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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>Annual Operational Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDPF</td>
<td>Capacity Development Partnership Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;D</td>
<td>Decentralization and Deconcentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>District Office of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoP</td>
<td>MoEYS Department of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTMT</td>
<td>District Training and Monitoring Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Education Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMIS</td>
<td>Human Resource Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIEP</td>
<td>International Institute for Educational Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoEYS</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>National Institute of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDP</td>
<td>National Strategic Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>Provincial Office of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFM</td>
<td>Public Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGC</td>
<td>Royal Government of Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUPP</td>
<td>Royal University of Phnom Penh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG</td>
<td>School Improvement Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>School Support Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

i. CAMBODIA CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP FUND (CDPF)¹

NATURE OF THE CDPF: The CDPF is a multi-donor fund combining contributions from the European Union (EU), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). The fund is administered by UNICEF and managed in accordance with UNICEF rules and regulations. It is now in its second phase, which began in January 2015. The initial phase, Phase I, was launched in November 2011 and ended in December 2014.

PURPOSE OF THE CDPF: To finance training, workshops, research, studies, technical assistance, study tours, grants to non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and universities in support of the capacity development (CD) objectives of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (MoEYS) Education Strategic Plan (ESP) and the MoEYS Annual Operational Plans (AOPs) at central, provincial and district levels through the MoEYS CD Masterplan.

GOVERNANCE: The CDPF Steering Committee, chaired by the Secretary of State for Education and co-chaired by the EU Delegation, is responsible for prioritizing activities to be financed by the CDPF, and planning annually for the fund in accordance with the ministry’s AOP. The Secretariat comprises representatives from MoEYS Department of Planning (DoP) and UNICEF.

ii. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND TARGET AUDIENCE

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION:

(a) Fulfil accountability requirements for Phase I of the CDPF;
(b) Ensure that lessons learned from Phase I are identified and documented, and used to inform the ongoing development and implementation of Phase II by informing the Phase II Theory of Change (ToC) and Results Framework.

EVALUATION CRITERIA: These are the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability, with evaluation questions defined for each criterion.

AUDIENCE: The evaluation report is addressed to the CDPF Steering Committee, which is also the reference group for the evaluation. The final report will be made available to all stakeholders in government, as well as Development Partners (DPs) and others.

iii. EVALUATION SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

SCOPE: An external consultant, Dr. Digby Swift (CfBT) undertook this summative evaluation of CDPF Phase I with DoP over a period of eight weeks (four weeks in-country) between 30 April and 12 June 2015.

INSTRUMENTS EMPLOYED:

• A documentation review.
• Interviews on project progress and assessment of effectiveness with 21 staff from MoEYS headquarters departments (finance, legislation, personnel, planning, primary education), the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP), DPs (UNICEF, EU, SIDA) and NGOs (CARE and VSO).

¹ This summary is based on the EU-UNICEF Contribution Agreement for the CDPF, Annex 1: Description of the Action, 2011.
Focus groups and interviews in four provinces with staff of four provincial offices of education (POEs), eight district offices of education (DoEs), and school directors and school support committee (SSC) representatives from 28 schools (mainly primary schools). There were 106 interviewees in total. The selected provinces were Ratanakiri, Kratie and Kandal, and Phnom Penh municipality. The team (consultant, two DoE staff and one translator) used a Most Significant Change approach to impact assessment, and identified key challenges and general effectiveness of the project in areas of relevance to the interviewees.

A questionnaire completed by 110 interviewees on changes observed; support received in key areas (CDPF and otherwise); and helpfulness of the support, including most and least favoured.

Observations during the visits.

A validation workshop on 29 May with 26 participants from MoEYS central departments and eight from the PoEs involved in the interviews, two representatives each from RUPP and the National Institute of Education (NIE), two NGO and six DP representatives, including four from UNICEF.

iv. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

CDPF I was highly relevant to needs, Capacity Development Masterplan (CD Masterplan) and equity issues (Score 5/6)

The review of documentation showed that annual plans in the final two years were based on the CD Masterplan, which was in turn based on the ESP. There has been ongoing adaptation of planning and monitoring to strengthen relevance to the ESP, notably the situational analysis undertaken in May 2012 and used to develop the December 2012 CD Masterplan. The 2013 progress report showed that funds were used in accordance with the Masterplan, while responses in focus groups, interviews and questionnaires, confirmed that respondents saw the high relevance of CDPF to the needs of recipients.

The ESP has an emphasis on gender equality and equity, and a wider equal opportunity policy. The Masterplan includes gender-focused activities and targets. The CDPF project managed by CARE is based in the most educationally deprived province (Ratanakiri) and focuses on poor, minority-group communities. Visits to schools here showed the CDPF relevance to equity improvements, however, there is no mention of equity in relation to disability in either the ESP or CARE reports.

CDPF I was reasonably effective in contributing to intended outcomes (Score 4/6)

The approaches, activities and governance structure have all contributed to achieving the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework Capacity Development Outcomes and progress towards the Strategic Outcomes.

However, CDPF was not as effective as it might have been for the following reasons:

- Short annual funding window: Direct transfer funds are not available until April and must be spent by October;

| Rating scale for extent to which CDPF I met each evaluation criterion: |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Satisfactory                    | Less than satisfactory          |
| 6                               | 3                               |
| Fully met the criterion         | Less than adequately met the criterion |
| 5                               | 2                               |
| Almost fully met the criterion  | Only met the criterion to a small extent |
| 4                               | 1                               |
| Adequately met the criterion    | Did not meet the criterion at all |


4 “Gender equality requires equal enjoyment by women and men of socially valued goods, opportunities, resources and rewards.” “Gender equity is the process of being fair to women and men.” [http://web.unfpa.org/gender/resources3.htm#2]
• **Lack of adequate recurrent budget** for operation and maintenance of supplied equipment;

• **Inadequately strategic emphasis on school-based management:** While there was substantial training for school directors and SSCs, with District Training and Monitoring Team (DTMT) involvement, it was not broad and strategic;

• **Excessive use of inefficient workshops:** Little active participation and inadequate use of other training modalities, especially longer-term, performance-linked professional development;

• **Insufficient involvement of decentralized levels:** PoEs did not feel sufficiently involved in planning for CDPF and therefore did not feel able to use the funds to greatest effect.

Progress reports described activities designed to achieve the intended outcomes but did not show explicitly to what extent the outcome targets were achieved.

**CDPF I was reasonably efficient in its implementation although more emphasis could have been given to value-for-money issues (Score 4/6)**

On the whole, funds and resources were used efficiently. Comparison of the Masterplan and annual plans with a draft hypothesized ToC shows that all CDPF areas are significantly contributing to the outcomes. The 2013 progress report shows a high utilization of the annual budget, with the major portion of funds going to decentralized levels.

However, inadequate emphasis seems to have been placed on value-for-money in:

• Assessment during design and during annual planning, by the steering committee and MoEYS, of the relative cost-effectiveness of a range of approaches to capacity development;

• Ensuring a demand-led, preparatory approach by MoEYS to high-unit-cost items (e.g. external advisers and VSO volunteers (VSOs)) to ensure they are used to maximum efficiency;

• Assessing cost-effectiveness of equipment in terms of maintenance and running costs.

**CDPF is having a significant impact, including at school level (Score 5/6)**

Interviewees agreed on CDPF’s impact on education outcomes in terms of pupil participation, dropout and the quality of education, especially on and through the DTMT and SSCs in Ratanakiri. However, this was not confirmed by overall Education Management Information System (EMIS) data. There was a high level of agreement on overall impact, at all levels of MoEYS and within schools, on coherent annual education planning and information handling. There were also significant gains in Aid Effectiveness by central pooling of DP funds to CDPF and through CDPF support to Provincial Joint Technical Working Groups (JTWG). However, impact will have been reduced in many provinces by an inadequately holistic and strategic approach to school-based management.

There does not appear to have been any unexpected positive or negative impact.

**CDPF is not yet sufficiently sustainable (Score 2/6)**

While CDPF interventions were integrated into the education system in terms of AOPs and mid-term plans, there is as yet:

• No major ongoing government funding for CD or plans to take over from DP funding;

• No government recurrent budget for the effective maintenance and use of equipment supplied;

• Inadequate use of strategic, sustainably resourced, multi-year training programmes.

CDPF M&E can best contribute to the sustainable strengthening of national and sub-national M&E by maintaining a high-level approach to M&E based on an ESP-based ToC.
v. MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATIONS TO GOVERNMENT OF CAMBODIA

- Provide matched Government Capacity Development Funding alongside DP support to CDPF II from 2016, leading to full government funding after the CDPF ends.
- From 2016, provide an adequate annual recurrent budget for maintenance and running costs of equipment.

RECOMMENDATION TO UNICEF AND OTHER FUNDING DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

- From 2016, increase the length of the annual funding window, with earlier release of funds and extended time until funds can be spent by the end of the year.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CDPF STEERING COMMITTEE

- Develop for use in 2016 the proposed CDPF ToC to maintain high-level oversight, a strategic approach to planning and systems development, and facilitate annual monitoring.
- Develop a strategic approach to human resource development and school-based management.
- Strengthen the involvement of PoEs and DoEs in planning and decision-making, for example in resource allocation at these levels and co-opting representatives to the steering committee.
SECTION 1: OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION

1.1 CAMBODIA CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP FUND (CDPF)

NATURE OF THE FUND

The CDPF is a multi-donor fund now in its second phase, combining contributions from the European Union (EU), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). The fund is administered by UNICEF and managed in accordance with UNICEF rules and regulations. The CDPF finances training, workshops, research, studies, technical assistance, study tours, grants to NGOs and universities and other means to achieve these objectives.

BENEFICIARIES

The beneficiaries of the fund are the Cambodian Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport (MoEYS) at central, provincial and district levels, and schools nationwide.

PURPOSE OF THE CDPF

To support the implementation of the capacity development objectives of the MoEYS Education Strategic Plan (ESP) and the MoEYS Annual Operational Plans (AOPs) through the Medium Term Capacity Development (CD) Plan. (EU-UNICEF Contribution Agreement)

The 2009-2013 ESP focused on equitable access, quality and efficiency of education services, and institutional development and capacity building for decentralization, linking with Education for All and related Cambodia Millennium Development Goals. The ESP contributed to the 2009-2013 National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP). This articulated Cambodia’s Rectangular Strategy for Growth, Employment, Equity and Efficiency, of which capacity building and human resource development were priority areas.

In December 2012, MoEYS defined the CD Plan in the CDPF purpose statement as the 2011-2015 MoEYS Masterplan for Capacity Development in the Education Sector, replacing an earlier CD Plan that was not sufficiently aligned to the ESP. The Purpose Statement is broken down in the EU-UNICEF Contribution Agreement into the following sub-objectives:

CDPF PHASE I SUB-OBJECTIVES

- Strengthen MoEYS capacity in education planning, management and monitoring for improved education service delivery, sector performance and outcomes;
- Strengthen capacities at national and sub-national levels to sustain coherence and synergy between macro and sector level reform processes for improved education service delivery and governance, especially public financial management, decentralization and deconcentration (D&D) and civil service/administrative reforms;
- Strengthen MoEYS capacities for improved absorptive capacity, improved system efficiency, education service delivery and accountability systems.

5 The information in this subsection is based on the EU-UNICEF Contribution Agreement for the CDPF, Annex 1: Description of the Action, 2011.
CDPF Phase II supports the 2013-2018 Capacity Development Masterplan and ESP, the latter supporting the 2013-2018 NSDP. The CDPF objectives have also been re-stated for Phase II through a memorandum of understanding (MoU).

**Governance** of the fund is through a CDPF steering committee set up to be responsible for:

- Prioritizing activities to be financed by the CDPF;
- Shaping the policy and strategic orientation for the CDPF to ensure alignment with the Masterplan and ESP in accordance with the financing agreement;
- Planning the use of funds annually in accordance with the ministry’s AOP.

**Figure 1: CDPF Governance Structure**

### 1.2 CDPF IMPLEMENTATION AND LOGICAL MODEL

CDPF Phase I, worth US$ 14.1 million, was launched in November 2011 and was completed in December 2014. Phase II is now being implemented, currently extending to the end of 2016.

The CDPF is planned on an annual basis with annual progress reports. The initial 2012 workplan, issued in March 2012, used a framework based on ESP programmes and sub-programmes. A situational analysis undertaken in May 2012 was used to develop the December 2012 CD Masterplan. In March 2013, a CDPF M&E Framework was developed based on the Masterplan, albeit

---


7 This 2011-2014 Education CDPF M&E Framework forms part of the ToR in Annex 1 of this evaluation report.
with six strategic outcomes rather than the seven in CD Plan\(^8\), in order to ensure alignment of CDPF priorities and approaches. Capacity Development Outcomes were added to create a more focused layer below the Strategic Outcomes which could be measured, and for which indicators were provided.

The CDPF M&E Framework was used as a structural basis for the 2013 and 2014 annual workplans and for reporting achievements in the 2013 Annual Report, issued in February 2014.

Phase I did not have an explicit logical framework or ToC; a hypothesized ToC\(^9\) based on the ESP and Masterplan was developed and used for this evaluation. Phase II also does not have an explicit logical framework or ToC. A draft ToC is proposed in Annex 8, based on lessons learned from this evaluation.

**CDPF ACTIVITIES AND APPROACHES**

The section of the 2011 EU-UNICEF Contribution Agreement for CDPF\(^10\) identifying its ‘Main Activities’ does so in terms of their aims in relation to the original Capacity Development Plan (for example *Activities aimed at supporting the D&D process, early childhood education and a clarification of NIE functions*). This is not helpful for present purposes in that: (a) the Capacity Development Plan was replaced by the Masterplan; and (b) the types of activities (workshops, advisory support, etc.) are not identified, only their aims. The Contribution Agreement was amended in October 2013 to align with the Masterplan, noting that ‘since the CDPF cannot fund all (Masterplan) activities, the CDPF Steering Committee will prioritize those activities which should be financed with a focus on critical capacities at district and school levels’.

The ‘range of approaches’ listed in the agreement is more helpful for present purposes and was used as the basis for assessing their contribution to the outcomes. These are shown in the box below. The Contribution Agreement included a ‘possible top-up of school operating budgets to strengthen school management’ but has not so far been employed, given existing funding under the School Improvement Grants programme.

---

**CDPF ACTIVITIES/APPROACHES**

- Grants to NGOs to build MoEYS capacity
- Grants to universities to conduct research
- Training
- Workshops
- Field research and assessments
- Institutional twinning and study tours
- Technical assistance (national and international)
- Equipment

The Masterplan identifies ‘Approaches for Developing Human Resources’ and also ‘Approaches for Developing Systems and Mechanisms’. These cover both the above ‘range of approaches’ and the ‘main activities’ in the Contribution Agreement. The approaches for human resources distinguish between training in the form of continuing professional development programmes and focused, tailored training programmes. The Human Resource Development approaches also include self-

---

\(^8\) The Masterplan and M&E Framework outcomes, activities and targets are not identical, as the 2012 Masterplan was seen as going beyond the scope of CDPF. See also Section 4.1.1.


learning, distance learning and action research. Approaches for developing systems and mechanisms include the development of mechanisms, frameworks and guidelines.

1.3 CONTEXT
Cambodia has had more than a decade of political stability, high economic growth and reduction in poverty through economic growth and pro-poor social policies. Nevertheless, Cambodia remains one of the poorest countries in the region.

The implications of ASEAN integration in 2015, and the National Vision and NSDP 2014–2018 commitment to middle-income status by 2030, require considerable investment in education. Both professional and well-qualified human resources and financial resources are required. Highly successful ASEAN countries have grown in part as a result of investment in education, often in excess of 5 per cent of gross domestic product (GDP).

MoEYS recognizes the importance of making the whole of the sector work together in order to respond to social and economic demands. The focus of the ESP 2014–2018 is on consolidating the gains already made in the previous ESP periods, reaching out to the most disadvantaged, providing learning that is of a high quality and relevant to national development. Education services need to be delivered professionally and accountably in order to lay the foundation for a knowledge-based and skills-based economy. The sector needs to develop its sector-wide quality assurance framework based on learning achievement and service delivery standards that respond to the needs of children, communities and the labour market. Capacity development at all levels is a key part of this, covering: systems; mechanisms for coherence, communication and collaboration; human resource development; and a strengthened enabling environment.

1.4 KEY STAKEHOLDERS
The direct beneficiaries of CDPF capacity building activities are: (a) government education managers within central MoEYS departments, PoEs and DoEs; (c) school directors and SSCs; and (d) university researchers undertaking research on education. The ultimate beneficiaries are young people attending or potentially attending schools. Other stakeholders include parents and wider school communities, and DPs, both official development agencies and NGOs.
SECTION 2: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

2.1 OPERATIONALIZING THE EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

The original ToR for this evaluation and ToC development are shown in Annex 1A, with the M&E Framework to which they refer in Annex 1B. Annex 1C shows a reformulation of the evaluation aspects of the ToR in a UNICEF-UN Evaluation Group evaluation framework. Subsequent aspects of this section are based on this reformulation.

2.2 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

(a) Fulfil accountability requirements for CDPF Phase I;
(b) Ensure that lessons learned from Phase I are identified, documented and used to inform the development and implementation of Phase II which started in January 2015.

As the CDPF does not yet have a logical framework or ToC, as noted in Section 1.2 above, the evaluation used a hypothesized ToC for Phase I. A ToC for Phase II forms one of the evaluation recommendations, including a draft ToC (see Section 6). An initial proposal for this Phase II ToC is presented in Annex 8.

The evaluation report is addressed to the CDPF Steering Committee, which is also the reference group for the evaluation. The final report will be made available to all stakeholders in government, as well as DPs and others.

2.3 OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

This eight-week\textsuperscript{11} summative evaluation\textsuperscript{12} of CDPF Phase I provides qualitative and quantitative evidence through a variety of means on the performance of CDPF Phase I in relation to the evaluation criteria.

The evaluation includes evidence on:

i. The extent to which CDPF is relevant and currently contributing to the achievement of the Capacity Development Outcomes and Strategic Outcomes of the CDPF Phase I M&E Framework;
ii. How well the funding is managed and used by the activity implementers in accordance with the 2012 MoEYS Masterplan for Capacity Development in the Education Sector and value-for-money criteria;
iii. Impact to date;
iv. Lessons learned from activity implementations, including strengths and weaknesses and sustainability issues.

The evaluation takes into account all CDPF operations of MoEYS at central, provincial, district and school levels, on a national basis. However, due to time limitations, primary data was acquired only on a sample of CDPF activities, through interviews with a sample of central MoEYS departments and through fieldwork in four of Cambodia’s 28 provinces. While the sample of provinces and districts covers a range of socio-economic contexts, it is limited to eastern Cambodia. Evidence on other provinces, MoEYS departments and CDPF activities relies on secondary data.

\textsuperscript{11} The consultant undertook two two-week visits to Cambodia, with one week of each visit engaged in fieldwork.

\textsuperscript{12} There is a formative element in that the results will feed in to ongoing planning for CDPF Phase II.
The evaluation focuses on outcomes and strategies for their achievement rather than detailed consideration of inputs and activities.

2.4 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS
The CDPF was assessed against the DAC/OECD evaluation criteria.

The evaluation questions for each of these criteria were:

2.4.1 RELEVANCE
i. Is the funding used in accordance with the programme document Description of the Action and the CD Masterplan?
ii. Is the ESP that is supported by the CDPF project encouraging gender equality and equity, and disadvantaged groups?

2.4.2 EFFECTIVENESS
i. Have the approaches, activities and governance structure of the CDPF contributed to achieving the Capacity Development Outcomes?
ii. Are they likely to achieve the Strategic Outcomes in the CDPF M&E Framework in future?
iii. How should the design and governance of CDPF be revised in order to increase its impact?

2.4.3 EFFICIENCY
i. Are the funding and resources being used efficiently?
ii. What is the comparative merit of each budget line in relation to value for money?

2.4.4 IMPACT
i. Is there any overarching impact from the CDPF: (a) within MoEYS; (b) on the education sector outcomes, capacity and processes more broadly; and (c) on aid effectiveness?
ii. What has been the most significant system, institutional or individual change?
iii. Has there been any positive change with regard to access to and quality of education as a result of the CDPF?
iv. Is there any unintended positive or negative impact?

2.4.5 SUSTAINABILITY
i. To what extent have CDPF interventions been integrated into the education system in terms of: (a) budget; and (b) AOPs or mid-term plans?
ii. Is it likely that CDPF impacts will be systematized?
iii. How can the CDPF evaluation be aligned with, and strengthen, national and sub-national monitoring and review systems?
SECTION 3: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

3.1 OVERVIEW

The evaluation questions in the operationalized ToR were analysed in terms of information required and means of acquiring it. The methodology comprised the following evaluation tools and samples selected for these tools:

- A study of the documentation;
- Interviews with 21 staff from MoEYS headquarters departments (finance, legislation, personnel, planning and primary education), the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP), DPs (UNICEF, EU, SIDA) and NGOs (VSO and CARE);
- Focus groups and interviews in four provinces (Ratanakiri, Kratie and Kandal, and Phnom Penh municipality) with 23 PoE staff and two VSOs, 20 staff of eight DoEs and 61 school directors and SSC representatives from a total of 26 primary schools and two secondary schools. There were 106 interviewees in total;
- Questionnaires completed by 110 interviewees;
- Observations during the visits to schools, PoEs and DoEs;
- A validation workshop on 29 May with 26 participants from MoEYS central departments, eight officers from the PoEs visited, two representatives each of RUPP and the NIE, four development partner representatives and two NGO representatives.

Triangulation of information was assured at the macro level through the range of tools employed – documentation, focus groups, interviews, a questionnaire and the validation workshop. Within the questionnaire and worksheets, both closed and open questions were structured to provide sufficient triangulation of responses.

Ethics: The evaluation was carried out respecting the United Nations Evaluation Group’s ethical guidelines: impartiality, independence of judgement, integrity, respect, accuracy and transparency were upheld in all possible ways.

3.2 SAMPLING

3.2.1 SELECTION OF CDPF PROGRAMMES FOR MORE IN-DEPTH EVALUATION

While the evaluation as a whole covered all CDPF activities, a smaller sample of CDPF programmes was used as a basis for the focus groups and interviews. The sample was selected on the basis of:

- Covering key activities at each level of the education system: central, PoEs, DoEs and schools;
- Involving key sector management issues - policy and planning, monitoring, managing human resources, managing financial resources;
- Involving systems development, institutional/relationship development and human capacity development;
- Involving a range of CDPF approaches.

The resulting selection of CDPF programmes from the CDPF Masterplan and their associated M&E Framework indicators are shown in Table 1 below:

---

13 See analysis of evaluation questions at Annex 5.
14 See list of documentation at Annex 4.
15 Children were not being taught in any of the schools visited during the first field trip, even though this was before the official holidays. However, this issue is only indirectly linked to the CDPF in terms of school management and was not part of the evaluation.
16 The selected CDPF programmes are also analyzed in terms of outcomes and activities in Annex 7A.
Table 1: CDPF PROGRAMMES SELECTED FOR MORE IN-DEPTH EVALUATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDPF Masterplan Programme</th>
<th>CDPF M&amp;E Framework</th>
<th>2014 Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Training and continuing professional development for managers and leaders</td>
<td>1.1 MoEYS and relevant institutions have the capacity to develop appropriate policies and undertake strategic planning</td>
<td>Policy priorities in the education sector promote coherence and complementarity between national and sub-national levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Training and other capacity development opportunities to build sub-national planning and M&amp;E skills</td>
<td>2.2 Provincial and district-level authorities have the capacity to undertake strategic and operational planning</td>
<td>10 Provinces have provincial ESPs 40 districts have district AOPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 MoEYS at national and sub-national levels has the capacity to review education sector performance, providing appropriate analytic diagnosis</td>
<td>EMIS data is analysed to diagnose sector performance in education congress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Preparing sub-national authorities (SNAs), POEs and DOEs for new roles and structures</td>
<td>2.3 MoEYS has the capacity to undertake a comprehensive planning process for SNDD reform integrated with national and sub-national plans</td>
<td>Coherent plans are developed regarding the transfer of functions, human and financial resources to sub-national levels of the education sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Developing Human Resource Management Information System (HRMIS) and how to use it</td>
<td>3.1 MoEYS has the capacity to put standardized policies in place to guide the deployment and management of MoEYS officials</td>
<td>POEs are able to use HRMIS to identify areas lacking teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Strengthening financial management systems (analysis and revision of school operating budgets, and timely disbursement and liquidation of school operating budgets)</td>
<td>5.1 Primary and secondary school directors have the capacity to plan and manage their schools effectively</td>
<td>At least 50 per cent of pre-schools, primary schools and secondary schools submit School Improvement Grant (SIG) proposals to the District Grant Management Committee (DGMC) on time and in line with requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Strengthening capacity of SSCs and communities to participate in school management and development</td>
<td>5.2 Primary SSCs have the capacity to monitor schools and be involved in decisions regarding the management of the school</td>
<td>30 per cent of the sample of selected primary schools have an SSC which meets at least once per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Strengthening RUPP and other identified higher education institutions to support education research</td>
<td>6.2 Research conducted by RUPP and relevant higher education institutions feeds into MoEYS policy-making and planning procedures</td>
<td>RUPP presents the findings of the MoEYS-commissioned research on secondary school curriculum at the JTWG/Education retreat, feeding into the policy dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

The time scale of this evaluation did not allow for a fully representative sample geographically: visits were confined to eastern Cambodia. Nevertheless, the provinces and districts were representative in terms of socio-economic and education indicators, such as poverty rate, primary completion rate and urban-rural balance. The sample sizes for focus groups, interviewees and questionnaires (see Section 3.1 above) were sufficient to give margins of error of between 10 per cent (for respondents overall) and 20 per cent (for MoEYS central, PoE and DoE staff), at a 95 per cent confidence level.

The first set of visits took place in Ratanakiri, including Bar Kaev and Ban Loung DoEs, and Kratie, including Sambour and Chhloung DoEs. The second set of visits took place in Kandal province, including Kandal Stung and Sa Ang DoEs, and Phnom Penh municipality including Chbar Ampau and Doun Penh DoEs. School directors and Chairs of SSCs from three schools took part in each the DoE meetings.
It was not possible to interview all MoEYS departments at central level. Those interviewed at central MoEYS and PoE level were selected on the basis of their involvement in the CDPF programmes shown in Table 1\(^{17}\).

### 3.2.3 Establishing a Counterfactual

It was not possible to arrange a counterfactual for impact assessment in terms of selecting districts that have not benefitted from the CDPF, as the CDPF is system-wide. However, some programmes and activities were present in some of the provinces and districts visited and not in others, notably NGO support through CARE (only in Ratanakiri) and VSO (only in Ratanakiri and Kratie). Where all had received similar support, the counterfactual was based on peoples’ memories of how things had changed over the period covered by CDPF, taking on board changes that might have taken place other than through CDPF support.

### 3.3 Design of Evaluation Tools

#### 3.3.1 Documentation Review

The documentation review was designed for the consultant’s general familiarization with the project and to provide evidence on the following, using the approach to the evaluation questions:

- Definition of CDPF activities and governance arrangements as set out in the programme document *Description of the Action* and the activities in the Masterplan, to enable an assessment of their contribution to the M&E Framework outcomes;
- Definition of CDPF approaches according to Annex 1 of the 2012 CDPF Masterplan;
- Areas in the progress reports indicating problems with budgets and use of funds and resources;
- Ongoing CDPF and national and sub-national systems for M&E and review;
- Education statistics indicating changes in regard to access to education and the quality of education;
- Comparison of annual plans with the Masterplan; progress reports with annual plans; annual expenditures with budgets; and CDPF reporting in relation to expectations;
- Reports from MoEYS, DPs and NGOs indicating CDPF impact to date.

#### 3.3.2 Focus Groups and Interviews

Discussions with PoEs, and at DoEs with DoE staff and school directors, took the form of focus groups, starting with a *Most Significant Change* approach to identifying major significant outcome achievements. This approach enables respondents to express the major (impact) achievements from their own viewpoint. It looks at changes in outcomes first, prior to looking at the causes of the changes and the role, if any, that CDPF played. A full most significant change approach, getting focus groups to prioritize and fully analyse the changes, is a time-consuming process that is not feasible to implement within the present time scale. However, there was some prioritization in that there was only time to cover three or four major changes during the discussions with each group.

To implement this approach, respondents were asked to describe the most significant changes they have seen in their department, province, district or school in the last three years in relation to ESP outcomes or factors contributing to ESP outcomes. They were asked to suggest what led to the changes and what role, if any, the CDPF played.

\(^{17}\) Annex 3 lists the people interviewed and sites visited during the evaluation.
Following this, respondents were asked to identify key challenges they had faced in the last three years.

This approach was also used for initial starter questions in interviews with PoEs, MoEYS central departments, the Royal University of Phnom Penh (RUPP), DPs and NGOs.

The interviews included discussion on the following areas of activity relating to their work:

- Management of primary schools: 5.1 (school grants) and 6.2 (SSCs)
- DOEs: 3.2 (new roles and structures); 2.3 (planning and monitoring capacity)
- POEs: 3.2 (new roles and structures); 4.4 (use of HRMIS)
- Central level: Dept. Planning/RUPP (7.2 research-based policy and RUPP/International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) training); Dept. Planning support to planning and monitoring; Dept. Legislation support to new roles and structures of DOEs and POEs; Dept. Personnel support to POE use of HRMIS; Dept. Finance involvement in school financing and SIGs; Dept. Primary Education support to school management/SSCs.

The interviewees were asked to state:

- To what extent CDPF activities in these areas have contributed to the intended outcomes;
- Challenges they have faced in these areas and the role of (a) any capacity development and (b) CDPF in this;
- Any examples of unintended consequences;
- Lessons learned to date.

Guidelines were used for the focus group and interviews, and were adapted to fit the respective participants.

### 3.3.3 QUESTIONNAIRES

The questionnaire focused on changes observed; support received in key areas (CDPF or otherwise); and value of the support, including most and least favoured modalities. All interviewees and members of focus groups were asked to complete the questionnaire. Sections A, B, C and D collected information about the person completing it, while maintaining anonymity. This included the respondent’s gender and length of time in present post. Section E assessed personal changes that might be expected as a result of CDPF support, with some questions framed in the negative to discourage people from agreeing with all suggested changes. The remaining sections looked at different forms of support in terms of:

(a) different approaches/modalities of support based on the range of approaches listed in the 2011 EU-UNICEF Contribution Agreement for CDPF (questionnaire questions 1 to 10), and

(b) different training topics, kept fairly general in scope to cover all recipients (questions 11-15).

The questions looked at what they had received from CDPF or otherwise, and how helpful it was: not at all, a lot, or helpful but with some problems. Finally, they were asked to rank the most and least helpful forms of support.

The questionnaire was the same for all respondents. The questionnaire was sent by the MoEYS Planning Department to PoEs and DoEs before site visits, and most of those sent to DoEs were

---

18 The focus group and interview guidelines and questionnaires are in Annex 6.
19 The questionnaire was amended slightly for DPs, NGOs and RUPP to respect their role as observers/supporters of the activities referred to in the questionnaire rather than implementers, i.e. what they saw rather than experienced.
completed prior to site visits. The questionnaires were collected at the end of each interview or focus group.

3.3.4 LANGUAGE
The questionnaire was translated into Khmer and focus group discussions and interviews were in Khmer where appropriate, using a translator. All respondents could communicate effectively in Khmer, including those (e.g. SSC members) from minority ethnic groups.

3.3.5 HYPOTHEZIZED THEORY OF CHANGE (TOC)
When assessing impact to date, a ToC helps show how CDPF approaches, activities, resources and governance structures could contribute to the Capacity Development Outcomes, CDPF M&E Strategic Outcomes and ESP objectives.

As Phase I did not have a ToC, a simple mapping was hypothesized, based on indications of the CDPF logic implicit in the ESP and CDPF documentation\(^2\). Besides assisting in testing the logic underlying the CDPF programmes and in aiding the prediction of future impact, this also helped in preparations for the ToC workshop discussed in Section 6.

3.3.6 VALIDATION WORKSHOP
A full-day validation workshop was held in Phnom Penh on 29 May to:

i. Check and authenticate the analysis of the findings to date from the evaluation;
ii. Consider the implications of the findings for CDPF Phase II, including the initial development of a ToC for CDPF Phase II.

The workshop, which included group work, involved 26 participants from MoEYS central departments and eight from the PoEs involved in the interviews, two representatives each of RUPP and NIE, four DP and two NGO representatives.

---

\(^2\) This theory of change mapping is at Annex 2.
SECTION 4: FINDINGS

4.1 RELEVANCE

4.1.1 RELEVANCE OF CDPF FUNDING TO THE MoEYS CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT MASTERPLAN

The Masterplan\(^{21}\) was developed by the MoEYS Department of Planning, with CDPF consultancy support and technical support from UNICEF. The Capacity Development Plan on which the CDPF was initially based was not sufficiently aligned with the ESP or AOPs, nor was it strategic: it consisted of lists of small-scale training. The MoEYS Capacity Development Masterplan, issued in December 2012, and a statement in the 2013 Workplan stated that it was aligned with the Masterplan using the strategic outcomes and targets. The Workplan also stated that the implementation framework of the Master Plan formed the basis of the development of the AOPs by technical departments.

Some nuancing is needed here. The 2013 CDPF Workplan was not structured directly in terms of the seven Masterplan Strategic Outcomes, but in terms of the six Strategic Outcome Indicators of the CDPF M&E Framework (2011-2014). The missing Masterplan Strategic Outcome 3: ‘Legislation and SNDD reform supported and implemented in the education sector’ was seen as not warranting a full strategic outcome for CDPF, as decentralization is a slow moving reform and does not represent a substantial amount of CDPF support. In the M&E Framework, decentralization comes under CDPF Strategic Outcome 2, and is in practice being supported by the CDPF through an international technical expert advising the MoEYS Department of Legislation. Some other Masterplan Strategic Outcomes have been amended in the CDPF M&E Framework, but overall the targets and activities are compatible with the Masterplan Strategic Objectives.

Thus, despite this complication, all activities in the 2013 and 2014 Annual Workplans – on paper – support the Masterplan Strategic Outcomes. The 2013 annual report shows that the 2013 Workplan was funded and implemented in line with the workplan. There is no 2014 annual report to check this for 2014. The 2014 activities were to be included in the CDPF Phase I final cumulative report that was being finalized at the time of the evaluation.

4.1.2 RELEVANCE TO GENDER EQUALITY AND EQUITY\(^{22}\), AND DISADVANTAGED GROUPS

Education Strategic Plan

The ESP 2009-2013 that was supported by CDPF Phase I placed ‘emphasis on ensuring that all Cambodian children and youth have equal opportunity for access to basic education, both formal and informal, without discrimination on grounds of race, skin colour, gender, languages, religion, political affiliations of parents, place of birth or social status\(^{23}\). It is noteworthy that the there is no specific mention of disabilities in the ESP, Masterplan or CDPF documentation.

The first of the three ESP policies requires the following actions:

- **Guidelines on creating study environments in response to children’s protection, school health and gender developed in 2012, to**
- **Increase the number of scholarships (cash or food) for students from poor families, especially girls, to ensure their access to primary and secondary school, and to**
- **Ensure strengthened support to better poverty/food security-targeted primary school feeding and**

---


\(^{22}\) “Gender equality requires equal enjoyment by women and men of socially-valued goods, opportunities, resources and rewards.” “Gender equity is the process of being fair to women and men.” (http://web.unfpa.org/gender/resources3.html#2).

grade 4-6 incentive programmes.

The third of the three policies: Institutional and Capacity Development for Education Staff for Decentralization required MoEYS to:

- Reduce gender disparities in management positions at national and sub-national levels. ESP 2009-2013 sub-programme 1.4 provides: Equitable Access and Provision of Scholarships to Poor and Disadvantaged students.

CDPF Design

CDPF Phase I was designed and implemented to strengthen support to gender equality and equity, and disadvantaged students. The CDPF-supported ‘School Governance Project’ through the NGO CARE focuses on the most educationally disadvantaged province, Ratanakiri. While ethnic minorities make up the majority of the population, ethnic minority students make up only one quarter of secondary enrolments. The project strengthens community involvement in schools by training SSCs through DTMTs to support children’s access to school, the monitoring of children’s attendance and performance, the monitoring of teachers’ attendance, and the resolution of problems between the school and the community. CARE includes a strongly gendered approach in all its support, and this is a premise of all its projects in north-east Cambodia.

The allocation of the VSO Education Management Advisers to 10 provinces was done on the basis of (low) education indicators in the provinces and VSO operational experience. The allocation of motorbikes to DTMT members was also done on the basis of low education indicators, and the provision of direct financial support to POEs was larger for disadvantaged provinces (guidance attached).

The M&E Framework includes the 2013 target that ‘20 percent of MoEYS officials and managers who take part in CDPF professional development opportunities are women’. This gender targeting is particularly important given the low proportion of women in senior positions in the sector. The low target of 20 per cent is realistic in terms of the present low numbers of women in senior posts and even in junior managerial posts, to which the CDPF professional training is particularly relevant. Only 16 per cent of respondents to the questionnaire were women, though the proportion who had been in post for less than three years (26 per cent) was greater than the combined figure for men and women (19 per cent), suggesting a trend towards a higher female proportion.

Staff charts observed in schools showed a reasonable gender balance overall, but with few female staff at senior levels and in PoE offices. Female posts were mainly at lower levels. More worryingly for the future, the charts of school student councils showed a similar biased profile in favour of boys. This is anecdotal and not necessarily a true reflection of the situation in all or even most Cambodian schools. Nevertheless, it is something that needs to be looked into.

24 A useful report on the CARE work in Ratanakiri is the School Governance Project End Line Survey, CARE, December 2014.
25 See CDPF CARE video documentary: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K07-W0_9W8s&feature=youtu.be
26 See the summary of responses from the questionnaires in Annex 7.
4.2  EFFECTIVENESS

4.2.1  CONTRIBUTION OF THE CDPF APPROACHES AND ACTIVITIES TO THE M&E FRAMEWORK CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

SECONDARY EVIDENCE

The 2013 Progress Report is based on the M&E Framework and clearly shows the CDPF activities and approaches undertaken in relation to each M&E Capacity Development Outcome, with a matrix of key achievements providing a useful summary. This shows progress towards the achievements.

Unfortunately, neither the matrix nor the rest of the report clearly and simply show which 2013 targets were achieved, which were not, and the extent to which CDPF contributed to this.

There is also the problem that some of the targets within the M&E Framework are not sufficiently specific and clearly defined to be readily measureable. The target is also not an effective measure of the outcome in every case. During the evaluation interviews, this impacted on efforts to assess achievements against the 2014 M&E framework targets.

Results in the 2013 progress reports against each of the M&E Capacity Development outcomes are shown at Annex 8. This annex also discusses the problems with some of the M&E outcomes and targets in terms of measurability and the way they have been handled in the progress report.

PRIMARY EVIDENCE FROM INTERVIEWS, FOCUS GROUPS AND OBSERVATION

The following are the summary findings on achievement of 2014 targets for those M&E Framework Development Outcomes that were discussed during the evaluation. Focus groups and interviews included questions on performance against the Masterplan. In the following paragraphs they are shown as achievements of the M&E Framework Development Outcomes. The evidence from different sources all showed the same direction of achievement – there was no evidence against achievement of the outcomes except as noted below in regard to outcome 5.1.

Outcome 1.1: Capacity to develop policies and undertake strategic planning. The 2014 target is not specific and thus not easily measureable: ‘Policy priorities in the education sector promote coherence and complementarity between national and sub-national levels’. On the other hand, the ESP itself appears coherent across levels, and this benefitted from CDPF-funded training for DoP. It was clear from the interviews at central, PoE and DoE levels that CDPF had supported capacity strengthening in regard to planning, especially annual planning, thereby enhancing coherence across levels. The findings in Annex 7 show frequent references in focus groups and interviews to improved planning, while the questionnaire showed training for planning to have been the most common and most helpful form of support.

Outcome 2.2: Provincial and district-level authorities have the capacity to undertake strategic and operational planning. The 2014 targets were to have 10 provinces with provincial ESPs 2014-2016 and 40 districts with AOPs. Ratanakiri had a provincial ESP and all the PoEs visited had JTWGs. All the DoEs visited had an AOP, largely as a result of CDPF support to training in planning. The same findings from focus groups, interviews and questionnaires as for Outcomes 2.1 apply to general capacity improvement in planning.

Outcome 2.3: MoEYS has the capacity to undertake a comprehensive planning process for SNDD reform integrated with national and sub-national plans. The 2014 target was that coherent plans are...

37 Seen Annex 7 for more information on focus group and interview responses in relation to outcomes.
developed regarding the transfer of functions, human and financial resources to sub-national levels in the education sector. This is not readily measureable. The only significant actions at PoE level and below were in supporting school-based management (with CDPF-supported training), given the increased school funding and autonomy, and in the case of Ratanakiri POE, separating out the departments of planning and accounting to allow more attention to planning.

Outcome 3:1 MoEYS has the capacity to put standardized policies in place to guide the deployment and management of MoEYS officials. POEs confirmed that, in accordance with the first 2014 target, they are able to use the HRMIS to identify areas lacking teachers. There was strong praise for the HRMIS, which has been developed with the help of CDPF-supported international technical assistance.

Outcome 5:1 Primary and secondary school directors have the capacity to plan and manage their schools effectively. In regard to the target of 50 per cent of schools providing acceptable school improvement grant proposals, all school directors interviewed from schools that were eligible for the grant had submitted successful proposals. The target of 30 per cent of schools having an SSC meeting at least once per semester seems to have been exceeded: this was true of all the SSCs taking part in the evaluation. In both cases this was helped by CDPF-funded training. Only in Ratanakiri were SSCs fully active in the school development plan, in following up on school absentees and similar tasks. Other SSCs saw their role as only securing resources for the school.

Outcome 6:2 Research conducted by RUPP and relevant higher education institutions feeds into MoEYS policy. It was evident from discussions with RUPP and DoP that CDPF-funded research played an important role in evidence-based MoEYS policy development.

OVERALL FINDINGS ON CONTRIBUTION TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

It appears from the above secondary and primary evidence that CDPF has contributed significantly to the M&E Framework Development Outcomes, and the evidence obtained suggested that targets were achieved in most cases.

4.2.2 CONTRIBUTION OF GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE TO CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

The existence of the steering committee led by the Secretary of State for Education seemed from discussions with MoEYS departments to have ensured full ownership of the CDPF within MoEYS, at least at central level. The prominent role of DoP was also important given the increasingly important role of coherent planning in the education sector and the crucial importance of planning for capacity development outcomes. Planning was seen in interview responses as the highest priority in CDPF support. Management of personnel and financial management within the sector are also key strands of the Masterplan, hence the importance of having the departments of personnel and finance on the steering committee.

The presence of the three DPs on the finance committee is also crucial, given the need to coordinate DP and government roles within the fund and in other closely related activities such as support to school grants.

The modest size of the steering committee means that it is able to respond efficiently to the decisions needed to achieve the Capacity Development Outcomes. The existence of a small secretariat allows more detailed and timely work to take place between steering committee meetings, as well as supporting the meetings. The composition of the secretariat is appropriate given the key role of DoP in the implementation of the CD Masterplan and UNICEF as fund administrator.
4.2.3 LIKELY CONTRIBUTION TO M&E FRAMEWORK STRATEGIC OUTCOMES

The M&E Framework Strategic Outcomes in summary form are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;E FRAMEWORK STRATEGIC OUTCOMES IN SUMMARY FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Effective leadership at all levels with robust and coherent policy priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Strong systems and human capacity for analysis, planning, M&amp;E and review at all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Effective systems for HR development/management, administration, ICT and information management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public financial management and audit systems function efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formal and non-formal education service delivery is managed effectively with clear quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. High-quality education management training, and research and learning across the education sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesized ToC at Annex 2 shows how CDPF interventions through activities detailed in the 2013 and 2014 workplans are logically linked to the eventual achievement of these outcomes. This has already led to progress towards these outcomes.

- Effective leadership (Outcome 1) has been developed through ongoing CDPF training programmes, and also through the high-level training from IIEP and CDPF support through IIEP to high-level training at NIE (Outcome 6).
- The development of coherent policy priorities (Outcome 1) has been helped by policy-linked education research at RUPP (Outcome 6) and through analysis and initiatives undertaken with NGO support and technical assistance. Research through the Education Research Council looks likely to be an important aspect of ongoing policy reform, with ministerial commitment to ‘think tanks’.
- The foundations have already been laid for effective systems of planning and analysis (Outcome 2), HR development and ICT (Output 4) and financial management and audit (Outcome 4), while quality-assured management of service delivery is being helped by support to school directors and SSCs.

The M&E Framework outcomes are thus likely to be achieved if the activities are continued at the same level in CDPF II.

The CARE School Governance Project in Ratanakiri has already shown significant progress towards effective leadership at school level in its target schools. The project, which started in July 2013, trains DTMTs and helps them train SSC members to play an active role in school development planning and school monitoring, and to take action within the community to identify school-aged children, encourage a commitment to education, strengthen community support for the school and follow-up on absentee students. CARE’s End Line Survey report in December 2014 showed a 2.5-fold increase in the activity of SSCs, and interviews in the evaluation with the PoE, DoEs and schools in Ratanakiri showed agreement among respondents on the effectiveness of this initiative.

4.2.4 PROPOSALS FROM RESPONDENTS TO IMPROVE CDPF DESIGN AND GOVERNANCE

Whilst CDPF I was effective in contributing to the M&E Framework Objectives, there were areas where changes in the design would probably have improved CDPF achievements. These were raised by interviewees in terms of challenges faced, and through comments on the questionnaires.

RECURRENT BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF EQUIPMENT SUPPORT

Thirty per cent of school directors and 50 per cent of DoE chiefs interviewed said operational budget limitations were major challenges. The motorbikes issued to DTMT members were ineffective, as the fuel budget was not adequate. The effectiveness of ICT equipment issued to PoEs and DoEs was
similarly reduced by the lack of an adequate budget for operation and maintenance, including costs of
toner, repairs and spare parts. The cost of high-speed Internet access impacted particularly on DoEs.
Some printers were only used for particularly important jobs because toner was so expensive, while
others remained broken for long periods due to the difficulties and costs of repair.

**INADEQUATE LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL DIRECTOR TRAINING**

Fifty per cent of the PoEs and DoEs visited raised this issue. While significant CDPF funding (more than
$300,000 in 2013) was used for school director training, this was seen by respondents to be far below
what was needed to achieve adequate service delivery outcomes. The much higher workload of
school directors and lack of accounting skills were raised as concerns, as well as the high turnover.
This showed the need for ongoing training programmes – another point raised by some respondents.
Given limited resources for training, it was felt that this could have been targeted more at the most
needy schools.

**INADEQUATE STRATEGIC LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR SSCs AND DTMTs IN MOST PROVINCES**

Two of the four PoEs visited raised this issue. The issue is not so much the level of funding as the
approach. Substantial funding from CDPF has been spent on school-based training and SSCs. This
support focused heavily on financial management of the Swedish-supported School Improvement
Grant and School Operating Budget. However, less attention has been given to broader school-based
management and strategic support to SSCs and DTMTs in developing overall school-based
management. Discussions with SSCs in provinces other than Ratanakiri suggested that the main
outcome of SSC training, where received, had been to encourage community physical and financial
support to schools, rather than take an active role in school planning, monitoring and education
promotion within the community. The fact that the SIDA Case Study on Cambodia found some
inactive SSCs shows that further SSC training is vital. Similarly, DTMTs seem not to have been very
active in other provinces. The CARE approach should be seen as a model for other districts.

**POORLY DESIGNED WORKSHOPS**

Comments were raised in interview and questionnaire responses that many ‘workshops’ arranged by
PoEs were just lectures without any practical element and without documentation for participants to
use after the workshop. Some repeated what had been presented in earlier workshops. There were
also concerns that not enough support was given to MoEYS staff providing the training, and that more
permanent arrangements should be established along the lines of the DTMTs with ongoing training
programmes run by teams of well-trained, and possibly institutionally based, trainers.

Some respondents commented that it would be more effective to emphasize long-term professional
development at decentralized as well as central levels, rather than the present emphasis on short-
term training and workshops.

There were suggestions that outcomes should be monitored to compare changes resulting from
training and the use of new systems.

**PERCEIVED LACK OF FLEXIBILITY IN USING CDPF RESOURCES AT DECENTRALIZED LEVELS**

There were comments at PoE and central level that the CDPF did not allow sufficient flexibility at PoE
level to maximize its effectiveness. One example was an apparently rigid cap on numbers of school
directors able to be trained, which left four directors untrained in one district. In another case,

---

additional premises could not be used for a workshop when participant numbers were excessive. Both RUPP and one PoE noted a lack of opportunity for action research at decentralized levels. It is important to be flexible to needs at the local level, as demonstrated by the steering committee commissioning boats and motorbikes for DTMTs.

A related concern was the lack of involvement of PoEs in identifying and planning for VSO needs. One PoE director saw the provision of a VSO as something that was decided at central level that he then needed to deal with. This was coloured by two previous VSOs having left after only a few months and thereby causing problems for the PoE, but the issue is still valid. While it is necessary to some extent for VSOs to develop their role once they arrive, and some have done this effectively, it is obviously better if advanced planning for this and other centrally procured activities is undertaken with the PoE.

This in turn implies greater interaction between PoEs and the CDPF steering committee and secretariat.

4.3 EFFICIENCY

4.3.1 EFFICIENCY IN USE OF RESOURCES

There was no evidence of waste, or budgetary or financial mismanagement of funds within the progress reports. However, two PoEs and staff at central level raised concerns over the short funding window each year. CDPF Direct Cost Transfer funds do not become available until April after the Annual Workplans are signed (in March), and must be spent by October, so that they can be accounted for to the EU by the end of the year. This leads to some inefficiency in the use of the funds, for example in preventing optimal timing for some activities. Another concern raised by two PoEs was the perceived application of different per diem rules used by UNICEF for CDPF compared with government rules. This had obvious implications, including inefficiency due to lack of motivation.

Subsequent feedback from UNICEF indicated that travel and accommodation rates were aligned with government travel, accommodation and workshop rates; but this was evidently not the perception at PoE level.

4.3.2 VALUE FOR MONEY

Procurement contracts were secured on a value-for-money basis, however, DoE and PoE respondents suggested some equipment was possibly too sophisticated. They said this led to high running and repair costs and therefore did not represent value for money in the long term.

There is no evidence of value-for-money analysis of the CDPF various budget lines in any of the documentation.

The budget allocation in 2013\(^\text{29}\) was:

**Table 2: CDPF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS IN 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ITEM</th>
<th>BUDGET (US$)</th>
<th>BUDGET per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash transfers to MoEYS for training, workshops, etc.</td>
<td>2,729,560</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and international technical assistance</td>
<td>627,943</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs (CARE and VSO) and institutions (research)</td>
<td>235,721</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{29}\) Programmable direct costs, not including UNICEF indirect costs.
More than half the funding was used by MoEYS for training, workshops and at central and decentralized levels. The budget was allocated through central MoEYS departments, so it was not possible to see what proportion was spent at central, provincial and district/school levels. However, UNICEF reports that the majority of Direct Cash Transfer support to MoEYS in 2013 was $1.7m to train more than 33,000 participants from Provincial and District Grant Management Committees and SSCs in all 11,000 schools nationwide. This support was heavily – perhaps too heavily – focused on financial management of the Swedish-supported School Improvement Grant and School Operating Budget and not sufficiently on broader school-based management.

Comments were raised by two respondents about inadequate attention being given to the use of high-cost items such as international technical assistance. On a unit cost basis, the most expensive items were external training/twinning and study visits, international technical assistance and the CARE project. The Joint Scandinavian Evaluation of Education Capacity Development in Cambodia refers to criticisms over the use of high-cost international technical assistance and international twinning. On the other hand, these also appear to have been the most effective forms of support towards achieving the M&E objectives.

As part of an attempt to compare the relative effectiveness of different activities, the questionnaire asked respondents which forms of CDPF support (i.e. activities) they had received, how effective this had been, and what they considered the three most effective and three least effective forms of CDPF support.

Figure 2 below shows the percentage of respondents who had experienced (or in the case of RUPP and NGOs, observed) the different forms of CDPF support, while Figure 3 shows how helpful they found the support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twinning, study visits, external training</td>
<td>694,749</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies (equipment)</td>
<td>495,505</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility, communications, translation</td>
<td>28,016</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF management</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,311,494</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 See questionnaire at Annex 6 and responses at Annex 7.
32 The questionnaire grouped CDPF support with MoEYS support, as particularly at school level, the respondents would not be able to differentiate these. In practice, this will have been almost entirely CDPF support. Indeed, some of the ‘received from other sources’ items in the responses in Annex 7 may have been CDPF support, as even at PoE level, it was not appreciated that the CARE support to DTMTs and SSCs was funded by CDPF.
The types of support that had been experienced (or in the case of RUPP and NGOs, observed) by most participants were workshops and seminars (88 per cent), short-term targeted training (95 per cent) and provision of guidelines (68 per cent). Targeted training and guidelines were mainly experienced through CDPF, with workshops and seminars coming from other support. The forms of capacity development experienced (or observed) least from CDPF were regional or international links (30 per
cent), English-language training (35 per cent), local advisers (20 per cent) and international advisers (21 per cent). This emphasis was partly influenced by the fact that half the sample was from schools.

The form of support perceived as most helpful for the 68 per cent who had experienced it (or in the case of RUPP/NGOs, observed it) was training in planning, with 83 per cent of respondents saying it helped a lot. Training in monitoring and accountability was also highly valued, with 81 per cent saying it helped a lot, though only 51 per cent of respondents had received this support.

Of the 30 per cent who had experienced (or observed) local advisers, mainly at DoE and central levels, 93 per cent found support from local advisers to be helpful, but in the majority of cases, ‘with problems’. Of the 38 per cent who had experienced (or observed) international advisors, 90 per cent said they had helped, but half of these had experienced problems with this form of support. Some of the problems may have related to delays in procuring some of the technical assistance, as described in the 2013 progress report. There was no suggestion raised in focus groups and interviews that the technical assistants were ineffective when appointed.

Respondents were asked to select what they thought were the three most helpful and three least helpful forms of support, whether or not they had experienced them. Figure 4 shows the number of responses in each case.

![Figure 4: Numbers of questionnaire responses selecting forms of CDPF support as among the 3 most or least helpful](image)

Long-term and short-term training were the most favoured forms of CDPF support, especially related to planning and monitoring and English-language training. Those least favoured were local and national technical assistance and training on gender and supporting disadvantaged groups. There were different views on several forms of support, with similar numbers of respondents putting them in the most favoured and least favoured groups. These included workshops and seminars, equipment and training in managing people. This mixed response may have been linked to the problems with workshops and the lack of operating budgets for equipment, mentioned in Section 4.2.3 above.
4.4 IMPACT

4.4.1 ‘MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGES’

The assessment of impact to date was undertaken primarily through a ‘most significant change’ approach. Respondents were asked to identify the most significant changes they had seen over the last three years. The most reported changes are shown below, with numbers of times each was identified.

![Graph showing most significant changes]

**Figure 5: Most quoted ‘most significant changes’ over the three years of CDPF I**

The reports on increased primary enrolment and decreased dropout are surprising, as they appear contrary to national statistics based on EMIS. While the latter shows an increase in the primary net admission rates (NAR) and decrease in dropout rate between 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, they show the opposite trend between 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

On the other hand, respondents gave logical reasons for the increased enrolment and dropout, notably:

- An increased school budget allowing improvements to the school (especially the school environment);
- Better school management as a result of CDPF-funded training for school directors especially on the school development plan and in identifying weaker students and students from poorer families for the allocation of scholarships; and
- The increased activity of the CDPF-trained SSCs. The latter training was especially important in Ratanakiri with the trained SSC members identifying school-aged children in the community, meeting with parents to encourage school attendance, and follow-up on those leaving school.

---


34 Many of the ‘occasions in which this was raised’ were focus groups involving several respondents, so the numbers are merely indicative of the level of response. The response also varied by level, and since most respondents were at school or district level, this biases the findings. Annex 7 gives more detail and summarizes the findings by level.
A number of factors could cause the divergence between the responses from the focus groups, interviews and the EMIS statistics. One could be the possibility that the respondents were from schools and districts where there was a higher than normal impact on education outcomes from CDPF and other inputs, and that these were too small in total to show up on the national statistics. Another possibility is that EMIS data is unreliable, for example, that a real improvement in education outcomes was accompanied by improvements in data management which reduced previously inflated figures; and indeed two of the other ‘most significant changes’ were seen as improved management at school and DoE levels, a major part of which has been improved data handling – noted particularly by PoE respondents.

This deserves further investigation and future monitoring.

Other ‘most significant changes’ referred to at central and PoE levels included the major central reforms of an increased sector budget, higher teacher salaries and direct payment through the bank, strengthened inspectorate, teacher development, reform of year 12 examinations, and the creation of the Education Research Council as part of policy-development ‘think tanks’.

4.4.2 PERSONAL CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS EXPERIENCED FROM CDPF SUPPORT

The questionnaire asked respondents to rate their experiences of personal, human development changes, although without linking this specifically to CDPF. The responses are shown in Figure 6 below, with 0 meaning definitely no improvement and 4 meaning definite improvement. The last two questions asked whether they now had the necessary equipment and ICT competence.

Figure 6: Personal Capacity Improvements over the last three years

---

The responses to subsequent questions showed that around two thirds of the capacity development they had received came from CDPF. This therefore shows the probable impact of CDPF support, particularly in regard to planning (working efficiently, understanding expectations and understanding relevance of their work) and reporting.

4.4.3 IMPACT OF CDPF ON EDUCATION SECTOR OUTCOMES

It is still too early in the life of the CDPF to expect significant impact on sector outcomes. Nevertheless, it appears that training for school directors and training for SSCs through DTMTs, alongside improved school funding, are already seen to be having an impact on participation and dropout, and on the quality of service delivery, especially in the educationally disadvantaged province of Ratanakiri.

4.4.4 IMPACT WITHIN MOEYS ON CAPACITY AND PROCESSES

Taking into account the findings in Sections 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 above, and the introduction of AOPs at all levels of the system, the major impact CDPF has already had within MoEYS has been on planning and reporting.

4.4.5 BROADER IMPACT ON CAPACITY AND SYSTEMS

SSC training is having a particular impact on the capacity of migrant communities to undertake their own voluntary social development and create links with supportive NGOs. Along with CDPF support to the development of JTWGs, there is a wider impact on the capacity of NGOs, the private sector and government to work effectively together. These system and capacity development preparations for decentralization could provide a model for other sectors, though there was no evidence during the evaluation that this transfer of experience to other sectors was taking place.

4.4.6 UNINTENDED IMPACT

There was no significant unintended impact of CDPF, though there were fears at DoE and PoE level of unintended consequences of decentralization on their ability to discipline school staff.

4.5 SUSTAINABILITY

4.5.1 CDPF INTEGRATION INTO THE EDUCATION SECTOR BUDGET

CDPF operations are expected to be integrated into the budget, and to support school budgeting. However, two major, linked threats to sustainability were raised by respondents in relation to the government education budget and CDPF-funded capacity development:

- There is virtually no government budget for capacity development alongside the CDPF, nor is there any budget ready to take over when external CDPF funding ends. Yet capacity development is an ongoing need. Education managers at all levels need to be retrained and updated to keep up to date with the developing context. In many cases, especially at district and school level, there is high staff turnover, and new staff need to be trained. Information and other systems need to be modified and developed. Without a capacity development budget similar to the CDPF when external funding ends, much of the impact of the CDPF will be lost.
- Capacity development appears in the budget as a capital investment. But there are significant recurrent budget implications. On one hand, several CDPF investments in capacity strengthening have recurrent budget implications, for example for equipment repair, maintenance and running costs (fuel, toner, fast Internet connection). On the other hand, much of the training is seen by respondents to be an ongoing annual programme, as is research. This implies the need to increase
recurrent budgets for running costs to make effective use of the CDPF investments, and for a government recurrent budget for capacity development.

4.5.2 CDPF INTEGRATION INTO EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANS

The CDPF operations have been integrated into the education system in terms of AOPs and the 2014-2018 ESP.

4.5.3 CDPF EVALUATION ALIGNMENT WITH NATIONAL MONITORING AND REVIEW SYSTEMS

The Capacity Development Masterplan was designed to be in line with the ESP used for overall sector monitoring and review. The minor divergence between the Phase I CDPF M&E Framework and the 2012 Capacity Development Plan has already been mentioned, but does not detract from aligning this evaluation with overall ESP M&E. The evaluation was also based in the DoP, and was undertaken partly by DoE staff; DoP is the focal point for M&E and reviewing, and related information systems within MoEYS.

4.6 OTHER FINDINGS

Focus groups and interview discussions on ‘most significant changes’ were followed by discussions on major challenges36. Some of these have already been considered, for example inadequate budget for running costs, inadequate funds to train sufficient school directors, the short six-month funding window, and problems with inflexibility in the use of funds. But other challenges lie outside the immediate remit of the CDPF. Some of these are worth recording here as they have implications for Phase II of CDPF and the ToC.

One issue is the allocation and management of teachers. While the number of teachers overall at both primary and secondary level is above that needed to meet the ESP student-teacher ratio targets, there is a teacher shortage in many rural areas, and a significant over-supply at central levels. There were also reports of high teacher absenteeism. In the absence of effective performance appraisal and sanctions and/or incentives, it is proving difficult for some school directors to ensure high levels of teacher attendance, as well as basic requirements of good teaching such as the provision of lesson plans and effective teacher meetings. As noted earlier, there are concerns that this could worsen if care is not taken with the roles of sub-national administrations under the D&D process.

Another issue is the high turnover of DoE staff who, in light of increased teacher salaries, now earn less than primary school teachers. This, along with the low DoE running cost budget, makes it difficult for DoEs to take full advantage of CDPF-supported MIS systems and fully support schools. There appeared to be positive interaction between DoEs and schools in the districts visited, showing their potential role in supporting school-based management.

In Ratanakiri, where there are particularly high levels of migration, it was apparent that students reported as having dropped out of school had probably migrated to a different district. Current information systems do not distinguish between fresh enrolments and dropouts, or whether students have moved to another school. The SSC was helping with this issue through family visits.

---

36 See report on the focus groups, interviews and these major challenges at Annex 7.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS

5.1 ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE EVALUATION CRITERIA

A score out of 6 is given in each case to indicate the extent to which CDPF Phase I met each evaluation criterion, from ‘not at all’ (1) to ‘fully’ (6).\(^\text{37}\)

RELEVANCE (5/6)

CDPF funding was used in full accordance with the Capacity Development Masterplan.

The funding was developed on the basis of the Masterplan and is in line with perceived needs at all levels: school, DoE, PoE and central level.

The ESP that is supported by CDPF clearly and specifically requires support for gender equality and equity and disadvantaged groups, and the CDPF itself is contributing directly in these areas. However more explicit attention should be given to disability.

EFFECTIVENESS (4/6)

The approaches, activities and governance structure of the CDPF have contributed to the achievement of intended CDPF outcomes, but there are ways the design and governance of the CDPF could be revised to increase impact.

CDPF has led to achievement of most of the Capacity Development Outcomes in the M&E Framework, and is likely to lead to the achievement of the Framework’s strategic outcomes, depending on how these are conceived.

The effectiveness could have been greater with:

- More attention to matching capital expenses (e.g. equipment) with the running cost budget for operation and maintenance;
- More strategic support to school-based management with DoE support, including more support for DTMTs and SSCs;
- More effective workshops with activities linked to participants’ work and full documentation, and more emphasis on longer-term professional development with accredited courses linked to staff appraisal and career development;
- Greater involvement of decentralized levels in planning for centrally procured items (e.g. technical assistance, VSOs, equipment); more flexibility in the use of CDPF funds at decentralized levels, including the possibility of action research, for example through staff incentives, staff release, innovation funds and other means. The current arrangement of funding through central MoEYS departments appears to limit decision-making and flexibility at decentralized levels;
- More attention to monitoring the changes resulting from training and use of new systems.

Progress reports described activities designed to achieve the intended outcomes but did not show the extent to which the outcome targets were achieved.

---

\(^{37}\) Rating scale for extent to which CDPF I met each evaluation criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Less that satisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6       Fully met the criterion</td>
<td>3 Less than adequately met the criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5       Almost fully met the criterion</td>
<td>2 Only met the criterion to a small extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4       Adequately met the criterion</td>
<td>1 Did not meet the criterion at all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFFICIENCY (4/6)

The funding and resources are in many cases being used efficiently, but there are areas where resources could be used with greater attention to value for money.

There is no evidence of waste, or budgetary or financial mismanagement of the funds within the progress reports. However, the short six-month funding window each year is a source of inefficiency. Procurement is carried out with concern for cost-effectiveness, but does not appear to be taking account of long-term running and maintenance costs. There does not appear to have been a value-for-money assessment of budget lines.

Concerns were raised by a number of respondents over the high cost of technical assistance, international training and study visits, and there was a negative response from questionnaires to these areas of support. However, they appear to have been highly effective and were probably cost-effective as one-off capital investments for key outcomes with high long-term impact. The impact of technical assistants and VSOs38 might be greater if key stakeholders take part in a demand-led preparatory approach to planning and ensure they are used with maximum efficiency.

The evaluation responses suggest that training in planning and reporting reflected good value for money; this was not the case for training on gender and support for disadvantaged groups. It may be that setting gender targets is a better way of handling gender issues, while the CARE approach is a better way of handling concern for disadvantaged groups.

It is likely that a more systematic approach to training, with a standard team of trainers and training that is linked to performance appraisal and career development, would be more cost effective than annually planned workshops and short-term training.

The cost effectiveness of different approaches could be compared by monitoring their outcomes.

IMPACT (5/6)

There has been a significant overarching impact from the CDPF.

There have already been perceived improvements in educational outcomes, and although these do not seem to agree with national EMIS data, they may still be real improvements. There has also been an improvement in aid effectiveness.

CARE support to SSCs and DTMTs in Ratanakiri is a good example of initiatives providing early impact. The impact would have been greater elsewhere with more strategic support to school-based management, especially through SSCs and DTMTs.

There is no evidence of significant unintended impact of the project.

SUSTAINABILITY (2/6)

While CDPF interventions have been integrated into the education system, there is no major government capacity development funding to sustain the CDPF impact.

Currently in Cambodia, capacity development is seen as primarily capital funding provided by DPs, with no parallel support from government to the CDPF, or arrangements to replace the current DP funding with government funding at the conclusion of CDPF funding.

CDPF evaluation is aligned with and can contribute to national and sub-national monitoring and review systems.

38 VSO volunteers are not among the highest unit cost items.
5.2 LESSONS LEARNED: CDPF STRENGTHS

The joint funding of capacity development by a group of DPs through a flexible, government-led process has been shown to be an aid-effective model. It could be used to advantage in other circumstances where there is no general pooled funding of the Government’s overall education programme within a Sector Wide Approaches (SWAps).

A strategic approach to capacity development in systems, especially planning systems through a department of planning rather than just providing ad hoc human capacity development through a department of personnel, and backed by a government capacity development Masterplan based on the sector strategic plan, has also proved an effective and replicable design.

Support to school governance through an NGO (CARE) has been a particularly effective component of the CDPF with applicability elsewhere.

5.3 LESSONS LEARNED: CDPF WEAKNESSES

Failure to start with matched government funding when starting a donor-supported programme is difficult to correct later, yet it is necessary to ensure sustainability.

Late release of annual funds, coupled with requirements for activities to finish early each year to allow for account finalization by the end of the year, creates constraints.

The CDPF is complex and the lack of a ToC in such circumstances makes it difficult to maintain an effective overview. This is especially apparent when, as in the present case, it is compounded by changes in the basis for monitoring. The passage from the original CD plan to the Masterplan, and then to the M&E framework, which is not fully aligned with the Masterplan (see Section 4.1.1), meant there was no consistent basis for monitoring the CDPF at a high level. This became more of a problem because of weaknesses in some of the M&E targets and a lack of reporting on whether or not they were achieved. Where conditions allow, it would be better to start with a ToC and associated Results Framework, which would be amended only as necessary. A longer-term strategic overview would also enable more emphasis on strategic multi-year training programmes linked to staff development and performance appraisal processes rather than, as in the CDPF, a tendency to rely too heavily on annually-arranged, short-term training.

5.4 APPLYING LESSONS LEARNED TO CDPF PHASE II

The relevance and general effectiveness and efficiency of present arrangements suggest that the continuation of most aspects of CDPF into Phase II was appropriate.

One much-needed key element for sustainability is a Government Education Capacity Development budget. This needs to be put in place alongside CDPF, leading to full government funding when CDPF ends.

The issues in 5.1, which limited the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of Phase I, can and should be addressed in Phase II. In particular, the lack of a ToC (or logical framework) for Phase I was a weakness that should now be corrected, along with a consistent framework for annual impact-level monitoring.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CAMBODIA

1. Provide matched government capacity development funding alongside DP support to CDPF II for the 2016 financial year, leading to full government funding after the CDPF ends.

2. In the 2016 financial year provide a recurrent budget to PoEs and DoEs to cover maintenance and running costs of equipment supplied through CDPF.

6.2 RECOMMENDATION TO EU, SIDA AND UNICEF

1. Investigate in time for application in the 2016 financial year the possibility of extending the annual funding window for Direct Cost Transfers, with earlier release of funds and an extended deadline for spending.

6.3 RECOMMENDATIONS TO UNICEF AS CDPF ADMINISTRATOR

1. Take into account the value for money of all future equipment procured through CDPF in terms of their lifetime and cost of maintenance, and include reference to this in annual progress reports.

2. Include in all future progress reports clear statements on whether or not M&E targets have been achieved, and where they have not been achieved, list reasons and action taken.

6.4 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CDPF STEERING COMMITTEE AND MoEYS

1. Develop, and use in planning for the 2016 financial year, the proposed CDPF ToC to maintain high-level oversight, a strategic approach to planning and systems development, and to facilitate annual monitoring of CDPF at school, DoE, PoE and central level.

2. In the follow-up to future activities at central and decentralized levels, incorporate monitoring and reporting of outcomes in terms of changes resulting from training and use of new systems.

3. Develop for the 2016 financial year, and encourage MoEYS departments, PoEs and DoEs to adopt in their annual planning, a holistic, strategic approach to school-based management, with more support to and through DTMTs, school directors and SSC training, building on lessons from the CARE programme in Ratanakiri.

4. Encourage in future annual plans from 2016 a strategic approach to human resource development and management:
   a. Increase the emphasis on longer-term professional development of education managers including school directors, linked to performance appraisal and career progression;
   b. Increase the emphasis on skills development as opposed to just knowledge development through more active, participative training, especially through workshops and short-term training; and
   c. Establish multi-year training programmes serving ongoing needs, with standing teams of trained trainers.

5. Develop procedure to facilitate the potential for CDPF Direct Cost Transfer Funds to support action research at decentralized levels from financial year 2016.

6. Examine, and put in place for 2016, means of strengthening the involvement of PoEs and DoEs in planning, monitoring and decision-making for CDPF resources, including planning for centrally contracted resources such as VSOs, to ensure they are used with maximum
efficiency. This could include co-opting a representative of PoEs and DoEs onto the steering committee and allocating funds to be used at the discretion of PoE directors.

7. Investigate the apparent mismatch between, on the one hand, perceptions of improved school performance apparent in the focus groups, and on the other hand, interviews and findings from EMIS that suggest little improvement. If appropriate, incorporate this in the 2016 progress report.

8. Investigate whether SSCs are generally male-dominated and if so, issue guidelines to address this. Incorporate this in training for school directors in 2016.
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