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Executive summary

This evaluation assesses UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner in the coordination of the education sector in Sierra Leone. The longstanding presence and convening role played by UNICEF in the sector led to the appointment of the Agency as Lead Partner in 2005. The main purpose of the evaluation is to take stock of UNICEF’s performance as Lead Partner since the launch of the Education Sector Plan in 2007. While the evaluation includes a summative element to assess the performance of the Lead Partner, the evaluation is primarily formative in nature. This means that the central rationale is to learn from past experiences and provide guidance for how UNICEF can best fulfill its role as Lead Partner in the years to come.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference (TOR), the evaluation examined four main areas, including the relevance, effectiveness, risks and benefits of UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner. A mixed set of methods was used to generate and analyse data on the role of the Lead Partner. The main source of data was a series of interviews with 22 key stakeholders in the education sector in Sierra Leone including representatives from the Ministry of Education, bilateral donors, multilateral agencies and international NGOs. This was supported and complemented by a review of relevant documentation and observations at the 2012 Annual Education Sector Review. The evaluation was commissioned by UNICEF Sierra Leone and spanned a period of six weeks work for one person.

Overall conclusions

The overarching conclusion of the evaluation is that the Lead Partner is largely fit for purpose and has, bearing the major contextual constraints in mind, successfully fostered stronger coordination of the education sector over the past five years. Key achievements include UNICEF’s crucial role in establishing, chairing and managing the Education Development Partner (EDP) Group, as well as the Lead Partner’s constant insistence on government involvement and control of the sector. There is strong endorsement from stakeholders of the Lead Partner’s focus on capacity development of the Ministry of Education and great appreciation for UNICEF’s investments in producing more quantitative data on children and education in Sierra Leone.

The case for UNICEF to be the Lead Partner in the education sector has been, and continues to be, very strong. Above all, UNICEF has a number of comparative advantages, including longstanding presence in the country, strong technical expertise and close relationship with the Ministry of Education. The Agency’s unique position in the sector is further reinforced by the limited presence of education specialists among other multilateral and bilateral donor agencies. Identified benefits for UNICEF of being Lead Partner include visibility, easy access to information and staff and easiness for the Agency to make important statements.

At the same time, to achieve the full potential of the Lead Partner, the evaluation identifies some areas for improvement. While the objectives of the EDP Group are comprehensive and have been specified in the TORs for the Group, the formal roles of the Lead Partner are far less comprehensive. The evaluation finds that this lack of clarity in the formal roles and responsibilities of the Lead Partner adds to the informal character of some parts of the coordination of the education sector. Further, one group of partners express an interest in a more ambitious agenda for the coordination of the sector and hence sees room for improvement in the work of the Lead Partner. Areas identified by partners include better
integration of the work of all stakeholders in the regular planning and monitoring of the Education Sector Plan and more active fostering of education policy discussions.

**Key recommendations**

The findings in this evaluation results in the following key recommendations for the role of the Lead Partner:

1. To suggest a revision of the TORs for the EDP Group in which the roles and responsibilities of the Lead Partner are better defined in relation to the overall objectives of the EDP Group.

2. To give high priority to support the strengthening of the planning and monitoring mechanisms for the implementation of the Education Sector Plan, as this is the basis for better coordination of the work of all major actors in the sector.

3. A stronger role for the Lead Partner in assisting the Ministry of Education in monitoring disbursements of all external funds supporting the implementation of the Education Sector Plan.

4. To consolidate and expand the Lead Partner’s collaboration with INGOs for better coordination of education sector work at the district level.

5. The Ministry of Education and the Lead Partner should together make sure that every district has at least one strong partner to work with.

6. To foster stronger policy discussions within the EDP Group and to move away from discussing detailed grant implementation issues at the EDP Group meetings.

7. To take the lead in harmonising levels of fees and per diems used by partners for participation in national workshops and training activities.

8. Continue to focus on capacity development of the Ministry of Education as an important measure to reduce risks linked to the governance, management and financing of the education system.

9. Continue to invest in data on education and children as an important measure to address risks linked to poverty and inequalities.

10. Conduct a thorough risk assessment of the likely upcoming funding from the Global Partnership for Education, including measures to manage implementation risks with clearly defined responsibilities for the parties involved.
Chapter 1: Introduction

‘Coordination is about making sure that each individual partner does not only see to its own needs. I know we all have different funding sources and that there is more and more pressure to deliver results. But I think we can all do better individually if we work together’.

(Interviewed stakeholder)

This evaluation assesses UNICEF's role as Lead Partner in the coordination of the education sector in Sierra Leone. UNICEF has been active in the country for over twenty years, including the decade of civil war between 1991 and 2002. The long standing presence and key convening role played by UNICEF led to the appointment of the Agency as the Lead Partner in the education sector in 2005. Since then, the Sierra Leonean government and its development partners have taken several important steps towards more coherent planning and monitoring of the country's education sector.

1.1 Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is for UNICEF to have a greater knowledge and understanding of its performance as Lead Partner in the education sector. UNICEF sees a need to take stock of its strengths and weakness as Lead Partner and hence, a central rationale for the evaluation is to learn from past experiences and provide guidance for how the Agency can best fulfill its role in the years to come.

In accordance with the Terms of Reference (TOR), the main objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Determine the purpose, rationale, and retrospective and prospective relevance of UNICEF role as lead partner in the sector
- Determine to what extent the role has been effective and beneficial for UNICEF and its mandate taking into account the resources (human and capital/financial) necessary to fulfill this role
- Identify past and potential constraints and the risks involved in the role and advise on its sustainability as well as its impact on UNICEF reputation and work in the sector.
- Provide UNICEF with a set of recommendations on the nature of this role and on how the role can be better fulfilled in the future

The full background to, and description of, the evaluation are given in the TORs in Annex 1.

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation covers, in accordance with the TOR, the period from the year 2007 to the present (2012).

It is important to bear in mind that this is an evaluation of UNICEF's role as Lead Partner, and not of the coordination of the education sector in Sierra Leone as a whole. The role of the Lead is of course intimately linked to the nature and quality of the partnership between the key actors in the sector. While the evaluation pays some attention to assessing the
coordination of the education sector, it should constantly be kept in mind that the main focus of the evaluation is on UNICEF's role as such.

While the evaluation includes a strong summative element to assess the performance of UNICEF as Lead Partner, it should be stressed that the evaluation is primarily formative in nature. This implies that the aim of the evaluation is to contribute to the development and further refinement of UNICEF's role as Lead Partner and not to pronounce any definite or irreversible verdict on that role.

1.3 Audience and expected use of the evaluation findings

The evaluation is aimed for members of the Education Development Partners Group in Sierra Leone in general, and UNICEF in particular. The purpose of the formative nature of the evaluation is expected to assist UNICEF, in close collaboration with other partners, in defining the broad priorities of its work as Lead Partner in the coming years.

Sierra Leone presents an interesting example of coordination of education sector interventions in a highly fragmented and weak capacity environment. The findings are therefore also likely to interest education development partners working with coordination in other similar country settings.

1.4 Structure of the report

This report is divided into five main chapters, prefaced with an executive summary including a synopsis of the purpose, objectives, main findings and recommendations for the way forward. Chapter 2 presents the methodology and the evaluation framework used to achieve the agreed evaluation objectives. The chapter also stresses the major limitations of the evaluation. The main findings of the evaluation are set out in chapter 3, focusing on the relevance, effectiveness, risks and benefits of UNICEF's roles as Lead Partner. Chapter 5 concludes and a core set of recommendations are provided in order to offer UNICEF stimulus to reflection on possible ways of taking its role forward.
Chapter 2: Evaluation approach and methodology

This chapter presents the methodological approach for the evaluation. The evaluation started by a short inception phase in April 2012, followed by data collection, data analysis and report writing in June and July 2012. In total, the evaluation spanned a period of six weeks work for one person.

2.1 Evaluation framework

To respond to the overall objectives of the evaluation, an evaluation framework was developed in consultation with the UNICEF Sierra Leone office during the inception phase. The framework includes four key questions and ‘lines of inquiry’, focusing on the relevance, effectiveness, risks and benefits of UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner in the education sector (Annex 2). The use of the Framework throughout the data collection, data analysis and drafting stages proved valuable for a coherent steering of the work.

2.2 Data collection methods

The evaluation used a mixed set of methods, including:

- **Review of relevant documentation**: One important part of the evaluation included a review and analysis of documentary evidence. In particular, this part of the evaluation helped in assessing the relevance of UNICEF as Lead Partner, as well as gaining a better understanding of the content of the Education Development Partner Group meetings. The list of reviewed documents is found in Annex 3.

- **Interviews with key stakeholders in the education sector**: The Education Development Partner (EDP) Group has a total of 21 member organizations, including representatives from the Ministry of Education, bilateral donors (5), multilateral agencies (7) and international NGOs (8). Together, these are the key education stakeholders at the national level in Sierra Leone. During the inception phase, it was decided that as many of the EDP Group members as possible would be interviewed and a total of 23 informants were identified. The consultant was able to interview the majority of EDP Group member organisations, and Annex 4 includes a list of the interviewees. A semi-structured interview guide was used for the interviews (Annex 5) and in total, eighteen face-to-face interviews and two phone interviews were conducted. The average interview lasted for 1 hour, but with two interviews lasting for only 40 minutes and one for nearly 2 hours. One organisation (World Vision International) provided written responses to the questions in the interview guide, instead of an interview. Two members of the EDP Group, EC and UNDP, replied that they have not been active in the education sector in recent years and could therefore not assess the performance of UNICEF as Lead Partner.

- **Observation of meetings**: The consultant attended one stakeholder forum meeting and the Annual Education Sector Review in June 2012. The observations made at both of these meetings provided valuable insights and inputs to the evaluation, not least for gaining a better understanding of some of the political dynamics in the sector.
2.3 Key limitations

Overall, the evaluation has been able to follow the broad methodological approach that was set out with the UNICEF Sierra Leone office during the inception phase. However, there are some important limitations to the evaluation that need to be taken into account. These include:

- **National level only**: Due to the limited time available for the evaluation, the focus is on perceptions and opinions among education stakeholders active at the national level in Sierra Leone. Considering the ongoing efforts to strengthen the planning, monitoring and coordination of education sector activities at the district level, the national focus is an important limitation of this work.

- **Education sector stakeholders only**: Similarly, the evaluation was not able to engage with representatives from other sectors or ministries. In particular, if more time had been available, it would have been useful to conduct interviews with representatives from the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development. It would also have been useful to compare the situation in the education sector with that of the health sector, where UNICEF is also Lead Partner.

- **Joint UN Programming**: The evaluation was not able to review or consider the possible implications of the One UN and UNDAF processes (called United Nations Transitional Joint Vision in Sierra Leone) on UNICEFs role as Lead Partner.

- **Limited assessment of internal risks**: The evaluation was not able to fully assess the internal risks for UNICEF of its role as Lead Partner. Although this aspect was included as a question in the evaluation framework, a deeper assessment of UNICEF organisation and internal planning and monitoring structure was beyond the scope of this evaluation. However, to fully assess internal risks, such an assessment would have been needed.

- **Challenging to evaluate coordination**: A slightly different, but yet important limitation of the evaluation has to do with the difficulties in evaluating such a loosely defined concept as coordination of development partners. As mentioned earlier, a constant challenge of the evaluation has been to focus on and distinguish the role of the Lead Partner within the coordination of the education sector as a whole.
Chapter 3: The Lead Partner in context

This chapter highlights some of the main factors which have influenced UNICEF’s work as Lead Partner since the endorsement of Sierra Leone’s Education Sector Plan in 2007. The chapter does not intend to provide an exhaustive picture, but rather flash out some of the main factors that have supported, as well as put limits to UNICEFs role.

Above all, UNICEFs role has been, and continues to be shaped by the development environment in the country. While the perceptions and opinions tend to differ on whether Sierra Leone is still in a post-conflict reconstruction phase, the legacies and effects of the civil war are still very present. Chronic poverty is widespread, with deep rooted inequalities across geographical areas and by gender. In 2011, Sierra Leone was ranked 180 out of 187 included countries in the UN’s Human Development Index (HDI) and had a gross national income (GNI) per capita well below the average of low income countries, at only US$340 in 2010 (UNDP 2011; World Bank 2012).

UNICEFs role is also shaped by the overall aid architecture in the country. Sierra Leone is highly dependent on external aid, with net Official Development Assistance (ODA) estimated at 24.9% of the country’s GNI in 2010 (OECD 2012). Despite some important progress in improving the effectiveness of aid since 2007, major challenges remain. Between 2007 and 2011, a recent report from OECD on aid effectiveness points to improvements in only five out of fifteen indicators of aid effectiveness over the period in Sierra Leone. Examples of improvements include use of national public financial management systems and aid predictability (OECD 2011). Yet, the delivery of aid to Sierra Leone is still highly fragmented and government ownership, alignment and harmonisation are difficult to achieve due to a large number of uncoordinated interventions by external partners.

3.1 Education sector development

To grasp the nature of education sector coordination in Sierra Leone and UNICEFs role in it, an understanding of the sector and how it has evolved in recent years is essential. Since the end of the civil war in 2002, Sierra Leone has come a long way in rebuilding its education system. Most notably, the country has seen a remarkable increase in the number of children enrolled in primary education. One estimate points to a doubling in enrolment between 2001/02 and 2004/05, with a more rapid increase for girls than for boys (World Bank 2007). With a larger cohort of children in primary education, there is also an immense - and rapidly growing - demand for secondary education. The country’s first national school census, launched in 2012, reports that the Gross Enrolment Ratio at the junior secondary level increased from 44% in 2004/05 to 62% in 2010/11 (MEST 2012b). The census also reports a 38% increase in the number of primary schools and, from a very low level, a 291% increase in the number of secondary schools between 2004/05 and 2010/11 (MEST 2012b). Table 1 provides an overview of the targets set for the sector in the 2007 Education Sector Plan, as well as progress against those targets as of 2010/11. It should be noted that there are inconsistencies in some of the data reported in the table and the school census report.
Table 1: Key performance indicators, 2007 Education Sector Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Base year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio (GER)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils Gvt assisted</td>
<td>7,9%</td>
<td>7,9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross intake rate grade 1 (GIR)</td>
<td>159%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxy completion rate grade 6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of repeaters</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio (GER)</td>
<td>121%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils in private schools</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teacher ratio (public)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher remuneration as multiple of GDP per capita</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>4,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending on inputs other than teachers as % of total recurrent spending</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate (primary --&gt; JSS)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival rate</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of repeaters</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
<td>8,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio (GER)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils in private schools</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils per class (public)</td>
<td>48,5</td>
<td>46,6</td>
<td>46,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teacher ratio (public)</td>
<td>28,9</td>
<td>32,1</td>
<td>32,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending on inputs other than teachers as % of total recurrent spending</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate (JSS --&gt; SSS)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of repeaters</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
<td>7,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment ratio (GER)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of pupils in private schools</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils per class (public)</td>
<td>42,3%</td>
<td>41,1</td>
<td>40,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil teacher ratio (public)</td>
<td>27,1</td>
<td>28,7</td>
<td>28,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending on inputs other than teachers as % of total recurrent spending</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from (MEST 2012a)

Despite the major achievements, the challenges for the future development of the sector are immense. The latest MICS4 reveals that an estimated 26% of all children of primary school age are still not attending school, with important disparities across districts and socio-economic groups. The survey also notes a worrying slowdown in getting children into primary education. It reports that the adjusted primary school net attendance ratio (NAR) increased from 69% in 2005 to ‘just’ 74% in 2010 (Statistics Sierra Leone and UNICEF-Sierra Leone 2011). Gender disparities remain high at post-primary levels and the system faces serious shortages of trained teachers, school infrastructure and learning materials. While the Sierra
Leonean government devotes a relatively high share of its resources to education, the sector is in desperate need for more financial resources to achieve the goals set in the 2007 Education Sector Plan.

From a systemic point of view, some of the most important building blocks for the education achievements so far have been:

- **Government commitment to education, backed up by strong community engagement:**
  Over the past decade, the government of Sierra Leone has given relatively high priority to the education sector in the allocation of public resources. From 2008 to 2012, the share of recurrent expenditure allocated to education averaged 20%, representing the largest share devoted to any sector (MEST, 2012). In addition, significant economic growth has led to increased education expenditures in real terms over the past five years.

  At the same time, parents and local community’s active participation and financial contributions to education are substantial. The country has experienced a rapid expansion in the number of primary and secondary schools, with a considerable share of schools started without any assistance from the government. The 2010/11 school census shows that overall, just over one-third of the country’s 7,671 schools have not been approved to operate by the Ministry of Education (MEST, 2012).

- **Strengthened legal and policy frameworks:** The government’s determination to invest in education is also evident in the growing body of legal and policy documents for framing the work in the sector. The Education Act 2004, which stipulates that all children should complete basic education, marked the beginning of a more solid basis for the development of the education system. The endorsement of the country’s first Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper in 2005, and the following Agenda for Change in 2008 have been important statements of the country’s high priority to human development. Further, the Education Sector Plan process in 2006 and the following endorsement of the Plan in 2007 formed a momentum for a more comprehensive approach to education sector planning in Sierra Leone.

  The 2007 Education Sector Plan is currently under revision. The government and its development partners are well aware of the need to only have one plan that guides the work in the sector and following the issuing of a White Paper and a new National Education Policy in 2010, it was decided to align the Plan with those key official documents. The government intends to use the revised Education Sector Plan to apply for a second round of funding from the Global Partnership for Education during the first half of 2013.

- **More data and research available:** With the gradual move towards more coherent planning of the education sector, the need for better data has become evident. While Sierra Leone still struggles with poor education and population data and have yet to establish a functioning Education Management Information System (EMIS), some

---

1 The identified issues are largely taken from the Country Status Report published by the World Bank in 2007, the Education Sector Plan 2007-2015, the Aide Memoires from the 2010 and 2011 Education Sector Reviews and the presentations at the 2012 Education Sector Review.

2 Including 6 years of primary and 3 years of junior secondary education
major investments have been made in collecting survey and census data, as well as conducting research on urgent topics.

- **Decentralisation of public service delivery:** The 2004 Local Government Act set a major decentralisation reform in process. Important transfers of power and responsibilities for the delivery of basic social services, including basic education, have been made to local governments. The Local Councils are responsible for such day to day activities as recruitment and payment of teachers, provision of textbooks and rehabilitation and construction of schools, while the role of the Ministry of Education should be to focus on education planning, monitoring, standard setting and policy development.

In all of the above mentioned areas, major stumbling blocks still remain. Above all, the most critical bottleneck is the weak ability of the system to deliver. Throughout the whole system, the capacity of staff and units to manage human, financial and physical resources in an effective and efficient way is very limited. These weaknesses are widely recognized and taking appropriate actions to strengthen the capacity of the system and its staff to deliver is by many seen as the most essential trigger for further education progress.

### 3.2 Education sector coordination in Sierra Leone

The development of Sierra Leone's first Education Sector Plan (ESP), endorsed in March 2007, created an important momentum for closer coordination of the education sector. In particular, the ESP represented a shift towards a more comprehensive approach of education sector planning and the drafting and endorsement of the Plan brought together the government and education development partners in a new way. The Ministry of Education led the ESP process, with strong financial and human support from the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI), UNICEF and the World Bank. Because of its critical role in supporting the Ministry on a day to day basis, UNICEF was appointed Lead Partner already in June 2005 (Schmidt 2009).

Since its inception, the ESP has been intimately linked to the EFA-FTI, recently renamed the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). The rapid drafting of the ESP and the following endorsement and appraisal by sixteen Development Partners in 2007 was to a large extent driven by expectations to receive funds from the EFA-FTI’s Catalytic Fund (Schmidt 2009). However, Sierra Leone’s process to receive and implement funds from the FTI Catalytic Fund has been cumbersome. It took more than fifteen months to finalize the grant agreement of US$13.9 million (from June 2007 to September 2008) and another nine months for the country to receive the first tranche of funding (US$3 million) from the EFA FTI-Catalytic Fund. Due to a range of different reasons, including a too heavy focus on inputs in the project design and underestimated capacity constraints, the project only gained momentum in December 2010 (World Bank 2011).

Besides the Education Sector Plan, the governments of Sierra Leone and development partners have taken a number of steps to build a sound foundation for improved coordination of the education sector. In particular:

- The **Education Development Partners Group** meets on a regular basis since 2005. The meetings are convened by UNICEF and co-chaired by the Ministry of Education.
All Education Development Partners who appraised and approved the Education Sector Plan are members. The objectives, roles and responsibilities are specified in the Terms of Reference for the Group, with the most recent version dated June 2011 (Appendix 6). The Group has paid significant attention to the challenges with Sierra Leone’s participation in the EFA Fast Track Initiative/GPE.

- **Annual Education Sector Reviews** are held since 2008 and brings together all education stakeholders to assess sector performance. The reviews have had slightly different format each year, but are characterized by attendance by a wide range of stakeholders. There is strong commitment to these reviews from the Ministry of Education.

- In 2008, a set of **Partnership Principles** for Support to the Education Sector in Sierra Leone was endorsed by the government and its development partners.

- The **Stakeholders Forum** brings together national and international NGOs to share information on activities and learn from each other. It is chaired by the Ministry’s **Partnership Coordinator**, who is also the Ministry’s Deputy Secretary. Although the Stakeholders Forum is reported to have functioned relatively well in 2009 and 2010, the forum has met less regularly over the past year.

- Technical **working groups** (on basic education, policy and management, monitoring, financing, TVET, higher education and capacity development) have met on an ad hoc basis to work on key issues linked to the implementation of the Education Sector Plan. The working groups are chaired by Ministry officials and supported by a development partner with helpful expertise in the area covered by the working group.

- An **Education Sector Plan Coordinator** is responsible for the day-to-day work on technical issues related to the implementation of the ESP. Much of the ESP Coordinator’s time has been devoted to the use of funds in the Education Sector Support Fund (ESSF). The ESSF is a special pooled account, mainly including resources from the EFA FTI Catalytic Fund and Swedish Sida. Although contributions to the ESSF are pooled, the Ministry of Education earmarks donor contributions to specific activities in an annual work plan for the ESSF.

Sierra Leone’s education sector is supported by a wide range of actors, including bilateral donors, multilateral agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Data on aid disbursement to the sector are scarce and not yet comprehensive, with the best available estimates recorded in Sierra Leone’s Development Assistance Database (DAD) (Synergy International Systems Inc 2012).

---

3 This group includes Ministry of Education, Action Aid, AfDB, CONCERN, CRS, DFID, EC, GIZ, IRC, Irish Aid, JICA, Plan Sierra Leone, Save the Children UK, World Vision, UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, WFP, World Bank. Sida (Swedish International Development Agency) - represented in-country by DFID - and IBIS (a Danish NGO operating in Sierra Leone) have also joined the group more recently.
Table 2 provides an overview of direct bilateral and multilateral aid contributions to the education sector as recorded in DAD\(^4\). It shows that although a relatively large number of donors have supported the sector over the past five years, less than a handful have been able to provide more substantial amounts. According to the DAD data, only AfDB, EC, IDA/World Bank and UNICEF disbursed each a total of more than US$17 million in aid to the education sector in Sierra Leone over the period 2007-2011. While it is recognised that all aid to the sector is not recorded in this database, the year to year fluctuations appear very substantial. While the trend needs to be confirmed, these data also point to a worrying decline in direct aid contributions to the sector in recent years.

Table 2: Direct aid disbursements to the education sector in Sierra Leone, 2007-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct aid disbursements to the education sector, current US$ thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1 676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1 798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>1 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>16 819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDA</td>
<td>3 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>3 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29 530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

\(^4\) In addition, three of these donors (AfDB, DFID and the EC) provide general budget support to the government of Sierra Leone.
Chapter 4: Evaluation findings

This chapter presents evaluation findings against each of the four key questions and lines of enquiry included in the Evaluation Framework. It is based on information gathered through interviews, as well as a review of relevant documentation. Each line of enquiry includes a brief framing of the issues involved and a presentation of the main findings.

4.1 Assessment of relevance

Key finding: There has been, and continues to be, a strong rationale for UNICEF to be the Lead Partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone. The Agency’s long standing presence in the country, its strong technical expertise and close relationship with the Ministry of Education gives UNICEF a strategic and unique position in the sector. This position is reinforced by the limited presence of education specialists among other multilateral and bilateral donor agencies. The identified roles and responsibilities of the Lead Partner are appropriate in relation to existing coordination needs, although most of these roles have not been formalised. UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner fits well with the objectives of the Agency’s Medium Term Strategic Plan and Education Strategy to foster partnerships and work more on upstream engagement in macro level policy issues.

This section focuses on the relevance of UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone. Three essential aspects of assessing this relevance are:

- how appropriate UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner is against existing coordination needs in the education sector
- the comparative advantage of UNICEF as Lead Partner
- how well UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner fits with the strategic direction of the Agency as a whole

Existing coordination needs in the education sector

The relevance of UNICEF’s role as lead partner calls for an assessment of this role against the existing coordination needs in the education sector. As highlighted earlier in the report, Sierra Leone has together with partners developed different mechanisms for coordinating the interventions of partners in the sector, with the three most important coordination fora being the Annual Education Sector Review, the Education Development Partner Group meetings and the Stakeholders forum.

In reviewing the literature, two key documents that specify the objectives of education sector coordination are the ‘Partnership Principles for Support to the Education Sector in Sierra Leone’ (2008) and the ‘Terms of Reference for the Education Development Partners Group’ (2011). The Partnership Principles specifies that ‘the Development Partner Group has been established to:

- support Government ownership and leadership for the ESP and encourage strong Government-led donor coordination in line with the Paris Declaration, OECD/DAC principles;
ii. promote coordinated policy dialogue and technical support on strategic issues in education with the Government, the private sector, and civil society; and

iii. ensure that the support of Development Partners to education is increasingly provided to the Government in a predictable, harmonized and coordinated manner.’ (EDP Group 2008).

In addition, the more recent Terms of Reference for the EDP Group details the following objectives for the group:

1. To ensure harmonization and coordination of aid in the education sector
2. To ensure harmonization of Technical Assistance from development partners
3. To discuss key milestones, timeframes, and processes for plans and implementation of education
4. To update all stakeholders on progress in the education sector- with particular focus on the Education Sector Plan approved existing work plans
5. To ensure sharing of information on education sector policies
6. To discuss and clarify specific areas of policy concerns and priorities and support their effective implementation
7. To inform the Ministry of Education regarding Development Partners expectations and standards as a basis for resource mobilization

A few interesting aspects are worth noting on these two sets of objectives. First, the phrasing of the objectives in the Partnership Principles is largely seen from the perspective of development partners. This is most evident in the first objective, which states that the objective of the Development Partners Group is to support government ownership and leadership. By contrast, the objectives of the EDP Group as stated in the recent Terms of Reference are expressed from the viewpoint of all its members, including the government, donors and INGOs. Second, it is unclear whether the scope of the recent Terms of Reference is only for the EDP Group meetings, or if it also covers what the members of the EDP Group should be doing in between the meetings. While the above mentioned objectives of the EDP Group seem to imply a scope that is not limited to the meetings only, the following sections in the TORs on the responsibilities of the Ministry of Education, the Lead Partner and other Development Partners are to a large extent restricted to their respective roles in relation to the EDP meetings.

Turning to UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner in relation to the stated objectives of education sector coordination, surprisingly little is specified about this role in the reviewed documentation. The only formal specification that has been identified is what is stated in the recently adopted terms of reference for the EDP Group. It stipulates that:

‘The main responsibilities of the Lead Education Development Partner are:

i. To co-chair

ii. To provide the secretariat for the Group meetings, including:
a. convening the meetings and organising the venue and other relevant necessities
b. recording and disseminating minutes within two weeks from the meeting
c. updating membership contact details
d. ensuring distribution of all necessary documents to the Group

iii. To support the Ministry where required with follow up of action points agreed by the Group at the meeting’ (EDP Group 2011).

Clearly, these responsibilities are relevant in relation to the stated objectives of the EDP Group. As co-chair, the Lead Partner is put in a unique position among partners to steer the Group to fulfill its objectives. The Lead Partner is also given the full responsibility for managing the Group by acting as the secretariat for the meetings. And finally, but perhaps most importantly, the Lead Partner is given a strong role in supporting the Ministry to take action based on the decisions made by the EDP Group.

While these tasks are all appropriate for accomplishing the goals of the EDP Group, it can at the same time be questioned whether the current specifications of the responsibilities of the Lead Partner are sufficient. In particular, the way in which the responsibilities are specified signals a rather minimalistic role for the Lead Partner. On paper, it appears as if the role of the Lead Partner is restricted only to the EDP Group meetings and to supporting the outputs of those meetings.

This minimalistic role on paper becomes even more evident when comparing it with the responsibilities of the Lead Partner as specified in the Charter for the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). Whilst the Charter for the GPE is not prescriptive and recognises that the composition and arrangements for sector coordination vary across countries to reflect different country needs, the Charter still provides a valuable source of guidance for the roles of the Lead Partner (called Coordinating Agency, or CA, in the GPE documents). The following roles and responsibilities are specified in the Charter (EFA-FTI 2011):

- The CA serves as the communications link between the Government of the developing country partner, the LEG (including the Supervising Entity and/or the Implementer) and the Secretariat.
- The CA fosters and further develops the relationship between the LDG, the developing country partner and CSOs and other non-governmental organizations.
- The CA leads, or otherwise facilitates the LDG and CSOs in their roles of supporting and monitoring the development, endorsement, and implementation of the education plan.
- The CA plays a facilitating role with respect to the timely and efficient disbursement of all funds supporting implementation of the education plan. The CA reports on progress of education plan implementation, including on funding commitments and disbursements to the developing country partner, the Board of Directors and the Partnership through the Secretariat.
Compared to the TORs for the EDP Group, the Charter specifies a much wider scope of responsibilities for the Lead Partner. It stipulates the different responsibilities of the Lead Partner in relation to the other key bodies involved, including the Government, the Local Education Group (corresponding to the EDP Group in Sierra Leone), the Local Donor Group (LDG) and Civil Society Organizations (CSO).

However, interestingly, the minimalistic role for the Lead Partner as specified in the TORs for the EDP Group is not entirely consistent with the roles that the key stakeholders mention in the interviews. In the interviews, a much broader set of responsibilities for the Lead Partner come forward. The interviewed key stakeholders report that the Lead Partner currently has the following main responsibilities:

- Lead and support the EDP meetings, with supervision of agreed activities
- Support monitoring, such as the school census
- Responsible for sharing information
- Push the government to finalise things
- Piloting new initiatives and scaling up
- Initiate new research
- To bring evidence to the table
- Arranging of meetings and maintaining contacts
- Help the Ministry to strengthen its system
- Lead Partners in consciously together build the capacity of the Ministry
- Identify capacity gaps and negotiate solutions with the Ministry and Partners
- To provide the big picture of sector development
- Ensure that Partners do not replace the government
- To convey Partners
- Special role in assessing capacity and inform Partners about the Ministry’s constraints

Together with the formal roles specified in the TORs for the EDP Group, these responsibilities capture the roles and responsibilities that the interviewees think that the Lead Partner plays in the education sector in Sierra Leone. To a high extent, these roles and responsibilities are found to match the objectives that have been set for the coordination of partners in the sector. However, at the same time, a proper assessment of the relevance of the role of the Lead Partner is complicated by the fact that very little is formally specified about the responsibilities of the Lead Partner. The evaluation finds that there is a logical - yet to a large extent informal - link between the roles undertaken by the Lead Partner and the stated objectives for education sector coordination in Sierra Leone. The lack of clarity in the formal roles and responsibilities of the Lead Partner adds to the informal character of some parts of the coordination of the education sector.
UNICEFs comparative advantages

The case for UNICEF to be the Lead Partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone is very strong. In particular, there is great awareness and recognition among all key stakeholders of the Agency’s longstanding presence, technical expertise and good relationship with the Ministry of Education.

Not one single stakeholder questions the role of UNICEF as Lead Partner in the education sector. UNICEF is seen as the obvious Lead by ministry officials, donors and INGOs, with the most frequently cited reasons being its longstanding presence in the country and its technical expertise in the sector (see Box 1).

The comparative advantage of UNICEF is amplified by the fact that the group of bilateral and multilateral agencies with strong presence in the country is limited. When asked whether any other partner could take on the role, none of the interviewees could see that another partner could do this at the moment.

Box 1: UNICEFs comparative advantages as Lead Partner

One of the questions in the interview was: ‘Do you think there are comparative advantages for UNICEF to be the lead partner in the education sector? If so, what are they?’ A representative selection of the responses is given below.

‘UNICEF has many staff on the ground and they can advocate and convince, also internationally’

‘They have a large office here, with good outreach and technical expertise on the ground. Strong presence.’

‘UNICEF is interested in the education system as a whole. They are less focused on specific subsectors than other partners. This makes them better placed to lead.’

‘UNICEF has leverage, is closely linked to donors and can easily meet with everyone when they want’

‘Better organised, financially strong, have long experience and have the capacity to lead’

‘They have the capacity to coordinate NGOs, they work in the field and are results-driven. They have easy access to the appropriate people, a longstanding relationship’

‘They have the presence, the staff and the experience. And good relationship with the government’

‘UNICEF is best placed within the UN structure. UNESCO is the other, but for the kind of programmes we have here, UNICEF is the most appropriate. They have the expertise, the mobility and can move around the country. Also sound administration. They are the most well established organisation here. No one else can do it.’
Strategic direction of UNICEF as a whole

Since the mid 2000s, UNICEF promotes a shift from direct social service delivery to working more on upstream engagement in macro-level issues with relevance for children’s wellbeing. For the Agency to achieve progress in its upstream policy work, the organisation’s strategic documents stress the need to foster partnerships with key actors at international, regional, country and local levels.

The relatively recent direction for UNICEF of working ‘upstream’ is clearly manifested in the Agency’s Medium-Term Strategic Plan (MTSP), initially adopted for the period 2006-2009, and extended until the end of 2014. The MTSP has five focus areas, including (1) Young child survival and development; (2) Basic education and gender equality; (3) HIV/AIDS and children; (4) Child protection from violence, exploitation and abuse; and (5) Policy advocacy and partnerships for children’s rights. The high priority to macro-level policy issues is particularly evident in the way UNICEF specifies the aim of the MTSPs focus area 5:

‘UNICEF (...) will collaborate with partners to stimulate dialogue around macro level policies that guide national frameworks, legislative reform and budgetary allocations affecting children and women, and advocate for actions, build capacities and leverage resources such that national and global investments contribute to fulfilling the best interest of the child, including in emergency situations’ (UN 2005)p.29).

The MTSP specifies that UNICEF will have to reorganise its human resources and improve its work on partnerships. The focus area 5 highlights four key results areas for strengthened policy advocacy and partnerships:

1. Support for collecting data and information on the status of children and women
2. Support research and policy analysis on children and women
3. Utilize evidence and analysis for advocacy and policy dialogue with decision makers at all levels of society
4. Enable the views of children, adolescents and young people to be taken into account in the design and implementation of policies and programmes that affect their lives

The MTSP also states that by fostering partnerships, UNICEF will be able to address a number of policy issues that cut across several sectors. The examples of comprehensive national child and family policies, social protection and safety nets and early warning and emergency preparedness plans are given.

The other key document specifying the overall direction of UNICEF in the area of education is the Education Strategy, adopted in 2007. To a large extent, the Education Strategy reiterates the MTSP and its emphasis on partnerships and supporting countries to develop credible education sector plans and decide on sector priorities:

‘As an in-country partner that is active in education in most developing countries, UNICEF helps countries with the consultative and participatory process for developing plans for education and linking them to poverty reduction strategies or a national development plan. The agency is also committed to the principle of sector-wide budget support to countries (...)’
and will increase efforts to leverage funding for national plans and priorities, first emphasizing budgeting for children and then funding to support its own work’ (UN 2007).

The Education Strategy further specifies that UNICEF will give priority to programmes that adhere to the following broad principles:

- Work within existing national frameworks and reinforce existing mechanisms and tools
- Focusing on partnerships that are interlinked and seamless
- Intersectoral linkages in education programmes
- Value added and evidence-based contributions
- Responsive to urgent and critical needs
- Building knowledge through learning from doing

UNICEF’s strong engagement in the coordination of the education sector in Sierra Leone is found to be in accordance with the broad objectives of UNICEF’s Medium Term Strategic Framework and Education Strategy. In particular, the Agency’s position as Lead Partner is an excellent means through which UNICEF can fulfill the MTSPs objectives for policy advocacy and partnerships for children’s rights.
4.2 Assessment of effectiveness

**Key finding:** The Lead Partner is largely fit for purpose and has, bearing the major contextual constraints in mind, successfully fostered stronger coordination of the education sector over the past five years. One group of partners expresses an interest in a more ambitious agenda for the coordination of the sector and hence sees room for improvement in the work of the Lead Partner. This is particularly the case with regard to better integration of the work of all stakeholders in the regular planning and monitoring of the Education Sector Plan and with regard to joint structured policy discussions.

The Lead Partner is dependent on others for its success

The overall aim of the Education Development Partners Group is to reinforce Sierra Leone’s capacity to carry out its own education sector priorities (EDP Group 2011). For the Lead Partner, the success of its work is intimately linked to, and constrained by, three distinct factors. Before considering the effectiveness of the Lead Partner itself, it is worth underlining what those constraints are:

**The Lead Partner is dependent on other Partners involvement:** Without other Partners interest in, and active participation in the coordination of the sector, the Lead Partner stands alone, making its role impossible to achieve. With the heavy dominance of project aid in the Sierra Leonean context, it is sometimes too easy for Partners to only see to the interests of their own projects. Several respondents point to the large number of projects and fragmented funding streams as complicating factors for the coordination of the sector. A few respondents also mention that the current drive for measurable results to show to the public in donor countries makes participation in coordination activities more difficult to justify. At the same time, these same partners say that the strategic direction of their organisations are to participate more in coordination and thereby improve the effectiveness of aid. More broadly, partners overall policy direction and commitment to the principles of aid effectiveness appear to matter for their participation in coordination. One partner said that because his/her organisation is not very strong in this area, he/she has problems in justifying coordination work towards headquarters.

**The Lead Partner is contingent on the Government’s willingness and capacity to cooperate:** As the strengthening of the Ministry of Education’s ability to steer and manage the education sector development is the ultimate objective of coordination, this necessarily requires a close and good working relationship between the Lead Partner and the Ministry of Education. It is evident from the interviews that such a good relationship, based on mutual respect, exists since a number of years. As noted by one person at the Ministry of Education: ‘The work of UNICEFs representative in 2006 or 2007 started an upward trend in the strong relationship between the Ministry and UNICEF.’ However, at the same time, the capacity of the Ministry to steer and to manage the rapidly expanding education system remains weak, putting major constraints to what it is feasible for the Lead Partner to achieve.

**UNICEFs own financial and human resources put boundaries to what is achievable:** In terms of resource allocations, UNICEF Sierra Leone gives relatively high priority to its role as Lead Partner. The Agency estimates that 30% of the time of the Chief of Education and 70% of the time of one Education Specialist are devoted to the role as Lead Partner. In addition, the UNICEF representative chairs the EDP meetings and regularly participates in meetings
linked to its role as Lead Partner in the education sector. In terms of programme resources, as of November 2011, the expenditures for UNICEF supported activities linked to coordination for the year 2011 amounted to approximately US$457,000 (UNICEF 2011). Taken together, these aspects show that the Agency devotes considerable financial and human resources to fulfill its role as Lead Partner.

**UNICEFs performance as Lead Partner**

How well does UNICEF fulfill its responsibilities as Lead Partner? What are the areas in which Partners think UNICEF can improve? And what expectations do they have on the Lead Partner for the coming years? Bearing UNICEFs dependency on others in mind, these are some of the core questions analysed in this section. The section is framed around the main responsibilities of the Lead Partner as identified in the previous chapter, and reports UNICEFs strengths and weaknesses as seen by the education sector's main stakeholders.

**Great appreciation for UNICEFs role in developing the coordination structure:** There is overall a strong recognition of UNICEFs role in establishing and improving education sector coordination in Sierra Leone. In different ways, this appreciation was repeated by nearly all interviewees, including stakeholders from the Ministry, Donors and INGOs. One example of this appreciation is:

> UNICEF has done an amazing job. They have taken on the role as Lead very seriously and they are very committed. They are good at communication, have fostered a strong Education Group and developed a strong structure for coordination.

A few interviewees mentioned a change in UNICEFs way of working over the past decade. Highlighted aspects of this change include a move from immediate support to resettlement after the end of the war to more involvement in overall sector issues. In the words of one Partner:

> I see that UNICEF is gradually pulling out of direct implementation. They now focus on working through partners and the direct government relationship. They insist on working through the government. And to give the government more control. The days when the message was ‘let’s do it for them’ is over.

UNICEFs insistence on government ownership and control of the sector is seen as a central element of the Lead Partner's work for stronger coordination. Although the weak capacity of the Ministry of Education to steer and manage the sector is widely recognised, there is strong endorsement from stakeholders of UNICEFs strategy to improve sector coordination by persisting on government involvement and control of the sector.

At the same time, while not questioning the strategy of government control as such, a few partners did express some frustration over the limited results of this strategy so far, thinking it has held up sector advancements. One INGO representative said that:

> The Ministry is very weak. UNICEFs strategy is to give government the ownership and show them respect. But this leads to less progress. Partners that can could come together more and push the government more on critical
issues. We should participate more in decision making and assist with technical assistance.

The large majority of stakeholders think that UNICEF as Lead Partner has a key role to play in helping to strengthen the capacity of the Ministry of Education, at central as well as at decentralised levels. A limited number of stakeholders refer to UNICEF's support in producing the Capacity Development Strategy and sees this as a positive step. However, there are some signs that the Capacity Development Strategy is not well known among all Partners. Several stakeholders do not seem to be well aware of UNICEF's efforts in relation to the Capacity Development Strategy, pointing to further needs for communication on this topic. Among the partners that are familiar with the Capacity Development Strategy, two express doubts about the Ministry's ability to move forward with its implementation.

Two other interesting aspects of the Lead Partner's role in relation to capacity building emerge from the interviews. First, there appears to be strong support from Partners for UNICEF's (and the World Bank/GPE's) financial support to some key positions in the Ministry of Education. While it is acknowledged that the Ministry's dependency on UNICEF through this support becomes even stronger, it is as if many see this gap-filling as the only solution at the moment. One Partner clearly thinks that the gap-filling of key positions in the Ministry should be a temporary solution and that the Government should be able to finance and recruit to these positions itself. On the other hand, two Partners think that although gap filling is unsustainable in the long run, UNICEF should be prepared to increase its financial support to key positions in the Ministry. Policy and Planning is mentioned as one essential area. Currently, this unit only has one permanent staff member.

Second, one key stakeholder suggests an even stronger role for UNICEF in relation to assessing the Ministry's capacity and informing Partners about existing constraints. He/she says that the Ministry's constraints and conditions are well known to UNICEF and that Partners therefore should discuss feasibility with the Lead Partner before taking decisions on major projects. He/she further adds:

We must all together ensure that capacity exists. If UNICEF had been consulted and could have acted earlier on the initial FTI design here, I wonder how that would have changed things?

The EDP Group meetings are useful, but too focused on the FTI Catalytic Fund: The large majority of stakeholders view the EDP Group meetings as valuable events. Several interviewees stress the importance of the co-chairing arrangement between the Minister and the UNICEF representative and give credit to UNICEF for managing to arrange the EDP Group meetings on a regular basis. For example, one stakeholder noted that:

UNICEF has leverage. To get the Minister and all the right people around the same table is in itself a major achievement.

One stakeholder with a long experience in the sector pointed to the importance of these meetings for getting to know each other better as individuals, as well as organizations. He/she said that before those meetings took place, members of the Group did not know each other as well and that the meetings have helped to build closer relationships across organizations.
There is also appreciation for UNICEF’s ability to act as the secretariat for the EDP Group. Nearly half of the interviewed stakeholders expressed satisfaction with UNICEF’s work in coordinating communication and information sharing within the EDP Group. Several stakeholders also mention that UNICEF is good at providing day to day technical support to the Ministry, including support to the Ministry for accomplishing agreed EDP Group actions.

However, despite those positive aspects, some major criticism also comes forth on the content of the EDP Group meetings. Above all, there is a strong sense among a large number of stakeholders that the meetings are too dominated by issues related to the FTI Catalytic Fund instead of the broader Education Sector Plan. For example, two remarks on this are:

*The EDP meetings are too focused on the FTI. The agenda must be broader and we need to use this forum more effectively. We should discuss issues of relevance for all.*

*The EDP meetings are well chaired, but the important issues are few and far between. They should not be about the GPE5 all the time.*

Several stakeholders do express an interest in updates on how Sierra Leone’s funding from the FTI/GPE evolves, but they find that the EDP Group meetings are not the right fora for discussing the many technical details of the FTI Catalytic Fund. Several stakeholders think that the meetings should discuss issues that are more relevant for all members of the Group and they expect the Lead Partner to make this change happen.

The stakeholders that are interested in a broader agenda for the EDP Group meetings are not always entirely clear about what such a broadened agenda would entail in practice. However, a limited group of people appears to have given the content of the meetings considerable thought. At the heart of their remarks lies a strong belief that the meetings should be more strongly driven by the Education Sector Plan (ESP) and that the Group should meet to assess the implementation of the Plan as a whole. One stakeholder expresses the following:

*UNICEF has to think through how to better monitor education sector plan implementation. How can the Group achieve comprehensive monitoring, but not too comprehensive so you can’t identify a set of issues over each year? How UNICEF makes that happen is very important.*

Two strands of thought come out on how the EDP Group could better monitor the implementation of the ESP. One is concerned with bringing the work of all stakeholders into the planning and monitoring of the ESP. The other is about expectations on the Lead Partner to pay more attention to policy discussions.

*Take the work of all education sector actors better into account:* There is a strong sense among a large number of the interviewed stakeholders that the current planning and reporting mechanisms are weak and they see a great need for better integration of the work of all stakeholders in the regular planning cycle of the ESP. The annual Education Sector Reviews are seen as a major achievement, with several stakeholders pointing to

---

5 Global Partnership for Education, the new name of the EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI).
improvements in their usefulness over time. Several interviewees also see the wide range of stakeholders participating in the Reviews as a key strength.

Although it is widely recognised that the primary responsibility for improving the planning and monitoring of the ESP lies with the government, more than half of the interviewees think that the Lead Partner could play an even stronger role in bringing more stakeholders into the coordination of the education sector. For example, one stakeholder says:

> At both national and district levels, the planning process is not done well. It needs to start by a situation analysis and need to integrate all partners. I see a big role for UNICEF here. There are a lot of duplications by partners at the district level.

A large number of stakeholders are concerned with the weak planning and monitoring at the district level. The three most commonly mentioned weaknesses are unclear roles and responsibilities between the Local Councils and the District Education Offices, limited cooperation between these two entities, and weak coordination with NGOs. A few stakeholders also mention that a lot of good and innovative work is done by small local NGOs, but that their work is not well known. This is seen as missed opportunities for learning, and for possibilities to scale up good activities. In the words of one stakeholder:

> How UNICEF supports decentralisation is a challenge. The coordination at the level of the Council is very important and does not work well everywhere. Councils need to know what partners are doing in their districts. And MEST needs to keep track of all this.

Several stakeholders, in particular among the INGOs, see UNICEF’s recent support to IBIS and CONCERN for strengthening the coordination in a couple of districts as a very positive step. There appears to be a strong interest in taking this initiative forward and there are expectations that the Lead Partner will pay even more attention to coordination at the district level in the coming years. One idea on this:

> We could have like high level EDP meetings at the district level too. Important issues could then be channeled up to the national level. The reporting at the district level is not functioning. There is no link to the national EDP meetings. Perhaps the Director of the Inspectorate could be that link.

Several stakeholders, including INGOs and government representatives, point to weak reporting from INGOs to the Government as a longstanding challenge. The Ministry of Education expects the INGOs to report on their funding and activities to the central level according to an established format on a quarterly basis. At the same time, some INGOs say that they report to the district level and think that it is then up to the district to feed this information up to the central level. The situation seems to be a source of some friction between the Ministry and the NGO community. A few stakeholders expect the Lead Partner to assist further with unblocking this issue.

In this context, making the Stakeholders forum work better is seen as essential. Several persons make the remark that the Stakeholders forum was more effective a few years ago and that it then served as a useful forum for information sharing and joint lessons learning among a larger group of NGOs than just the EDP Group members. The appointment of a Partnership Coordinator at the Ministry is seen as an important step. At the same time,
several stakeholders note that this is not a full time position and question whether the Partnership Coordinator has sufficient time to devote to the coordination of NGOs to make any real impact. A few stakeholders say they would like UNICEF to finance this position for a few years.

The opinions about how well UNICEF communicates and shares information differ widely. One relatively large group of stakeholders expresses satisfaction with the Lead Partners information sharing and communication within the EDP Group. However, a smaller group thinks that this part could be further improved. In particular, a few stakeholders expect the Lead Partner to push Partners who are not reporting to do so more firmly. As one stakeholder says:

*UNICEF is good at passing on government information to partners, but less good at getting information from partners to government focal points. I see a stronger role for UNICEF here. UNICEF is doing its best from its own angle, but there has to be better coordination of partners. UNICEF should facilitate and convince partners to share information with the Ministry.*

**To foster stronger policy discussions:** There is great awareness among stakeholders that UNICEFs position in the sector is unique and that it has the ability to influence sector developments. A recent example of this was given by one of the interviewees. He/she referred to a conversation where a partner had asked a senior ministry official whether the Sierra Leonean government would accept the new policy directive from the West African Examination Council that stipulates that pregnant teenage women are no longer allowed to take the final examination at the end of secondary school. The answer from the senior ministry official was: ‘Do you really think UNICEF would let us do that’?

Several stakeholders bring up and value UNICEFs investments in producing more data and research on education in Sierra Leone. The 2010/2011 school census, MICS and a survey on out-of-school children are frequently mentioned. Together, this body of evidence is repeatedly mentioned as an indispensable basis for more informed policy and decision making.

At the same time, around one third of the interviewed stakeholders show a relatively strong interest in working more with upstream policy issues. This group of stakeholders would like the Lead Partner to put a stronger emphasis on fostering policy discussions within the EDP Group. Three stakeholders showed great interest in issues around learning, with one expressing hope that UNICEF will take the lead in the national coordination around learning. Two stakeholders give the example of the gulf between most partners' sector priorities and several of the key recommendations emerging from the so-called White Paper. They regret that there have not been more opportunities for a coordinated voice from partners on this issue. One other stakeholder thinks that in the dialogue around the White Paper, key issues have been raised more by the World Bank than UNICEF. When it comes to the revision of the ESP, a few stakeholders hope that many partners led by UNICEF will contribute with comments and that efforts are made to avoid that the commenting is dominated by just one entity. Two stakeholders mention UNICEFs current role in leading the commenting from partners on the next PRSP as a good example of UNICEF fostering policy discussions. A few suggestions for what UNICEF could do in this area are:
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- An opportunity at least once a year for bringing in international expertise on a burning policy issue and discuss its relevance in relation to the context here in Sierra Leone. ‘Like the recent workshop in Rwanda on learning, but here’.

- An end of the year report or statement from the EDP Group commenting the policy direction in the sector.

- Joint Partners response to the Education Sector Review

**Room for improvement in UNICEF’s internal coordination:** A few stakeholders mention that UNICEF’s role in the education sector is not limited to its role as Lead Partner, but that the Agency plays several other roles as well. Apart from being the Lead Partner, UNICEF also receives funds for implementation from some bilateral donors and, in turn, acts as a donor towards NGOs in the country. For some INGOs, UNICEF’s role as a donor/funder of their projects and activities clearly play a major role in the way they perceive UNICEF. When asked about areas for improvement with regard to UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner, several stakeholders bring up a need for UNICEF to improve its own internal coordination and reporting to the EDP Group. Issues including late planning and calling to meetings, which sometimes overlap with other meetings called by UNICEF staff, and higher fees and per diems paid by UNICEF for participation in training and workshops are mentioned as problems by several INGOs. In short, a limited group of stakeholders expect UNICEF to better lead by example by making some improvements in its own internal planning, monitoring and reporting procedures.

### 4.3 Assessment of risks

**Key finding:** UNICEF’s measures to reduce risks linked to its role as Lead Partner have been largely appropriate. The gradual increase in available data provides a basis for more thorough dialogue between development partners and the government on education inequalities. UNICEF’s focus on capacity development is a promising effort to manage risks linked to the weak ability of the public sector to deliver education services.

UNICEF has identified several risks that it needs to pay close attention to in order to achieve its programme objectives (UNICEF 2012). These risks apply to UNICEF’s education programmes as a whole, including its role as Lead Partner. With its front position in the sector, these risks are particularly pertinent for UNICEF’s ability to perform well as Lead Partner:

- High levels of poverty and persisting inequalities in human development is not only identified by UNICEF as a security threat, but poverty and inequalities also constitute major risks for achieving education sector goals. As such, these factors represent risks for UNICEF’s ability to fulfill its Lead mandate. While the ultimate responsibility of addressing poverty and inequalities obviously lies with the government, the Lead Partner also has an important role to play. If in the medium term perspective the Sierra Leonean government shows limited results in addressing education disadvantages and if the Lead Partner has not been able to raise and influence those policy concerns together with the EDP Group, this represents a risk for the credibility of the Lead Partner.
• The limited capacity of the public sector in Sierra Leone to deliver education services at scale is a major risk for the Lead Partner’s emphasis on assisting the Ministry of Education in implementing the Education Sector Plan.

• To expand and sustain the country’s education service delivery, Sierra Leone will need to mobilise additional resources. The system struggles with major inefficiencies and donors’ confidence in the public financial management and procurement systems are low. The Lead Partner has a special role in assisting in mobilizing additional external resources to the sector, and together with other partners to monitor the efficient disbursement and use of funds. If this is not done in a good way, the credibility of the Lead Partner is at risk.

To address the above mentioned risks, UNICEF has adopted several strategies. First, UNICEF puts a strong emphasis on improving the availability of data on education, children and household characteristics. Improved data is seen as one critical element for the Lead Partners to have evidence-based discussions with the government on how to address risks linked to poverty and inequalities in the education system. In the last five years, UNICEF has financed and provided technical support to several major data collection exercises. Two recent examples include the 2010/11 National School Census and MICS4.

Second, UNICEF has provided support to the Ministry of Education to develop an institutional and organizational capacity development strategy. This is seen as an important, yet medium- to long term measure to address the constraints of the public sector to deliver education at scale. The Capacity Development Strategy was completed in November 2011 and the roll out and implementation is expected to follow. At least one major donor shows an interest in funding the implementation of the strategy. UNICEF has also provided financial support to pay the salaries of some key positions in the Ministry of Education.

Third, to address the financial constraints in the sector, UNICEF has in its position as Lead Partner made efforts to mobilize and leverage additional resources. In particular, UNICEF has been in close contact and assisted Sweden in starting up its financial contributions to the education sector in 2009. The results of the Swedish support have however been very disappointing. Sweden decided to channel US$2.85 million through the then newly established Education Sector Support Fund (ESSF). The aim of the ESSF was to pool resources for the implementation of the Education Sector Plan and take steps towards closer dialogue between the Ministry of Education and Development Partners. As of mid-2012, only 27% of the initial advancement from Sweden had been used. Sweden is currently in the process of phasing out its support to Sierra Leone and it is likely that the government of Sierra Leone will have to repay non-utilised funds.

In relation to financial risks, it is also not clear to what extent UNICEF has used its strategic position to ensure efficient use and equitable distribution of available resources. Although efforts have been made to provide training on education financing and budget analysis for key actors such as parliamentarians and councilors, it is difficult to see whether and how these activities are part of a broader effort of the Lead Partner to focus more on addressing constraints and risks linked to education financing. As mentioned earlier in the discussion on effectiveness, some interviewees expect the Lead Partner to pay more attention to this area.

However, overall, the evaluation finds that UNICEF has made concerted efforts to reduce some important risks linked to its role as Lead Partner. Although the results of some of these
efforts are yet to be realized, the initial investments in better data and capacity development are assessed to be appropriate for managing risks in the Sierra Leonean context.
4.4 Assessment of benefits

**Key finding:** While a relatively high number of stakeholders could not point to any benefits for UNICEF of being Lead Partner, all except one see major benefits for their own work of engaging in education sector coordination. The most frequently cited benefits were that it helps to know who is doing what where, that it is useful for information sharing and that it avoids duplication. Identified benefits for the Lead Partner included visibility, easy access to information and staff and that it makes it easier for UNICEF to make key statements. Another benefit is that UNICEF as an organisation can learn from engaging in national policy issues.

Not all interviewed stakeholders expressed clear views or opinions about the benefits for UNICEF of being Lead Partner. Of those that did (about one-third of the interviewees), the following aspects were mentioned:

- Two stakeholders noted that UNICEF over the past decade has been moving towards working more with national policy issues (not only in Sierra Leone, but also referring to some other countries) and thought that this work is beneficial for UNICEF as an organization. One stakeholder mentioned that this makes UNICEF support more sustainable approaches in education. The other stakeholder expressed that it is beneficial for UNICEF to better understand what it means to scale up the child friendly school approach at the national level, taking financial constraints into account. This latter stakeholder also mentioned that traditionally, the World Bank has been more involved in discussing financing issues than UNICEF, but that both organizations can learn a lot from each other. He/she thinks that the current close collaboration between the two organizations in Sierra Leone is beneficial for both parties, as well as for the government. In the words of this stakeholder:
  
  "Just as the World Bank needs to learn from the child friendly school approach, UNICEF now benefits and learns from the World Bank on macro issues such as financing. Together, they can be very powerful."

- Three stakeholders mentioned that UNICEF’s strong presence and close relationship with the government and many development partners is beneficial for the organization. One of the mentioned benefits is that UNICEF has easy access to information and staff.

- Two stakeholders thought that UNICEF has become more and more visible in Sierra Leone and said that at least part of this visibility is linked to its role as Lead Partner. One of them said:
  
  "When UNICEF is presented as the Lead Partner in education, this definitely adds to their good reputation and publicity."

- Two stakeholders expressed that UNICEFs role as Lead Partner makes it easier for the Agency to make important statements, and that these are often backed up by new research findings and data.

All of the interviewed stakeholders except one viewed the education sector coordination as such as highly beneficial for their work. The most frequently mentioned benefits of
coordination was that it helps to know who is doing what where, that it is useful for information sharing and that it avoids duplication.
Chapter 5: Conclusion and recommendations

The final chapter of this evaluation presents conclusions and recommendations based on the findings provided earlier in the report. The chapter is structured along the four lines of inquiry of the evaluation, hence focusing on the relevance, effectiveness, risks and benefits for UNICEF of acting Lead Partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone.

5.1 Lead Partner relevance

Conclusion

The case for UNICEF to be the Lead Partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone has been, and continues to be, very strong. The evaluation identifies three main reasons for this:

First, UNICEF has strong comparative advantages in the sector, most notably through its longstanding presence in the country, strong technical expertise and close relationship with the Ministry of Education. The Agency’s strong position in the sector is further reinforced by the limited presence of education staff among other multilateral and bilateral donor agencies.

Second, the evaluation finds that UNICEF’s roles and responsibilities as Lead Partner are relevant in relation to existing coordination needs. External aid to the education sector in Sierra Leone is still highly fragmented and relatively small scale. Government ownership and alignment and harmonisation of partner activities are difficult to achieve due to a large number of uncoordinated interventions. Further, the weak ability of the Ministry to steer and manage the sector is widely recognised by all major actors. In this challenging context, the evaluation finds that there is a logical link between the roles undertaken by the Lead Partner and the objectives that have been specified for the work of the Education Development Partners (EDP) Group. However, while the objectives of the EDP Group are comprehensive and have been specified in the TORs for the Group, the formal roles of the Lead Partner are far less comprehensive. The TORs for the EDP Group signals a minimalistic role for the Lead Partner, focusing only on the role of the Lead Partner in relation to the EDP Group meetings. However, it is evident from the interviews that the Lead Partner has a much broader set of responsibilities than just the chairing and managing of the EDP Group meetings. The evaluation finds that the identified roles of responsibilities of the Lead Partner are appropriate in relation to coordination needs, but that most of the roles remain informal.

Third, UNICEF’s roles and responsibilities as Lead Partner correspond with the strategic direction of UNICEF as a whole. The Agency’s Medium-Term Strategic Plan, as well as its Education Strategy promote a shift from working with social service delivery to upstream engagement in macro level policies with relevance for children’s wellbeing. Both documents stress the need to foster partnerships to achieve results for children. UNICEF’s position as Lead Partner is found to be an excellent mean to achieve the Agency’s objectives for policy advocacy and partnerships for children’s rights.

Recommendation

Against these findings, the evaluation recommends that UNICEF:

- Suggests the engagement of the EDPs in a revision of the TORs for the EDP Group in which the roles and responsibilities of the Lead Partner are better defined in
relation to the overall objectives of the EDP Group (not only in relation to the EDP Group meetings). The roles and responsibilities of the Coordinating Agency as specified in the Charter for the Global Partnership for Education can serve as a useful guide for such a revision. It would in such a revision also be worthwhile to include the roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Education, Donors and NGOs in relation to the overall objectives of the EDP Group.

5.2 Lead Partner effectiveness

Conclusion
The Lead Partner is largely fit for purpose and has, bearing the major contextual constraints in mind, successfully fostered stronger coordination of the education sector over the past five years. One group of stakeholders expects a higher level of ambition for the coordination of the sector and hence sees room for improvement in the work of the Lead Partner. On the Lead Partner’s performance, the following main areas of success and concern emerged from the interviews:

- **Great appreciation for UNICEF’s role in establishing and improving the coordination of the education sector in Sierra Leone,** in particular referring to the EDP Group meetings. There is strong endorsement from stakeholders of UNICEF’s strategy to improve sector coordination by constantly insisting on government involvement and control of the sector. There is equally strong endorsement of UNICEF’s strategy to focus on capacity development of the Ministry of Education.

- **The EDP Group meetings are valuable, but too focused on the FTI Catalytic Fund.** Despite widespread appreciation of UNICEF’s ability to co-chair and act as the secretariat for the EDP Group, a large number of stakeholders think that the meetings have been too dominated by technical issues related to the FTI Catalytic Fund. Several stakeholders express that the meetings should discuss issues that are more relevant for all members of the Group and expect the Lead Partner to make this change happen.

- **To foster policy discussions:** There is great awareness among stakeholders that UNICEF can influence sector developments. UNICEF’s investments in producing more quantitative data are repeatedly mentioned as an indispensable basis for informed policy making. Some stakeholders would like the Lead Partner to foster stronger policy discussions within the EDP Group. Learning is mentioned as one such policy topic. The discrepancies between donor policy priorities and the recommendations in the White Paper is another suggested topic for policy dialogue.

- **Take the work of all education sector actors better into account.** A large number of stakeholders think that the current planning and reporting mechanisms are weak and see a need for better integration of the work of all stakeholders in the regular planning cycle of the Education Sector Plan. Although it is recognised that the primary responsibility lies with the government, more than half of the interviewees think that the Lead Partner could play an even stronger role in bringing the work of more stakeholders into the planning and monitoring of the sector.
• **Room for improvement in UNICEF’s internal coordination**: For some stakeholders, UNICEF’s role as a donor play a major role in the way they perceive UNICEF. When asked about areas for improvement with regard to UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner, several stakeholders mention a need for UNICEF to improve its own internal coordination, including planning and monitoring procedures.

**Recommendations**

Following these findings, the Lead Partner is recommended to:

• Give high priority to support the strengthening of the planning and monitoring mechanisms for the implementation of the new Education Sector Plan due in 2013. While the details of this will of course have to be worked out by the Ministry of Education in close dialogue with other development partners, some guiding principles that emerge from the evaluation are:

  ➢ A need to work out a more solid system for the monitoring of the implementation of the Education Sector Plan, a system which embraces the work of **all** major actors. Monitoring of the EFA-FTI/GPE project is not the same as monitoring of the Education Sector Plan. The Lead Partner should play a key role in this work, as this is the very basis for further strengthening of the coordination of the sector.

  ➢ A stronger role for the Lead Partner in assisting the Ministry of Education in monitoring disbursements of all external funds supporting the implementation of the Education Sector Plan.

  ➢ The Lead Partner should consolidate and expand its collaboration with INGOs for better coordination of education sector work at the district level. The work at the district level should feed into the monitoring at the national level and pay attention to possibilities to disseminate and scale up good local initiatives.

  ➢ The Lead Partner should ensure that no district is left behind in the implementation of the next ESP. The Ministry of Education and the Lead Partner should together ensure that every district has at least one strong partner to work with.

• To foster stronger policy discussions within the EDP Group. The precise format for such discussions is best decided by the EDP Group members, but suggestions include bringing more international expertise to Sierra Leone for joint seminars, an end of year statement from the EDP Group and joint partner responses to the Annual Education Sector Review. Suggestions for topics include the use of learning assessments to support monitoring of student performance and subsequent planning for the improvement of learning, as well as the policy priorities of the White Paper.

• To better lead by example: UNICEF should take the lead in harmonising different levels of fees and per diems used by partners for national stakeholders participation in workshops and training.
5.3 Lead Partner risks and benefits

Conclusion
The evaluation finds that UNICEF’s measures to reduce risks linked to its role as Lead Partner have been largely appropriate. Above all, **UNICEF has helped to improve the availability of data on education, children and household characteristics.** This is seen as one critical element for informed dialogue with the government on how to address risks linked to poverty and inequalities in the education system. To address the constraints of the public sector to deliver education at scale, **UNICEF has provided support to the Ministry of Education to develop an ambitious Capacity Development Strategy.** The Lead Partner has also made efforts to mobilize and leverage additional funding to the sector, in particular by assisting Sweden and the GPE in providing additional resource through the establishment of the Education Sector Support Fund. Due to the initial poor design of the EFA-FTI Catalytic Fund project and weak capacity of the Ministry of Education to manage this project, **the results of resource mobilization efforts have been disappointing.**

Relatively few stakeholders could identify the benefits brought to UNICEF by its role as Lead Partner. Those who were able to do that identified **visibility and authority as two major benefits for UNICEF.** Other mentioned benefits include easy access to information and staff, which in turn gives UNICEF the necessary knowledge and expertise to make important statements, backed up by new research findings and data. Two stakeholders expressed that it is beneficial for UNICEF as an organisation to work more with national policy issues and that this makes the Agency support more sustainable approaches in education.

Recommendations
The Lead Partner is recommended to:

- Continue to focus on capacity development of the Ministry of Education as an important measure to reduce risks linked to the governance, management and financing of the education system.

- Continue to invest in data on education and children, and to increasingly use these data to address risks linked to poverty and different types of inequalities. Apart from being an important measure to reduce risks, the publishing and use of such data contribute to the visibility and good reputation of UNICEF.

- Continue to leverage additional funding to the sector by continuing to engage with existing, as well as potentially new partners. UNICEF will also act as the Coordinating Agency for the upcoming application to the Global Partnership for Education. Based on the difficult experience of the FTI Catalytic Fund, it is recommended that the Lead Partner/Coordinating Agency and the Supervising Entity conduct a thorough risk assessment of the GPE funding. Such a risk assessment should include pertinent measures to manage risks for the implementation of the next round of funding from the GPE, with clearly defined responsibilities for the parties involved.
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Terms of Reference

Background

Sierra Leone is one of the first post-conflict and fragile states that successfully developed a comprehensive Education Sector Plan (ESP) in line with its Poverty Reduction Strategic Plan. The ESP was endorsed in 2007 by the Education Development Partners Group including Government representatives, bi-lateral and multilateral donors, and international NGOs working in the Education Sector in Sierra Leone. UNICEF played a major role in the process. Hence, UNICEF was nominated as the Lead Education Development Partner.

The establishment of an Education Development Partners Group is a mandatory requirement for the implementation of the Fast Track Initiative Catalytic Fund supported programmes, and so is the nomination of the Lead Partner. The role of the Lead Partner is to provide coordination for the other Development Partners and to co-convene and co-chair all sector group meetings with the Government. In the spirit of promoting harmonization as defined in 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, the Lead Partner also liaises with Education Development Partners to obtain consensus on communication with the Government and also channels communication between the Government and the EFA FTI Secretariat as well as other external bodies.

With such premises, UNICEF nomination to the role has been motivated by the underlying general acknowledgement of its comparative advantage stemming from its “Ability to use synergy of partnership to turn good practice, successful innovation and efficient use of resources into a quality education for children”, (UNICEF Education Strategy 2006-2015) and in “Facilitating effective alliances to achieve results for children among national and local partners in both the public and private sectors” (UNICEF Mid-Term Strategic Plan).

Rationale/ Purpose

UNICEF is the lead coordinating agency in the education sector in Sierra Leone. The purpose of the exercise is to:

- Provide UNICEF with a set of recommendations on the nature of this role and on how the roles can be better fulfilled in the future
- Determine the purpose, rationale, and retrospective and prospective relevance of UNICEF role in the sector
- Determine to what extent the role has been effective and beneficial for UNICEF and its mandate taking into account the resources (human and capital/financial) necessary to fulfill this role
- Identify past and potential constraints and the risks involved in the role and advise on its sustainability as well as its impact on UNICEF reputation and work in the sector.

Three events justify a critical reflection on UNICEF role as the lead coordinating partner. One is the plan for the Government of Sierra Leone to apply for a new round of EFA-FTI Catalytic Fund. Another is the EFA-FTI Board having approved a new Charter for the EFA-FTI, which redefines the role of the Education Development Group and the lead Development Partner/Coordinating Agency. The third is the approaching end of the current UNICEF Country Programme (2008-2012). A thematic analysis will complement the broader review of the Country Programme and inform planning for the education component in the next cycle.
An evaluation of all aspects of UNICEF comparative advantage in Sierra Leone as the lead coordinating partner in the education sector must be conducted within the framework of the current changes and deadlines. This will lead to a deeper understanding of how UNICEF comparative advantage may have facilitated that role in the past years and of how that role will need to be shaped in the years to come. It will also allow UNICEF Sierra Leone Country Office to take stock of how its position at the core of education sector networks has important implications for the provision of quality and equity for the realization of the right to education for all, and to the achievement of a World Fit for Children. Ultimately this will result in better-informed, evidence-based planning of UNICEF role as a major player in Sierra Leone Education Sector in future programme cycles.

Scope and Focus

The Consultancy is expected to last a total of 6 weeks.

The evaluation should be designed to assess the lead development partner role UNICEF has been undertaking since 2007 to present, and evaluate the effectiveness of the role, the weaknesses and the perceptions of the Government partners, Donor Partners and other education development partners regarding UNICEF's performance to date. The evaluation will also provide recommendations for the redefinition of such role in the future, if necessary.

In order to achieve that, the exercise will need to:

- Identify the value added by UNICEF in the education sector, in its role as a lead Development Partner and Coordinating Agency in EFA-FTI countries
- Identify UNICEF strategic advantage as a key player in Sierra Leone education sector against Sierra Leone Education Sector Plan priorities, UNICEF mission statement, UNICEF Mid-Term Strategic Plan, UNICEF Education Strategy 2006-2015, the Millennium Development Goals
- Determine to what extent that advantage continues to exist
- Assess the degree to which UNICEF role as the coordinating leading agency in the sector in Sierra Leone is compatible with UNICEF global policies and Education Strategy
- Evaluate UNICEF performance in this role to date, i.e. effectiveness and impact
- Assess the degree to which UNICEF role in the sector promotes equity and strengthens advocacy for education
- Identify resources needed to fulfill the role and risks accompanying the role
- Assess whether UNICEF support can be improved in the future to ensure sustainable progress in meeting the MDGs and EFA Goals, taking into account the set of Coordinating Agency’s roles and responsibilities outlined in the new Charter of Education For All Fast Track Initiative, 2011 (Annex 1) and their relevance to the context of Sierra Leone education sector
- Identify those strategic partnerships and roles that may help enhance UNICEF role for the optimization of its mandate in the future
- Provide recommendations on those areas where UNICEF may need to increase or decrease focus in order to redefine its role, if necessary, in view of UNICEF next programme cycle
- Provide a set of general recommendations to support the efficient and effective undertaking of the coordinating role in the education sector in Sierra Leone

The findings and recommendations will be used:

- By the UNICEF Country office to guide future programming
- To send to the Regional and HQ groups to guide UNICEF's role as coordinating agency in other countries
By the Education Development Group to develop Terms of Reference for the coordinating agency.

**Methodology**

The consultant is expected to develop tools to consult relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.

Information sources include the Government and other members of the Education Development Partners Group. Other sources include national NGOs and CSOs.

The consultant will submit an inception report outlining the methodology to be adopted. The Inception report will highlight how the evaluation process will be ethical and how the confidentiality and dignity of participants to the evaluation will be respected.

Tools used by the consultant can include, but are not restricted to:

- Analytical chart: for analysis of literature to identify the value added by UNICEF to the education sector, in its role as a lead Development Partner and Coordinating Agency in EFA-FTI countries
- Questionnaires and on-line survey tools: for structured and semi-structured interviews and survey with Government, Education Development Partners Group members including multilateral and bilateral Donors, NGOs, and UNICEF, EFA-FTI Secretariat, any other relevant party
- Individual and focus group meetings - in workshop and discussion form - as necessary: to consult with relevant parties

Methods can include, but are not restricted to:

- Desk literature analysis, for definition of background and rationale – including, where possible, a review of learning from the implementation of recommendations of previous similar evaluations
- Stakeholder analysis and mapping
- Analysis of accountabilities in the education sector

**Roles and Responsibility of the evaluators and the stakeholders**

**Responsibilities of Consultant**

- Provide own Computer equipment and mobile telephone
- Provide own transportation to and from the UNICEF office
- Be flexible to work from own hotel/ own location when space is not available within UNICEF office
- Review necessary literature to define the intended approach/methodology to the consultancy and to support the drafting of specific tools to be used for the literature review analysis and for the data gathering from primary sources
- Develop the specific evaluation tools
- Submit an Inception report including tools and proposed methods (questionnaires, list of potential respondents, interview schedule, etc.)
- Undertake a more detailed documentation review/desk review of available literature to identify UNICEF Sierra Leone specific comparative advantage as a coordinating partner in the education sector against global and local goals and targets in the sector
- Consult with MEST and relevant institutional bodies and organizations to gather information on UNICEF role as a coordinating partner in the education sector
- Develop recommendations on the most appropriate definition of UNICEF role in the future, based on UNICEF comparative advantage against the Sierra Leonean context
- Submit a Draft Report on the identified comparative advantage and added value by UNICEF
- Submit a Final Report with recommendations for the next programme cycle

**Responsibility of UNICEF**

- Identify international consultant and contract them and cover the costs
- Provide working space and necessary transport to international consultant when available
- Coordination and monitoring of project in collaboration with MEYS
- Facilitation of meetings in collaboration with MEST and other education development partners
- Funding support for carrying out the activities

**Responsibilities of MEST and other Education Development Partners**

- Provide access to Consultant and Team
- Facilitate sharing among education sector partners

**Time Schedule and Deliverables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review necessary literature to define the intended approach/methodology to the consultancy and to support the development of specific tools to be used for the literature review analysis and for the data gathering from primary sources.</td>
<td>An Inception report including tools and proposed methods (conceptual and ethical rational, questionnaires, list of potential respondents, interview schedule, etc.). Submitted soft copy in Word.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a more detailed documentation review/desk review of available literature to identify UNICEF Sierra Leone specific comparative advantage as a coordinating partner in the education sector against global and local goals and targets in the sector.</td>
<td>A Draft Report on the identified comparative advantage and added value by UNICEF. Submitted soft copy in Word.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with MEST and relevant institutional bodies and organizations to gather information on UNICEF role as a coordinating partner in the education sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop recommendations on the most appropriate definition of UNICEF role in the future, based on UNICEF comparative advantage against the Sierra Leonean context.</td>
<td>A Final Report with a stand-alone two page executive summary, targeted recommendations for the next programme cycle and an accountability framework for the sector. Submitted soft copy in Word.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills and Competencies**

- Ability to work independently with a variety of stakeholders
- Detail oriented with excellent organizational skills
- Technically sound in drafting and editing evaluation reports with excellent communication and writing skills in English
- Adaptability and flexibility, client orientation, confidentiality, initiative, concern for accuracy and quality
- Knowledge of education sector coordination mechanisms, of UNICEF role as a coordinating agency, and of Sierra Leone Education System is highly desirable

Qualifications and Experience

- Advanced degree in the Social Sciences or development related field
- A minimum of 8 years working experience in education sector with previous work experience including engagement with donor partners and government at the coordination level
- Extensive technical knowledge of education systems and sectors including planning, policy, finance and programming
- Previous relevant experience with UNICEF or with other UN Agencies will be a definite advantage
- Previous experience of developing evaluation tools
- Previous experience of conducting evaluations
- Excellent writing, communication and analytical skills
- Computer literate
Annex 2: Evaluation framework

To respond to the overall objectives of the evaluation, the evaluation framework raises four key questions and ‘lines of enquiry’:

➢ **Relevance**: To assess the relevance of UNICEF role as lead partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone:
  o How does UNICEF’s role as lead partner help create conditions that promote the realisation of Sierra Leone education sector priorities? What are the cause-effect relationships?
  o How appropriate is UNICEF’s role as lead partner in relation to existing needs?
  o How compatible is UNICEF’s role as lead partner with UNICEF’s Medium Term Strategic Plan (MTSP) and Education Strategy?
  o What is the comparative advantage of UNICEF as a key player in the education sector in Sierra Leone against the Education Sector Plan, UNICEF mission statement, UNICEF MTSP and UNICEF Education Strategy 2006-2015?
  o How has the comparative advantage of UNICEF evolved since 2007?

➢ **Effectiveness**: To assess the effectiveness of UNICEF role as lead partner in the education sector
  o What are the main responsibilities of the lead partner?
  o How do the responsibilities of the lead partner match the roles and responsibilities of the Coordinating agency as specified in the Charter for the EFA-FTI?
  o How well does UNICEF fulfill its responsibilities?
  o What does UNICEF’s ‘implementation strategy’ look like for fulfilling its responsibilities as lead partner, including human and financial resources?
  o How appropriate is this strategy under the prevailing circumstances and possible alternatives?
  o How has this ‘implementation strategy’ changed over time?
  o What are the current strengths and weaknesses in the coordination of the education sector?
  o How have these changed over time?
  o What role has the lead partner played in addressing these strengths and weaknesses in the coordination of the education sector?
  o What emphasis is given to issues of ownership and control in the (formal and informal) discussions between the key stakeholders in the sector and what is UNICEF’s position on these issues?

➢ **Risks**: To assess internal and external risks for UNICEF linked to its role as lead partner
  o What are the major internal risks for UNICEF in its role as lead partner?
  o What are the major external risks for UNICEF in its role as lead partner?
  o What efforts have been made to minimize internal and external risks?

➢ **Benefits**: To assess the benefits for UNICEF and its mandate of acting lead partner
- In what ways is it beneficial for UNICEF to be lead partner?
- What are some concrete examples of how it has mattered for UNICEF to be lead partner?
- What are the effects on UNICEF’s reputation and work in the education sector of being lead partner?
Annex 3: Interview guide

Context

1. In what ways have you been involved in the education sector in Sierra Leone? Please describe your involvement in the sector, as well as in the coordination of the education sector.

2. What are the major accomplishments of the education sector to date?

3. What do you see as the main constraints for further education progress and why has it been challenging to address these constraints?

Relevance

4. What role can the coordination of Education Development Partners play in addressing the remaining constraints in the education sector?

5. Do you think there are comparative advantages for UNICEF to be the lead partner in the education sector? If so, what are they?

6. Over time, how have the comparative advantages of UNICEF evolved against the Sierra Leonean context (e.g. against the country’s overall development context, as well as against the overall aid architecture)?

Effectiveness

7. What are the main responsibilities of the lead partner?

8. How well do you think UNICEF fulfill these responsibilities?

9. What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses in the coordination of the education sector?

10. How has this changed over time?

11. What role has the lead partner played in addressing the strengths and weaknesses in the coordination of the sector?

12. If UNICEF was not the lead partner, who could take on this role instead? Why?

Risks and benefits

13. What have been the risks for Education Development Partners of engaging in the coordination of the education sector in Sierra Leone?

14. What have been the risks for UNICEF of being lead partner?

15. What efforts have been made to minimize the risks involved in education sector coordination and how successful have these efforts been?
Evaluation of UNICEF’s role as Lead Partner in the education sector in Sierra Leone

16. What have been the benefits for Education Development Partners of engaging in the coordination of the education sector?

17. In ways has it been beneficial for UNICEF to be lead partner?

The future

18. What do you see as the major challenges for the coordination of the education sector in the years to come?

19. What expectations do you have on the lead partner for the coming years?
## Annex 4: List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Kpana</td>
<td>Education Programme Manager, Save the Children UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C. Dupigny</td>
<td>Consultant, Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>Country Coordinator, IRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine Allieu</td>
<td>Country Director, PLAN Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bidemi Carrol</td>
<td>Human Development Specialist, World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Samoh</td>
<td>Education Programme Coordinator, ActionAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Davis</td>
<td>Education Advisor, DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel Gborie</td>
<td>Focal Point for School Feeding, WFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Persson</td>
<td>Senior Education Programme Officer, Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim Kamara</td>
<td>Technical Advisor for Health, Plan International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyomi Korona</td>
<td>In Country Consultant, JICA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Jones</td>
<td>Chief of Education, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahimbo Mdoe</td>
<td>Representative, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Mareso</td>
<td>Education Specialist, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Sillah</td>
<td>Country Director, ActionAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuru Deen</td>
<td>Policy Advisor, IBIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Allmiu</td>
<td>Education Coordinator, CONCERN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prema Clarke</td>
<td>Senior Education Specialist, Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reginald C King</td>
<td>ESP Coordinator, Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salieu Kamara</td>
<td>Chief Education Officer, Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegfried Gross</td>
<td>Team Leader, GIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hirshberg</td>
<td>Task Team Leader, World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Terms of Reference for the Education Development Partners Group

(Technical Aid Coordination)  
Sierra Leone  
09 June 2011

1. BACKGROUND  
The Local Education Development Partners Group met for the first time in September 2005 and the second time in June 2006. Since then meetings have regularly taken place after every two months. Meetings are convened by UNICEF and co-chaired by the Ministry of Education. During the endorsement process for the Fast Track Initiative Catalytic Fund allocation, the number of participating donors increased. INGO partners took part in the consultations for the first time when the “Zero Draft” of the Education Sector Plan was presented in September 2006.

2. PURPOSE AND RATIONALE  
The main objective to form this group was (a) to facilitate Sierra Leone’s participation in the Fast Track Initiative Partnership and (b) to facilitate its request for Fast Track Initiative Catalytic funding. However the broader ambition of the group was always regarding the coordination of the education sector and the implementation of the Education Sector Plan. The mandate of the group has been extended to the Education Sector Plan implementation including the implementation of the - Action Plan. The Education Development Partners Group was involved in the development and finalization of the grant modality, the Action Plan and the progress indicators. The group endorsed the annual work plans and procurement plans of the districts and was involved in the preparations of the first Annual Sector Review. The ultimate aim of the group is to reinforce the country’s capacity to carry out its education priorities.

3. OBJECTIVES  
i. To ensure harmonization and coordination of aid in the education sector  
ii. To ensure harmonization of Technical Assistance from development partners  
iii. To discuss key milestones, timeframes, and processes for plans and implementation of education  
iv. To update all stakeholders on progress in the education sector- with particular focus on the Education Sector Plan approved existing work plans  
v. To ensure sharing of information on education sector policies  
vi. To discuss and clarify specific areas of policy concerns and priorities and support their effective implementation  
vii. To inform the Ministry of Education regarding Development Partners expectations and standards as a basis for resource mobilization

4. EXPECTED OUTCOMES  
i. Increased efficiency in the management of aid in the Education Sector  
ii. An empowered Ministry of Education with increased absorptive capacity  
iii. Increased evidence based planning for the Education Sector  
iv. Increased efficiency in the implementation of the Education Sector Plan  
v. Reinforced synergies in the Education Sector
5. **EXPECTED OUTPUTS - MEETINGS**

Meetings are to be held on average every two months, with a total of 6 meetings each year. The minutes of each meeting will record:

i. Participants present and their contact details

ii. Corrections of previous minutes and adoption of the same

iii. Action taken from previous minuted action points

iv. Reports on substantive issues

v. New action points based on report and discussion, and

vi. Any other business recorded at the meeting

vii. Any presentation made or document shared, attached as annexes

6. **EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS GROUP MEMBERS**

Members of the Education Development Partners Group are bilateral and multilateral organizations and major INGOs active in the education sector. These are organisations and institutions working in partnership together, and with the Government of Sierra Leone. They provide financial and other assistance to the Government in line with the Partnership Principles (annexed) and the Education Sector Plan to develop and improve education throughout the country.

All Education Development Partners who appraised and approved the Education Sector Plan are members. This group includes Ministry of Education, Action Aid, AfDB, CONCERN, CRS, DFID, EC, GIZ (former GTZ), IRC, Irish Aid, JICA, Plan Sierra Leone (former Plan International), Save the Children UK, World Vision, UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, WFP, World Bank. SIDA (Swedish International Development Agency) - represented in-country by DFID - and IBIS (a Danish NGO operating in Sierra Leone) have also joined the group more recently.

New membership to the Group is agreed on the basis of criteria and following the process outlined below.

7. **CHAIRING**

The Education Development Partners Group is co-chaired by the Ministry of Education and the Lead Education Development Partner - currently UNICEF.

8. **MEMBERSHIP ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

Eligibility for membership is based upon satisfaction of the following criteria:

i. Members must be established, officially recognised organisations/institutions

ii. Members may have been part of the group of organizations/institutions which endorsed the Education Sector Plan in 2007

iii. Bi-lateral and Multilateral Donors and Agencies, must be recognised by The Ministry of Finance, Development Assistance Coordination Office (DACO) and the Ministry of Education as donors within the Education Sector. They must have the necessary agreements in place and must be reporting to DACO as required

iv. INGOs must be registered with the Ministry of Education as Education Sector implementing partners and must be reporting to the Ministry of Education as required.
v. Members must keep audited accounts and their funds must be held in an account in the name of the organization/institution

vi. Members’ activities must contribute to the achievement of Sierra Leone’s Education Sector Plan objectives, particularly in the area of policy development and implementation

vii. As part of their support to the Education Sector, members must provide one or more of the following elements: direct funding to Government of Sierra Leone to support the education sector, operational partnership, training and/or technical support for the sector.

Membership of the Education Development Partners Group is conditional upon the members accepting and abiding by the annexed Partnership Principles finalized and endorsed by the Education Development Partners Group in 2008.

9. APPLICATION PROCESS

Membership application may be solicited:

i. Directly by non-member organizations/institutions that fulfill the above seven criteria

ii. By invitation from the Education Development Partners Group following agreement reached at Education Development Partners Group meeting

In both cases acceptance will be subject to vote at Education Development Partners meetings. Successful applicants must receive positive votes from two thirds of voting Education Development Partners.

In the case of direct application by non-member organizations/institutions, application must be submitted to the Education Sector Plan Coordinator, for submission to the Education Development Partners Group. Applications will be considered by the Education Development Group as part of the agenda of Education Development Partners meeting under any other business. Applicants may be invited to support their application with a presentation to the Groups prior to the voting session.

Any action taken in relation to the application process will be minuted under Any Other Business.

10. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

The main responsibilities of the Ministry of Education as a member of the Education Development Partners Group are:

i. To co-chair (the Minister or the authorised representative)

ii. To ensure appropriate action is taken on all action points and to report back to the Group at the following meeting on the same

iii. To prepare the Education Sector Plan Update detailing progress made regarding the approved work plan and other Ministry activities pertinent to the successful implementation of the Education Sector Plan (the Education Sector Plan Coordinator)

iv. To facilitate other presentations as agreed, to be substantive issues for the meeting

11. RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEAD EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT PARTNER
The main responsibilities of the Lead Education Development Partner are:

i. To co-chair

ii. To provide the secretariat for the Group meetings, including:
   a. convening the meetings and organising the venue and other relevant necessitates
   b. recording and disseminating minutes within two weeks from the meeting
   c. updating membership contact details
   d. ensuring distribution of all necessary documents to the Group

iii. To support the Ministry where required with follow up of action points agreed by the Group at the meeting

12. Responsiblities of all Education Development Partners
The main responsibilities of all Education Development Partners are:

i. To attend meetings regularly and provide necessary inputs where required

ii. To share information relevant to discussion of items on the agenda

13. Quorum
Qualified majority (two third of the votes from attendees) is required for a motion to be carried out.

In the event a majority vote cannot be achieved, this will be minuted noting which organisations have voted for and against the motion with reasons.

14. Duration
The Education Development Partners Group meetings are planned to run until 2015 in support of the Education Sector Plan
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