICEF issue, but it can affect UNICEF efforts.

Regarding country ownership of AGEI programming: In the Government of Guinea, UNICEF is considered to be a critical partner in a government-based AGEI initiative. FAWE and others also take ownership in AGEI. This is not the case in Burkina Faso, where 3,000 satellite schools written into the national plan are still sometimes viewed as part of a UNICEF project rather than the national school system.

Regarding criteria for 'success', this is based on a discrepancy model: change over time and goal attainment. Countries laid out what they intended to achieve and whether they achieved it. When countries faced emergency situations, evaluators were happy to see girls continuing to go to school, especially when progress could have been eroded.

One participant observed that the main point of an evaluation is not to answer the question “What are we doing well?” but to answer the question “What can we do better?” A second point was that UNICEF is doing more in terms of educational quality, but that there are three areas that still need to be addressed more concretely and that can affect girls’ education. These are early marriage, early pregnancy and polygamy.

## **Lessons Learned**

In this session, evaluators presented a tentative set of lessons learned in the following areas: (1) gender parity/equality; (2) managing for results; (3) cost and efficiency with a human rights-based approach; and (4) sustainability, replicability and mainstreaming.

1. *The gender equity (parity) approach is necessary but not sufficient.* It needs to be complemented by approaches that emphasize girls’ and women’s empowerment and full participation, that is, gender mainstreaming. There is a need for contextual analysis of gender roles and relationships, and to linking girls’ education to a human rights-based approach to programming.

2. *Managing for results is one of the primary challenges.* There is a growing commitment to girls’ education, processes and outputs. However, more attention needs to be given to outcomes and impact that can be directly attributed to the programme. Monitoring data on trends in girls’ education does not in itself satisfy the requirements of programme monitoring and evaluation needed for accountability and for measuring impact. Mechanisms and factors that contribute to the success of specific interventions and effects on gender equity and equality need to be documented.

3. *Assessing efficiency requires the collection of transparent and complete cost data for all stakeholders.* To adequately assess efficiency, attention is needed in the areas of investment, recurrent, direct and indirect costs. One conundrum is how to replicate and mainstream strategies that are effective but expensive.

4. *Lessons for sustainability, replicability and mainstreaming.* It is necessary to establish strong links between formal and non-formal education in a unified yet diversified system to reach EFA goals. Links among national, subnational and local government actions aimed at girls’ education need to be strengthened. Decentralization needs to be strengthened through greater involvement of diverse groups of local stakeholders that include women and girls. The male bias in these structures needs to be rectified to achieve gender equity and equality.

## **Small Group Discussions on Lessons Learned**

Participants worked in four small groups, divided according to the categories outlined above: gender parity/equality; managing for results; cost and efficiency; and sustainability, replicability and mainstreaming. The groups were then asked to: (1) comment on or reformulate the lessons learned; (2) provide additional dimensions that should be considered; (3) explain the implications for UNGEI.

## **Panel Discussion**

A panel of participants, including representatives from Norway, an NGO and UNESCO, then gave feedback on presentations from the small groups and from the session on lessons

learned. Questions were asked and clarification provided about UNICEF's participation in the Fast Track Initiative and other joint programming exercises. Cream Wright explained that UNICEF has been very involved in the Fast Track Initiative, including suggesting changes in the normative framework. UNICEF supports the initiative because it believes it will bring about serious systemic reform. Others noted that (1) a recently completed FAWE evaluation calls for talking about gender first, then girls' education; (2) countries need help in building capacity for data analysis and for monitoring and evaluation; (3) it is critical to get the indicators right; and (5) some development partners are putting cost issues front and centre in their rights-based approach to programming.

## DAY TWO

### IV. MAKING THE TRANSITION FROM AGEI TO UNGEI

#### UNGEI: Evolution and Roll-out

**Cream Wright** gave a presentation on the evolution of UNGEI and its roll-out. AGEI was the precursor to UNGEI, whose vision, mission, and intentions were announced by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in Dakar in 2000. The mandate outlined UNICEF's role in leading and coordinating UNGEI. The programme has since developed a two-track approach: global and local, with 13 partner entities and a rich array of activities already under way. UNESCO contributed a major study showing the gaps that girls' education and UNGEI would need to address.

Early lessons from UNGEI point to the fact that "coordination is easier said than done." Although UNICEF was given the mandate, this did not mean that other partners necessarily accepted it readily. The critique was made that UNICEF was "trying to coordinate, but was not providing leadership," and that a "legal, bureaucratic style" needed to shift to a "consensus/ inspirational" style. Coordination options included formal structures and mechanisms, as well as to those that offered more flexibility, which included a relationship between UNGEI and UNICEF's acceleration strategy.

Regarding partnerships in UNGEI: an agency may not have girls' education as its priority, but it can still be involved. An agency may be more interested in population activities than girls' education, for example, or in rural development. However, what we can achieve together is far more than we can achieve alone, particularly with achievement related to EFA, the Millennium Development Goals, A World Fit for Children and the World Summit on Sustainable Development. UNGEI partnerships will be characterized by a divergence of focus and objectives; shared interest in gender issues; shared interest in education issues; addressing core commitments—using girls' education in a strategic way; leveraging some benefits, in the area of water and sanitation, for example; and building synergy for impact. All partners will take the lead in some areas. It was noted that there are ethical responsibilities in partnerships that go beyond pursuing one's own interests.

UNGEI 2000 has a ten-year lifespan. For the target year 2005, we are looking for assurance that we are heading in the direction of reaching our goals.

The way forward for UNGEI will be characterized by the following:

- strong leadership and links (with the Fast Track Initiative, for example)
- roll-out and rapid response for all initiatives, including the Fast Track
- joint advocacy for mainstreaming
- a common communication strategy
- joint reviews, monitoring and evaluation
- 2005 as a watershed year and a platform for launching 2015 goals.

### **UNGEI Coordination Mechanisms**

**Ellen van Kalmthout** described the proposed coordination mechanisms for UNGEI. She observed that while the informal task force that was set up early on was very good, it was not sufficient to make an impact at the country level. In July, the EFA Working Group meeting in Paris discussed ‘flagship’ initiatives with similar experiences, that is, enthusiasm at the international level, but little experience at the country level. For UNGEI, an advisory committee was suggested as part of the programme’s evolution. This would be an *advisory* committee, not a steering committee with legal status, so it does not add another layer at headquarters for focusing on regional and country-level issues.

Comments and questions included the following: (1) A key issue for implementing UNGEI will be time. Ministries of education need time to develop national plans within the frameworks of poverty-reduction strategies, EFA and the Fast Track Initiative; we need to be careful about requesting more action plans at the country level. (2) How does this relate to UNICEF’s board and reporting mechanism? (3) In practical terms, what does the launch of Mali’s UNGEI mean? Answer: It is a call to reinforce partnerships rather than a launch *per se*. Mali’s Minister of Education had called for ministers from other sectors to attend. (4) A communication strategy is critical to reinforce in-country work already under way. (5) From an NGO perspective, UNGEI could serve two key roles: first, as a meeting point for partners to come together (as in Zambia, where the government now is coordinating partnerships); and, second, as a watchdog on programmes being set up in the name of girls’ education. (6) Monitoring groups face a dilemma, since they can only use data that have been officially sanctioned by governments, which is usually two to three years’ old.

## **V. BUILDING ON AGEI**

### **Regional Perspectives**

The Eastern and Southern Africa region sees UNGEI as a movement to build on AGEI and to strengthen and accelerate UNGEI within countries. It will facilitate countries’ capacity to use a human rights-based approach to programming and community capacity to strengthen partnerships.

The roll-out of UNGEI means that it must be incorporated into the work plan of the regional office for 2004. The work plan articulates how the office will support the partnership and coordination of UNGEI at the country level. The timeline for UNGEI in the region is the following: In January 2004, the UNGEI regional programme officer will begin to provide support to the

region; in February 2004, there will be a regional education network meeting with UNGEI as the theme. Each country will plan how to roll out UNGEI and the regional office will discuss how it plans to support the countries' efforts. Between February and June, countries will dialogue about their own UNGEI initiatives, key issues and what they hope to achieve. Between June and August, the regional office will bring countries together to accelerate lessons learned. Multisectoral planning and monitoring and evaluation still need to be thought through more thoroughly.

Essential components include (1) a conceptual framework anchored in a human rights-based approach to programming with gender at its core; (2) strengthening and building on existing structures, including Common Country Assessments and UN Development Assistance Frameworks, sector investment programmes and sector-wide approaches, and the NGO coalition; (3) partnerships and networking: establishing a role for young people and involving regional NGOs and partnerships within UN agencies; (4) advocacy and communication: developing a communication strategy, a regional launch of UNGEI, and an UNGEI newsletter.

The West and Central Africa region noted that UNGEI has been established at the global level and is concrete at the country level, but the regional office is in the middle and still needs to figure out where to position itself. Existing partnerships and mechanisms will be essential to its success. This includes teacher training, school feeding, and dialogue at the country level across sectors. Developing a 'culture of partnerships' and creating synergies will also be key to the strategy.

Seeds of country teams were developed when 24 ministries from the region came together in 2003; these will be nurtured for UNGEI.

The West and Central Africa region will also focus on the following: (1) thinking regionally in trying to promote the UNGEI vision; (2) multi-country initiatives that see schools as centres for development in a community; (3) utilizing initiatives such as 'positive emergencies' and the movement for solar energy in schools; and (4) regional leadership such as '2005 Watch' and 'gender watch', using evidence-based analysis and fact sheets.

### **Country-Level Perspectives**

Mali **Patrick Bogin**: UNICEF will take the lead but other agencies will rotate into leadership positions through poverty-reduction strategies and the UN Development Assistance Framework. Key areas for UNGEI will be reinforcing partnerships; taking specific policy measures (for example, introducing gender training into teacher training); and restructuring the girls' education unit.

Uganda (**Sibeso Luswata**): Uganda has a gender task force convened by the government and many policies on girls' education and gender; UNGEI will use these as it continues to develop its human rights-based approach to programming. Other areas of focus will include ongoing efforts in decentralization; developing accurate indicators (to describe, for example, what it means to say "I know a girl has changed"); using gender as both a tool and an approach (for example, the GEM; gender in education policy and planning); costing all projects with the ongoing support of Lucien Back; and looking at issues of scaling up and adaptation.

## Partnerships in Practice

*'Positive emergencies'*. **Cream Wright** described this concept, which is part of the acceleration strategy. The concept first surfaced in Kenya when the government declared universal primary education and schools were flooded with students. UNICEF and other agencies wanted to respond by providing supplies to children, even setting up tents for schools. The Government refused and agencies had to scale back direct provisions in order not to interfere with Government plans. At a meeting on funding girls' education, the issue surfaced and was discussed. The concept now involves making an 'invisible' problem visible to ensure that it is addressed, for example, by showing people the 23 million children out of school in West and Central Africa?" Burkina Faso is the first country where a positive emergency campaign has been launched.

*Start-up in Burkina Faso.* Burkina Faso declared first grade free to all girls and is providing materials to them at no cost. The Government instructed all teachers to ensure that no child was turned away from registration for space reason. As a result, 120,000 girls registered instead of the usual 20,000 – a "positive emergency". It was suggested that the country get a funding commitment from donors for one to two years while the government adjusts to the influx of children. This "positive emergency" included a rapid assessment and was followed by assistance.

*Minimum learning packages and other strategic interventions.* In this session, representatives from several agencies described strategies they have undertaken to attract girls to school. Isabelle Laroche, Alliance for Action, described minimum learning packages. The World Food Programme (WFP) brings school meals. Other partners (for example, UNICEF) contribute support in areas such as water and sanitation, deworming, prevention education for HIV/AIDS and malaria, and school gardens. They expect to expand the programme from 1 million children to the 6 million children living in crisis in the Sahel. Changu Mannothonko then described (1) the Eastern and Southern Africa region's focus on life skills and (2) the ten-point action plan developed to respond to multiple countries in crisis. A rapid survey revealed that, as a result, attendance rates for girls in primary school remained steady (Although monitoring systems were weak, WFP and UNESCO developed a common instrument to measure school attendance.)

In the discussion following these sessions, one participant suggested that using the language of hope might be preferable to that of emergencies (for example, 'looking for and creating opportunities' through an 'engine of acceleration'). It was also noted that the Fast Track Initiative is neither fast nor on track; concern was voiced in a November meeting in Oslo that money is not flowing as hoped into the programme.

## Thematic Funding to Support Girls' Education

In this session **Ingalill Colbro** described the purpose of thematic funding: to save transaction costs for both donors and UNICEF. The thematic areas are integrated early childhood development, girls' education, HIV/AIDS, child protection, and humanitarian response. Under thematic funding, donor contributions are pooled in the same theme; there is no separate tracking of each donor's contribution; and one project proposal and one consolidated report will be submitted to all donors.

The Governments of Norway and Sweden have already contributed thematically and appeared, through their comments, to be very supportive of the idea. Other donors present were curious to learn more.

Cream Wright noted that such funding arrangements are closer to the direction in which UNICEF wants to go and is pleased that donors are also satisfied with them. He then described some of the principles of thematic reporting, which represents a new challenge. It will be based on results-based management in planning and reporting; the timing will be different; and the necessity of careful analysis and high-quality reporting is acknowledged.

The day concluded with a reception led by the Minister of Education, Mali.

## DAY THREE

### VI. FIELD VISIT TO MOPTI

On the third day, participants had the opportunity to visit schools in the Mopti area involved in 'Gouvernement des Enfants', a pedagogical tool to make schools friendlier to children, especially girls, through their active participation. Through a participatory process, children identify issues and priorities for action and constitute 'ministries' in charge of improving the situation. For each ministry a minister is elected, with the provision that half should be girls, the other half boys. Through discussions with children and teachers, in particular members of the schools' governors, the meeting participants were able to get a flavour of this 'child-rights in action' programme and the wide-ranging results it yielded. These ranged from a greater sense of empowerment, changed attitudes and practices on the part of teachers regarding children's participation, improved school environments, and improved social interaction and responsibility.

The results often went beyond the school. For example, children had visited particular families to ask parents not to remove girls from school. In another school, they had approached local government offices to improve school water and sanitation. In yet another, children had organized a cleanliness week in their school and community. After the school visits, government education staff and UNICEF national staff gave a comprehensive presentation about the programme, with an opportunity for questions.

## DAY FOUR

### VII. A HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROGRAMMING

#### Objectives of the Session

- To inform participants about the latest developments in a human rights-based approach to development cooperation
- To exchange information, experience and perspectives about rights-based programming in the education sector.

**Opening:** **Joan French** explained that a practical right-based approach, with gender equity as the central theme, could be seen in the Mopti area schools that the group visited. In these schools, both teachers and students are aware of child rights, and the participation of children in school management contributes to the quality of the learning environment. Building on the Mali

example, French explained that a right-based approach to programming in UNICEF is not a prescription from headquarters, but a process of learning from experience in the field that has fed into consensus-building within the organization. A rights-based approach to programming is an institutional commitment for UNICEF, but also a global movement.

**Introduction: Dorothy Rozga** provided a brief background on the issue. She explained that the UN Secretary-General's programme for UN reform constituted a 'rediscovery' of the human rights mandate of the United Nations. As a result, rights-based programming was mainstreamed at the UN. In UNICEF, the approach was made increasingly operational by documenting and sharing experiences from the field through case studies and a systematic analysis of a variety of country office reports and documents. Lessons learned are then incorporated into programming tools. Many other UN agencies as well as several bilaterals, for example, the Nordic countries, also have invested considerable effort into developing a rights-based approach to programming. The concept is still evolving, and many ideas as to what it actually means exist.

A list of resources on a rights-based approach to programming is available on the UNICEF website and was made available to participants; diskettes from global consultations held in Ecuador and the United Republic of Tanzania will be forwarded to participants.

Subsequently, small groups deliberated on the meaning of the human rights-based approach and the implications for education programming. The groups pointed out (1) the international legal frameworks and instruments that guide such an approach, in particular the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Rights of the Child, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; (2) the paradigm shift brought about by using a rights framework: from needs to rights, from philanthropy to the realization of rights for all (universality); (3) the distinction between rights/claim holders and duty bearers, with resulting accountabilities as well as a need to build capacity of duty bearers; (4) the requirement to consider the right to education in education and through education; (5) hence, the need for inclusiveness, intersectoral approaches, attention to quality, formal as well as non-formal education, and a reconsideration of cost and results.

For UNICEF a human rights-based approach means that:

- the aim of all programmes is realizing the rights of all children and women
- the principles of human rights and children's rights guide programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process
- programmes develop the capacity of duty bearers to meet their obligations and of rights holders to claim their rights.

## VIII. RIGHTS-BASED PROGRAMMING: CONCEPT AND THEORY

**Urban Jonsson** presented the concept and theory behind the rights-based approach to programming. A framework linking process and outcomes demonstrated that development needs good *outcomes* (for example, survival) as well the good *process* (for example, sustainability). While human development work in the past focused more strongly on outcomes and on social, economic and cultural rights, human rights work often emphasizes process and civil and political rights. However, there is shift in which both are moving closer together.

A very useful framework within the rights-based approach to programming is that of claims and duties, with claim holders (subject) having a valid claim towards a duty bearer (object) who has a correlative duty. For example: a school-aged child has a valid claim (right) to education – others have duties (or obligations) to ensure that the right is realized. This framework allows for the mapping out of patterns of claim-duty relationships in society. Another useful framework is one that juxtaposes good programming versus human rights-based programming, illustrating that good programming practices become obligatory within a human-rights based approach. For example, empowerment becomes obligatory when one considers that respect for human rights demands respect for the dignity of the individual.

Regarding the UN and human rights: it should be noted that the UN Charter is unambiguous on the centrality of fundamental human rights. As part of the UN reform, the UN Secretary-General outlined that all programmes of development cooperation should further the realization of human rights, that human rights standards should guide all development cooperation and programming, and that development cooperation needs to contribute to the development of capacities of duty-bearers to meet their obligations and/or rights holders to claim their rights.

UNICEF held a consultation with several partners in 2003 in Quito to take stock of the operationalization of the human rights-based approach to programming within the organization. Key findings include the following: (1) a rights-based approach has become the norm; (2) specific attention needs to be given to women's rights; (3) good progress has been made in child participation, but it remains mostly events-based; (4) legal reform is an essential component of a rights-based approach to programming; (5) for the progressive realization of rights, the Limburg principle should be applied; (6) a rights-based approach should be applied in humanitarian crises; (6) development requires both outcomes and process: (8) results-based management is an essential tool for rights-based programming.

The methodology for a rights-based approach to programming that is being developed in UNICEF consists of several components: causality analysis, assessment of roles/patterns, analysis of capacity gaps, identification of priority actions, and the programme of cooperation. The assessment of roles/patterns and the analysis of capacity gaps are new for UNICEF.

The causality analysis should lead to a set of rights being violated or at risk of being violated and the major causes of these violations. Based on the causal analysis, the role/pattern analysis considers the relationships between claim holders and duty bearers. Assuming the child as the primary claim holder, the analysis should result in a set of secondary claim holders and a set of duty bearers at different levels of society. The capacity gap analysis considers the capacity of claim holders to claim their rights and the capacity of duty bearers to meet their duties. Building on the analysis, priority actions are identified and a programme of cooperation developed.

In concluding, Urban Jonsson said the rights-based approach to programming provides us with a new set of conceptual glasses. He stated that the approach has been gathering momentum, but that more staff learning and training is required, as well as the development of related monitoring and evaluation tools.

## **Discussion**

Lucien Back, reflecting on the implications and challenges of rights-based programming for monitoring and evaluation suggested that the AGEI evaluation had been conducted in the 'traditional' mode, with a focus on outcomes, and had perhaps not paid sufficient attention to process. He also suggested that there is still an uneven interpretation of rights-based

programming in UNICEF, which the Quito consultation had clarified to a great extent. He agreed on the need for a common language on the rights-based approach, but said that there is also a need for flexibility depending on the context and partners with which we communicate.

Lucy Lake said that the experience of her organization, the Cambridge Female Education Department (CAMFED), has provided an example of rights-based programming for the last ten years. Using the life-cycle concept, CAMFED addresses the capacity of duty bearers in all sectors to fulfil girls' rights to education. Very inspiring are the young women who completed school empowered, and are now activist duty-bearers, supporting the education of girls who are poor and working to change legislation.

Claire Hughes questioned whether the framework does not set up a dichotomy between rights bearers and duty bearers. She said that the present framework does not fully capture the complexity of relationships, and could be taken further. She also questioned the presumption that children have only rights and no duties. In terms of the politics of rights-based programming, she suggested that human rights language may close doors, and that there is a need to be pragmatic and to package the language so it is understandable to those we are trying to communicate with.

In his response, Urban Jonsson referred to an upcoming Executive Directive that will provide clarity and guidance to the organization as a whole on rights-based programming. He suggests that in discussions with governments, it is possible to broach the idea of children's rights as important for long-term development, and stated that development work would often benefit from a more political edge. This requires a new type of activist, who talks about political choices rather than political will, and realization not violation of rights. As regards the dichotomy between rights holders and duty bearers, he explained that the categorization is broad and that only limited examples were presented. He also clarified that the Convention on the Rights of the Child includes participation but no 'duties' for children. Regarding the tension between outcomes and process, he said that perhaps the definition of results could be broadened to include process results, or that results may be limited to outcomes while making provision for monitoring process.

## IX. APPLYING A RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TO PROGRAMMING IN EDUCATION

**Cream Wright** addressed programming in education from a rights perspective. He presented an analytical framework with four strategic components to identify disparities: access, attendance, attainment and achievement, or the '4 As'. He categorized the key groups of duty bearers *vis-à-vis* children's right to education as parents/households/ communities, teachers and school managers, planners and administrators, central/local government policy makers, NGOs and civil society organizations, and development partner agencies. He stressed that in conceptualizing a rights-based approach, it is important to use the notion of an interrelated *network* of duty bearers. He also suggested that for a rights-based approach to programming in education, a causality analysis of barriers to access, attendance, attainment and achievement is an extremely useful tool as a precursor to a capacity gap analysis.

Several examples illustrated programming from the perspective of duty bearers. For example, parents, households and communities have a duty to send children to school, actively take up opportunities for schooling, and lobby for schools or take initiative to provide educational opportunities (community schools). What parents, households and communities require to fulfil

their duties is empowerment. Teachers and school managers require support, capacity and codes.

A child-rights angle leads to very different perspectives than those traditionally held. It challenges duty bearers to confront and address a legacy of denial that has resulted in millions of children still out of school. For example, it hones in on the rights of children rather than the needs of society; on financing the education of children, rather than the financing of schools. Delivery of child-centred education requires a different approach to goal setting and investing. However, the reality is also that countries face multiple challenges in educational provision and that hard choices are required.

**Simon Mphisa**, in a brief presentation on the rights-based programming in Eritrea, said that the Eritrea example showed how applying a human rights-based approach had prompted changes in content and focus in the education programme. These changes included a narrower geographic and thematic focus, more links among sectors, and enhanced attention to capacity development at all levels of the education system.

**Mamadou Bagayoko**, in her presentation on rights-based programming in Burkina Faso, focused on how conceptual frameworks and analyses relate to education as well as on educational innovations within the UNICEF country programme. The presentation then showed how that analysis informed changes in education strategies and activities.

### **Perspectives of Donor Organizations**

**Swedish International Development Agency:** Anna Haas explained that SIDA has just produced a paper on the human rights-based approach to programming. The foundation for the work was laid in 2000-2001 when SIDA developed its overall policy for sector development, with a stronger emphasis on human rights. Internal processes in SIDA led to the preparation of a human right-based perspectives framework. In terms of the content of the framework, it considers the right *to* education (for every individual), the right *in* education (content, processes and results, for example, in fundamental areas such as teachers and curricula) and the rights realized *through* education (which are important for outcomes).

This framework is simple and is used extensively within SIDA. It provides the organization with (1) a normative framework; (2) broad guidance for SIDA support (for example, sector-wide approaches, contributions that are not earmarked); (3) a recognition of the role of civil society; and (4) recognition of the important role of teachers as facilitators, partners in the education system, and holders of rights. This is an area SIDA and UNICEF could possibly work together on. The rights-based approach to programming has influenced the assessment methodology that SIDA uses and has created a stronger focus on the issues of legislation and ownership. Together with partners, SIDA combines its contributions to sector-wide approaches with initiatives for change that yield more rapid results.

**Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Norway:** Kristin Hansen indicated that the first page of Norway's education strategy states that assistance is based on human rights principles. However, work is still in progress on a human rights-based approach to programming development assistance. Norway is still trying to better define what this means, and the results of that discussion will appear in a paper that will be produced in the first six months of 2004. In terms of partnerships, Norway sees its role as raising the right of all children to education, but would like to see more creative thinking generated around this issue. She said that it would be

very useful to remain in contact with UNICEF on the issue of rights-based programming in education.

**Department for International Development (DFID), United Kingdom:** Claire Hughes mentioned the DFID strategy paper on realizing people's rights to development. The rights perspective encompasses three levels: participation; inclusion (for example, the values of equality and non-discrimination; and fulfilling obligations (at the state level). The human rights-based approach to programming is not developed to the extent that it has been in UNICEF. Thinking in DFID is diverse, but there is an interest in understanding the approach and DFID has commissioned a study of the value of the approach for DFID and the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. This study will be made public in spring 2004. She said that UNICEF appears to be leading the way in rights-based programming, and that DFID can learn from the work of UNICEF and others.

## Discussion

Joan French probed more deeply into the disparity analysis, pointing out that there is not the same level of ideological opposition in relation to disparities between rural and urban populations, or between people who are poor and wealthier sections of the population, as there is in relation to gender issues. Embedded cultural values perpetuate women's unequal status in society. Hence, a rights-based approach to programming should include a more profound analysis of the underlying causes behind the violation of girls' and women's rights. Karen Hickson underlined the points raised regarding gender, and also expressed concern that gender was not sufficiently integrated into the rights-based programming approach.

Marcel Rudasingwa said he saw a rights-based approach to programming as enhancing the work being carried out since the major international development conferences, including those in Stockholm, Johannesburg and Rio de Janeiro, and contributing to the sustainability debate. Development indicators are still alarming after decades of work because the rights perspective has been missing. The human rights perspective gives humanity a common value system. For individual staff members in UNICEF this means making a personal commitment to read the materials made available by the organization and to internalize them. Questions we have to ask are: Are we doing the right things? And are we doing them right?

Other comments related to the implications of rights-based approach to the structure of UNICEF and its relationship to UNGEI; to what extent the rights-based approach has permeated donor countries; and whether such an approach could be carried out in stages, that is, human rights-*oriented* programming followed by human rights-*based* programming.

## Response

In response to comments regarding gender, Cream Wright stated that UNICEF does not compromise on gender equity, and sees its role as influencing other partners in this direction. UNGEI helps further the dialogue on gender equality, while the acceleration strategy places gender equity at its core. Joan French added that the causality analysis and the disparity analysis need to be seen together to ensure that gender issues are analysed and understood at deeper levels.

French also addressed the issue of 'compromise', stating that advocacy in situations where partners do not accept children's rights is an issue, and that it is important to always consider the consequences of not acting. Anna Haas expressed that all countries deal with the same

issues, with the struggle being harder and at a different level in developing countries. Claire Hughes gave the UK example, where a human rights-based approach has underpinned domestic policy since 1997. As in developing countries, the UK process is often messy and people frequently feel that they have no stake and no voice.

In relation to the question on how UNICEF is changing its structure as a consequence of human rights-based programming, Dorothy Rozga explained that the posts of child rights officers have been abolished, that every staff member is a human rights officer and that every section and division in headquarters is charged with that responsibility. For girls' education and UNGEI the same principle applies: girls' education is an intersectoral issue, and therefore the responsibility of the entire country office, not only the education officer.

Urban Jonsson clarified that the rights-based approach should be empowering, and explained the concept of full rights (for example the right to speak and the right not to speak) and half rights (for example, the right to education when compulsory). He further stated that a gender analysis should be part of the analysis of human rights relationships. A difficult issue is that of the progressive realization of rights, on which there is work in progress by the Committee on Social and Economic Rights. With regard to UNICEF staff, he said he is not concerned about staff's willingness and capacity to internalize and apply a human rights-based approach, but that there is a need to ensure all staff have strong programming skills.

## **Closing**

Cream Wright thanked all participants for taking the time to attend, and for the deep thinking and productive exchanges of ideas. He thought the meeting was a successful combination of events under one broad umbrella, enriched by the presence of partners. He pointed out Norway's important role in supporting AGEI over the years, and stated that a major step had been taken at this meeting in building on the AGEI experience and taking UNGEI forward.

With regard to the AGEI evaluation, he mentioned the fruitful discussions held, and stated that he looked forward to an enriched AGEI evaluation report. With regard to UNGEI, he reiterated that the UNGEI Advisory Committee is a mechanism to help ensure a systematic country-level focus, and that he was encouraged by the current plans and momentum generated to take the initiative to the country level, including the posts created at the level of the UNICEF Regional Office.

Partnerships are at the heart of efforts to make progress in education, and several examples were presented, including the WFP Alliance for Action. He also reflected on how thematic funding is changing the patterns of engagement and said that UNICEF's reporting on the use of thematic funding may have different formats (for example, meetings with donors on finances, and technical and strategy meetings with a broader range of partners). He invited further suggestions in that regard.

Wright thanked the Mali office for an excellent field trip and acknowledged the strong partnerships already under way in education in the country. He also thanked Mali's Minister of Education for his efforts to reinforce these partnerships. He concluded that UNGEI already has a footing in Mali. The last day of the meeting dealt with a human rights-based approach to programming, which is critical for UNICEF, the UN and the development community as a whole.



## ANNEX 1. List of Participants

	Name	Title	Organization	Country
UNICEF				
1	Simon Mphisa	Education Project Officer	UNICEF	Eritrea
2	Sibeso Luswata	Education Project Officer	UNICEF	Uganda
3	Joan French	Representative	UNICEF	Burkina Faso
4	Mamadou Bagayoko	Education Project Officer	UNICEF	Burkina Faso
5	Dorothy Rozga	Representative	UNICEF	Ghana
6	Augustine Agu	Education Project Officer	UNICEF	Ghana
7	Liv Elden	Senior Programme Officer	UNICEF	Ghana
8	Saori Ohkubo	Junior Programme Officer	UNICEF	Ghana
9	Marcel Rudasingwa	Representative	UNICEF	Guinea
10	Assane Amadou	Education Project Officer	UNICEF	Guinea
11	Francis Turner	Representative	UNICEF	Mali
12	Patrick Bogino	Education Project Officer	UNICEF	Mali
13	Idrissa Diarra	National Officer, Education	UNICEF	Mali
15	Jim Ackers	Sr. Project Officer, Education	UNICEF	Nigeria
16	Jessica Salamanca	Junior Professional Officer	UNICEF	WCARO
17	Dina Craissati	Regional Education Adviser	UNICEF	WCARO
18	Changu Mannathoko	Regional Education Adviser	UNICEF	ESARO
19	Urban Jonsson	Special Adviser	UNICEF	NYHQ
20	Lucien Back	Senior Programme Officer, Evaluation	UNICEF	NYHQ
21	Ingalill Colbro	Senior Programme Funding Officer, PFO	UNICEF	NYHQ
22	Cream Wright	Chief Education	UNICEF	NYHQ
23	Aster Haregot	Programme Officer	UNICEF	NYHQ
24	Ellen van Kalmthout	Programme Officer	UNICEF	NYHQ
25	Flora Sibanda-Mulder	Senior Programme Officer	UNICEF/WFP	Italy

Partner Organizations				
26	Kristin Hansen	Senior Executive Officer	MFA	Norway
27	Merete Wilhelmsen		MFA	Norway
28	Claire Hughes		DFID	UK
29	Maria Trigueiro		CIDA	
30	Mariam Kane	Gender Specialist	CIDA	
31	Anna Haas	Deputy Head of Education	SIDA	Sweden
32	Anne Marie Tyndeskov Voetman	Head of Section	MFA	Denmark
33	Theo Oltheten		MFA	Netherlands
34	Aicha Bah Diallo	Head of Basic Education	UNESCO	France
35	Amina Osman	Senior Programme Officer	Commonwealth Secretariat	UK
36	Lucy Lake	Programme Director	CAMFED	UK
37	Anne Jellema	Advocacy Coordinator	Global Campaign for Education	South Africa
38	Jo Lesser		USAID	Mali
39	Aminata Maiga		World Bank	Mali
40	Bonaventura Maiga	Technical Adviser	Ministry of Education	Mali
41	Arhamatou Diallo		WFP/PAM	Mali
42	Joaquim Segurado		Plan International	Mali
43	Mariama Sarr-Ceesay		FAWE	
Evaluation team and resource person				
44	David Chapman	AGEI Evaluator	University of Minnesota	USA
45	Karen Hickson	AGEI Evaluator	Consultant	NYHQ
46	Shirley Miske	AGEI Consultant	Resource person	USA

For more information contact:  
Education Section, Programme Division  
[www.unicef.org/girlseducation/index.html](http://www.unicef.org/girlseducation/index.html)

Cover photo: © UNICEF/HQ98-1087/GIACOMO PIROZZI

© The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), New York