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Executive Summary

Management review

The creation of the Global Education Cluster co-lead arrangement was a bold attempt to bring something new to the cluster approach to humanitarian response. It was – and remains – a unique organisation of agency resources predicated on the expectation that a UN/NGO partnership might add value to the work of a cluster. As one of the last in a series of clusters to be created – and one which was controversial at the time – the Global Education Cluster offered an appropriate and timely vehicle for this pioneering experiment.

The purpose of this review is to help inform the forthcoming Global Education Cluster evaluation, and to suggest improvements in the co-leadership arrangement’s management and operations in their own right. The approach taken by The Partnering Initiative (TPI), as the commissioned consultants for the review, emphasises an analysis of the co-lead arrangement as an actual or potential cross-sector partnership which can be further developed and refined in order to benefit the Global Education Cluster.

The review team from TPI employed a multi-strategy approach to generating and analysing data on the co-lead arrangement. The main source of data was a series of interviews with 32 key participants in the Global Education Cluster. This was supported by access to a substantial range of documentation relating to the Cluster and by surveying of views from 34 individuals working in regional and country level offices whose responsibilities included some work for the Cluster. In addition, a final phase follow-up questionnaire was sent to 8 key Cluster personnel to draw additional data on the issues of the Cluster management structure as a whole and on the mainstreaming of cluster responsibilities within the agencies.

As a specialist organisation in the field of cross-sector partnership, TPI has also drawn on its accumulated expertise, published documents and comparable research to provide insights into the partnership under review. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the review specified a series of questions that would need to be addressed. For convenience, these questions are presented in Table 1 at the end of this Executive Summary, with reference to the sections of the review that address each particular question. A brief summary of the findings and recommendations is presented below.

The overarching conclusion of the review is that the Cluster structure has been set up according to the terms of the MoU, is progressing well in achieving its objectives and that the co-lead arrangement offers added-value to the Global Education Cluster in terms of the overall legitimacy of the Cluster, its institutional inclusiveness, the breadth of its agenda and its ability to provide country-level staff with appropriate information, tools and training.

However, some elements of the Cluster structure are not operating as effectively as they might and the full potential of the co-lead arrangement is still some way from being achieved. In particular, there are unresolved challenges in the structuring, staffing and resourcing of the Education Cluster Unit; issues around the governance and oversight role provided by the Steering Group; and a lack of coordination among the Cluster roles mainstreamed into the agencies. These issues are exacerbated by a lack of clarity over the nature of the arrangement as a full, and equitable, partnership between the two agencies.

---

1 See section 3.2 for a full discussion of the review methodology
Key successes

“The added value is tremendous. With all the difficulties we still see tremendous potential in this co-lead arrangement. It brings new positive dimensions to the work, great degree of accountability and most of all the co-lead provides credibility to the cluster.” (On-line survey respondent, Question 8)

Although the review was explicitly not an impact assessment, it identified the following factors that indicate that the co-lead arrangement is contributing well to the achievement of the Education Cluster’s objectives:

- Co-leadership gives the Global Education Cluster a distinct character and sends a strong signal on partnership to both the UN and NGO communities.
- The structure of the Global Education Cluster has been set up in accordance to the MoU.
- The Education Cluster Working Group (ECWG) has established a wide and inclusive network of agencies and the Global Education Cluster has a breadth of agenda that reflects this inclusive membership.
- The ECWG has established active Task Teams and Thematic Groups to meet Cluster objectives.
- The ECWG and the Education Cluster Support Unit (ECU) has been well supported by strongly committed individuals in both co-lead agencies.
- Both agencies have achieved significant progress towards the mainstreaming of Cluster support within the organisations.
- Guidance and standard-setting materials have been provided to the Cluster at country level, and training for cluster co-ordinators has been rolled out extensively during 2010.
- The comparative advantages that each agency brings are recognised (if not yet fully realised) at global and country level.
- Co-leadership is beginning to offer an inclusive and high quality response to humanitarian crisis.

Key challenges

The Global Education Cluster required both the setting up of a completely new structure and the adoption of a level of partnership working which was relatively unfamiliar to both agencies. As such, it is inevitable that the operationalization of the new structure would face challenges and much of the detail would need to be developed as it was rolled out.

The review identified the findings below that indicate that revision and further development of the co-lead arrangement need to take place for it to achieve its full potential.

Set-up

- The decision to establish a co-lead arrangement for the Cluster was more the result of innovative leadership than of a specific needs-based rationale.
- The practical implementation of the new concepts of co-leadership specifically, and partnership more generally, between a UN Agency and an NGO, were not sufficiently clarified before implementation. The nature of shared leadership within the partnership is still not well understood and the procedures for managing the co-lead arrangement – including on decision-making and accountability – have not been adequately defined, leading to challenges in implementation.
- Although now significantly more symmetric, institutional commitment to the principle of co-leadership was initially quite unbalanced, with UNICEF more sceptical over working in partnership with Save the Children than vice-versa.
• There are continued concerns over the reliance on a single source of funding for the Cluster and how it is administered through UNICEF.

Overall management structure
• Although the overall architecture adopted by the Cluster would appear to be fit-for-purpose, its effective operationalization is being held back by a lack of clarity over the roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of each of the elements (ECU, ECWG plus sub-groups, Steering Group, mainstreamed agency roles).
• Although now improving, the Steering Group has not played a sufficiently strong role in its oversight of the ECU, leading to insufficient guidance and action to overcome problems holding back more effective operations.
• There is a need for stronger buy-in and commitment of agencies in the ECWG to extend a sense of collective responsibility for the success or otherwise of the Global Cluster. Balanced with this is the need for stronger oversight to ensure focussed and effective delivery of projects in accordance with the Cluster objectives.
• The ECWG is not sufficiently well linked into the country level to ensure that the global activities respond to the needs on the ground.
• There is insufficient coordination and communication between the mainstream agency roles and difficulties occur due to different structures of roles within the two agencies.
• A lack of agreed clear process and formal responsibilities to which the agencies could be held accountable has put significantly more responsibility on the individuals involved – and their relationships across agencies – to make it work.
• There remains significant confusion at the country level over how the Global Cluster operates and how the co-leadership arrangement should play out at the country level.

Performance of the ECU
• Although the situation has been improving, UNICEF is seen as not delivering sufficiently on its commitments and responsibilities within the ECU.
• The ECU has not been operating effectively as a team across the two organisations. Other elements such as the Education Cluster Working Group and the dedicated Task Teams have been working much more successfully.
• The structuring of the roles, responsibilities and lines of reporting within the ECU exacerbates difficulties in working together as a team.
• Communication between the partners within the ECU has not been sufficiently effective.
• Although a plan was drafted, there is no agreed management plan in place to guide the operation of the ECU.
• The physical separation of the ECU UNICEF and Save the Children staff inhibits effective team work between the organisations.

2 Note: at the time of writing of this report, the situation within the ECU was changing with the appointment of a new Cluster Coordinator. This finding predates that appointment.
External aspects

- Support to country-level staff is seen as uneven. Country level staff would like to see stronger advocacy and more focus on country, rather than global, concerns.
- The Cluster has not yet achieved an identity as a single entity. A balance between individuals representing their organisation’s interests and representing the Cluster’s interests has not yet been achieved.

Relationship

- UNICEF’s unilateral decisions on the appointment of the first two Co-ordinators were a serious breach of the partnership protocol and spirit, and continue to have repercussions for the partnership relationship.
- The comparative advantages of the two organisations are being utilised, if not yet to their full potential, but their different operating cultures can be a constraint to effective co-leadership, for example in the creation of a joint deployment roster.
- Equity between the partners – as felt within the partnership, and as perceived from the outside – has not yet been achieved.

Monitoring

- There is no system currently in place to monitor the effectiveness of the overall management of the Global Cluster or of the health of the partnership and effectiveness of the work relationship between the lead agencies.

Key recommendations

Informed by the knowledge and experience gained to date and the findings and specific recommendations of this review, the co-lead agencies should institute a collaborative process to take a step back and re-build the partnership, including adapting or instigating new management structures and procedures as necessary, to ensure the co-leadership is fit-for-purpose to deliver on the Cluster’s remit.

The collaborative process could involve:

- Developing a clear vision for the partnership, including an agreed definition of what partnership and co-leadership mean in practice and what ‘success’ would look like from each partner’s point of view.
- Developing clear objectives for the partnership (including explicitly what benefits are expected from co-lead rather than single-lead arrangement) and ensure transparency over individual objectives of the agencies.
- Developing new and revised structures and procedures to ensure the most efficient and effective delivery, and an operational plan which will best utilize the resources and competitive advantages of each agency to achieve the Cluster objectives.
- Taking a ‘clean sheet’ approach, determining the roles and competencies, and hence job descriptions, for the portfolio of staff required for effective delivery of the revised plan.
- The MoU between the agencies should be updated to reflect the new understanding and expectations of the partnership that come out of the re-building process, based on best practice guidelines for partnering agreements.

As a steer for the recommended collaborative process for moving forward, there are a number of specific recommendations which should be considered:
Overall management architecture

- There needs to be a more active role in the oversight of the Cluster as a whole and, as the central coordination mechanism, the ECU in particular. To help achieve this, the agencies should consider splitting the Steering Group roles into two separate entities: A UNICEF / Save the Children Management Group overseeing the co-leadership arrangement (including line management of the ECU; the partnership between the agencies; institutionalizing / mainstreaming the work of the Cluster within each organisation); and a newly formed expanded Steering Group to include two or three other agency partners and UNICEF and Save the Children implementing staff (including regional and country level) which would provide guidance to, and be accountable for, the full Cluster’s strategy and activities.

- The (potentially expanded) Steering Group should more strongly oversee the work of the ECWG by increasing the resources of the ECU to play a more active role in coordinating and supporting the ECWG sub-groups and projects. The ECU should also facilitate stronger connections between the ECWG and country level clusters.

- Stronger coordination mechanisms should be put in place to ensure maximum benefits from the Cluster work mainstreamed into agencies’ staff roles. For example, there could be a regular forum between the agencies to exchange information, coordinate an approach and identify new opportunities.

- Once agreed, clear guidance should be created/updated and disseminated to explain the whole Global Cluster architecture including:
  - Purpose and responsibility of each element of the Global Cluster.
  - Roles and responsibilities of each agency (including external agencies) within each element.
  - Definition of lines of reporting / accountability.
  - Decision-making and discrepancy resolution mechanisms (where relevant).

Finance

- Strong efforts should be made to diversify the resource base for the Global Cluster beyond the Dutch government, in particular with a focus on funding that can come through Save the Children. This will firstly reduce the reliance on a single donor and secondly, if through Save the Children, will help to promote equity between the partners.

- If feasible, a trust fund (or other instrument) should be dedicated as a central pot for the Cluster to administer funding for the ECU and certain Cluster activities, with joint decision-making on allocation (i.e. it becomes ‘Cluster money’ as opposed to ‘UNICEF money used for the Cluster’).

Performance of the ECU

- The roles, job descriptions and reporting lines of the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator be reviewed to engender more effective management and ensure stronger accountability.

- The Steering Group (or new Management Group) ensures that the ECU establishes, and adheres to, consistent and transparent processes of internal decision-making.

- The ECU Co-ordinator, in consultation with the Deputy Co-ordinator produces a twelve-month Management Plan to demonstrate to the Steering Group how the unit will operate in order to achieve its work-plan objectives.
• Appointment of future new senior staff must fulfil the agreed procedure and be based on consensus of the partners irrespective of the employing agency.³

• The whole ECU team should be physically sited together to promote better teamwork. Given the small size of the Save the Children operations in Geneva, the UNICEF office would be preferable to maximize linkage within the partner agencies.

Monitoring and review

• The Steering Group should put in place systems and procedures for the monitoring of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Cluster management to ensure issues and problems are highlighted early. These will include the development of targets both on outputs and on process (for example on responsiveness and communication).

• A regular, informal review meeting between the two agencies (both ECU and regional/HQ staff) should take place to bring up and talk through any issues around the partnership.

Evaluability component

The evaluability assessment component of the review aims to determine the most feasible scope of an M&E Framework and indicators of an eventual evaluation of the performance of the Global Education Cluster.

Comprehensive M&E Framework

No results matrix currently exists for the Education Cluster. Existing results statements pertaining to the Education Cluster are set out in the MOU and in Annex One, specifically. These statements are a mixture of partnership activities and outputs and objectives of the cluster approach. As set out in the management component of the report there is a need to define more precisely the objectives of the partnership itself, and the relationship between these objectives and the predetermined objectives of the cluster approach.

Global Education Cluster Evaluation

This Results Framework needs to be in place to enable the establishment of an M&E framework and in turn enable the Global Education Cluster evaluation to be carried out. Aspects of management review have already addressed certain aspects of the Education Cluster evaluation such as identifying gaps in the existing co-leadership arrangements, and reviewing the appropriateness and adequacy of the partnership. Therefore using the management review findings, the Global Education Cluster evaluation can focus on how working in partnership has added value or hindered the achievement of the objectives of the cluster approach.

The existence of sufficient measurable indicators

The existing Education Cluster currently has no M&E system or indicators in place to measure either the effectiveness of the Global Education Cluster management arrangement or the effectiveness of the cluster in terms of ensuring predictability, timeliness and accountability of international response. Therefore analysis of the sufficiency or reliability of existing indicators is not possible in this review. Nor has it been possible to make a comparison between the criteria for effective single, and co-lead, management arrangements.

Sufficient and measurable indicators for the Education Cluster would be needed at two levels. First, one level of indicators would identify success of the cluster approach objectives. At this level, one would consider adoption of indicators that reflect existing standards and guidelines, such as those of OECD or SPHERE, as they are aimed at assessing development interventions, rather than internal management processes. A second level of indicators would measure how effective, efficient and timely the management arrangement (co-leadership) was.

³ It is noted that this has been done in the recent (September 2010) appointment of the new Coordinator.
Within the other cluster systems, objectives and corresponding indicators are in place at the first level to measure the effectiveness of the cluster approach. Phase one provides an evaluation of the effectiveness of the cluster approach upon which possible baselines and corresponding targets can be developed. The Phase Two Cluster Evaluation Framework sets out a logic model to establish what the intended outcomes of the cluster approach and its effectiveness were. The corresponding indicators provide a range of ways to measure the effectiveness of the cluster approach. These are stated as being applicable to for use by each cluster in terms of measuring its effectiveness.

Although these indicators are relevant to evaluating the effectiveness of the Education Cluster’s approach they do not enable any meaningful measurement of the internal co-leadership relationship: the second level of indicators. These process level management indicators would examine the co-leadership role and its contribution to the Cluster’s effectiveness.

Feasibility of joint monitoring systems

In looking to establish a common M&E framework for the Global Education Cluster a number of considerations need to be taken on board for the Global Education Cluster evaluation.

- Striking a balance between the inclusion of common standards, such as the OECD criteria, at the global and country level that enable collectible and comparable data, and continued flexibility to allow the respective members to operate within their individual organisational culture.

- Establishing a common definition of terms such as ‘timeliness’ and ‘predictability’ that incorporate a range of stakeholders’ delivery methods and the range of emergency responses.

- Perceptions of what a humanitarian, rehabilitation or development educational response is may vary across the co-leadership, and across other stakeholders. Consequently, developing a common Education Cluster M&E framework to measure the effectiveness of the education cluster in emergencies will need to respond to this variation.

- Establishment of common evaluations will be part of an overall M&E framework. Common evaluations need to strike a balance between meeting the needs of each partner’s and stakeholder’s individual objectives and avoiding making the TOR too broad and hence the results redundant in terms of their relevancy to enabling improvements to the cluster approach.

Developing Co-leadership Indicators

Developing indicators to measure effectiveness and efficiency of the co-lead management arrangement by looking at three interconnected elements:

- How efficient and effective is the management of processes involving external (to the two agencies) organisations?

- From an internal perspective, how effectively and efficiently are the two agencies operating as a partnership?

- To what extent is the co-leadership arrangement delivering benefits beyond those a single-lead could deliver – i.e. what is the partnership’s added value?

Key indicators include:

---

4 Standard evaluation taking place across a number of agencies
## External Management Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Possible Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How engaged are external stakeholders and Save the Children and UNICEF staff at the appropriate level?</td>
<td>Representation of the majority(^5) of pre-identified key stakeholders attending /contributing to(^6) cluster working groups (percentage of key stakeholders taking an active role) (MOV: attendee list, variety of written contributions to working groups)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are meetings involving external stakeholders properly planned and managed?</td>
<td>Meeting agenda points are determined by a range of individuals (MOV: documentary evidence; level of satisfaction of participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information and knowledge management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are adequate knowledge management procedures in place?</td>
<td>Uptake and use of knowledge products (MOV: Selective interviews with country cluster members)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Internal Performance as a partnership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is each agency equitably and consistently represented in the co-lead arrangement?</td>
<td>Number of common advocacy issues identified by the country cluster and taken forward as a advocacy issue by ECU (MOV: Advocacy campaigns literature/meeting minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can each agency represent the partnership to external stakeholders?</td>
<td>Country-level cluster reports added value of the ECU by making emergency response more efficient through pooling of resources. (MOV: reported examples of added value, pooling of resources by ECU, number and types of requests resource polling identified by country cluster through survey of country cluster members)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project, financial and secretariat management</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability – What happens when roles/decisions do not follow procedures? Is there good governance?</td>
<td>Process for managing grievances is established (MOV: grievance procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grievance procedure is adhered to (MOV: audit of grievance procedure protocol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting action points from meetings are clearly stated and allocated to a named individual with an agreed timescale for completion (MOV: meeting minutes and action points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generation and management of funding is shared by both agencies and is not dependent on a single source (MOV: financial records)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) To be internally defined as to what constitutes a majority

\(^6\) ‘contributing’ as defined by written input.
### Recommendations for Global Education Cluster Evaluations

- In the first instance, a results matrix establishing the relationship between the co-leadership arrangements and the cluster objectives and incorporating the global and country level contexts needs to be developed. The logic model and related indicators in the Phase Two evaluation is a solid foundation upon which objectives and indicators for the co-leadership arrangement can be placed.

- Any common M&E framework should be light, simple and flexible, incorporating all the different ways the partners and stakeholders work. The resources need to be in place within the ECU to manage the framework and each respective implementing partners within country level clusters need to sign up to and see clear added value of the framework. Therefore, in practice, this means the framework would focus on common principles rather than specific requirements and guidelines. Issues of processes as they relate to impact evaluations should be set out as best practices within the framework.

- Develop guidelines for carrying out common evaluations to include areas such as:
  - Common Definitions of key evaluation terms;
  - Standards and Principles upon which to carry out an evaluation
  - Parameters of partner and stakeholder participation in the common framework, including minimum requirements;
  - Common and joint evaluation guidance and administration (such as lines of report, DSA, etc.);
  - Feedback mechanisms for the framework (how the Results Framework will be adapted if it is seen to be no longer working);
  - Mechanisms for negotiating any disagreements arising from the findings;
  - Management: dedicated staff participation across the co-leadership;

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Performance as a partnership.</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External internal communications / relations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Is the process for making decisions clear and transparent?</td>
<td>Key representative from each agency sign off on key decisions (MOV: evidence of written sign off of decision set out in decision protocol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day-to-day accountability</strong>&lt;br&gt;Can partners rely on each other to complete agreed tasks?</td>
<td>Existence of mutual accountability procedures (MOV: accountability procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Added Value</strong>&lt;br&gt;Do partners feel they are achieving more as a partnership than they would alone?</td>
<td>Number and type of contacts made across the two agencies (MOV knowledge sharing events; joint actions agreed by the Steering Group; joint advocacy campaigns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions from the review Terms of Reference

Table 1, below, provides the questions from the review ToR and maps them to the relevant section or sub-section of the report in which they are explored.

**Table 1: Location of material addressing the ToR questions and sub-questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main question or sub-question</th>
<th>Location of response (Section and sub-section number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How well are the partners managing together, and what if any changes need to be made in order for the co-leadership arrangement to be managed in the most effective manner possible?</td>
<td>4 (Findings) 5 (Recommendations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how effectively have co-lead agencies fulfilled the terms of their cooperative arrangement stipulated in the UNICEF-Save the Children MOU?</td>
<td>4.1 (Set-up) 4.2 (Operations) especially 4.2.1 to 4.2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What if any outcomes, both positive and negative and intended and unintended, are attributable to the partnership (e.g., as opposed to the cluster more generally)?</td>
<td>4.2 (Operations) 4.4 (Impact) 4.5 (Added Value and the Partnership Approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What if any value-added does the partnership arrangement appear to have offered, above and beyond what single-agency cluster leadership arrangements have done?</td>
<td>4.5 (Added Value and the Partnership Approach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors have enabled effective partnership in the co-leadership arrangement itself?</td>
<td>4.1 (Set-up) especially 4.1.1 to 4.1.4 and 4.1.7 4.2 (Operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors have done so in other, similar partnerships elsewhere, against which the co-leadership arrangement can be benchmarked?</td>
<td>4.3 (Relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What promising approaches have been developed so far and why?</td>
<td>4.2.2, 4.2.6, 4.2.7 4.3 (Relationship), 4.3.1 4.4 (Impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What comparative advantage does each of the two co-lead agencies bring to the partnership, and what complementarities exist between them?</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has this been acknowledged, mapped, and strategically planned around?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What specific functions can co–lead agencies fulfil according to expectations?</td>
<td>4.2 (Operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the country level, are pre-existing approaches implemented by the local actors, or individual partners, more effective and why?</td>
<td>4.2.7 4.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main question or sub-question</td>
<td>Location of response (Section and sub-section number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How clearly differentiated is the division of labour between the two co-lead agencies? What overlaps in their roles have been observed?</td>
<td>4.1.7, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How successfully have the parties harnessed their respective resources to achieve the objectives outlined in the UNICEF-Save the Children MOU?</td>
<td>4.3.1, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, to what extent have the benefits gained through the co-leadership arrangements justified the resources invested to date? What alternative resources should be dedicated to the co-leadership arrangement in order to make it more effective, efficient, relevant and/or sustainable?</td>
<td>4.3.2, 4.4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting across all of the foregoing questions, what factors have been pivotal in helping or hindering effective and efficient co-leadership of the cluster?</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What if anything should be changed moving forward (e.g., in the arrangement’s guiding documents, in the two partners’ working methods, procedures, protocols, operations, and so forth) to enhance the cluster’s effectiveness, efficiency and relevance?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What alternative arrangements would be preferable moving forward?</td>
<td>4.6, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What would the optimal benchmarks of the cluster co-leadership arrangement’s performance be?</strong></td>
<td>6 (Evaluability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With what SMART indicators might one operationalize successful cluster co-leadership in relation to key evaluation criteria (e.g. relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, connectedness)?</td>
<td>6.4, 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent are these made explicit in guiding documents, to what extent can they be inferred from these documents, and to what extent must they be developed during the present analysis itself?</td>
<td>6.2, 6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways, if any, do these indicators differ from those already established for single-agency cluster coordination?</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do cluster leads measure their own success differently in co-led settings versus single-agency-led settings?</td>
<td>6.1, 6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Acronyms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>Education Cluster (Support) Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECWG</td>
<td>Education Cluster Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIEP</td>
<td>International Institute for Educational Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEE</td>
<td>Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (or variations on the theme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPI</td>
<td>The Partnering Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water Sanitation and Hygiene (Cluster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMO</td>
<td>World Meteorological Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **Introduction and background**

1.1 **Origin of the review**

The creation of the Global Education Cluster was approved by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in 2006 as an additional sector in the IASC’s overall cluster approach. In contrast to all other cluster sectors, the Global Education Cluster was established with a co-leadership arrangement whereby leadership of the cluster is shared by UNICEF and Save the Children. Given this pairing of two organisations of very different types, the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the co-lead agencies stipulates that a review should take place within two years of the cluster’s creation. The current exercise, led by The Partnering Initiative, constitutes this review and seeks to offer an independent, impartial analysis of the Global Education Cluster co-leadership arrangement. The Terms of Reference for this exercise set out the review’s purpose, objectives and preferred mode of procedure. The ToR states that

“The purpose of this exercise is.....not merely to help inform the forthcoming Global Education Cluster evaluation, but rather also to suggest improvements in the co-leadership arrangement’s management and operations in their own right.” (UNICEF/Save the Children 2010:1)

The TPI review team notes that the current review takes place within the context of a planned review of the Global Education Cluster as a whole and needs to provide insights on the co-lead arrangement that will inform that wider exercise. Second, that the review should combine an analysis of the structure and operation of the co-lead arrangement with an assessment of evaluability indicators that might feasibly be used to measure the performance of the co-lead arrangement. Finally, that the review should be “formative and forward-looking” (UNICEF/Save the Children 2010: 3) and focus on identifying ways of improving the performance of the co-lead arrangement.

1.2 **The Inception Report and basic premise**

As the chosen consultant for the review, The Partnering Initiative set out its response to the Terms of Reference in an Inception Report, submitted to UNICEF/Save the Children in May 2010 and, following consultation and revision, signed off by all parties on 18 June. The Inception Report acknowledges the main guidelines provided in the Terms of Reference and specifies the particular approach to be adopted by The Partnering Initiative in order to structure the review process and to offer added value in the analysis of the partnership between UNICEF and Save the Children. Relevant details of the guidelines and approach adopted are provided within the appropriate section of this report.

Central to the approach adopted by The Partnering Initiative is the assumption, drawn from the review ToR, that both parties to the co-lead arrangement aspire to partner more effectively, even if the co-lead arrangement was not originally established with strict and explicit partnership guidelines. The fact that the agencies wish to continue to work together to deliver the Cluster objectives is made explicit in the review ToR:

“it is assumed that the co-leadership arrangement will likely continue to form the mode by which the Global Education Cluster is managed.” (UNICEF/Save the Children 2010:1)

The review does not therefore attempt to compare the effectiveness of the co-lead arrangement with a counterfactual single-lead arrangement. Rather, it assumes that the better the functioning of the existing partnership, the more effective the Cluster will be at achieving its primary aim of improving education in emergency preparedness and response.

Consequently, TPI has employed a partnership framework to produce an analysis of the co-lead arrangement as it currently stands and also to identify opportunities for the parties to engage in a partnership development process to take the co-lead arrangement forward.
1.3 Working definition of a partnership

In the context of this review, and as agreed in the Inception Report, partnership is defined as:

“An on-going, working relationship characterised by equity, transparency and mutual benefit with a strong, supportive relationship in which the partners:

- Have overlapping (or at least complementary) interests and agreed objectives,
- Co-create projects and programmes,
- Share risks as well as benefits,
- Are mutually accountable, and
- Contribute resources to the partnership.”

This working definition is a synthesis of three broadly similar definitions: the UN definition of partnership which guides UNICEF, the Global Humanitarian Platform’s Principles of Partnership which have been endorsed by Save the Children and the definition used by The Partnering Initiative based on 20 years’ experience of analysing effective multi-sector partnerships worldwide. The definition clearly sets out the characteristics of a partnership in a way which distinguishes it from other forms of relationship such as an MOU or implementation contract (which are also quite often referred to as ‘partnerships’).

The extent to which the agencies institutionally (and their individual staff members) consider that the co-lead is a partnership, in the sense defined here, is one of the issues explored in this review and discussed explicitly in section 4.6.

1.4 Framework for analysis of a partnership

The review uses a framework for analysis that has been developed by The Partnering Initiative and used extensively in a wide variety of evaluations and reviews.
The full framework analyses the partnership within the following elements:

1. **Setup** – how well has the partnership been set up?
2. **Operations** – how efficiently is the partnership operating?
3. **Relationship** – how well are the organisations working together as partners?
4. **Partnership added-value** – what are the benefits or otherwise of working in partnership rather than as a single organisation?
5. **Impact** – what impact is the programme having?

The focus of this review is on the first four elements, which pertain to the management and effectiveness of the co-lead arrangement itself.

Of course no framework is perfect and certain findings of the review will fall across more than one of these elements.

### 1.5 Organisation of the Draft Report

This report is divided into six main sections and prefaced with an Executive Summary providing a concise synopsis of the purpose, scope, main findings and recommendations of the report as a whole. Sections 2 and 3 describe the scope of the review exercise and the methodology adopted to achieve the review’s agreed objectives. The main findings of the review are set out in detail in section 4 and are organized within the structure of the chosen partnership framework, moving from the Set-up of the partnership through Operations, Relationship and Impact to an assessment of its Partnership Approach and Added Value.

It is important to note here that, although the report includes a section on ‘Impact’, the current review is not an impact review and its scope does not extend to a full assessment of the impact of the Global Cluster.

In section 5, a series of recommendations are presented in order to offer the parties to the Global Education Cluster stimulus to reflection and discussion on the possible ways of taking the co-lead arrangement forward.

Finally, in section 6 the evaluability component of the review is explicitly addressed by an independent evaluation consultant. The evaluability component includes the identification of appropriate indicators to measure the performance of the co-lead arrangement.

To ensure clarity of procedure and replicability, copies of all the main research sources and instruments utilised in the review are made available in Appendices listed at the end of the report.
2. **Scope of the review**

2.1 **Objectives of the co-lead review**

In line with the origin and overall purpose of the co-lead review described in 1.1 above, The Partnering Initiative has organized the review process in order to achieve the main objectives set out in the Terms of Reference i.e. to determine:

- A sense of whether the elements in place to manage the co-leadership arrangement are adequate, both with regard to its architecture (Set-up) and its partners’ mode of working together (Operations and Relationship); and
- The indicators an evaluation of the Global Education Cluster co-leadership arrangement might use to measure the co-leadership arrangement’s performance (Evaluability).

However, it has done so in such a way as to emphasise the central role of partnership values in the relationship between the co-lead agencies and to encourage those agencies to address the question of how they develop their co-lead arrangement as a true partnership.

2.2 **Draft review process**

The review process as set out by The Partnering Initiative in the Inception Report includes a consultation stage at which all parties were able to respond in detail to the contents of the Draft Report. Comments on the Draft Report have been incorporated in the production of this Final Report.

In the Inception Report, this consultation stage included a face-to-face workshop which aimed to provide an opportunity for the co-lead agencies to develop a degree of consensus over the findings and to discuss and jointly identify specific strategies for amending and improving their partnership. Unfortunately, logistical constraints have now precluded this option within the scope of this review.

The Final Report provides as full an account of the review’s findings as possible to address the main questions posed in the Terms of Reference, namely:

> “How well are the partners managing together, and what if any changes need to be made in order for the co-leadership arrangement to be managed in the most effective manner possible?”

> “What would the optimal benchmarks of the cluster co-leadership arrangement’s performance be?”

However, the report should be seen as a starting point: a working document offering information, insight and concrete recommendations to the partner agencies in the expectation that the agencies will internalize the lessons learned and engage together to take this work forward as a partnership.

2.3 **Limitations to the current review exercise**

In the Inception Report a number of limitations and risks were identified (TPI 2010: 17). Many of these concerns relating to staff changes, access to sources and inter-personal conflicts, have not materialized. The overall time schedule for the process has been altered significantly in response to the constraints of the review process and the exercise has had to be carried out with a constant view to using time as efficiently as possible. The need for detailed consultation with the review management team on materials, research instruments and outputs has added to the time commitment for the TPI review team but has also offered considerable additional expertise and organisational knowledge. It has also facilitated access to documentary and personal sources and has enabled the review to progress with the continued consent and support of all parties.
The one substantive change to the process, as mentioned above, has been the clients’ decision to take out the consultative workshop from the process. This does not directly affect the evidence gathered during the data collection stages of the review but it does put more emphasis on the review findings, which had, in the original plan, been seen as feeding into a face-to-face event that would contribute significantly to the formulation of conclusions and actions from the review.

There are some important limitations to this review that need constantly to be borne in mind. First and foremost, it is a review of the co-leadership management arrangement and not of the Global Education Cluster as a whole. As noted, this will be the subject of a separate exercise at a later date to which the current work will offer contributory insight.

Second, its focus is the operation of the co-leadership arrangement at the global level – most particularly the Education Cluster Unit, but also the Steering Group, Education Cluster Working Group and associated Task Teams, and – to a lesser extent – the Cluster functions mainstreamed into agencies’ roles. In both the Terms of Reference and the Inception Report it was recognised that the scope of the current review could not extend to the country level but that some data would need to be gathered at that level in order to capture views on the operation of the global co-leadership arrangement. TPI has gathered evidence accordingly and data from a survey of country level offices are included in this report to provide an additional perspective on the structure and operation of the global level partnership.

Finally, the review, while including a summative element to “diagnose” the state of the partnership, is primarily formative in nature. That is to say, the purpose of the review is to contribute to the longer-term development of the partnership between UNICEF and Save the Children and not to pronounce any final, irrevocable judgements on that collaboration.

### 2.4 Focus on the Education Cluster Support Unit (ECU)

The review does have a significantly stronger focus on the operation of the ECU than of other elements in the Global Education Cluster. As this has been the subject of critical feedback during the process of drafting and consulting on this report, it is worth noting here why this is the case.

There are three main reasons:

i. In the interviews undertaken in the inception phase, strong concern was expressed from both Save the Children and UNICEF over how the ECU was operating.

ii. The ECU is in many ways the embodiment and centre of gravity of the partnership relationship. Created in the co-lead MoU, the unit provides an administrative / coordination centre (a ‘secretariat’) for the cluster and is the practical representation of the collaboration between the two agencies. As such, it carries considerable symbolic as well as practical significance: its functioning sends messages to staff and partners about the success of the co-lead partnership. It is therefore, inevitably and rightly, an important focus for the report.

iii. The interviews clearly demonstrated a strong focus of interest on the ECU. Asked about what had or had not worked well within the co-lead, it was the issue of the functioning of the ECU to which interviewees repeatedly and overwhelmingly referred. In this respect, the review team responded to the issues that naturally emerged from the data-collection, capturing the concerns of those involved in the cluster.

Nevertheless, the TPI review team acknowledges that too strong a focus on the ECU risks undervaluing the work done by the ECWG, the Task Teams, the Steering Group and by the co-lead agencies through their own respective organisations. Each draft of the report has sought to redress this balance and this final version (2.0) has been significantly updated to take account of the other elements.
3. Methodology

3.1 Research methods used in the review process

The broad methodological approach to gathering data for the management review and evaluability component followed what was set out in the Inception Report. This responded to the requirements of the Terms of Reference, which stated that the review should utilise a “mixed-method approach” including a review of documentation relating to the Cluster; a wider review of other relevant literature and documentation relating to partnership practice; semi-structured one-to-one interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders; and direct observation of formal and informal meetings.

In response, the Inception Report set out a methodological approach which consisted of four main stages: i) literature review; ii) one-to-one interviews; iii) remote/on-line survey; and iv) a review workshop. The primary aim of this approach was to generate sufficient data, primarily of a qualitative nature, to “complete an analysis of the partnership as it stands” and “to provide recommendations for how it could be improved” (TPI 2010: 9).

As mentioned previously, it was decided not to conduct the review workshop. Hence the contents of the report are based on the first three stages of that four-stage process: drawing data from the analysis of documentary evidence, one-to-one interviews and an on-line survey of staff in country offices. In addition, as the other methods of data capture did not draw out sufficient information on certain issues, a written questionnaire was sent out to a limited number of people in the final phase of the review. Each of these methods is described in greater detail below.

The review team would strongly recommend that the co-lead agencies consider, as originally intended, the added value of a further review workshop element as a next step to this process, in which evidence and recommendations can be processed jointly with a view to deciding actions to take the co-lead arrangement forward.

3.1.1 Analysis of documentary evidence

Internal documentation

The TPI review team was provided with a very substantial quantity of documentation both from the review management team and from senior individuals in each of the partner agencies. Although this was accompanied by guidance on what were “must-see” documents, it also presented some difficulties as there was duplication of documents from different sources, occasionally complicated by differing titles being used by each organisation. Additional material was provided by some individual respondents to the one-to-one interviews, where documentation existed which were referred to in interviews or, in general, thought to be of relevance to the co-lead review. In total, the team was provided with 80 documents, an amount that presented a rich resource but one that was difficult to do full justice to within the timeframe of the review process.

External documentation

In compiling this draft report, the TPI review team has drawn on the substantial resource of material produced by TPI itself in the course of its work as a pioneer in the research, standard-setting, capacity building and evaluation of cross-sector partnerships. This resource includes tool books, case studies and previous evaluation exercises. The team has also accessed insights from the published literature on partnering including both academic and practitioner material. Works explicitly cited in this report are included in Section 7 (References); documents accessed in the review process but not cited are listed in Section 8 (Bibliography).
3.1.2 One-to-one interviews

Telephone interviews during pre-Inception phase

Telephone interviews were conducted with a small number of personnel closely associated with the Global Education Cluster as a preliminary to the production of the Inception Report. These interviews were relatively informal and structured by a short questionnaire consisting of seven questions as a stimulus to wider discussion. A copy of the questions used in this survey is included in Appendix 1. Seven individuals were interviewed during this phase, four from UNICEF and three from Save the Children, including the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator of the Education Cluster Unit. Data from these interviews were used to shape the Inception Report and to identify other individuals who might be interviewed during the main phase of the review.

Questionnaire survey used in face-to-face and telephone interviews

After producing the Inception Report, the TPI team worked closely with the review management team to identify a wider group of individuals engaged in work relating to the Global Education Cluster and, specifically, to the operation of the co-lead arrangement between Save the Children and UNICEF. This list was further expanded using suggestions from senior members of the partner agencies and from the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator of the Education Cluster Unit. A few additional names were added during the early stages of the interviewing process as respondents identified colleagues whom they thought would prove of interest to the TPI review team.

A list of 39 individuals was compiled, which would act as a sampling frame for the main interview process. The list comprised individuals not just from UNICEF and Save the Children but also from UNESCO, UNHCR, OCHA, INEE, IIEP and Plan International. The aim was to interview as wide a cross-section as possible so that responses would be gathered from representatives of the various constituent organisations within the Global Education Cluster – the Steering Group, the Working Group, the Education Cluster Unit and the themed Task Teams (e.g. Capacity Development; Knowledge Management). Because the interview process was the main data-gathering tool for both the management review and the evaluability component, the list of interviewees included a number of people specifically identified by the consultant developing the evaluability indicators. These included several interviewees working (or recently working) in regional or country offices and the two Monitoring and Evaluation experts from UNICEF and Save the Children who were managing the co-lead review on behalf of their respective agencies.

The interviewing was carried out in two broad, if overlapping, phases. In the first, two of the TPI team visited Geneva to carry out face-to-face interviews with all the members of the Education Cluster Unit, those directly associated with the Unit and members of the Education Cluster Working Group based in Geneva. Over two visits to Geneva, 12 individuals were interviewed, representing all but one of those originally identified.

In the second phase, telephone interviews were conducted with Education Cluster participants from a range of organisations and locations. In this phase, a further 20 individuals were interviewed. A copy of the full questionnaire used in both the face-to-face and telephone interviews is included in Appendix 2. Three names on the original list were removed after further consideration; one declined to be interviewed; and three didn’t respond to our requests for interviews during the time period designated for the interviewing. Of these four non-respondents, two had already been interviewed during the pre-Inception phase of the project so the TPI team had some data from them. In total, 32 individuals were interviewed in this phase, including the two members of the review management team. Taken together with the pre-Inception interviews, the TPI team had interview data from 34 individuals associated with the work of the Global Education Cluster, representing 82% of the original sampling frame population.

In addition, a written questionnaire was sent out to 8 individuals as a follow-up to get further information and opinions relating specifically to the overall management architecture and to the mainstreaming of Cluster roles and activities within the two agencies.
3.1.3 Observation of meetings

Although this method was considered – and discussed with the review management team – the opportunities available were limited and the practical arrangements not easy to achieve. In practice, one meeting was observed. Two members of the TPI review team sat in on a bi-weekly meeting of the Education Cluster Unit in Geneva. This was done informally, and with the full agreement of the participants. Some brief comments based on this observation are included in section 4.3.3.

3.1.4 On-line survey of country and regional offices

The Inception Report proposed a small-scale survey carried out at the country level “to gain insights into local management arrangements and, in particular, interactions with and opinions of the ECU in Geneva.” (TPI 2010:15) The sample of respondents selected for the on-line interviewing consisted of Cluster co-ordinators and other core staff in country and regional offices where the Global Education Cluster is represented. There was some discussion between the TPI team and the review management team over whether to target a selected sample of offices or to offer all personnel a chance to participate in the survey. Both for reasons of inclusivity and practicality it was agreed to make the survey generally available. This was felt to be the policy that would be most likely to ensure both a reasonable response rate (at a time when typically low rates may be even lower due to holidays) and to offer the chance of securing a spread of different local arrangements (e.g. single-lead; co-lead etc).

A list of 94 individuals was identified, covering 39 countries where the Global Education Cluster is active. In advance of the survey going live on-line, an email was sent from the review management team to Cluster co-ordinators alerting them to the survey and asking for their co-operation. Immediately prior to going live, the TPI team sent an email alert to a wider group of potential respondents introducing the survey and asking for responses within a two-week (10 working days) period. Mid-way through that period a reminder email was sent to encourage those who had not yet responded. A copy of the on-line survey is included in Appendix 3.

The response rate was slightly better than expectations, given the remote contact and the timing at the height of the holiday season. 39 individuals completed the on-line questionnaire, representing 41.5% of those contacted. Of those responding, 19 (48.7%) were from UNICEF, 19 (48.7%) from Save the Children and 1 (2.6%) from Plan International. Of the 39 countries contacted, responses were received from 21, with between 1 and 3 respondents from each office.

Over half of those respondents (53.8%) were acting as the local cluster co-ordinator and other respondents included those managing or supporting cluster co-ordinators; those acting as cluster co-leads; and those heading up their respective agencies in a particular country or region. Only four (10.3%) of the respondents spent 100% of their time on tasks related to the Cluster and two-thirds (n= 26) spent 30% or less of their time on Cluster work. The majority of respondents (74.4%, n=29) described their local Cluster leadership as co-leadership between UNICEF and Save the Children; a small, and evenly divided, minority were operating in a single lead arrangement under either UNICEF (7.7%, n=3) or Save the Children (7.7%, n=3). Four respondents (10.3%) were working in co-lead arrangements either with different agencies involved or with the addition of a government partner to the normal UNICEF and Save the Children arrangement.

Data from the survey responses has been used to provide additional evidence in sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 on the inter-relations between the Cluster at global level (and the ECU specifically) and those carrying the work of the Cluster at regional and country level.

3.1.5 Final phase follow-up written questionnaires

As previously mentioned, the information from the data sources focussed predominantly on the operations of the ECU. From the various comments on early drafts of this report, it became clear that there was a need to bring in more strongly an analysis of the architecture and management structure of the co-lead arrangement as a whole and around the mainstreaming of Cluster responsibilities within the two agencies.
Without sufficient data from existing sources it was decided to send out a written questionnaire focussing specifically on these issues to a limited number of people: 11 senior level Save the Children and UNICEF staff and 2 people from external agencies strongly involved with Cluster.

Seven forms were completed and returned within the limited time (10 days) available for completion (response rate: 54%) with 4 from Save the Children, 2 from UNICEF and 1 from an external agency.

Information received from the questionnaires has mainly been used within the findings section 4.2.5 and corresponding recommendations.

3.2 Methodological issues: access, sampling, reliability, replicability

There were no major access problems in operationalizing the methodology adopted for the data-gathering part of the review process. The TPI team enjoyed full co-operation from the review management team, which helped to define the target population, refine the research instruments and ease access to potential respondents. There was a very high degree of goodwill shown by members of the Global Education Cluster and, in Geneva, the Cluster Unit staff offered all assistance required in the interviewing. In general, the TPI team benefited from the undoubtedly high level of interest in, and commitment to, the co-lead arrangement evinced by virtually everyone associated with the Cluster. As a result, response rates were excellent in the main phase of interviewing and, even in the on-line survey, were respectable by established benchmarks.

In terms of sampling, the TPI team’s aim of interviewing a substantial cross-section of organisational representatives in the first phase was fully achieved. Interviews were completed with 32 of the 39 individuals originally identified (82%). Of these, 12 were from UNICEF and 11 from Save the Children. Of the remaining nine, 1 was a former Save the Children employee now working as a consultant with UNICEF; 1 worked for UNESCO; 1 for OCHA; 1 for UNHCR; 2 for INEE; 1 for IIEP; 1 for WMO (formerly for UNICEF) and 1 for Plan International. In terms of organisational reach, the sample included at least one member of each of the following Global Education Cluster organisations: the Steering Group; the Advisory Group; the Education Cluster Unit; the Education Cluster Working group; the Capacity Development Task Team; the Global Oversight Task Team; the Field Operations Task Team; and the Knowledge Management Task Team.

For the on-line survey, the response rate of 41.5% gave a good spread and representation, with an equal number of Save and UNICEF staff responding and a distribution of offices representing 21 different locations.

The procedures that were followed in the design and use of research instruments should ensure an acceptable level of reliability in the data generated, although those data are predominantly qualitative in nature. Analysis of qualitative data inevitably relies to a great extent on the interpretation of the researchers so it is important that the process of selection and interpretation of data is both logical and transparent. The process used by the TPI team in this review was based on identifying the key themes or issues that emerged from the interview data and selecting those themes that were a recurrent feature of interviews and which related directly to the questions posed for the review in the ToR. Issues and opinions were not included if they were voiced by one individual alone or if there was no supporting evidence from other interviews, from documentary evidence or from the on-line survey. In practice, this selection was achieved by a six-step procedure:

- **Step 1:** Possible areas of interest were identified through an initial series of telephone interviews with senior participants in the Global Education Cluster (0 above);
- **Step 2:** An interview questionnaire was produced, based on the requirement of the co-lead review ToR and the areas of interest emerging from step 1 (0 above);
- **Step 3:** This questionnaire was tested and refined in consultation with the co-lead agencies’ review management team;
- **Step 4:** After carrying out the interviewing, the three contributing members of the TPI team read all of the interviews and discussed the selection of themes to be included in the report. Only themes agreed by all
three contributors were included and these constituted issues identified as of general concern and of relevance to the ToR questions and sub-questions;

- Step 5: Evidence from the interviews on the selected themes were compared with data from documentary evidence, including existing Lessons Learned reports relating to the Global Education Cluster (0 and 3.1.3 above);

- Step 6: Quotations were selected from the interviews to illustrate the selected themes and, where appropriate, to demonstrate that each issue selected was a point of concern for staff from both co-lead agencies and/or from external stakeholders.

This process facilitated comparison both within each research activity (e.g. comparing responses between each of the one-to-one interviews) and between research activities (e.g. comparing responses from one-to-one interviews with accounts from the documentary evidence and responses to the on-line survey). Thus, using this mix of methods, a degree of triangulation of data was possible and the validity of each data source enhanced. This conforms to what Layder (1993) denotes as a “multistrategy approach” to social research in which the researcher addresses the same corpus of evidence from a number of different methodological directions. It does not guarantee the reliability of data in a way that is comparable to a fully realised statistical analysis of quantitative data but it does permit the generation of a much richer body of qualitative data while still permitting the confirmation of main findings through comparison of data sources.

One important test of the reliability and robustness of any research process is the ease with which other researchers might replicate the methodology and findings of the study. In this case, the TPI team used clear, conventional and well-documented methods to gather its data. All of the face-to-face and telephone interviews were carried out by one of the core members of the TPI review team, using the semi-structured questionnaire agreed with the clients’ management team. The on-line survey was also the result of collaborative development and used a mix of closed and open questions to probe a number of issues regarding the relation between the global and the country elements of the Global Education Cluster. All of these research instruments and the sampling frames used for contact are made available in this report and the study itself could easily be replicated for comparison purposes, either with the same cluster at a later date or with another cluster.

The use of quotations to illustrate or extend points made in the main text necessarily reflects the subjective judgements of the review team. However, unless otherwise stated, the quotes are both representative as well as illustrative, i.e. they represent opinions expressed by a majority of those respondents who expressed an opinion on the matter and which occurred with sufficient frequency to merit inclusion within the main review themes. Wherever possible, quotations are selected to illustrate an opinion expressed by members of both lead agencies and/or by members of other stakeholder organisations in the Cluster. Where there is a significant divergence of opinion (i.e. from more than one respondent), it is mentioned in the text.

### 3.3 Development of the Evaluability Indicators

The evaluability component of the review constitutes a complementary component to the management review approach with inputs obtained during the data collection process as outlined above. In addition to the above, specific research on indicators took place, firstly examining the existing literature to determine what if any indicators existed within the education and other clusters. This illuminated to what extent indicators were explicit in guiding documents and/or to what extent they can be inferred from these documents. Secondly, wider research was undertaken into what indicators other initiatives similar to the Education Cluster were using and to examine if there was any transferability between them. This identified potential indicators used in existing/similar partnerships; this research included the relevant resources and evaluation experience of TPI.
4. Findings

The co-lead management arrangement has been set up in accordance with the MoU and is successfully delivering many elements of its mandate. However, the partnership itself has been suffering significant ‘teething pains’ and is not operating as effectively as it should in a number of areas. These partnering issues, along with management structure issues, are preventing the co-lead arrangement from achieving its full potential.

4.1 Set-up

The focus of this section is the way in which the co-lead arrangement was conceived, planned and structured. The emphasis is on the impact of that initial structuring process and the way in which the organisation and procedures that were (or were not) established had implications for the potential effectiveness of the collaboration. The analysis demonstrates how strongly the achievements of a partnership can be influenced by the system created for its operation and, thus, how systemic changes may be necessary to enable operational success.

4.1.1 Bringing the arrangement into being

The decision to establish a co-lead arrangement for the Cluster was more the result of innovative leadership than of a specific needs-based rationale.

The Global Education Cluster co-lead arrangement, with joint UN and international NGO leads, is unique among the global clusters for humanitarian relief. In 2004, the UN Emergency Response Coordinator commissioned a review which identified serious gaps in humanitarian response, including coordination problems between the UN system and NGOs. Consequently, the cluster approach was developed as a component of a wider humanitarian reform initiative.

Under the cluster system, IASC agencies are designated as "lead agencies" for defined areas of humanitarian assistance. Cluster lead agencies co-ordinate interested parties at the global level to develop surge capacity, pre-position supplies; provide technical guidance and training, together with appropriate procedures and operational support. Overall, lead agencies are responsible for strengthening system-wide preparedness and technical capacity, ensuring predictable leadership and accountability, as well as partnership. Lead agencies are also responsible for coordination at global and country levels, and as “providers of last resort” where gaps arise in response capacity.

In 2005, cluster lead agencies were designated in nine key programme and operational levels and it was also determined the cluster approach should be applied at the country level. The Education Cluster was not initially identified as a sector to be included at the global level but was established in 2006 in response to advocacy to the IASC both from NGOs and from within the UN system\(^\text{10}\).

\(^{10}\) The formal objectives of the cluster are stated in the Global Education Cluster MoU (Annex 1 to the Memorandum of Understanding between UNICEF and the International Save the Children Alliance, 30.10.2007:3) as follows:

- Promote increased awareness in the key roles education plays in all phases of humanitarian emergency response and recovery
- Promote and improve standards of good practice in education responses to emergencies and early recovery, including the dissemination of lessons learnt
- Coordinate humanitarian agencies in the provision of education services in emergency situations in collaboration with relevant local and national agencies
- Strengthen global response capacity in terms of the available skills, personnel and knowledge-related resources
Accounts of how the co-lead arrangement came to be proposed differ in details and emphasis among our interviewees, although all agree that the initial proposal came from the (then) Emergency Relief Co-ordinator. There is a consensus around the notion that those within both the UN system and leading NGOs were keen to form closer working arrangements and to explore the possibility of partnerships so that each could benefit from the strengths that the other might bring to humanitarian relief. The creation of the Education Cluster, as the last addition to the cluster sectors, appeared to offer an opportunity to translate this enthusiasm into practice.

Some interviewees regard the actual instigation of the co-lead arrangement as a ‘top-down’ process – a case of a small number of key players at senior level making a decision to experiment – whereas others have seen it more as reflecting pressure from the grass-roots, especially from the NGO sector’s desire to have more influence on the UN system. Most agree that it was an idea ‘whose time had come’ and that the strong push from the Emergency Relief Co-ordinator generated the impetus for both parties to realise the existing potential for partnership. However, interviewees who were very close to the original decision-making process suggest that there might have been less enthusiasm in some areas of the UNICEF organisation.

Once Save the Children had accepted the principle of a co-lead arrangement, the Emergency Relief Co-ordinator:

“had to explain that decision to UNICEF— I don’t know how much the idea had previously come into discussion at UNICEF.” (Save the Children)

Another interviewee described Save the Children’s role as:

“the terrier at the heels of UNICEF – goading them to take on the responsibility.” (Capacity Development Task Team member)

Regardless of the precise details of the co-lead arrangement’s inception, the context and the process had interesting implications. Education had been one of the last sectors to be accepted as a cluster: it had required special advocacy and support to justify its participation in the cluster system. Yet it was the first, and only, sector to go beyond co-operation with NGOs to create a unique co-lead arrangement. This was a bold move to take as it meant creating a partnership to provide leadership within a system established with an assumption of single-agency leadership.

4.1.2 The definition of co-leadership

Co-leadership between a UN Agency and an NGO, as a new concept, lacked initial clarity over its practical implementation.

In the MoU between UNICEF and Save the Children, the role of the co-lead arrangement is defined, almost exclusively, in terms of its outputs, i.e., its responsibility to lead the Global Education Cluster in a way that achieves the cluster objectives. The nature of that leadership is defined at the institutional level but not at the operational level. Yet, as Tennyson notes,

- Strengthen the global availability of essential supplies and resources required to respond to emergency situations
- Improve the capacity of partner agencies in rebuilding the education system following an emergency and over the longer term with significant improvement in delivery and quality of education services
- Strengthen education in terms of risk awareness, reduction and emergency preparedness
- Maximise funding opportunities for emergency education response through the collation and coordination of proposals and appeals

The selection of issues for discussion and the use of representative quotations to illustrate these issues are discussed in 3.3.5 above.

Quoted interviewees are identified as from UNICEF or Save the Children. If the interviewee is not employed by one of these organisations, they are identified by their role in the Education Cluster to minimise the risk of personal identification.
“Partnerships raise interesting questions about leadership. What is the role of a leader in a paradigm that is essentially collaborative and based on a notion of equity between the key players? Is collaboration between equals and the notion of strong leadership incompatible?” (Tennyson 2003: 18)

No simple answer to these questions exists but a research into the operation of partnerships has shown that a good partnership will be able to ask the questions openly and, collaboratively, seek workable solutions. Indeed, in an earlier document on the development of the co-lead arrangement, some of these leadership challenges are anticipated:

“The process of applying the cluster approach to education needs to be driven by strong, capable and accountable leadership so that it does not become bogged down by undue bureaucratic procedures or inter-agency competition.” (Draft Concept Note, January 2007: 10)

This statement recognises the potential hazards facing an organisational set-up which is both unique within the IASC ‘family’ of cluster sectors and complex in terms of devising a working arrangement that would deliver strong leadership. It also identifies a number of areas for which the co-lead arrangement needed to be prepared through its structure, recruitment and governance procedures. These concerns are not captured in the final MoU or in its Annex so that there was no written guidance to the Education Cluster Unit as to how a new partnership would achieve this essential strong leadership.

The practical arrangements for co-leadership have therefore developed, under the guidance of the Steering Group and of the UNICEF and Save the Children Cluster line managers, while the Cluster has been operating in earnest. Combining the day-to-day demands of delivery with the need for space and reflection to develop optimal systems, is a challenge faced by many partnerships and inevitably results in an element of trial and error.

Without fully developed and robust systems yet in place, success relies heavily on individual performance. There are many examples where individuals from both UNICEF and Save the Children have made things work despite unhelpful systems. However, in other cases, as one interviewee reflected on the ECU:

“Partnering and coordination is a skill and that comes down to leadership – that is missing at the higher levels.” (Capacity Development Task Team member)

4.1.3 Partnership working

A further important omission in the MoU is the lack of any explicit discussion of how the co-lead arrangement would work as a partnership. Although there is the basic language of partnership (“UNICEF and the International Save the Children Alliance will collaborate to manage the Global Education Cluster.”, MoU Annex 1:5) there is no recognition that the partnership qua partnership needs explicit and agreed procedures. The MoU creates the structure (the ECU, the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator post; the Steering Group etc.) but says nothing about the process. In contrast, The Partnering Initiative model for new partnership agreements proposes that the agreement should specify not only the roles and responsibilities of partners and the arrangements for co-

---

ordination and administration but also the nature of decision-making processes within the partnership (Tool 3 ‘Sample Partnering Agreement’ in Tennyson 2003).

These omissions within the formal set-up of the co-lead structure can lead to areas of potential weakness that can generate problems during the operation of the partnership. The very real commitment to create a collaboration was not matched by an investment in developing the detail of how that collaboration would work in practice:

“The operational side was not properly thought through from conception - how the two agencies actually worked together at every level of the cluster wasn’t properly planned. “ (UNICEF)

According to one Save the Children interviewee, this was mainly a consequence of circumstance, where there was significant external pressure to focus outwards and get on with the work of the Cluster rather than spend time focussing internally. However, a lack of agreed clear process and formal responsibilities to which the agencies could be held accountable puts significantly more responsibility on the individuals involved – and their relationships across agencies – to make it work. And, as with ‘co-leadership’, it has meant the challenging task of having to develop the understanding and practical implications of partnership while under the pressure of delivering the programme.

4.1.4 Institutional commitment to the partnership

Although now significantly more symmetric, institutional commitment to the principle of co-leadership was initially quite unbalanced, with more staff within UNICEF sceptical over working in partnership with Save the Children than vice-versa.

In the documentation for the Global Education Cluster, there is an explicitly equal commitment from both agencies to the co-lead arrangement. The agencies are “joint leaders of the Global Education Cluster” (MoU:2) and the Annex to the MoU sets out the common principles both agencies share and the comparative advantages that each brings to this collaboration. This is a picture that was questioned by interviewees from both the co-lead agencies and from other agencies in the Cluster. Although, most interviewees felt that there was a genuine desire from all parties in the Global Education Cluster to pursue the principle of a co-lead arrangement, many felt that the desire was less deeply rooted in UNICEF than in other agencies. Scepticism was aired, both from UNICEF interviewees and cluster members more widely, about the depth and strength of UNICEF’s commitment, especially at the most senior level.

“To be absolutely honest, I think that UNICEF, at the beginning, was a little sceptical about why Jan Egeland was imposing this added burden on them.” (Save the Children)

“accountability might be improved in terms of taking on workload – UNICEF has not taken on all the tasks that need to be done and I know Save has been frustrated by this – Save has taken on a lot of the work. “ (EC Advisory Group member)

“Save has taken it more seriously than we have” (UNICEF)

It should be noted, though, that this situation was seen to be improving as the role of the Global Education Cluster developed and the collaboration matured. There was a sense that initial misgivings were being mitigated by the experience of working together, especially within the ECWG Task Teams. There were also steps being taken to address the membership of key committees and Task Teams through more dedicated resourcing. This was seen as necessary as, for many UNICEF staff outside the ECU itself, participation in the Cluster had been an additional task on already full workloads.

“There’s been a definite shift in attitude of senior management in UNICEF to taking the Steering Group role more seriously –that had been a bit of a gap and some issues should have been resolved earlier.” (UNICEF)
"The commitment of certain individuals and strength of relationships has helped a lot." (Capacity Development Task Team member)

4.1.5 Visibility of the co-lead arrangement

The co-lead arrangement has increased visibility for the Cluster, but there remains a lack of clarity among external stakeholders over how it operates.

The fact that education was the last cluster to be created provided an additional challenge to the co-lead agencies: clearly not all parties to the cluster approach had been in favour of the creation of the Global Education Cluster and it would need both to establish a strong profile and to benefit from continued advocacy in order to succeed. Not all of our interviewees saw this as having been achieved. For some the relationship with other UN agencies, and OCHA in particular, remained a difficult one. Convincing others that Education is an emergency priority was, in one respondent’s words, “a battle that hasn’t been won” (UNICEF).

The establishment of the innovative co-lead arrangement has helped to gain visibility for the Cluster and to mark it out as distinctive from other humanitarian relief clusters. Yet, the visibility of the global operation – especially the ECU – still seems to present a problem. This is particularly true of those representing the Cluster at country level. There appears to be a lack of clarity about the role of the ECU and, more broadly, about the benefit to be gained from the partnership at global level. A frequent comment from interviewees was that there needed to be a clear re-statement of the function and purpose of the co-lead and a much more visible profile for the ECU.

Similar issues arose in the emergency response to the Haiti earthquake. Although the overall performance of the Cluster was praised by participants, questions were raised over the degree to which the co-lead agencies were working in a co-ordinated and unitary way.

“The co-lead agencies did not consistently present as ‘one voice’ to the outside world...” (Global Education Cluster 2010:17)

4.1.6 Resourcing

There are continued concerns over the reliance on a single source of funding for the Cluster and how it is administered through UNICEF.

The long-term resourcing of the Global Education Cluster depends, as with other clusters, on donor funding. This is recognised in paragraph 5.3.3 of the Annex to the MoU. The funding referred to in the MoU was funding raised specifically through the 2007 Cluster Capacity Building Appeal, which was for all clusters. It was agreed by Save the Children and the Education Cluster Advisory Group at the time that UNICEF would receive and channel the funds received against the Appeal but that prioritization and decision-making would lie with the Education Cluster Advisory Group. UNICEF, with its existing mechanisms for funding cluster activities, is to act as “Administrative Agent for donor funding but the two agencies “will work together to propose funding allocations against the Education Cluster budget”.

In practice, a number of practical objections have arisen to these arrangements. Despite the fact that the Global Education Cluster is in an unusually privileged position of having access to a very substantial tranche of donor funding from the government of the Netherlands, some participants in the Cluster voiced dissatisfaction with the management of the funding. This dissatisfaction related to three issues: transparency of the Cluster budget; the bureaucracy of funding allocation; and the over-reliance on one main donor.

The transparency issue was raised regularly by individuals from both agencies, who felt that, in an equal partnership, the management and allocation of the budget should be equally clear to all parties.
“There may be a lack of transparency at the global level, especially over funding and decision-making: it’s hard for Save to see UNICEF’s internal working and there’s a feeling that the funding decisions have been kept inside UNICEF.” (EC Advisory Group member)

However, there are differences of opinion on the current situation, with at least one UNICEF staff member disagreeing that the management of the funding was not transparent. Whatever the exact details, the fact that this has been brought up so regularly means that there is an issue to be addressed here.

In addition, the fact that UNICEF had formal control of the money created a “big issue” according to one UNICEF interviewee who felt that it

“alienated attempts by Save to be effective at global and country level.” (UNICEF)

And another, who said bluntly:

“It is not a partnership of equals, the reality is that money talks and UNICEF had the money. It creates an uncomfortable relationship.” (UNICEF)

Another dimension of this criticism was frustration at the time it took to agree the allocation of funding and to release it to operational staff. Interviewees from both partner organisations complained that the UNICEF systems were “opaque” and apparently cumbersome.

“UNICEF dominates the funding through the Netherlands money and that has created a bit of a dependency...not sure if that has impacted the agenda but it has impacted timeframes...made things more bureaucratic and slowed things down, mainly because of UN bureaucracy.” (UNICEF)

“In (name of operational sector) finances have been a nightmare and it has taken too long to get contracts in place – this is due to the wheels of the UN moving slowly...actually could have used Save better by letting them take the lead so it gives an alternative.” (ECWG member)

The problems reported in this review are not unique. In Stott’s 2007 study of an unsuccessful partnership between a UN agency and a major manufacturing company, one of her UN interviewees commented that

“I believe that if the partnership ‘failed’ it was due to...archaic and bureaucratic procedures i.e. spending authorisations and...controlling mechanisms...this is something we need to address internally.” (Stott, 2007:12)

However, it is important to acknowledge that part of the constraint on utilising funds is the need for accountability to donors and accountability will frequently lie with the UN agency. Interviewees from both of the co-lead agencies in our review recognised that donor governments are more likely to look for accountability through a relationship with a UN agency than an NGO. Yet, the fact remains that within the Cluster the mechanisms for acquiring, managing and disbursing funding are creating problems for staff in both agencies.

Many also saw the over-reliance on one donor as creating problems as well as opportunities for the Cluster, especially in the long-term: having the bulk of activities dependent on a single source of funding might make the Cluster vulnerable.

“So,...funding all the structures – that needs to be looked at. What happens when the funding dries up and how can this structure be sustained? What can continue to be funded long term?” (UNICEF)

“If the Dutch pull the plug, there’s a problem.” (UNICEF)

It was widely acknowledged that there needed to be a diversification of funding sources but, equally, that it has been difficult to make progress on this.
4.1.7 ECU roles, responsibilities and reporting

The structuring of the roles, responsibilities and lines of reporting within the ECU exacerbates difficulties in working together as a team.

The formal provisions for the co-lead arrangement extended to the appointment of a Global Education Co-ordinator “who will act as “Director” (MoU :5) and “a second Cluster staff member with a different substantive Job Description, who will act as “Deputy Director”(*ibid.*). The vagueness of the language employed here betrays the lack of clarity over these two key posts. It suggests not that the two roles had been thought out in terms of the Cluster’s needs but that the commitment to a co-lead inevitably implied the creation of two leadership posts. This is also reflected in the employment and line management arrangements: although both posts were to be filled “following a joint exercise of review and selection” by the two agencies, each was to be formally appointed and employed by an agency separately – the Co-ordinator by UNICEF, the Deputy by Save the Children. So, from the outset, the Education Cluster Unit would have, in effect, two leaders, each answerable to their respective employer as well as to the governance structure of the Global Education Cluster.

The creation of these two posts also implies a lack of equity between the two agencies, which was frequently commented upon by respondents to our interviews. UNICEF assumes the role of the senior partner in the collaboration, employing the Co-ordinator of the unit, while Save employs the Deputy. The linking of each of the senior management posts to a specific agency risks embedding in the structure of the unit an implicit hierarchy between the agencies which is contrary to the spirit of the partnership. The unit will operate, it is stated, “under the leadership” of the Co-ordinator. In the same paragraph of the MoU (MoU Annex: 5, para 5.3.5) the agreement states that the two agencies will collaborate to manage the Global Education Cluster “with UNICEF as chair and the Alliance as co-chair.”

This situation is further complicated by a line-management structure in which the Co-ordinator does not directly manage the Deputy: instead, each reports to a senior member of their respective organisations. Not only does it make management accountability more cumbersome – it may also result in split loyalties and risks reinforcing the separation, rather than the integration of the two agencies in the central unit.

It has been noted above, in relation to the issue of leadership, that the definition of roles and responsibilities in any partnership can be critical to its success and, indeed, that in this instance the key roles in the ECU do not seem to have been successfully thought through.

There is further evidence for this in the respective job descriptions for the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator posts. Although both share the overall objectives set for the unit, the role definitions are significantly different, and in fact in practice the roles did not conform fully to the descriptions. The duties and responsibilities section of the former post is that of a senior leader: the role-holder “Directs, co-ordinates and manages the day to day activities of the ECU...”; “Provides overall leadership in the visioning and formulation of ECWG programme goals and pertinent policies,”; and “Provides overall guidance in development and establishment of contingency plans, monitoring, tracking performance and reporting on results.” (UNICEF 2010, Job Description Post No: 53209).

In contrast, the Deputy Co-ordinator post offers a profile of an almost exclusively support role. The post-holder is to “deputise for the Senior Education Adviser/Cluster Co-ordinator in the overall management of the Cluster Unit.”; “provide effective support and leadership to the Education Cluster”; and “provide leadership and effective co-ordination to groups working on people-capacity building initiatives” (Save the Children, Job Description: Senior Education Adviser/Deputy Cluster Co-ordinator, undated).

---

14 Without over-interpreting linguistic nuances, it is still difficult to understand why the two agencies are not, therefore, both co-chairs.
4.1.8 Initial recruitment and appointment of staff

UNICEF’s unilateral decisions on the appointment of the Co-ordinator role were a serious breach of the partnership protocol and spirit, and continue to have repercussions for the partnership relationship.

If the structuring of the two core ECU posts suggests evidence of intrinsic lack of equity in the partnership, then the process of recruitment and appointment to those posts revealed the inequity to plain view. The selection and appointment of the Deputy Co-ordinator appears to have been achieved without significant difficulties or disagreements. The appointment of the Co-ordinator, however, was fraught with problems. Despite the MoU commitment to “a joint exercise of review and selection”, UNICEF twice appointed a candidate unilaterally, overriding the decision of a joint selection panel in the first instance and bypassing completely the selection panel for the second appointment. The first individual appointed stayed in the post a few months before moving on to a different role elsewhere. In her place, UNICEF appointed a candidate who, on his own admission, had not been seeking the post, had not been interviewed by a joint selection panel, and whose CV Save the Children never saw.

Regardless of the merits of the actual candidates, a serious breach of the partnership protocol and spirit occurred at this point, early in the collaboration process, and there can be little doubt that this was the single most frequently mentioned issue, regardless of the organisation and role of the respondent. One ECWG member, from neither Save the Children nor UNICEF, described the appointment as “shocking”, saying it “tainted the relationship and demonstrated the inequality of the relationship – it breached the agreement on appointments.” A senior UNICEF employee described the decision as the “greatest bugbear” between the two organisations: “UNICEF just dropped somebody in there leading to a downward spiral.”

One of the core elements of partnership is the ability to be transparent. Without transparency it is difficult to build trust; without trust it is difficult to sustain a partnership. Caplan (2003) makes the important point that trust isn’t something immediate. Individuals from different organisations trust each other because “they have built up a mutual respect for what each organisation and each individual can offer.” (2003:33). In the case of a new partnership, even if some prior relationships and co-operative working exist, this respect has to be built up on the basis of actual performance: each organisation, “delivering what they said they would deliver.” (ibid)

The breaching of the agreed process for recruitment and appointment signalled, to some, an assumption of the superiority of one partner and, to others, a fundamental lack of commitment to the collaboration on UNICEF’s part. In the words of one UNICEF member of the ECWG, the appointment of the ECU Co-ordinator “undermines the sense that we see them as a true partner”.

This issue clearly demonstrates a recurring challenge of partnership: a mismatch between a partner’s internal systems and rules and any external agreements made between the partners. In this case, the MoU clearly stated the process for hiring the Coordinator, but this process was inconsistent with the strict HR rules within UNICEF. This resulted in either UNICEF’s internal rules or the external agreement having to be broken. In this case, the MoU should have qualified the hiring process to say that it would have to conform fully to UNICEF HR rules, or UNICEF should have sought internal dispensation from the rule.

Where such immovable rules governing a partner’s behaviour exist, they should be clearly identified, and all partners should appreciate these constraints so that they become one of the parameters in the design of the partnership.

4.1.9 Physical Location of the ECU

The physical separation of the ECU UNICEF and Save the Children staff contributes to the lack of a full partnership and inhibits effective team work between the organisations.
In the MoU establishing the co-lead arrangement, one of the elements of the “framework for operating arrangements” is specified as

“Shared staffing, hosting and accountability arrangements, and parameters for the functioning of the Education Cluster Unit that will be established in Geneva;” (MoU 2007:3)

Although this phrase leaves the precise arrangements open to interpretation, the implication (to an outsider at least) would be that the ECU would have a single location housing staff from both partner agencies. In practice, this has never been achieved. The ECU is still geographically divided between the Deputy Co-ordinator, Knowledge Management Officer and part-time Administrator in a Save the Children office and the Co-ordinator in the UNICEF building, quite separately located in Geneva. The UNICEF building also houses two consultants working with the Education Cluster and the Senior Education Specialist who sits on the ECWG, co-chairs one of the Task Teams and attends the ECU’s bi-weekly team meetings.

Participants in the Global Education Cluster’s work in Geneva recognise that this is a less than ideal situation. It was suggested that operating out of two separate offices

“means that they do not think of themselves as a team” (ECWG member)

Or as a Steering Group member put it,

“They should have sat together to build things together” (Save the Children)

Nevertheless, despite attempts to resolve what looks like a relatively minor obstacle, the issue remains. As with the issue of the recruitment process, the impact here is less on the operational impact (though that exists) than in the signal that it sends to those within and beyond the Global Education Cluster about the level of commitment to the partnership.

4.2 Operations

The focus of this section is the actual day-to-day operation of the Education Cluster at global level and, in particular, the workings of the ECU in Geneva as the dedicated body created to co-ordinate the Cluster at global level. In the previous section, the emphasis was on the way in which the set-up of a partnership enabled or constrained its subsequent operation. In this section, the emphasis is on how, within those systemic limits, the co-lead arrangement at global level has been operating to deliver its targets.

4.2.1 Delivery of partner commitments

Although the situation has been improving, UNICEF has been seen as not delivering sufficiently on its commitments and responsibilities within the ECU. In other parts of the Global Cluster there has been stronger commitment.

At the core of the global operations is the small team recruited from both organisations to form the Education Cluster Support Unit (ECU) in Geneva.

It has been generally acknowledged from both within and outside the ECU that – for whatever reasons – there have been significant gaps in the leadership and fulfilment of tasks on UNICEF’s side.

“At global level accountability might be improved in terms of taking on workload, UNICEF hasn’t taken on all the tasks that need to be done and I know Save has been frustrated by this – Save has taken on a lot of the work.” (EC Advisory Group member)

“I never see the cluster coordinator at meetings. I assume he’s based in New York, yes?” (Geneva-based UN agency)
These workload issues have at times put more responsibility on UNICEF Cluster staff outside the ECU to step in and take up some of the slack, in addition to their existing workloads. Senior education personnel in both agencies have contributed beyond their formal roles in order to ensure that progress was not hampered.

The situation has begun to ease somewhat with the addition of capacity within UNICEF and with the appointment of additional, functionally-dedicated staff to the ECU.\(^{15}\)

The dominant impression from the interviews is that issues of commitment and co-operation within the ECU have slowed the progress of the Cluster in its early stages but that the work of committed individuals from both agencies, both within and beyond the ECU, has contributed to improved effectiveness. This is well summed up by a member of the Steering Group, to which the ECU is accountable:

“At face value, it’s not too bad, they are getting on with business, but it could be an awful lot better. It has certainly improved over the last six months.” (Steering Group member)

It is important to note that the criticisms levelled at UNICEF over its commitment to the operation of the ECU were not a one-way street: each agency had misgivings about the commitment of its partner, even though the dominant attitude was one of enthusiasm and belief in the value of the co-lead. As one UNICEF respondent to the follow-up questionnaire wrote, “Save the Children is very quick to criticise UNICEF without being adequately and constructively self-critical”.

In the Global Education Cluster more widely, there has been much clearer institutional commitment by both agencies. For example, by UNICEF: the HQ-level line management of the ECU and the roles played in the ECWG and Task Teams by regional Education in Emergency specialists and by other UNICEF divisions or sections.

Likewise, Save the Children UK has made a significant effort to integrate the work of the Cluster across Save the Children organisations and also played roles in the ECWG and Task Teams.

4.2.2 Teamwork

The ECU has not been operating effectively as a team across the two organisations. Other elements such as the Education Cluster Working Group and the dedicated Task Teams have been working much more successfully.

Within the ECU

As was shown in section 4.1, the ability for the ECU to operate as a team was hampered by the structures put in place: the physical location of personnel, the reporting lines and the transparency of access to resources.

In terms of everyday operations, as noted above in 4.2.1, there was significant concern expressed by staff from both agencies over the lack of delivery and responsiveness by UNICEF on agreed ECU tasks. From Save the Children’s perspective, this lack of response and delivery militated against cross-organisational working and caused significant problems in the working relationship between the Coordinator and Deputy Coordinator. To get tasks done, it was often considered, in the words of a Save the Children interviewee, “easier for us to just do it ourselves”.

It appears that these challenges, a rumbling discontent caused in part through the breakdown of the agreed hiring process, and the fact that the internal problems became publically aired, led to something of a polarization between the organisations and, to a certain extent, a loss of feeling of mutual or collective responsibility for the delivery of the objectives.

\(^{15}\) Note that the situation has changed again since this part of the report was written with the appointment of a new Coordinator in September 2010.
This was concisely summarised by one of the respondents to our follow-up questionnaire. Emphasising that the various elements of the Cluster would work more effectively once all participants put past problems behind them and accepted responsibility for the co-lead’s performance, they argued for “Clear acknowledgement by all of the principles of partnership, which are mutual rather than one way. Shared risks and shared ownership of results go together.” (UNICEF)

One example of the ECU not operating as a team with collective management was the appointment by UNICEF of a consultant to work on the ECU. The consultant was appointed on a job description that was developed unilaterally by UNICEF to meet their specific needs, rather than jointly developed with Save the Children to meet the needs of the whole ECU. This is a relatively minor issue but again gives an indication of the problems faced within the ECU over effective teamwork and the allocation of roles and responsibilities.

Despite the clear problem at the most senior level, there was evidence that the operation of the ECU team has been improving. A number of interviewees cited the arrival of a dedicated Knowledge Management officer for the ECU (within the Save the Children office) and the appointment of additional UNICEF staff as having improved both the communication between the partners and the pace at which progress was being made towards the Cluster’s targets.

It is worth noting that the challenges faced had not diminished the sense that representatives of both agencies remain committed to the partnership. In the words of one interviewee:

“.........there’s a sense from others in Save and UNICEF that they want to make it work...there’s good interest on both sides to have a proper partnership.” (Steering Group member)

Elsewhere within the Global Cluster

At the level of the Education Cluster Working Group (ECWG) and the dedicated Task Teams, there was evidence of very positive and productive collaboration between participants. These teams were seen to be working as real teams with achievements being attributable to co-operation of partners from a range of different organisations.

Both agencies have identified staff to act as ‘focal points’ to support the mainstreaming of the Cluster’s work into their respective organisations. As co-leads, UNICEF and Save the Children are collaborating with an extensive network of Cluster partners through the ECWG and its operational Task Teams (see 4.2.6 below). In addition, there is anecdotal evidence from several interviews of excellent collaboration across the agencies by a number of key individuals at HQ or regional level with Cluster responsibilities. However, the response to the follow-up questionnaire demonstrated that this is not systematic and in general coordination across the agencies in regard to mainstreamed activities and strategies is ‘very poor’. This issue is discussed in more detail in section 4.2.5 which examines the architecture of the co-lead arrangement.

The co-lead arrangement at global level does not dictate arrangements at local level where there is still a mix of co-lead and single lead arrangements. Data from the country-level survey showed that 74% of our respondents were operating in local co-lead arrangements. Asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement ‘The lead agencies work effectively and efficiently together’, the majority (16 of 18 responding; 84%) either agreed or agreed strongly. There was also a positive response to the statement ‘There is effective communication and transparency between the co-lead organisations on all important issues’. Here, 12 of 17 respondents (70%) either agreed or agreed strongly. There was less agreement with the statement ‘There is clear accountability and a procedure for dealing with problems that arise’ (9 of 19; 47%) and least agreement with the fourth statement ‘Risks, responsibilities and resources are equitably shared between the co-lead organisations’ (5 of 17 agreeing; 29%).

These variations suggest a fairly encouraging picture of partnerships operating locally with a good deal of positive participation and communication. This is especially so given that over half of our respondents (51.3%) in the online survey spent no more than 20% of their time on Education Cluster activities. The lower ratings for the statements relating to procedures and risks would appear to parallel some of the problems encountered at global level, i.e., that agreeing sound procedures for co-leadership and ensuring that risks and resources are equitably
shared takes more than just goodwill and a commitment to the principles of collaboration: it takes attention to the detailed workings of the partnership and the time to develop a mutual understanding of very different organisations’ cultures and systems.

### 4.2.3 Internal communication and transparency

Communication between the partners within the ECU has not been sufficiently effective.

This review has already noted the endemic problems of poor communication and lack of transparency created by the structuring of the co-lead arrangement within the Geneva unit. At an operational level this was regarded as a problem by core personnel within the ECU both in terms of day-to-day communication and, in particular, in terms of establishing a mutual understanding of how the two partner agencies operated.

Clearly, in any partnership across sectors, there is the potential for a clash of organisational cultures: procedures, systems, and attitudes may all be substantially different. One of the challenges of partnership is to both recognise those differences and to find ways of reconciling them. Often this reconciliation takes the form of creating a ‘third’ or ‘hybrid’ culture - a way of doing things specific to the partnership itself.\(^\text{16}\) The operation of the ECU has not yet achieved this reconciliation: staff, especially within the Save the Children office, have struggled to understand UNICEF procedures and have expressed frustration at the apparent lack of transparency in the process of turning decisions into actions. Even within the ECU itself, UNICEF budgetary procedures were described as “opaque”.

> “There may be a lack of transparency at the global level, especially over funding and decision-making: it’s hard for Save to see UNICEF’s internal working and there’s a feeling that the funding decisions have been kept inside UNICEF.” (EC Advisory Group\(^\text{17}\) member)

As in 4.2.2 above, there was evidence from the interviews that some of these problems were being eased both at a personal level by the introduction of staff committed to the principles of partnership, and at a systemic level by the creation of posts with a dedicated remit.

### 4.2.4 Management planning

There is no management plan in place to guide the operation of the ECU.

One of the responsibilities of the ECU – and specifically of the Co-ordinator – was to produce a management plan which would demonstrate how the unit would operate in order to achieve the objectives set out in the overall work-plan for the Cluster. This was a specific request from the Steering Group but both the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator recognised that this had never been satisfactorily completed, with one of them commenting:

> “...it went back and forth...but we had difficulty in differentiating tasks so it was never finalised.” (UNICEF)

The fact that this has not been done is evidence of the failure of leadership within the ECU and further evidence that, without effective systems in place – of planning, control and accountability – personal failings will obstruct the work of the unit as a whole. Poor systems may be mitigated by the actions of exceptional people but this is not the basis on which to plan a long-term collaboration.

\(^\text{16}\) For a discussion of ‘hybrid’ culture see Reid et al (2009) Section 5.2

\(^\text{17}\) The Advisory Group was part of the setting up of the Cluster and was replaced by the ECWG on operationalization
“So much of what’s successful is personality driven – people wanting it to work and to work together – but that’s not sustainable and not institutional. So this does need to be properly institutionalised and not dependent on personalities to make it work.” (ECWG member)

4.2.5 Making the architecture of co-leadership work

The design of the architecture of the Global Cluster is in general sound, with the potential to deliver the Global Cluster’s objectives. However, the structure is not yet operating as efficiently and effectively as it might in part due to insufficient coordination and oversight, and a lack of widespread clarity and understanding over how the elements operate individually and collectively.

Throughout this review of the co-lead arrangement data have been presented relating to the set-up and operations of the individual elements of the Global Education Cluster. However, there remains the question of how these separate but inter-related elements operate effectively together. This issue was the main focus for a follow-up questionnaire completed by seven senior Cluster participants during the final revision of this review.

The Global Education Cluster architecture consists of:

- **The Steering Group**, made up of two UNICEF and two Save the Children staff, is responsible and accountable for the delivery against annual work plans and the achievement of the agreed Cluster objectives.

- **The Education Cluster Unit** (ECU), staffed by UNICEF and Save the Children staff, is the central coordinating mechanism and is responsible for the development and implementation of the annual Global Cluster workplan with and through the ECWG and Task Teams. It reports to the Steering Group.

- **The Education Cluster Working Group** (ECWG), comprised of UNICEF, Save the Children and a number of other UN agencies and International NGOs, is the main priority-setting body for the Cluster and develops the Cluster’s workplans. It includes activity-specific task teams and thematic groups within its structure. The ECWG is supported and overseen by the ECU.

- **Lead agency staff** at HQ or regional levels have responsibilities for the implementation of Cluster activities, mostly mainstreamed into their roles.

Based on the data collected, it is the view of this report that the architecture itself is in general a sound one, with the potential to deliver the Global Cluster’s objectives. However, the structure is not yet operating as efficiently and effectively as it could. In general, there is a lack of clarity over the roles, responsibilities, operating practices and accountabilities of each of the elements of the architecture. There is also insufficient coordination of and communication between the elements, and insufficient steerage.

In this section each element is discussed in relation to the architecture as a whole.

**Steering group**

At the set-up of the co-lead arrangement, attention was paid to the issue of accountability by the establishment of a Steering Group that would “be responsible and accountable for the delivery against the annual workplans and achievement of the agreed cluster objectives.” (Annex, 2007: 8) The Steering Group currently consists of two senior representatives from each of the co-lead partners and thus constitutes an important element not only in ensuring accountability but in developing the co-lead arrangement at the senior level.

Some criticism emerged from the first phase of interviews regarding the effectiveness of the Steering Group in the early stages of the co-lead arrangement, confirmed by several respondents to the follow-up questionnaire. Given the evident problems that emerged in the day-to-day operation of the ECU, it was the Steering Group that would
have been the primary mechanism by which the ECU leadership was held accountable and the failures – both systemic and personal – promptly addressed.

“The Steering Group... seems to have had very little oversight over the functions and outputs of the ECU and ECWG.” (UNICEF)

That this was not initially the case seems to be in part attributable to changes in personnel during the early days of the Cluster, which meant that the Steering Group membership was not fully operational and – in the eyes of the ECU staff – there was insufficient scrutiny of the unit’s activities.

Changes to membership and a stronger commitment were widely regarded as having improved the Steering Group’s performance.

“There has apparently been a higher-level of communication and trust between steering group members which has allowed for a more open discussion about key issues such as funding and staffing.” (Save the Children)

Along with praise for the improving role of the Steering Group, the respondents to the questionnaire set out a number of areas for the Steering Group to consider.

One recurrent issue which came out either explicitly or implicitly from approximately half the questionnaires as well as consistently from the interviews was around a lack of shared understanding of the role of the Steering Group and a need for clarification. As one questionnaire respondent put it:

“[The Steering Group does] seem to be uneasy as to the extent of its oversight and role of facilitation versus direction versus management. These seem to be interpreted differently by different actors” (UNICEF)

In particular there are two major and distinct responsibilities which, from the MoU, would appear to fall to the Steering Group:

- Direction of the co-leadership management arrangement (including line management of the ECU; the partnership between the agencies; institutionalizing the work of the Cluster within each organisation);
- Guiding, and being accountable for, the full Cluster’s strategy and activities.

The former responsibility is purely within the domain of the two agencies and so a Steering Group constituted of the two agencies is appropriate. When it comes to the latter responsibility, two questionnaire respondents suggested that the Steering Group should be more widely constituted, bringing in other major players within the cluster to ensure stronger accountability and engender stronger institutional commitment beyond the two agencies.

Common to several of the interviews and questionnaires was a desire for the Steering Group to take on a more active ‘steering’ role within their organisations. One respondent set out a vision of what this might mean in practice:

“They could do more to institutionalise the work of the Education Cluster within their respective organisations, making it a top priority at the highest levels. Given their seniority and influence, they should be acting as advocates for the Education Cluster, making links with other workstreams and processes within their organisations, and seeking out opportunities for funding from donors. When needed, they should get involved in management issues and deal with poor performance before it undermines the work and reputation of the Education Cluster.” (Save the Children)

Finally, there was concern expressed by around half of the questionnaire respondents that the Steering Group’s meetings were not sufficiently frequent and that the meeting schedule (quarterly) should be strictly adhered to, with decisions being actioned more promptly.
ECU

Much has been written elsewhere in this review about the operation of the ECU but it is worth noting here, in the context of the Cluster’s overall architecture, that a key challenge for the Cluster going forward is to ensure that the role and responsibilities of the ECU is clear to all participants. This issue came up at every stage of the research for this review and was again voiced in our final phase of questionnaire interviews where communication was an issue for four of our seven respondents: the need for better communication of the ECU’s work – as the ‘figurehead’ organisation of the Cluster.

In addition, as mentioned below, a regular if not universal theme from interviews and the questionnaires was the need for the ECU to significantly strengthen its role in the coordination and oversight of the work of other elements of the Cluster, most notably the ECWG and sub-groups.

ECWG

The ECWG exists as the main forum in which the priorities of the Cluster are agreed and those priorities are actioned through the mechanism of Task Teams and Thematic Groups. The breadth of membership of the ECWG is frequently the subject of praise from Cluster participants interviewed for this review as it is seen as signifying the inclusiveness of the Cluster’s work. However, that breadth has also been a challenge in terms of achieving consistency of meeting attendance and continuity of participation with a model of open attendance. An attempt to address this issue has been made by ensuring institutional commitment to attend for a minimum period of a year.

Elsewhere in this review (4.2.6; 4.4.1; 4.4.2; 4.4.3) the positive outputs from the ECWG are discussed in greater depth but, with regard to its effective operation within the structure of the Cluster, there are three clear issues to be addressed.

The first of these is around the need for stronger buy-in and engagement of other agencies.

“The meetings to date have been very much focussed on UNICEF and Save the Children, rather than taking full account of all the agencies involved, even though there has been open membership to attend, full use of the experience and expertise of these agencies has perhaps not been utilised to the full.” (ECWG Member, final phase questionnaire)

“The group does not yet seem to be fully embracing the collective responsibility of success or failure.” (UNICEF, final phase questionnaire).

Both of these comments demonstrate a need to bring external agencies more deeply into the fold and build up a stronger sense of partnership and collective responsibility among all ECWG participants. The rules ensuring participant agencies sign up for a minimum of a year will help but more needs to be done to encourage more agencies to take a lead on individual projects.

The second issue is how to ensure effective and focussed operations of the ECWG and sub-groups, particularly with a more inclusive membership. Two regularly occurring themes came through the data: i) the challenge of the considerable effort involved in the role of chairing sub-groups, usually in addition to an individual’s regular assignments, and ii) a need for significantly stronger oversight and steering of the Task Teams and Thematic Groups, and better coordination across the teams.

“...the ECU and Steering Group have not ensured sufficient oversight of the ECWG over the last two years so there is little synergy between task teams, task team outputs have not correlated with an overarching cluster strategy, and there has been absolutely no oversight over project development and budget expenditure.” (UNICEF, final phase questionnaire)

Indeed, two respondents to the questionnaire (one from Save the Children, one from UNICEF) went further to suggest that the ECU should play more of a leadership role and assume accountability for the work of the ECWG sub-groups:
“In my view, the ECU should have final accountability, and in particular, step in where Task Teams are not functioning well, and/or in those areas that are core to the IASC mandate for clusters.”

(UNICEF, final phase questionnaire)

The third issue – mentioned in every phase of our interviewing – is that of articulation between the ECWG and the regional and country level staff: there appears to be a consistent view that, in the words of one respondent,

“More needs to be done to link the ECWG and the country-level clusters... and to ensure that work done at global level responds to real needs on the ground.” (Save the Children, final phase questionnaire)

Mainstreaming

Less immediately visible than the work of the ECU or the ECWG are the activities of staff in each of the co-lead agencies, whose remits include mainstreaming the Cluster’s activities into their agencies’ work. This was not an issue that emerged strongly during the bulk of the research for this review and so was included in the final phase survey.

All of our respondents felt that significant progress had been made in both agencies on mainstreaming. Save the Children, for example, has built up a focal point system in which time is dedicated by a number of technical advisors within Save the Children members, creating a broad network supporting Cluster work:

“It is my experience that the Focal Point system has worked very well in getting countries interested in and started on the co-leadership. They very much appreciate the continuous support and interest from the global level.” (Save the Children, final phase questionnaire)

UNICEF has integrated its accountabilities for the Cluster Approach in the revision of UNICEF’s Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action. UNICEF HQ Education Section staff, as well as Regional Education in Emergencies staff, have responsibilities for the cluster, in particular for participation in the ECWG sub-groups, or reference groups for particular projects. Regional Education in Emergencies staff have been particularly active in developing and rolling out capacity development initiatives. One respondent wrote:

“UNICEF’s Regional Education in Emergencies Advisors provide very strong and sustained technical support to country level clusters (not just to UNICEF colleagues but to other cluster coordination staff including from Save the Children, MoEs, other NGOs, etc.), primarily because this support is not forthcoming from the global (ECU) level and we have had to step in to provide this.” (UNICEF, final phase questionnaire)

The final statement is particularly revealing of a lack of agreed understanding of the roles of the various elements of the Global Cluster: in this case, who should be providing technical support to country level clusters? The ECU would counter the statement by saying that the provision of support by Regional Advisors is not in any way a failure of the ECU, but rather evidence of success of the Global Cluster in its mainstreaming of Cluster activities.

In several interviews and questionnaire responses, the issue of a difference in structure between UNICEF and Save the Children was raised. Save the Children has the Focal Point system whereas UNICEF has Education in Emergencies Advisors responsible for regions. In addition, there is no direct (full-time) counterpart in UNICEF to the position of Head of Strategy in Save the Children, who works across the Save the Children members on supporting and mainstreaming the Education Cluster. This means that in any particular situation there may not be clear counterparts within Save the Children and UNICEF to more easily enable a coordinated response. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that although co-leadership does not mean that both agencies have to do everything, this does appear to be the general expectation of the co-leadership arrangement.

Two other major issues become evident from the questionnaire results. The first is around funding. At present, most of the mainstreamed activities by Save the Children and by UNICEF are funded from the single source Dutch funding for the Cluster. As one respondent put it:
“Resource mobilisation also needs more attention. Advocacy and donor liaison experts within both agencies should be brought in to mobilize funds for the Education Cluster at both global and country levels.” (Save the Children, final phase questionnaire)

The second issue was around ‘very poor’ (as described, unprompted, by two respondents from UNICEF and Save the Children) coordination between the mainstreaming strategies and activities of the two agencies.

“I feel that SC and UNICEF are working a bit in silos. It is not that we are in it together and try to use all our resources to work jointly for the EC.” (Save the Children, final phase questionnaire)

**Overall architecture**

There was also concern – from both agencies – that not all of the questions raised by co-leadership had yet been answered and that this was especially true of the implementation of the co-lead at the regional and country level. There was still concern therefore that the overall architecture of the Cluster would function more effectively if the nature of the co-lead arrangement at every level was jointly clarified and if both agencies felt there was parity of resourcing and commitment.

“The onus and workload for cluster support tends to fall on UNICEF staff at country and regional levels which means that co-leadership is undermined and rarely balanced.” (UNICEF, final phase questionnaire)

However, the expectation that there can be parity of resourcing between UNICEF and Save the Children, and hence an expectation of an equal contribution at country and regional level, is unrealistic. As mentioned previously, co-leadership does not mean that both partners have to do everything, nor does a partnership necessarily mean ‘equal’ contributions from the partners. What is important is to find a suitable balance of responsibilities and activities according to partner strengths and capacity, in which the greatest benefits of the co-leadership arrangement can be realized.

### 4.2.6 Collaboration with other stakeholders

The Global Education Cluster has been very successful at building relationships and working effectively with other agencies.

Throughout the documentation on the Global Education Cluster – and indeed, the cluster approach in general – there is an emphasis on the importance of the cluster lead agency building relationships with other agencies as a basis for achieving cluster objectives. In this respect, the Global Education Cluster has a head-start - the whole cluster being lead by a UN/NGO collaboration – and this was regarded as an advantage by participants at the global level. The ECWG and its themed Task Teams bring together a truly impressive range of agencies to take forward the activities of the Cluster. The formal membership of the ECWG runs to 123 individuals representing 29 organisations including many UN agencies, leading NGOs, small action groups and independent consultants. The ECWG meets every six months and, over the four meetings to date, an average of 47 people has attended each meeting.\(^\text{18}\) Bringing together this many people, from such a range of organisations, constitutes a significant achievement in terms of inclusivity and representation in the Global Education Cluster.

Within the ECWG, attitudes to the co-lead arrangement were generally positive and supportive. Although members recognised the obstacles that had arisen both from personality and procedures, the principle of establishing a co-led cluster was respected and praised. Also, at the level of the ECWG and the Task Teams the impact of the problems within the ECU itself was diminished and participants committed to the aims of the Global Education Cluster have been able to achieve real progress towards its objectives.

\(^\text{18}\) Figures from Education Working Group Attendance document dated 01 June 2010
One central relationship for the co-lead partnership at global level is with the Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE). The INEE is a significant contributor to the Global Education Cluster both in its established expertise in the field of education and in its development of standards for the delivery of education in emergencies. There is substantial overlap between the work of the INEE and the remit of the Global Education Cluster at global level, and the potential exists for duplication of effort. At the July 2008 meeting of the Education Cluster Advisory Group, it was noted that:

“Discussion highlighted the need for ECWG ToR to emphasize field support and describe overlap with INEE more clearly.”

Certainly, not all of our respondents felt comfortable that the two organisations were sufficiently distinct in their objectives and operations. This was acknowledged by the INEE respondents to the interviews. Going forward, it is important that the ECU clearly distinguishes (to other agencies as well) its own work from the work of the INEE and that INEE’s involvement in the ECWG is utilised to continue to build synergy, rather than overlap, between the agencies. This need is already being addressed as the Global Education Cluster and the INEE are planning a joint strategic planning process, which is intended precisely to distinguish the work each is doing, areas of collaboration and synergies.

The four Task Teams are not perceived as being equally successful in what they have achieved to date. Both the Capacity Development and the Knowledge Management Task Teams are regarded as working well and as having produced valuable outputs (see Section 4.4 below for Impact). This was less true of the Global Oversight, Advocacy and Liaison (GOAL) team, which had been hampered by issues of appropriate membership and attendance.

This highlights another endemic problem for the Cluster at global level i.e. that many members of the operational groups do not have dedicated time and resources allocated for their cluster work. As a result, attendance at meetings has been irregular and/or proxy members often attend. This could have a negative impact on the continuity, quality and effectiveness of decision-making. At the time of the review the ECU was in the process of addressing the particular problems of ECWG membership and attendance.

4.2.7 Collaboration with the Education Cluster at the country level

There remains significant confusion at the country level over how the Global Cluster operates and how the co-leadership arrangement should play out at the country level.

Ultimately, the work of the Global Education Cluster at global level must achieve the objectives of the Cluster at country level by providing countries and regions with the knowledge, tools, capacity and leadership to respond effectively to humanitarian emergencies. The scope of this current review does not include an assessment of the performance of the country offices or of the Cluster’s achievement of its objectives. However, the quality of the articulation between the global and the country level is pertinent to a review of the functioning of the Cluster at the global level as is the perception of the ECU’s effectiveness from those at country level.

During the first phase of interviews for this review, a small number of individuals were interviewed who were working at country or regional level. In addition, some of the global level interviewees had had recent country level experience. Their views of the effectiveness of the co-lead arrangement were complex and often divergent. There was, however, consensus on one key issue - that the role and purpose of the ECU in particular was not sufficiently clear at local level. Although all Cluster participants had been notified of the co-lead arrangement and of the creation of the ECU, there was still a degree of confusion over what precisely the unit would deliver and how it operated on a day-to-day basis.

19 Summary Record Education Cluster Advisory Group Meeting, as of 4 July 2008, point 3.1
This had been exacerbated by what was regarded as a relatively low level of communication between the ECU and the Cluster’s country offices and, specifically, by a lack of visible leadership from the ECU. This was a view also expressed by some at the global level. A number of interviewees stressed the need for a clear re-statement of the purpose of the co-lead arrangement and of the role of the ECU and other elements in delivering the Cluster’s objectives.

“We need to be very clear that we need to have a leadership that is coming from both sides and the leaders have a dialogue and provide a different outlook and give the message that we have a united front. If it wants to succeed it must not be a self-serving cluster but a cluster that serves the countries.” (UNICEF)

A more diverse set of opinions prevailed when it came to the effectiveness of the co-lead arrangement at local level. This essentially has two components – the effectiveness of the global level in delivering the resource needs at the local level; and the effectiveness of the co-lead arrangement within country offices themselves. The latter is not the focus of this review but was included within the survey of country offices in order to highlight issues of the implementation of the co-lead arrangement across the Cluster.

In her report on the Global Education Cluster at the country level (Houghton 2009) Houghton notes the lack of clarity over how the co-lead arrangement is to be put into practice at the country level. She rightly observes that “Although the global co-leadership arrangement does not assume co-leadership [at the country level]... this is generally how it has been interpreted.” (Houghton, 2009:iii)

A number of our interviewees remarked on the difficulties of establishing co-leadership at country level, where resources between the co-lead agencies are often dramatically different and, where – both for financial and political reasons – UNICEF frequently has to be the single, or dominant, lead agency. The findings echo Houghton’s observation that “…the lack of guidance on how to operationalize this arrangement is acutely felt.” (ibid.) still holds, despite the fact that joint guidance has been created and widely disseminated. It is not clear from the survey whether this is because the guidance is still not known about or if it is not sufficient or sufficiently well understood.

The view from the country offices themselves reveals a mixed picture: for example, three times as many country office staff regarded themselves as receiving “strong” or “very strong” support from individuals within their own agency rather than from the ECU in Geneva (On-line survey, Question 13). This, however, may be in line with cluster objectives as local support is intended to come primarily from within the respective agencies as the cluster approach is ‘mainstreamed’.

However, there was noticeable variation in the assessment of the four main areas in which the global level organisations have a responsibility to provide local support. Whereas only 27% of respondents rated the support received from the global level for cluster Advocacy as “sufficient” or “very sufficient”, the equivalent ratings for Capacity Development, Support for Emergency Response, and Guidance and Standard-setting were 41%, 48% and 59% respectively. Although even the best of these ratings is not particularly high, there is encouragement for the ECU and ECWG in that the highest rating has been achieved in an area (Guidance and Standard-setting) which has been a priority at global level (On-line country survey Question 12). Table 2 below summarises the extent to which country-level respondents thought the support from the global level to be sufficient in each of the four core areas.
Further evidence on the same point can be gathered from the response to the Haiti experience. The humanitarian disaster following the earthquake in Haiti in January 2010 provided a major test for the Global Education Cluster’s ability to respond and the Lessons Learned Report produced by the Cluster (Global Education Cluster 2010) again endorses Houghton’s work – and the findings of this Review – in highlighting some of the shortcomings in the leadership from the global level. Although, overall, the performance of the Cluster was judged to be very strong, some of the weaknesses again related to the co-ordination between the co-lead agencies and to the need for more effective deployment of resources to the local level:

“Renew efforts to improve surge capacity for the Cluster by agreeing on triggers for rapid response, making better use of rosters, and explore new sources of deployable capacity...” (Global Education Cluster 2010: 3, Recommendation 2)

“Institutionalize regular discussions between co-lead Heads of Agencies in crisis-prone countries to establish relationships pre-emergency...” (Global Education Cluster 2010: 4, Recommendation 15)

The latter recommendation highlights a recurring point raised in both the interviews and on-line survey in this review – the need for more resources to be directed towards ‘preparedness’, i.e., building a strong cluster relationships and capacity before an emergency situation occurs. In the on-line survey, respondents were also asked what type of support they would like to see coming from the global level (On-line survey Question 14). Responses were mixed, with 22 respondents citing seven different areas of support. The most cited need was for better information and guidance (6 of 22 responses) including overall management of knowledge in the Cluster. The second most frequently cited was for more training and capacity-building (5 of 22) and, third, for more contact with the global level and better co-ordination from the ECU (4 of 22). We have already seen (Table 2 above) that Guidance and Standard-setting was regarded as the most successful area of global support and it would also seem to be the one where support from the global level will have the most immediate impact. The fact that almost half of the respondents mentioned the need either for better information or for more co-ordination appears to reinforce the point (made above in relation to the global level interviews) that the visibility, purpose of the global cluster needs to improve. In the words of one country-level respondent:

“More support is needed from the Education Cluster Unit in Geneva who have the overview of cluster co-ordination. There is more co-ordination amongst the cluster unit and agency global staff but very little involvement from the country offices where...all the work is being done.” (On-line survey respondent, Question 14).
4.3 Relationship

Much has already been said, in the preceding sections, about the nature of the partnership established between UNICEF and Save the Children in creating the co-lead arrangement for the Global Education Cluster. This section focuses exclusively on that core relationship by highlighting a number of issues that are shaping the collaboration between the two agencies and thus influencing the effectiveness of the partnership.

It should be noted that creating any kind of partnership between organisations from different sectors, with different histories, structures and cultures, represents a major challenge. Stott’s case study of a partnership between a UN agency and a large private company (Stott, 2007) provides an interesting parallel to the partnership currently under review. Many of the challenges that Stott identifies have parallels in the co-lead arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children: contrasting organisational cultures; tension over the management of finance; perceptions of inconsistent institutional buy-in; and a lack of clarity over the nature of the partnership. Stott’s recommendations in that case also have resonance here in that she suggests the partnership might have been improved by “more thoughtful planning; awareness-raising and relationship-building activities” (2007: 12). It is to the credit of all involved in the Global Education Cluster co-lead arrangement that the relationship between the agencies has continued to evolve but, as this section highlights, there are practical ways in which further attention to the core relationships would enhance the partnership as a whole.

4.3.1 Comparative advantage in theory and practice

The comparative advantages of the two organisations are being utilised, if not yet to their full potential, but their different operating cultures can be a constraint to effective co-leadership.

The MoU between the co-lead agencies emphasises the common aims of UNICEF and Save the Children and sets out the comparative advantages that each, in principle, brings to the collaboration in terms of expertise, resources, experience and commitment. The common ground between the agencies is seen as the basis for collaboration:

“Based on a substantial convergence of mandates and institutional goals, both agencies appear to be uniquely qualified and compatible to co-lead the Global Education Cluster.”

And these common and complementary strengths are further described in the Annex to the MoU (Annex: Section 4 Common Principles and Comparative Advantage).

However, shared goals and some complementary resources are only part of the recipe for a successful partnership. The partners also need to be able to accommodate and exploit positively the differences between their organisations. Indeed the essence of a successful partnership is often its ability to capitalise on these differences in order to achieve a desired common purpose.

The argument for comparative advantage in the MoU is restricted to formal, institutional issues (e.g. formal objectives, country representation) and in this respect, UNICEF and Save the Children would appear to be a good fit as agencies in the Education Cluster. Most of our interviewees agreed with this, seeing Save the Children as possibly the only NGO that had the range, resources and experience to partner with a UN agency at this level. A few demurred, however, suggesting that the offer to Save the Children might have been premature and that consideration might have been given to other NGOs in the field. Although this was a minority view, some attention should be paid to the subsequent risk of Save the Children appearing to have a privileged position among NGOs because of its unique relationship with UNICEF.

The Annex lists 5 main points of complementarity: a common commitment to children’s rights and to the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals; participation in the IASC; international scope of operations; specialist expertise; commitment to partnership in humanitarian response.
The argument for comparative advantage from our interviewees gave considerably more emphasis to the difference in the character or culture of the two organisations. While acknowledging the similarities of purpose and values, respondents repeatedly and consistently emphasised the distinction between UNICEF with its huge resourcing, global visibility, legitimacy with governments and access to the UN system with Save the Children’s role as a more flexible and nimble organisation characterised by its access to local communities and its vocal advocacy role as an international NGO.

“UNICEF has much more rigid regulations and it’s harder to respond quickly.....wanted to overcome this with the education cluster so partnering with an NGO was seen as part of a potential solution to timely response.” (UNICEF)

A crucial question for the effectiveness of the co-lead arrangement is whether the comparative advantages that brought the partners together are being effectively used in the operation of the co-lead arrangement.

On this question the evidence seems divided and the situation is complex. For example, the fact that Save the Children can often move much faster than UNICEF to contract and deploy additional personnel in an emergency situation is a comparative advantage that has been utilized. However, exactly such a difference in systems can be more of a constraint than an enabler. The Cluster objective to create a common surge roster – a directory of trained personnel from both organisations available to be deployed – has foundered on differences between the two agencies in their Human Resources planning and procedures. In the words of one senior UNICEF participant:

“We need to put some systems in place that are really shared.”

The country-level survey asked respondents for their perception of the advantages of a co-lead arrangement locally and the overwhelmingly positive responses identified all of the shared and complementary strengths of the two agencies mentioned by interviewees at the global level. Only one respondent, out of 30, did not identify at least one advantage that flowed from having a co-lead arrangement. Despite the recognition of the shortcomings in some areas of country-level operations, co-ordinators and other Cluster staff were clear in their appreciation of the potential synergy of a co-lead arrangement. Two examples here may suffice:

“Save and UNICEF complement each other’s areas of expertise and bring a fuller picture of the whole situation. For example, Save has a larger involvement in early childhood centres/development and has brought that to the emergency response while UNICEF has a much larger engagement and capacity with the (name of country) Ministry of Education.” (On-line survey respondent, Question 8)

“The added value is tremendous. With all the difficulties we still see tremendous potential in this co-lead arrangement. It brings new positive dimensions to the work, great degree of accountability and most of all the co-lead provides credibility to the cluster.” (On-line survey respondent, Question 8)

4.3.2 Equity within the partnership

Equity between the partners – as felt within the partnership, and as perceived from the outside – has not yet been achieved.

A central tenet of partnership working is equity, an acceptance by the partner organisations that their respective contributions to the partnership are recognised as equally essential. Whatever the difference between partners in terms of their organisational size, resourcing, status and scope, the partnership itself should function as an alliance of respected peers.

“Equity is not the same as equality. Equity implies an equal right to be at the table and a validation of those contributions that are not measurable in terms of cash value or public profile.” (Tennyson, 2003:6)

The dominant feeling within the co-lead arrangement is that this sense of equity has not yet been achieved. Problems regarding equity have been noted in previous sections relating to the signals sent out by UNICEF’s
actions in the appointment of the ECU Co-ordinator and to UNICEF’s management of the Cluster funding. These have undoubtedly contributed to the current feeling that – in certain respects – Save the Children remains the poor relation.

“...it is not a partnership of equals: the power and the money sits with UNICEF.” (UNICEF country office)

One of the challenges of such a partnership is to acknowledge the difference in resources without – even by implication – downgrading one of the partners. This cuts both ways in this situation: UNICEF may need to give more recognition to what their smaller partner can bring to the table but Save the Children may equally need to acknowledge that UNICEF takes a greater risk and is more likely to be held accountable by government.

One specific point that needs to be made in relation to the perceived imbalance of the relationship between the agencies concerns the concept of “Provider of Last Resort”. This concept – and the responsibility it puts on the UN agencies – helps to shape both the partnership relationship and the perception of the co-lead arrangement by others. In emergency situations, it is the remit of the UN agencies to be provider of the last resort – it is not a role that Save the Children can easily take on – and UN staff cite this as, essentially, over-riding any other arrangements. The strength of this notion may be making it harder for the co-lead arrangement to be seen as operationally effective due to the perception that, ultimately, responsibility lies with the UN agency. This may be one of the factors that influenced most country office respondents in the on-line survey to disagree with the statement ‘Risks, responsibilities and resources are equitably shared between the co-lead organisations’ (see section 4.2.2 above).

4.3.3 Cluster roles vs. agency roles

The Cluster has not yet achieved an identity as a single entity. A balance between individuals representing their organisation’s interests and representing the Cluster’s interests has not yet been achieved.

One of the biggest challenges in building a partnership is to overcome factional interests and to create an operating environment in which the interests of the partnership are paramount. This means that participants must achieve the difficult trick of simultaneously representing their employing organisation and the collaborative partnership. Indeed, the partnership needs to develop sufficient identity of its own to be recognised as a legitimate agent of change by others. In the case of the co-lead arrangement, a host of structural and personal factors have militated against this happening to any significant degree.

“It is difficult to establish who is responsible for what. Also, it seems difficult at times to take off agency ‘hats’ and put on the cluster ‘hat’. (On-line survey respondent. Question 10)

Nevertheless, there are opportunities in the development of the global level and in country-level collaboration for this to be developed more effectively. Indeed, this was a view that was expressed by a number of our respondents at both global and country level: to create a real partnership, agency representatives need “to take their hats off”.

At the global level the problems for the ECU posed by separate location, poorly defined roles and personal divisions have already been catalogued. As the unit develops it will be vital that the formal common purpose is expressed more clearly to others by a sense of common identity. It was instructive, in this respect, for the TPI review team to observe one of the ECU’s bi-weekly team meetings. The bulk of the meeting’s business was a report from each individual on recent work progress, noting any specific achievements or challenges that the team needed to be aware of and any actions that need to be agreed and allocated. None of these items provoked any discernible degree of disagreement and the group appeared to work comfortably together. However, the one item that proved controversial concerned the identity of the unit. A proposal was made by the Deputy Co-ordinator that the Cluster might have its own logo and that this might be used in place of using both partner
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agency logos on correspondence, business cards etc. This generated a much more lively discussion and was regarded by the UNICEF members as a very sensitive area: the creation of a separate Cluster identity was seen as being impossible within the UN system.

Regardless of the rights or wrongs of the logo idea, the interesting points to emerge from this exchange were, firstly, that transcending joint identities to create a partnership identity is an institutionally difficult thing to achieve; and, secondly, that identity tends to be an emotive issue and one where individuals may find it hard to accept change. Yet, to many of those outside the ECU but within the Cluster, what the unit badly needs is a clearer identity and a public image that goes beyond the tensions evident between the partner agencies. As one interviewee put it:

“ECU is two institutions still..... less of a partnership and more a matter of each partner asserting their own identity – might be better if some people had ECU identity not their respective institution. Even for example, email addresses – definitely not seen as independent by outsiders so there is a suspicion of self-interest. (ECWG member)

“It would be a success if, from the outside, it didn’t even look like a co-leadership arrangement.”

(ECWG member)

Country level

This problem becomes more acute – and potentially more damaging – at country level, where issues of separate identities and procedures may influence the effectiveness of deployment of resources in an emergency response. As our survey data show, around three-quarters (74.4%, n=29) of the offices responding were operating in a co-lead arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children at local level. Some of these respondents noted the disparity between the formal co-lead arrangements and the reality on the ground:

“It’s a co-lead arrangement between UNICEF and Save, but the real job is almost exclusively done by UNICEF.” (On-line survey respondent. Question 6)

“Though it is co-lead, there is still a lot of unlearning that needs to happen with UNICEF to better understand what is meant by cluster co-ordination...” (On-line survey respondent. Question 6)

Others, however, were more positive about their local partnership:

“I believe there is mutual respect for the other’s contribution to leadership and willingness to share equally leadership.” (On-line survey respondent. Question 6)

“Though the Cluster structure mentions UNICEF as Cluster lead and Save as Deputy lead, the leadership and management of the Cluster function on a collegial basis between the Cluster lead, the Deputy lead and the Heads of the two agencies at country level.” (On-line survey respondent. Question 6)

Overall, when asked whether they thought the co-lead arrangement inhibited the support received at country level from the global level, 8 of the 22 individuals responding to this question said ‘None at all’ (On-line survey Question 16). Others cited variety of factors including continuing differences in the management style of the two agencies, unclear division of responsibilities and the issue raised here of tension between the cluster agenda and individual agency agendas.

This challenge also comes out very strongly in the Lessons Learned Report from the Haiti earthquake disaster. The section in the report dealing with co-leadership lists eight issues raised in feedback from Cluster participants (Global Education Cluster 2010: 17-18). These include comments on the nature of the co-lead agencies’ partnership which parallel many of the comments provided to this review at the global level.

“It has been difficult to create one strong team between two distinct agencies. Clear understanding of line management within the team has been particularly problematic.” (Global Education Cluster 2010:17)
“The roles of Cluster Co-ordinator (UNICEF) and Deputy Co-ordinator (SC) were unclear and at times caused confusion and tension.” (Global Education Cluster 2010:18)

Uncertainty over the exact nature of the partnership, including the allocation of roles and responsibilities, at the global level may be putting pressure on the operations of co-lead arrangements at country level, where similar divisions and blurring of responsibility are occurring. The co-lead agencies need to address the question of how to establish clearer lines of responsibility at all level and ensure those roles are properly resourced. To borrow the words of one respondent in the country-level survey:

“We do really seem like two agencies doing the same thing sometimes. I know that co-ordination is not simply about dividing work thematically and geographically. There should be moments when we step on each other’s toes and work through things dispassionately.” (On-line country survey respondent, Question 14).

Another school of thought, among interviewees and survey respondents was that each agency should ‘play to its strengths’ in each country. In other words, there was no point in having a co-lead arrangement for its own sake in a situation where a different set-up might be more effective. One of the challenges to the co-lead agencies may be to take decisions over where the co-lead arrangement is the optimal solution and where single-lead arrangements will be more effective.

4.4 Impact

The Cluster has produced valuable outputs in addressing its key objectives, despite the significant challenges the ECU in particular has faced.

Almost three years have passed since the signing of the MoU between the two agencies and just over two years since the ECU was put in place. Although some of the Cluster participants are quick to stress that “it is still early days”, the activity at the global level should by now show some tangible outputs and have had observable impact on the Cluster’s operations.

The current review is not an impact review and its scope does not extend to a full assessment of the impact of the Global Cluster. However, it is important to acknowledge the very real achievements of the Cluster under its co-lead arrangement as a balance to the detailed criticisms made of some of its structural and operational features. This section, therefore, offers a brief summary of some of the outputs from the Cluster’s activities at the global level to demonstrate the significant progress that the Cluster has made.

4.4.1 Standards and policy-setting

Setting standards for the delivery of education in emergencies is part of the Cluster’s core objectives and has been addressed by the ECWG. This has been an area where outputs have been produced and where the range of expertise in the Cluster has been used effectively. The work of the INEE in developing minimum standards has been harnessed by the Task Team for the creation of guidance material for country offices. The overlap of activities between the ECU and the INEE has been noted above, but, in the area of standard-setting, the close involvement of the INEE with the ECWG has been a source of productive work for the Cluster as a whole. This may not be a direct product of co-leadership but it does demonstrate the ECU’s ability to extend the principle of partnership working within the Cluster – another of its objectives.

“Successes are things beyond the co-lead. For example, the joint education needs assessment toolkit... but that is the product of an interagency effort – doesn’t come from the co-lead but has involved a lot of agencies.” (Knowledge Management Task Team member)

As was seen in section 4.2.7 above, the efforts of the Task teams in this area is reflected in the relative approval levels expressed by country office staff.
4.4.2 Building capacity

In order to deliver the right response in crisis situations, the Cluster’s country level offices need to have the capacity not only at the time of crisis response but also, at other times, to prepare for those potential crises. One of the potential advantages of a co-leadership arrangement is the Cluster’s ability to draw more readily on the resources of both co-lead agencies in building local capacity. This has been the challenge for the Capacity Development Task Team and 2010 has seen the roll-out of an extensive training programme for cluster coordinators. At the time of this review, according to figures provided by the ECU, 158 cluster coordinators had been through the training programme, 34 in a Global Cluster Training course (Montreux 2009) and 124 in Regional Cluster Co-ordinators Training (Bangkok, Dakar, Nairobi, Khartoum 2010). One more regional training (Beirut) and one more global cluster training (Paris) were planned for the remainder of 2010. This is a substantial achievement. In addition, there has been training provided for Ministry of Education officials and also for local staff through the Frontline Responder scheme.

As we have seen from the on-line survey data (section 4.2.7 above), capacity development was one of the functions that country-level staff looked for from the global cluster and it is a vital area in which the cluster has begun to deliver on some of its most pressing objectives.

4.4.3 Advocacy

Without impassioned advocacy, the Global Education Cluster itself might not have been created. Without continued advocacy, education might not be given the role in emergency response that the Cluster participants believe it merits. The Cluster as a whole, and the ECU in particular, has a role in maintaining this advocacy both to other agencies (especially OCHA and others within the UN system) and to potential donors. The impact of the co-lead arrangement in the Global Education Cluster is seen as mixed. On the one hand, the unique set-up of the leadership has attracted attention and enhanced the visibility of the Cluster to other bodies; on the other hand, the weakness of the ECU leadership has limited the extent of advocacy activities.

“The benefit is better profile and this can be good and helps us on the advocacy side. The voice through the cluster is powerful- this has benefits for the children.” (Save the Children)

Advocacy – especially the joint advocacy of two leading international agencies is regarded as a key component of the co-leads’ comparative advantage. However, at the country level in particular, the potential for effective advocacy is not being fully achieved. This is illustrated in the low approval rating (27%) given in the country office survey for support for Advocacy (see section 4.2.7 above).

4.4.4 Operational support to the Cluster at country level

This remains the most controversial area in terms of the co-lead impact. Some Cluster participants cite positive innovations such as the Global Education Cluster global meeting of cluster partners as evidence that global leadership is helping to mobilise the Cluster. Others cite specific emergency situations where human resources were able to be deployed more quickly due to access to the resources of both agencies. The absence of a joint surge roster has been noted elsewhere but there is evidence that collaboration between the co-lead agencies has begun to operate in emergency response.

In her 2009 country level report, Houghton (2009:iii) highlighted a number of areas where the Global Cluster could provide additional resources and support to the country offices. These included information management (“the use of standardised information tools”) and capacity strengthening (“the development of core competencies for cluster co-ordinators”). As has been noted above, both of these issues have been made priorities by the Global Cluster and specific outputs have been generated in support of the country offices.
This can be seen in the Cluster’s response to the Haiti earthquake in January 2010. Although many of the
difficulties of co-leadership at global level were also evident in the deployment of resources at local level, there
was also evidence that the Cluster was able to provide an effective response and, in particular, was able to
provide appropriate education support in challenging circumstances. The author(s) of the Lessons Learned Report
concluded:

“While this exercise has focused mainly on what didn’t go well and what needs to be improved, it
should be stated up-front that the overall message coming from consultations was extremely
positive. The majority of people consulted felt that the response from the Education Cluster was
strong, that staff deployed to Haiti were/are skilled and highly committed, and that much has been
achieved in extremely difficult circumstances.” (Global Education Cluster 2010:9)

4.4.5 Benefits to the partner organisations

Benefits to UNICEF

Perceived benefits to UNICEF centre around the influence of Save the Children on UNICEF’s involvement in the
Global Education Cluster. First among these influences is the balance that a more flexible NGO culture provides to
the more bureaucratic UN agency. NGOs tend to be used to working in a task-focused way, responding quickly to
the need for public advocacy, fund-raising or emergency response as those needs arise. Bureaucracies tend to be
more rule-focused, following sound, well-established procedures to achieve well-defined, long-term goals.
Respondents to the TPI review, frequently characterised Save the Children and UNICEF in these ways and saw a
real benefit accruing to the latter through the necessity of working with a culturally unfamiliar organisation.

“...the co-leadership has been helpful since Save plays a role to hold UNICEF to account and ensure a
bit more transparency and clear delivery on Education Cluster coordination.” (Save the Children)

Participating in the co-lead has also been seen to enhance the legitimacy of UNICEF with the NGO community
more widely. Agencies engaged in emergency response recognise the need for governments, UN agencies and
NGOs to work closely together in delivering humanitarian support so UNICEF’s willingness to enter into a full
partnership with Save the Children in the Global Education Cluster provides powerful evidence that this need is
taken seriously within the UN system.

“Education Cluster is special in the range of other clusters so outside the sector the creation of the co-
lead and the ECU is seen as meeting the UN need to show they are integrating better with NGOs. The
EC has had more attention because of this.” (ECWG member)

Benefits to Save the Children

Just as UNICEF may have gained legitimacy with the NGO community by participating in the co-lead arrangement,
so Save the Children may have enhanced its own legitimacy both with UN agencies, national governments and
other cluster organisations through its willingness to take on the leadership of the Global Education Cluster. Save
the Children personnel were keen from the outset to take the opportunity offered to them and regarded it as part
of their strategy for expanding the NGO’s impact. Although it is easy to see the benefits accruing to Save the
Children by taking on a leadership role in a critical area of humanitarian response, it is important also to recognise
the risks: by becoming a co-lead agency, Save the Children risks losing some of the independence and freedom
that characterises the traditional NGO role; as an organisation it may have to adapt its own culture to work more
closely with the UN system; as part of the NGO community it may find itself the subject of criticism from its peers.

4.5 Added value & the partnership approach

The creation of the co-lead arrangement was a bold attempt to bring something new to the cluster approach to
humanitarian response. It was – and remains – a unique organisation of agency resources predicated on the
expectation that an UN/NGO partnership might add value to the work of a cluster. As the last – and most
controversial – cluster to be created, the Global Education Cluster offered an appropriate and timely vehicle for this pioneering experiment. This section draws on the material already reviewed to discuss whether this innovative arrangement has delivered added value – whether, indeed, adopting a partnership approach can deliver value that a conventional, single-lead, arrangement cannot. In the subsequent section (4.6) a short discussion is included of the extent to which the current co-lead arrangement constitutes a true partnership.

4.5.1 Legitimacy of the Global Education Cluster

The Global Education Cluster was the last of the humanitarian response clusters to be established. It was the subject of disagreement and was only created after strong advocacy from different quarters. Asking the cluster to carry the additional burden of being a pioneer partnership within the cluster approach may have seemed like a high risk yet the overall impression given by the evidence gathered in this review suggests that the risk has produced rewards in terms of the added value offered by an operational partnership between the two agencies; by the positive signal this sends to other agencies in the humanitarian field; and by the reciprocal influence on each of the partner’s organisations. There are certainly individuals both within the Global Education Cluster and in other clusters who regard the co-lead arrangement as unproductive yet this appears to be a minority opinion. More common is the attitude that the Cluster has gained from the visibility and uniqueness that the co-lead arrangement has given it; that this distinctiveness may have gone some way towards offsetting the problems of the Cluster’s origins.

...“donors are keen to deepen relationships and impressed by the example of the education cluster so (the meeting with donors) acted as positive evidence of partnership possibility –the perception of the education cluster is rosier than other clusters because of this attempt at working in partnership.” (UNICEF)

“...the EC compared to others has moved ahead quickly and has built a good network of people and a much more coherent work plan than, for example, the WASH cluster. The cluster is more transparent from the outside in terms of its planning.” (UNICEF)

4.5.2 Institutional inclusiveness

All clusters draw on a broad coalition of agencies to do their work. In some, such as WASH, the UN remains the lead agency but an international NGO (in this case Oxfam) plays a leading role in delivering the cluster’s objectives. In all instances, clusters will need to work for inclusiveness of other agencies, even if the UN remains the provider of last resort. The existence of full co-lead leadership in the Global Education Cluster – though to date imperfectly realised – may have facilitated those efforts at institutional inclusion.

“One of the greatest benefits is that you’ve got more people from a wider range of agencies meeting together and engaged on the same project so both agencies have benefitted from that enforced dialogue – not tangible but very valuable. Without the co-lead perhaps some agencies, like Plan, might not be even part of the party – Save has helped open that up. It has broken the UN stranglehold on some aspects of the system.” (ECWG NGO member)

This characteristic of inclusiveness has also been noted at the level of field operations. The Lessons Learned Report from the Haiti disaster notes, as one of the Cluster’s key achievements that it constituted

“A strong Cluster with broad and inclusive membership – the only Cluster operating entirely in French.” (Global Education Cluster 2010:6)

4.5.3 Breadth of agenda

It has already been noted that partnership with an NGO may have had a positive impact on the behaviour of UNICEF in terms of its ability to accommodate a more flexible partner. It is also argued that partnership has helped to broaden the agenda which is addressed within education i.e. UNICEF has been encouraged to adjust its
outlook in response to specifically NGO concerns and that this has added value to the work of the cluster by broadening the agenda of issues. This has given the Global Education Cluster a distinctive voice and advocacy role within the humanitarian cluster community.

4.6 Discussion: Is the co-lead arrangement a partnership?

The co-leadership arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children was set up as an inter-agency collaboration to achieve stated goals within the Global Education Cluster. It was not initially described as a partnership nor does its MoU set out the kind of procedural details that would characterise a partnership agreement. Nevertheless, if the arrangement is to work it must either be a partnership – in the sense defined at the beginning of this report – or it must classify its collaboration in other terms. Either way, for the arrangement to be sustainable, it must be more clearly defined and a definitive joint agreement must be in place. Just as importantly, both parties must adhere to both the spirit and the letter of such an agreement.

The view of the TPI review team is that the co-lead arrangement is, indeed, a partnership in its intention, its underlying spirit and its manifestation to others. Its very existence is regarded in some quarters as an achievement and its innovative quality has helped both to distinguish the Global Education Cluster and to give it legitimacy within the cluster approach. Working together has asked hard questions of both agencies and required them to adjust some elements of their normal working culture but it has sent a strong signal to the rest of the UN and NGO communities that full partnership may be a productive mode of handling common challenges. The injection of NGO flexibility and advocacy is seen as having broadened the agenda for the cluster and encouraged a more inclusive approach to working with other agencies. The visible symbol of this process is the Education Cluster Working Group and the tangible outputs are the standards, guidance and training that the global level has provided to the Cluster at country level.

It is not, however, a partnership in its operational procedures, resourcing and balance of commitment. The pioneering nature of the co-lead arrangement has meant that crucial issues of structure, procedure and roles were not adequately addressed early in the relationship and these systems issues have had a detrimental effect on the ability of the ECU (where the partnership is most clearly manifested), in particular, to do its job. The sensitive issue of resourcing has also not been effectively resolved and the need for greater transparency and for a mutual commitment to the sustainability of the partnership is paramount. Finally, the visibility of the partnership and especially the clarity of its purpose for the Cluster at country level have to be addressed as a matter of urgency. In Section 6 below, a set of Recommendations is presented as possible means of improving the operation of the co-lead arrangement and taking forward the partnership between the two agencies and its larger network.
5. **Recommendations from the management review**

On the basis of the review carried out by The Partnering Initiative, the following provisional recommendations are made in respect of developing the co-lead arrangement between UNICEF and Save the Children.

The recommendations are divided into sub-sections that map to the framework for analysis of the partnership used in the findings of the report (section 4). The sub-section titles below refer in italics to the relevant sub-section of the findings.

Although the recommendations have also been marked in the left-hand column with an indicative priority from (low) one to (high) three ticks, given the complexity and interconnectedness of the findings of the review and of the recommendations themselves, this is necessarily highly subjective. Indeed, a more appropriate prioritization should be performed as part of the process of re-developing the partnership by the partner agencies working together.

The target of the recommendation – as far as can be determined by the reviewers – is indicated in the left-hand column as follows: ECU – Education Cluster Unit; SG – Steering Group; HQ – Headquarters level of the co-lead agencies. However, the partners themselves will be in a better position to determine the most appropriate target.

### 5.1 Set-up (4.1)

**5.1.1 (Re)building the partnership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The co-lead agencies to institute a collaborative process to take a step back and re-build the partnership, its structures and procedures to ensure they are fit-for-purpose to deliver on the Cluster’s remit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The process could begin with a workshop for participants from across the agencies (and potentially select externals) to jointly develop a clear vision for the partnership, including an agreed definition of what partnership and co-leadership mean in practice (including decision-making process), and what ‘success’ would look like from each partner’s point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop clear objectives for the partnership (including explicitly what benefits are expected from co-lead rather than single-lead arrangement) and ensure transparency over individual objectives of the agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informed by the knowledge and experience gained to date (including the findings and recommendations from this review) collectively develop new and revised structures and procedures to ensure the most efficient and effective delivery, and an operational plan which will best utilize the resources and competitive advantages of each agency to achieve the Cluster objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.2 Partnership documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ ☑ HQ</td>
<td>- The MoU between the agencies should be updated to reflect the new understanding and expectations of the partnership that come out of the re-building process, based on best practice guidelines for partnering agreements^{21}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ☑ ☑ ECU  | - Once agreed, clear guidance should be created/updated and disseminated to explain the whole Global Cluster architecture including:  
  o Purpose and responsibility of each element of the Global Cluster.  
  o Roles and responsibilities of each agency (including external agencies) within each element.  
  o Definition of lines of reporting/accountability.  
  o Decision-making and discrepancy resolution mechanisms (where relevant). |

5.1.3 Financial resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ ☑ HQ/ECU</td>
<td>- Strong efforts should be made to diversify the resource base for the Global Cluster beyond the Dutch government, with a focus on funding that can come through Save the Children. This will firstly reduce the reliance on a single donor and secondly, if through Save the Children, will help to promote equity between the partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ HQ</td>
<td>- If feasible, a trust fund (or other instrument) should be dedicated as a central pot for the Cluster to administer funding for the ECU and certain Cluster activities, with joint decision-making on allocation (i.e. it becomes ‘Cluster money’ as opposed to ‘UNICEF money used for the Cluster’). Guidelines would be required over exactly which activities would be eligible for support from this pot, and which activities would be mainstreamed into existing institutional structures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4 ECU setup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ ☑ ECU/HQ</td>
<td>- Within the context of the ‘rebuilding process’, a full review of staffing should take place to ensure that the ECU has the right portfolio of staff to achieve their specific aims and objectives. The review should take a ‘clean sheet’ approach to determine the roles and competencies, and hence job descriptions, required for effective delivery. These would then be mapped against existing personnel and adjustments made to achieve what may be a quite radically different portfolio of staff best fit to deliver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ ECU</td>
<td>- Job descriptions, particularly for senior roles in the ECU should emphasize the candidates’ ability to work in fully collaborative partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ ☑ ☑</td>
<td>- The roles, job descriptions and reporting lines of the Co-ordinator and Deputy Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^{21} See, for example, TPI’s Partnering Agreement Template (The Partnering Toolbook, Tennyson 2003)
should be adjusted to engender more effective management and ensure stronger accountability. Two possible options are:

- The Deputy Coordinator reports directly to the Coordinator who reports to the Steering Group;
- The roles are made equivalent – i.e. two Co-coordinators – accountable for clearly set out areas of responsibility, both reporting to the Steering Group.

The co-lead agencies should consider the feasibility, advantages and disadvantages of decoupling the two senior management roles at the ECU from specific agencies so that they effectively become employees of the Cluster (although of course administratively they would have to be employed by one or other). The roles would then report internally within the Cluster structures and hence be more accountable to both agencies, rather than to their own specific agency.

The whole ECU team should be physically sited together to promote better teamwork. Given the small size of the Save the Children operations in Geneva, the UNICEF office would be preferable to maximize linkage within the partner agencies.

### 5.1.5 Cluster architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ SG</td>
<td>- There needs to be a more active role in the oversight of the Cluster as a whole and, as the central coordination mechanism, the ECU in particular. To help achieve this, the agencies should consider splitting the Steering Group roles into two separate entities: A UNICEF / Save the Children Management Group overseeing the co-leadership arrangement (including line management of the ECU; the partnership between the agencies; institutionalizing / mainstreaming the work of the Cluster within each organisation); and a newly formed expanded Steering Group to include two or three other agency partners and UNICEF and Save the Children implementing staff (including regional and country level) which would provide guidance to, and be accountable for, the full Cluster’s strategy and activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Operations (4.2)

#### 5.2.1 Cluster oversight and coordination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ SG / ECU</td>
<td>- The (potentially expanded) Steering Group should more strongly oversee the work of the ECWG by increasing the resources of the ECU to play a more active role in coordinating and supporting the ECWG sub-groups and projects. The ECU should also facilitate stronger connections between the ECWG and country level clusters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ SG / HQ</td>
<td>- Stronger coordination mechanisms should be put in place to ensure maximum benefits from the Cluster work mainstreamed into agencies’ staff roles. For example, there could be a regular forum between the agencies to exchange information, coordinate an approach and identify challenges and new opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.2.2 ECU

**Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ECU</td>
<td>- The ECU Co-ordinator, in consultation with the Deputy Co-ordinator produces a twelve-month Management Plan (including a clear breakdown of roles, work allocation and normal workload and identify any gaps) to demonstrate to the Steering Group how the unit will operate in order to achieve its work-plan objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ SG</td>
<td>- The Steering Group (or new Management Group) immediately addresses outstanding tasks with the ECU management and sets clear, SMART indicators for ECU performance over the next twelve months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ECU</td>
<td>- The co-lead agencies agree a staffing and administrative budget for the ECU for the next 3 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ✔ ✔ ECU | - All meetings of the ECU team and any subsidiary working groups to be adequately minuted with clear action points, allocation of responsibility and appropriate deadlines for completion.  
- System put in place to ensure accountability over the following-up of agreed action points. |

**Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ECU</td>
<td>- All new ECU staff to be appointed by consensus of the senior management to job descriptions that meet functional needs in the ECU rather than to ensure parity of staff between the agencies or other single agency’s needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ SG</td>
<td>- The Steering Group (or new Management Group) should play a stronger, more direct role in ensuring accountability of the work of the ECU, and ensuring that any problems arising are dealt with quickly and effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ECU / ECWG / TT</td>
<td>- The ECU should develop and implement a robust internal communications plan to ensure strong teamwork, accountability, informed decision-making and good management both within the ECU and – as necessary – across the other elements of the Global Cluster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ECU</td>
<td>- The ECU should improve its external communication to ensure stakeholders know how the Cluster operates, what can be expected from it, and whom to contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2.3 Relationship with other stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>The ECU and ECWG should use partnership-building techniques to increase buy-in from, and synergy with, other agencies, leading towards a more robust wider partnership and a stronger sense of collective responsibility for the success of the Global Cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>The co-lead agencies to clarify the differences and synergies in contribution to the Cluster between the ECU and the INEE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Relationship among partners (4.3)

5.3.1 Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ SG / ECU</td>
<td>The co-lead agencies should more actively promote and use an identity and branding for the Cluster (rather than agency identities) to help break away from an ‘us’ and ‘them’ mentality. For example, business cards could have primarily the Cluster logo rather than the agency logo and email addresses for 100% dedicated staff could be Cluster emails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ECU</td>
<td>The ECU should encourage and provide guidance to Cluster staff on how to represent the Cluster (rather than their own agency) externally in order to reinforce a unitary voice and identity for the Cluster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Transparency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ UNICEF ECU</td>
<td>As the fiduciary agent, UNICEF should produce a document clearly outlining the procedures (and typical timings) for processing budgetary requests and allocating funding to tasks. UNICEF should be as transparent as possible over the funding that is available for the operation of the Global Cluster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Institutional commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ HQ</td>
<td>Each co-lead agency internally review and appropriately renew their commitment to the partnership moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ HQ</td>
<td>The co-lead agencies, at all organisational levels adhere to the spirit and the letter of a revised partnership agreement (whether a new MoU or other instrument) and fulfil their commitments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specifically, appointment of future new senior staff must fulfil the agreed procedure and be based on consensus of the partners irrespective of the employing agency.

### 5.4  Added value & partnership sustainability (4.5)

#### 5.4.1 Added value to Cluster goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ECU</td>
<td>The co-lead agencies – through the ECU – to issue a Review Statement to all country offices and Cluster partners clearly setting out the purpose, role and structure of all the Cluster architecture and the procedures for operating the co-lead at global and country level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ ECU / ECWG</td>
<td>The ECU, through the ECWG, to prioritise the continued provision of Cluster guidance, standard tools and co-ordinator training to the country level offices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4.2 Added value to partner organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ ✔ SG</td>
<td>As part of the overall review, the co-lead agencies to review the comparative advantage that each brings to the partnership and agree ways of better exploiting those advantages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.4.3 Partnership sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔ HQ</td>
<td>The co-lead agencies individually should regularly assess the value they are each gaining from the partnership to ensure they are each receiving sufficient benefit to continue their commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔ HQ</td>
<td>A grievance procedure should be put in place to work through difficulties at an institutional level which cannot be solved by the Steering Group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Evaluability**

6.1 **Introduction**

The evaluability\(^{22}\) assessment component of the review aims to determine the most feasible scope of an M&E Framework and indicators of an eventual evaluation of the performance of the Global Education Cluster. The indicators will focus on the evaluability of the management arrangements of the co-leadership arrangement however by its nature it will also touch lightly on cluster approach objectives against which partnership indicators will ultimately be reviewed.

The Global Education Cluster evaluation\(^{23}\) looks at the establishment of a comprehensive M&E framework for its global and country level activities and an evaluation of the Education Cluster work. To establish the Global Education Cluster evaluation’s feasibility and scope it will be examined in terms of:

- relevance and design of the expected outcome statements and results matrices;
- existence of sufficient measurable indicators;
- feasibility of joint monitoring systems.

This evaluability assessment will also set out potential indicators for co-leadership and make a number of recommendations for the Global Education Cluster evaluation.

6.2 **Feasibility and Scope of an M&E framework and Global Cluster Evaluation**

6.2.1 **Relevance and design of the expected outcome statements and results matrix**

**Comprehensive M&E Framework**

No results matrix currently exists for the Education Cluster. Existing results statements pertaining to the Education Cluster are set out in the MOU and in Annex One, specifically. These statements are a mixture of partnership activities and outputs and objectives of the cluster approach. As set out in the management component of the report there is a need to define more precisely the objectives of the partnership itself, and the relationship between these objectives and the predetermined objectives of the cluster approach.

Furthermore the development a Results Framework (results chain and corresponding indicators) needs to incorporate both the objectives specific to the Global Education Cluster itself and the objectives of country-level partnership clusters. The challenge in this is developing SMART Results; relating to predictability, timeliness and strengthened system-wide preparedness of the Education Cluster that incorporate the variety of field operations such as type, scale, location etc. This risks creating a statement that is so general that it cannot be meaningfully measured, or so specific that it negates a range of country cluster experiences.

\(^{22}\) Questions raised in the TOR for the evaluability component:

- With what SMART indicators might one operationalize successful cluster co-leadership in relation to key evaluation criteria (e.g. relevance and appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, connectedness)?
- To what extent are these made explicit in guiding documents, to what extent can they be inferred from these documents, and to what extent must they be developed during the present analysis itself?
- In what ways, if any, do these indicators differ from those already established for single-agency cluster coordination? In what ways do cluster leads measure their own success differently in co-led settings versus single-agency-led settings?

\(^{23}\) Reference Draft TOR December 2009: Consultancy for the Monitoring and Evaluation Component of the Education Cluster: aim to develop a comprehensive M&E framework for its activities at the global and country level, and to oversee the undertaking of initial evaluations based on this framework, including an initial evaluation of the global level Education cluster work
Global Education Cluster Evaluation

This Results Framework needs to be in place to enable the establishment of an M&E framework and in turn enable the Global Education Cluster evaluation to be carried out. Aspects of management review have already addressed certain aspects of the Education Cluster evaluation such as identifying gaps in the existing co-leadership arrangements, and reviewing the appropriateness and adequacy of the partnership. Therefore using the management review findings, the Global Education Cluster evaluation can focus on how working in partnership has added value or hindered the achievement of the objectives of the cluster approach.

6.2.2 The existence of sufficient measurable indicators (collection of reliable data for analysis)

In looking for the existence of sufficient and adequate indicators, the M&E framework within the existing Education Cluster was consulted, and the M&E frameworks within other cluster systems were examined for their usefulness in developing measurable indicators for effectively measuring the success of the Education Cluster.

The existing Education Cluster currently has no M&E system or indicators in place to measure either the effectiveness of the Global Education Cluster management arrangement or the effectiveness of the cluster in terms of ensuring predictability, timeliness and accountability of international response. Therefore analysis of the sufficiency or reliability of existing indicators is not possible in this review. Nor has it been possible to make a comparison between the criteria for effective single, and co-lead, management arrangements.

Sufficient and measurable indicators for the Education Cluster would be needed at two levels. First, one level of indicators would identify success of the cluster approach objectives. At this level, one would consider adoption of indicators that reflect existing standards and guidelines, such as those of OECD or SPHERE, as they are aimed at assessing development interventions, rather than internal management processes. A second level of indicators would measure how effective, efficient and timely the management arrangement (co-leadership) was.

Within the other cluster systems, objectives and corresponding indicators are in place at the first level to measure the effectiveness of the cluster approach. (See: Phase One, Cluster Approach Evaluation\(^{24}\), Final Draft\(^{25}\) and Phase Two Cluster Evaluation\(^{26}\) Framework\(^{27}\)). Although the Phase One evaluation did not examine the added value/impact any co-leadership arrangement would have on the cluster approach, it provides an evaluation of the effectiveness of the cluster approach upon which possible baselines and corresponding targets can be developed. The Phase Two Cluster Evaluation Framework sets out a logic model to establish what the intended outcomes of the cluster approach and its effectiveness were. The corresponding indicators\(^{28}\) provide a range of ways to measure the effectiveness of the cluster approach. These are stated as being applicable for use by each cluster in terms of measuring its effectiveness, with a noted need for a consideration of the differences between clusters to be taken into account, such as the examples set out in the table below that are specific to the Education Cluster.\(^{29}\)

---

\(^{24}\) TOR: Phase 1 was tasked to provide ‘evidence of major achievements and shortcomings of the approach’, and to ‘assess concrete changes in operational response’ resulting from its application.


\(^{26}\) Jessica Alexander, February 2009, Geneva

\(^{27}\) the overall objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess the main outcomes of the joint humanitarian response at country level, with particular reference to the role of the cluster approach and other components of the humanitarian reform process
- Assess the overall operational effectiveness of the cluster approach (including the role of the Global Clusters) in facilitating and supporting the coordinated joint humanitarian response at country level through an analysis of common country-level findings

\(^{28}\) (page 8-13)

\(^{29}\) Phase II evaluation cluster
Education

- Extent to which the INEE Minimum Standards are being applied by all Education Cluster members for programme implementation, preparedness or advocacy.
- Number of Education Cluster members, including Ministry of Education, specifically trained on the INEE Minimum Standards, contingency planning, preparedness planning and information management in emergencies.
- % of districts or other relevant administrative or geographic entity in the affected area with an Education Cluster / or similar mechanism.
- % of Education Cluster requested funding needs funded through either Flash Appeal or CHAP/CAP.

Although these indicators are relevant to evaluating the effectiveness of the Education Cluster’s approach they do not enable any meaningful measurement of the internal co-leadership relationship – the second level of indicators. These process level management indicators would examine the co-leadership role and its contribution to the Cluster’s effectiveness. These indicators, set out below, aim to be clearly distinct from the measurement of the overall performance of the Global Education Cluster or of the impact of the Cluster in terms of its external objectives.

6.2.3 Feasibility of joint monitoring systems

In looking to establish a common M&E framework for the Global Education Cluster a number of considerations need to be taken on board for the Global Education Cluster evaluation. These are set out below:

- Striking a balance between the inclusion of common standards, such as the OECD criteria, at the global and country level that enable collectible and comparable data, and continued flexibility to allow the respective members to operate within their individual organisational culture.
- Establishing a common definition of terms such as ‘timeliness’ and ‘predictability’ that incorporate a range of stakeholders’ delivery methods and the range of emergency responses.
- Perceptions of what a humanitarian, rehabilitation or development educational response is may vary across the co-leadership, and across other stakeholders. Consequently, developing a common Education Cluster M&E framework to measure the effectiveness of the education cluster in emergencies will need to respond to this variation.
- Establishment of common evaluations will be part of an overall M&E framework. Common evaluations need to strike a balance between meeting the needs of each partner’s and stakeholder’s individual objectives and avoiding making the TOR too broad and hence the results redundant in terms of their relevancy to enabling improvements to the cluster approach.

6.3 Developing Co-leadership Indicators

This report concentrates on developing indicators to measure effectiveness and efficiency of the co-lead management arrangement by looking at three interconnected elements:

- How efficient and effective is the management of processes involving external (to the two agencies) organisations?

30 Standard evaluation taking place across a number of agencies
- From an **internal perspective**, how effectively and efficiently are the two agencies operating as a partnership?

- To what extent is the co-leadership arrangement delivering **benefits beyond those a single-lead** could deliver – i.e. what is the partnership’s added value?

For the purposes of analysis, the first of these (external performance) is presented separately (section 6.4 below). This set of indicators relates only to a limited number of issues and focuses solely on the effectiveness of the relationship between the co-lead and external stakeholders beyond the co-lead agencies. Any final indicators would primarily be measured using two techniques: analysis of documentary evidence (e.g. meeting attendance, meeting minutes); and an opinion survey of external stakeholders. The two remaining issues (internal performance as a partnership and added value) are dealt with jointly in 6.5 below.

Possible means of verification are also set out in the brackets in the tables below. From this list a number of optimal benchmarks have been underlined for inclusion in the Education Cluster M&E framework. They have been chosen for their ease of monitoring, relatively low cost, while still providing sufficient information to the Steering Group and senior management in the ECU.

### 6.4 External management processes

This element looks at the external management processes from the outside, as if the partnership were a black box – i.e. irrespective of the details of internal partnership workings. A restricted number of areas are proposed for evaluation. These are: representation, external communication, meeting management, knowledge management, and reviewing.

**Table 3: Suggested indicators for the monitoring of external management processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Evaluation</th>
<th>Possible Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representation</strong></td>
<td>• Representation of the majority(^{31}) of pre-identified key stakeholders attending / contributing to(^{32}) cluster working groups (percentage of key stakeholders taking an active role)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means of verification: attendee list, variety of written contributions to working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Representation of Save the Children and UNICEF staff at appropriate level (percentage of meetings attended against an agreed target figure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External communication</strong></td>
<td>• Key Cluster staff(^{33}) are known to external stakeholders (user satisfaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsiveness to external stakeholders (average time to respond to queries; satisfaction with response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increasing percentage of public information available on the website; user satisfaction in finding necessary information easily on website and appropriate use of email/newsletters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good relationship management / engagement. (MOV:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{31}\) To be internally defined as to what constitutes a majority  
\(^{32}\) ‘contributing’ as defined by written input  
\(^{33}\) Representing different global structures
### Meeting management
Are meetings involving external stakeholders properly planned and managed?

- Members provided with sufficient advance notice (one week) of meetings (MOV: level of satisfaction of participants)
- Meeting agenda points are determined by a range of individuals (MOV: documentary evidence; level of satisfaction of participants)
- Well facilitated meetings (MOV: measured against agreed targets e.g. meeting runs to specified timescale; all agenda items are covered; participants feel their views are properly acknowledged)
- Meetings properly documented (MOV: documentary evidence; level of satisfaction of participants)
- Action items clearly defined and completed in a timely manner (MOV: documentary evidence of action completion; level of satisfaction of participants)

### Information and knowledge management
Are adequate knowledge management procedures in place?

- Information and knowledge are well captured (MOV: documentary evidence; Survey addressing level of satisfaction of relevant parties, uptake and use of knowledge products through interviews with country cluster members)
- Timely / important information and knowledge are actively disseminated (MOV: level of satisfaction of relevant parties survey, mode and medium of distribution, number of recipients using products)
- Information and knowledge are easily retrievable (knowledge management procedures are clearly documented and accessible to all stakeholders through a common platform)

### Monitoring and review
Does provision exist for effective review of the co-lead’s performance?

- Appropriate processes are in place for the regular monitoring and review of impact and operations (details of existing procedures; level of satisfaction of relevant parties)
- Accountability procedures are transparent (documentary evidence)

### 6.5 Internal performance as a partnership

This section sets out which type of indicators might operationalize successful cluster co-leadership. When determining which indicators to use to measure the effective operationalization of the partnership the review has adopted the assumption that Save the Children and UNICEF want the partnership to be both *transactional* and *transformative* in nature.

The distinction between transformative and transactional originally derives from literature in the field of leadership and management following Burns’ suggestion that leadership can have a transforming approach which creates significant change in the life of people and organisations, redesigning perceptions and values. (Burns, 1978). This has been adapted to apply to other aspects of organisational behaviour, including the management
and leadership of partnerships. In the current context, transactional indicators would be indicators that focus on immediate activities and outputs, such as completion of joint training. Transformative indicators, however, would reflect something that could not have been achieved by a single agency and focuses on joint performance, which mutually supports the respective agencies achieving the goals and objectives of coming together. Ultimately monitoring and evaluation of the partnership would include both transactional and transformative indicators and it is acknowledged that the precise distinction between the two can be a matter of debate and interpretation.

Table 2 below divides the possible indicators between these two levels as a basis for future discussion.

Suggested optimal benchmarks against which to measure the effectiveness of internal working relationships between two agencies are captured in selected elements of the Partnership Enhancement Tool, which is the distillation of TPI experience from multiple partnerships. This tool not only captures relevant aspects of the original evaluation criteria but provides additional aspects of working in a co-leadership arrangement. The table below sets out some possible criteria against which indicators can be developed to measure the co-leadership arrangement. At this stage the indicators are not yet formed into SMART statements, but are suggestions which could be developed in the future in consultation with key stakeholders. On finalisation of indicators, two to three will be chosen for each partnership objective.

The final factor included in the table is Added Value: measuring the value added by a partnership approach to the ultimate achievement of the objectives of the cluster approach over and above a cluster led by a single agency. The indicators relating to added value are of particular importance when it comes to evaluating the Education Cluster’s effectiveness as this will show the potential benefit or challenges in working together to achieve objectives which might otherwise be delivered by a single agency. Identifying added value is not simple as there is rarely a counterfactual example against which to compare and contrast. At the beginning of a partnership, it is common to create a set of specific objectives that it is hoped will be achieved through working in partnership. However, as has been noted in the management review, the MoU for the co-lead arrangement is not explicit in identifying the purpose and objectives of having a co-lead rather than a single lead. Even the ‘comparative advantage’ section of the Annex, where there is scope to highlight potential added value of working together, remains limited to facts and lacks analysis and instruction on the Cluster architecture. Instead the documentation concentrates on the objectives of the Cluster itself. This uncertainty in the MoU is also reflected in stakeholders’ response when asked what indicators could be used to measure the co-leadership arrangement, where they would commonly cite Cluster objectives.

This lack of information creates a vacuum when attempting to develop indicators to measure whether the arrangement is achieving its partnership objectives. In the table, some potential benefits of running as a co-lead as opposed to a single-lead cluster are included, based on views emerging from the research carried out for this review. However, it is strongly recommended that the partnership jointly reassess and develop the hoped-for benefits and related indicators further.

---

34 The Partnership Enhancement Tool was developed by TPI through work evaluating the partnerships of the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition.

35 Specific measurable Achievable Realistic Time bound

36 Typical responses when asked what indicators they would use to measure the co-leadership arrangement included:

- More children in schools;
- Level of assistance given within any given disaster;
- Comprehensive needs assessment and response plan that address the full spectrum of needs;
- Level of government involvement in the cluster approach.
### Table 4: Suggested indicators for monitoring internal performance as a partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Evaluation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Representation**                           | **Transactional:**  
- Representation of each agency within ECU and TASK teams, working groups, advisory group and steering group  
- Membership of working groups approved by both partners (sign off procedure)  
- Number of common advocacy issues identified by the country cluster and taken forward as an advocacy issue by ECU (MOV: Advocacy campaigns literature/meeting minutes)  
**Transformative:**  
- Country-level cluster reports added value of the ECU by making emergency response more efficient through pooling of resources. (MOV: reported examples of added value, pooling of resources by ECU, number and types of requests resource polling identified by country cluster through survey of country cluster members) |
| **Fulfilment of partner commitments**        | **Transactional:**  
- Establishment of MOU outlining clear comparative advantages in each country’s emergencies at the start of a country cluster response  
- Fully operational steering group established  
- Task force groups are fully represented by members from each agency  
- Roles and responsibilities of the senior management at the ECU specified in writing and clearly distinguished from each other  
**Transformative:**  
- Evidence of respective agencies deferring to partner on its area of added value (Added value of respective agencies identified and reviewed as part of cluster evaluations) |

---

37 This covers the potential relevance of the partnership in terms of it bringing added value in delivering the objectives of the Education Cluster, i.e. it achieves something that could not be achieved without a partnership. At the transactional level relevance would mean that the comparative advantage of the agencies added something to the Cluster – it is utilising the comparative advantages brought by the agencies. Has Save the Children brought something to the Cluster that could not have been brought by UNICEF alone, such as educational expertise, and outreach into communities? In this case the co-led arrangement would become less relevant if it failed to deliver the added value of each agency or if it failed to enable the comparative advantages to be used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area for Evaluation</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project, financial and secretariat management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transactional:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there adequate representation at meetings from different agencies?</td>
<td>- Process for managing grievances is established (MOV: grievance procedure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability – What happens when roles/decisions do not follow procedures? Is there good governance?</td>
<td>- Grievance procedure is adhered to (MOV: audit of grievance procedure protocol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing – Was the partnership adequately resourced in relation to its objective?</td>
<td>- Attendance of meeting by agency representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A mutually agreed and transparent budget exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Financial decisions have sign-off from both agencies at an agreed level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funds allocated in a timely manner as set out in revised MOU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Expenditure is linked to work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting action points from meetings are clearly stated and allocated to a named individual with an agreed timescale for completion (MOV: meeting minutes and action points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External internal communications / relations</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transactional:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the process for making decisions clear and transparent?</td>
<td>- Meetings are documented and minutes distributed to key stakeholders in a timely fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the management of meetings inclusive of all partners?</td>
<td>- Decision protocol established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are meetings followed up by action (next steps with timelines and reviewed delivery)?</td>
<td>- Decision protocol adhered to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establishment of an annual management plan demonstrating how the unit would operate in order to achieve the objectives set out in the overall work-plan for the Global Education Cluster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Channels of communication between the partner agencies, at each level, exist and are clearly documented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformative:</strong></td>
<td>- Key representative from each agency sign off on key decisions (MOV: evidence of written sign off of decision set out in decision protocol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Documentation relating to the co-lead arrangement is equally accessible to both partners (distribution lists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area for Evaluation</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Communications**                        | **Transactional:** • Balanced number of inputs from different stakeholders on task force outputs  
A sign-off procedure for tools and policies?  
**Transformative:**  
• One communication network established to communicate from ECU to country offices |
| **Day-to-day accountability**             | **Transactional:**  
• Existence of mutual accountability procedures  
**Transformative:**  
• Increased adherence to accountability procedures |
| **Added Value**                           | **Transactional:**  
• Joint advocacy campaigns initiated  
• Exit strategies in place for each and both parties should they want to end the partnership  
• Number and type of contacts made across the two agencies (e.g. knowledge sharing; joint action; joint advocacy)  
**Transformative:**  
• Key stakeholders feel the co-leadership arrangement brings added value to the cluster approach. (level of satisfaction/ survey)  
• External stakeholders are requesting to engage in the Global Education Cluster to ensure the achievement of its objectives.  
• Other cluster groups refer to the Education Cluster for best practices and lessons learnt.  
• Additional new partnerships are established between UNICEF agencies and STC on other areas of identified concern. |

### 6.6 Recommendations for Global Education Cluster Evaluations

Recommendations set out below to be fed into the Global Education Cluster Evaluation TOR:

- In the first instance, a results matrix establishing the relationship between the co-leadership arrangements and the cluster objectives and incorporating the global and country level contexts needs to be developed. The logic model and related indicators in the Phase Two evaluation is a solid foundation upon which objectives and indicators for the co-leadership arrangement can be placed.

- Any common M&E framework should be light, simple and flexible, incorporating all the different ways the partners and stakeholders work. The resources need to be in place within the ECU to manage the framework and each respective implementing partners within country level clusters need to sign up to and see clear added value of the framework. Therefore, in practice, this means the framework would
focus on common principles rather than specific requirements and guidelines. Issues of processes as they relate to impact evaluations should be set out as best practices within the framework.

- Develop guidelines for carrying out common evaluations to include areas such as:
  - Common Definitions of key evaluation terms;
  - Standards and Principles upon which to carry out an evaluation
  - Parameters of partner and stakeholder participation in the common framework, including minimum requirements;
  - Common and joint evaluation guidance and administration (such as lines of report, DSA, etc.);
  - Feedback mechanisms for the framework (how the Results Framework will be adapted if it is seen to be no longer working);
  - Mechanisms for negotiating any disagreements arising from the findings;
  - Management: dedicated staff participation across the co-leadership;
  - Toolkit of impact measurement tools and procedures;
  - Cluster review mechanisms to ensure learning;
  - Vision/mission of common evaluations – consistent with the vision of all affiliates.
7. References


Draft Concept Note: Applying The Cluster Approach: Education Sector Response In Emergencies, January 2007: 10 (no author)


Save the Children (undated) Job Description: Senior Education Adviser/Deputy Cluster Co-ordinator.


UNICEF (2010): Job Description Post No: 53209

UNICEF/Save the Children (2007a): Memorandum of Understanding between UNICEF and the International Save the Children Alliance

UNICEF/Save the Children (2007b): ANNEX 1 to the Memorandum of Understanding between UNICEF and the International Save the Children Alliance


8. Bibliography

1. Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations Children’s Fund and the Save the Children Alliance, 7 November 2007
   - Annex 1: List of Interviewees
   - Annex 2: Overview of Agency Mandates and Objectives
   - Annex 3: Staffing and Funding Commitments to the Global Education Cluster
   - Annex 4: Niche Capacity in Study Agencies
   - Annex 5: Material Capacity at Global and Regional Level
   - Annex 6: Numbers of Emergency Education Advisors in Different Deployment Mechanisms
   - Annex 7: Overview of Education in Emergencies Training Packages
   - Annex 8: Other Training Provided
   - Annex 9: HR Capacity, including for Emergency Education Recruitment
   - Annex 10: Other Funding Information
   - Annex 11: Funding for Emergency Response
   - Annex 12: Operating Costs for Country-Level Clusters
   - Annex 13: Objectives and Outputs of the Global Education Cluster’s Capacity Assessment Study
   - Annex 1: Concept Note for the Lessons Learned Study from Country-level Education Clusters
   - Annex 2: List of Interviewees
   - Annex 3: Suggested Indicators for an ‘Effective’ Cluster
   - Annex 4: Education Cluster Profiles
   - Annex 1: IASC Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Response
   - Annex 2: Generic Terms of Reference for Sector/Cluster Leads at the Country Level
   - Annex 3: Joint Letter from Cluster Lead Agencies to their Directors/representatives at Country Level
   - Annex 4: Memorandum of Understanding between UNICEF and the International Save the Children Alliance – Leadership of the Global Education Cluster
   - Annex 5: IASC Operational Guidelines on Designating Sector / Cluster Leads in Major New Emergencies
   - Annex 6: IASC Operational Guidelines on Designating Sector / Cluster Leads in Ongoing Emergencies
   - Annex 7: Making Education a Priority in Emergencies
   - Annex 8: GHP Principles of Partnership A Statement of Commitment
- Annex 9: Sample Memorandum of Understanding for a Country-level Education Cluster Co-Lead Arrangement
- Annex 10: Education Cluster Generic Terms of Reference

10. Save the Children Project Proposal (July 2009)
11. Save the Children Project Proposal (December 2009)
13. Education Cluster Development (Phase 1). Project Definition v0.2. December 2006
15. Proposed Education Cluster Modalities, Save the Children. NOT FOR CIRCULATION – Internal review only, 20 October 2006
16. 76th Working Group Meeting. Cluster Approach Evaluation Phase 2. Inter-agency standing committee. 7-9 April 2010
17. Education Cluster Advisory Group meeting with UNICEF and the Save the Children Alliance. Meeting notes, June 2007
18. Education Cluster Advisory Group meeting with UNICEF and the Save the Children Alliance. Meeting notes, June 2008
23. Education Cluster Needs Assessment Indicators, June 2010
27. Matrix of co-lead, co-chaired, co-facilitated arrangements at the country level, OCHA/HCSS, 29 April 2010

29. INEE Petition Letter, 02 November 2006
30. Internal Save the Children UK Update on Education Cluster September 4 2007
31. INEE/ICVA/SCHR education cluster discussion, Susan Nicolai, 26 October 2006
32. ECWG Meeting 14-16 October Priority Activities, Geneva
34. Education Cluster Appeal and Workplan, 2007-2008
35. Draft Mechanisms to Deliver EC Objectives, January 2007
37. Deliverables over three months development phase, January 2007
38. Components in ToRs, MoUs, LoUs. 29 April 2010 OCHA/HCSS
40. TORs, Senior Education Specialist L-5, UNICEF, February 2010
41. Job profile, Senior Education Adviser/Deputy Cluster Co-ordinator, Save the Children, August 2007
42. Job Description, Knowledge Management Adviser for Global Education Cluster, Save the Children 19 August 2009
43. Job Description, Office Administrator, Save the Children, August 2009
44. Global Education Cluster, Country Implementation Table
47. IASC Members List (undated)
9. Appendices

The following documents are available in a separate zip file:

Appendix 1: Pre-inception interview questions
Appendix 2: Main interview questions
Appendix 3: Online survey questionnaire
Appendix 4: Final phase follow-up questionnaire