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3. Executive Summary

**Background and purpose of the evaluation:** The importance of girls’ education is not longer an issue of debate. Many writers have demonstrated the relationship between women’s education and economic development, health and education of their children. Due to this girls’ education has become an area of concern to both international and national leaders as evident in their commitments to EFA and MDGs. Yet, many girls are either out of schools or fail to complete due to several reasons ranging from both in school to out of school factors. It is such continued challenges that led to the launch United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) in April 2000 by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan with a corrective intent. In Uganda, UNGEI was launched in 2004 as an overarching multi-stakeholder response that would set forth a context-specific development roadmap for girls’ education in the country.

This report forms part of a broader study commissioned by the United National Girls’ Education Initiative Secretariat in New York to document United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) experiences in four countries namely, Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria, and Uganda.

The overall goal of this evaluation was to ascertain the contributions of the United Nation Girls’ Education Initiative in promoting girls’ education, especially with regards to gender responsiveness of education policy, policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school; the identification, documentation, dissemination and institutionalization of ‘good practices’ and promotion of effective partnership. The findings will not only provide a baseline for benchmarking UNGEI’s progress but would also feed into future efforts to improve the UNGEI’s design and strengthen its implementation in Uganda.

**Evaluation Process and Methodology:** A multiple data collection strategy involving documentary review, semi-structure interviews, and FGD was employed in a mutually supportive manner. Contribution analysis was then applied to gauge the contributions of United Nation Girls Education Initiative in the achievement of the outcomes.

**Context:** Despite the remarkable economic transformation in recent years, in the Human Development Index, Uganda is ranked 143 out of 169 countries. It is characterized by low per capita incomes, high population growth rates (3.2%) and poor service reach. With specific reference to education, while Uganda has made commendable progress in providing access to schooling as evident in the massive increment in enrollment after the introduction of UPE and USE, the quality of education remains wanting. And considerable inequalities remain in the regional, social class and gender divides. The girls, in particularly in rural areas continue to lag behind their male counterparts in nearly all the access, quality and efficiency indicators. For instance, although the Net Enrolment Rate (NER) progressed from 86% (89% for boys, 82% for girls) in 2000 to 93% (96% for boys, 90% for girls) in 2009, completion remained low. In 2000 the
completion rate was 63% (71% for boys and 55% girls) but this dropped to 52% (55% for male and 48% for girls) in 2009. In addition, girls constitute the largest proportion of out-of-school children and lag behind boys in performance in national examinations. The dwindling completion rate is attributed to class repetition estimated at 11% and school drop outs at 6.7%.

**Status of UNGEI in Uganda:** UNGEI Uganda has a three-tier management structure spanning the national, district and sub-county/community levels. The Gender Task Force (GTF), District Advisory Committees (DACs) and CECs provide strategic guidance on girls’ education within their areas of jurisdiction. Despite being a fairly inclusive multi-stakeholder partnership, UNGEI Uganda largely remains a loose coalition of non-committal partners; with no secretariat and physical office space of its own, and a rather amorphous administrative structure that leaves room for divided loyalties and near-zero coordination between the national, district and community levels.

**Key findings:**

**Contribution to gender responsive Policies:** UNGEI’s exclusive focus on girls’ education approach has helped to raise the level of policy dialogue between GoU, providers of girls’ education and beneficiaries as well as gender consciousness and the prominence of girls’ education in the education policy discourse. UNGEI has become a key player in Uganda girls’ education policy development. Although government led UPE policy has improved enrollment, UNGEI’s contributions is evident in attendance, retention and completion. For instance, while in 2003, a year before the launch of UNGEI 66% of the boys and 47% of the girls completed primary seven, in 2004 (the year UNGEI was launched), there was an increase of completion rate to 72% for boys and 54% for girls in 2004.

**Policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school:** Although there is still no policy “offering girls another chance”, the MoES is, in concert with UNGEI partners, at advanced stages of resolving this policy gap. Even in the absence of a formal policy pronouncement, UNGEI has, in collaboration with the MoES, put in place several initiatives including Radio Talk shows, School Walk and School Visitation to raise awareness about the importance of sending back child mothers to school. These together with the circulars the MoES has kept sending to the school administrators urging them not to expel pregnant girls from school, are starting to change the community mindset to embrace the rationale for re-entry of pregnant girls or child mothers. However UNGEI’s activities have so far been limited to primary school level sometimes to the disadvantage of girls at the secondary school level.

**Good practices in girls’ education:** This is probably the one area where UNGEI’s contribution is most noticeable. UNGEI is effectively providing a platform for broad stakeholder involvement in the identification of good practices in girls’ education; sharing and advocacy for their institutionalization and for the pooling of resources for their scale up. The key limitation faced by UNGEI arises from shortage of funds for scaling up and implementation good practices.
**Strengthening partnership**: As a pioneer partnership for girls’ education in the country, UNGEI significantly altered the dynamic for collaboration between the participating partners especially at the district and community levels. By avoiding the employment of parallel planning, programming and implementation structures, the UNGEI partnership is: (i) strengthening government systems and local capacities; (ii) enhancing government as well as local community ownership; and (iii) improving the quality and availability of gender disaggregated data. The galvanization of a broad spectrum of partners each with its own comparative vantage point is, in itself, creating scope for synergy. Nevertheless, the low sense of ownership and collegiality, inadequate funding, differing policy and funding perspectives, the disconnect between the national and district levels and the non-regularization of UNGEI have undermined its visibility as a vibrant partnership.

Further, although the Regional office provided support and finances to map the partnership and conduct gender audit during the initial stages of UNGEI Uganda, over time that support has declined. In addition linkage with the global level appeared to have waned off.

Notwithstanding these limitations, several factors have helped to keep UNGEI Uganda afloat. They include; its role as a forum for bringing the voices of the various partners to a common planning table; its utilization of the national EFA action plans and other planning/policy frameworks to ensure a policy fit; having well spelt out TORs and work plan; conducting advocacy and communication in such a way that leads to a bottom-up build up of a social movement for girls’ education; engagement of boys and men as strategic allies; and the prioritization of girls’ education in all development activities.

**Conclusions**: Although UNGEI has contributed to the alignment of sector policy towards girls’ education and consolidation of partnership in girls’ education; its contributions to the outcomes are probably more discernible in the identification, documentation, implementation, and downstream institutionalization of good practices in girls’ education. However, the limitation of UNGEI’s interventionist work to the basic education sub-sector - to the detriment of the other sister sub-sectors - disturbs inter sub-sectoral articulation.

**Lessons learned**: The most notable deductions that can be gleaned from the evidence gathered are that; (i) UNGEI’s limited resources seem to have a better catalytic effect when utilized at the community and school levels than at national level launches; (ii) Behavior changes call for participatory approaches, continual messages for reinforcement purposes with follow up support supervision; capacity building, increased resource inflows, intensified advocacy and social marketing to create receptivity; monitoring and evaluation – all backed up with a strong political will from the top leadership; (iii) the engagement of children and the youth in the partnership process is critical and (iv) multi-sectoral interventions appear to have higher chances of success in girls’ education, since many problems relating to girls’ learning lie both within and without the education system.
Recommendations: Basing on the conclusions above, UNGEI Uganda needs to: (i) revive its support supervision role over the district UNGEIs in order to strengthen the partnership at this level; (ii) organize meetings of different district UNGEI committees to enhance information sharing at that level; (iii) go beyond the narrow focus on pre-primary and primary education and pay more attention to the full delivery chain covering the entire education sector; (iv) crowd in more multiple partners/donors, including the private sector, in order to forge ahead with its scale up agenda. This in turn will widen UNGEI financial base; and (iv) revive its closer ties with UNGEI at regional and global levels.
1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Purpose of Evaluation

Research on female education in many countries has shown that educating girls and women is critical to economic development. Female education creates powerful poverty-reducing synergies and yields several inter-generational gains. For developing countries, where women represent an untapped source of human capital for development, policies to reduce gender gaps in access to education can yield economic and social benefits that accrue to individuals, families and the society at large. Education is also important because it can help to eradicate poverty and hunger. Given the benefits of female education, it is important to promote equal access to education by boys and girls.

Hence, girls’ education, as a development issue, has been the concern of both international and national leaders for some time now. This is evident in the commitments made during the 1990 World Conference on Education For All (EFA) in Jomtien, that were realigned at the Dakar World Education Forum of April 2000, and reaffirmed by the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) of 2000. In particular, MDGs 2 and 3 sought to ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, are able to complete a full cycle of primary education (Kariuki, 2007) and that gender parity is achieved at all levels of schooling.

The relative but persistent “under visibility” and under performance of girls in education prompted the launch of United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) Uganda Chapter in December 2004 with a corrective intent. UNGEI Uganda was launched in response to a call by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan during the global launch of UNGEI in April 2000 at the World Education Forum in Dakar for member nations of the UN to adopt this initiative at country level.

Statement of the problem: UNGEI is now seven years old in Uganda. Over the years, Uganda has made great improvements in narrowing the gender gap in primary and secondary school. The country is indeed, on track in terms of achieving MDG2 (See Annex …). However, the findings of the 2008 UNICEF commissioned evaluation of UNGEI revealed three disturbing trends in girls’ education in Uganda, namely:

- While there is near gender parity in access and attendance at basic levels of education, progress is uneven across regions and different levels of schooling;
- There is compromised gender equality in school processes, textbooks, subject choices, teachers’ attitudes and susceptibility to violence; and
- Girls’ and women’s education is more vulnerable to adverse circumstances such as poverty, conflict, natural disasters and economic downturns.

This could imply that, the progress in girls’ enrolments in primary and secondary education has not been accompanied with gender responsive policies. It could also mean that structural causes of gender inequalities that undermine females'
Participation in education have not been adequately addressed. It may also signify failure to galvanize critical minimum mass of a partnership-based support required to roll forward the girls’ education agenda. These are the policy and practice gaps which UNGEI was initially meant to bridge.

The persistence of these gaps motivates an inquiry about UNGEI’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability.

1.2. Aims and Objectives of the Evaluation

The purpose of the formative evaluation of UNGEI is to establish the extent to which the UNGEI partnership in Uganda is achieving its intended outcomes, and the extent to which the global and regional efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership. The evaluation is anchored on monitoring and evaluation framework, which highlights the following four outcome areas of UNGEI:

- Policies that promote girls’ education and gender equality are in existence;
- Policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers;
- Good practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized; and
- UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality.

The overall evaluation of UNGEI covers the global, regional and country level engagement by UNGEI. Four countries were selected for detailed case studies: Egypt, Nepal, Nigeria, and Uganda (a fifth country, Ivory Coast, had to withdraw from the evaluation because of security concerns). At regional level the evaluation focused on East Asia and the Pacific. The evaluation included a comprehensive mapping of the UNGEI Partnership in all participating countries, as well as data collection and interviews with global stakeholders.

This report reflects the findings of the Uganda country study only. A separate overall evaluation report pulls together the findings from the evaluation as a whole.

It is anticipated that the formative evaluation will help UNGEI:

- Map the status of UNGEI partnerships in Uganda;
- Map the governance structure and administrative components of the UNGEI partnership in Uganda;
- Validate outcomes to be achieved in order to move forward the girls’ education and gender equality agenda in education;
- Collect empirical baseline data against which progress in future evaluative works can be measured;
- Define the key elements that make a strong partnership for girls’ education;
1.3. Scope of the Evaluation

The current report documents how the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative has interacted with and contributed to Uganda education processes and how this has impacted, or is expected to impact on girls’ education and gender equality in education. Thus, the Uganda evaluation will:

- Document what key changes have taken place in girls’ education and gender equality over time in the four outcome areas of UNGEI (gender responsiveness of education policies, Policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls, good practices and effective partnership).
- Identify where and in what ways UNGEI has made a specific contribution or enhanced the contribution of others.
- Provide evidence of the outputs and outcomes of these interventions.
- Finally, assess the relevance, effectiveness and outcomes of NGEI’s interventions as well as their sustainability.

The evaluation also maps the UNGEI partnership, its governance and administrative structure, operational mechanism, and its contributions to gender-responsive changes in education sector. The evaluation focused on answering the following questions:

- What key changes have taken place in Uganda with respect to girls’ education and gender equality since UNGEI was formed, with focus on the four outcome areas of UNGEI?
- In what ways did UNGEI contribute to these changes or enhance the contribution of others?
- What achievements were made possible as a result of the partnerships?
- How relevant were UNGEI’s interventions to the context and gender issues in the education sector?
- How effective have UNGEI’s interventions been in promoting changes?
- Were these results achieved in an economic manner (efficiency in the use of resources – human, financial, etc)?
- What have been the impacts/likely impacts of these changes?
- Are these changes sustainable over time?
- Does Uganda’s coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?

The evaluation will seek to determine if UNGEI has added value to Uganda-level results in girls’ education. Since it is always difficult to attribute results to only one source of inputs, actions or actors, to the extent possible, the evaluation will try to outline UNGEI’s contribution to overall results through a contribution analysis. Contribution analysis focuses on identifying changes that took place, and how different inputs contributed to the changes. The logical steps to determine the contribution of UNGEI are as follows:

- What was the context like before UNGEI – what was happening at level zero?
- What changed in the context over time (from before UNGEI until today)?
What did UNGEI do (taking into account inputs from the global/regional/country levels)?
What inputs – (training, workshops, policy, evaluations, etc) were provided by others?
What were the outcomes?
What was the contributions of UNGEI to the changes that took place in terms of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI’s inputs
How sustainable are the changes that were brought about?

Thus as emphasized in the Evaluation Guide, the following key steps were involved:
- Comprehensively mapping the situation at level “0” (before UNGEI)
- Examining what changed in the environment.
- Documenting inputs by stakeholders.
- Documenting changes.
- Determining the distinctive contribution of UNGEI

It should be noted that the last step is crucial and requires undertaking a contribution analysis. Rather than examining what changes took place and assuming that because changes took place when UNGEI was present, UNGEI must have contributed to the changes, contribution analysis goes further to construct a plausible story of influence, examining to what extent and in what ways UNGEI contributed. Because this is a formative evaluation this assessment did not only looks at outcomes but also at processes and structures that have been put in place and how these influence or may influence future outcomes.

As stated in the Evaluation Terms of Reference, the self-evaluation examined only activities/results that have been undertaken or achieved through collaborative efforts by the formal partnership (UNGEI). Activities which take place outside the UNGEI partnership arrangement, e.g., an international organization funding an activity implemented by the Ministry of Education or a local Non Governmental Organization (NGO), were excluded from the evaluation.

1.4. Structure of this report

This report is divided into nine sections. The first section is the Executive summary which is a synoptic representation of the entire report. Introduction provides a status scan of girls’ education globally and highlights some of the interventions made to improve girls’ education. The problem, purpose, objectives are then provided. The Evaluation Process and methodology shows the sample and data collection and analysis techniques.

The fifth section is the Uganda context which provides current demographic and governance status in Uganda. It also shows the education status such as trends in enrolment with a focus on girls’ education in Uganda before highlighting the national response. This is followed by a section on the Establishment and evolution of UNGEI in Uganda. This section describes the establishment and expansion of UNGEI in Uganda. It
also shows its structure, management and analysis of its vibrancy. The relationship between regional and global UNGEI is also presented in this section. The seventh section is findings. Presentation of this section shows the situation before the launch on UNGEI, inputs by UNGEI, impact and lastly the contributions UNGEI is making in respect to the four outcomes. It also highlights challenges hindering effective achievements of the outcomes. Section eight the Conclusions on the 4 outcomes are provided. Lessons Learned is a distillate of the lessons learned. Lastly, Recommendations for remedial action are provided.

Relevant annexes have also been attached to facilitate cross-referencing.
2. Evaluation Process and Methodology

This chapter outlines the evaluation process and methodology. It discusses the various phases of the evaluation, the activities that took place, and the role of the logic model in the evaluation process.

2.1. The Inception/Preparation Phase

The main output of the preparatory phase was the production of the Inception Report which provided a detailed outline of the evaluation methodology and approach, and highlighted issues emerging from the preliminary desk review. The Uganda inception report was circulated on 25th February 2011. This enable the Evaluation Manager, and the reference group adequate time to provide feedback before field work.

The preparation phase for the UNGEI evaluation started with the participation of the Consultant and UNGEI chairperson Uganda in the Orientation and Planning Workshop in Cairo, Egypt, from 23rd – 27th January 2011. The purpose of the workshop was to ensure a common understanding of the objectives of the UNGEI Formative Evaluation, and to ensure familiarity by the evaluation team with the proposed methodology, evaluation framework, evaluation tools and products. The numbers of people who participated in this preparatory workshop varied from one country to another. Uganda was represented by 2 people, Nepal - 3, Nigeria - 4, and Egypt, the host 7 persons. These included national consultants, M&E specialist from UNICEF (evaluation managers), UNGEI focal persons and officials from the Ministry of Education. In addition, regional and international consultants, members of UNGEI’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) working group, staff from UNGEI Secretariat, United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) staff from the East Asia and Pacific region, Eastern and Southern Africa (ESARO) and the headquarters also attended the workshop.

2.2. Key activities undertaken during preparation phase

The preparatory work commenced on return from Cairo. Focus during this stage was on documentation review and fine-tuning of the evaluation methodology and drafting of field instruments. The key activities undertaken during this phase were:

- Study of the overall Evaluation Guide.
- Familiarization with the literature on girl’s education in Uganda.
- Reading of country documents on the UNGEI.
- Identification of information gaps and key issues which require review and/or verification during field work.
- Production of summary findings on UNGEI establishment, membership, structure, achievements and challenges.
- Finalization of sampling frame and list of respondents (stakeholder map).
- Preparation of data collection instruments – finalization of Uganda Evaluation Framework and Logic Model, drafting of interview schedules and focus group discussion guides.
- Finalization of activity plan and time lines.
During the Cairo meeting it was agreed that:

a) A UNICEF staff from the head quarters visits Uganda to provide support and brief the Evaluation manager who did not attend the Cairo meeting, and

b) Data collection instruments would be piloted in Uganda.

Visit by the UNICEF staff: This visit took place from 1\textsuperscript{st} – 4\textsuperscript{th} March. The main purpose was to brief the evaluation managers and UNICEF of their roles in the evaluation. During this visit several meetings including three in which the Consultant participated were held. These were;

a) A meeting with the UNICEF staff from Education and Social Policy and Evaluation sections (1\textsuperscript{st} March 2011). During this meeting, the participants were briefed about the Cairo meeting, the roles of UNICEF, Evaluation Manager and the Reference Group. The inception report was presented and feedback received.

b) Meeting with the Evaluation Manager (2\textsuperscript{nd} March 2011): There were 3 participants. During this meeting the data collection instruments were discussed and adjustments suggestions. By the time of piloting the instruments, it had therefore been validated by the Evaluation Manager and the UNICEF staff from the head quarters and Uganda.

c) Gender Task Force meeting (3\textsuperscript{rd} March 2011): There were 20 participants from government ministries, donors and NGOs. During this meeting, participants were brief about the UNGEI evaluation, the inception report was presented and feedback provided. It was also during this meeting that the Reference Group was set up. A total of 6 people volunteered as members of the Reference Group.

The reference group provided guidance to the evaluation process. They reviewed inception report, draft report and final report.

Piloting data collection instruments: This took place from 27\textsuperscript{th} March to 1\textsuperscript{st} April. From 27\textsuperscript{th} to 29\textsuperscript{th} March, the International Consultant accompanied the National Consultant in undertaking the pilot. Thereafter the National Consultant together with the International Consultant shared their experiences with the other consultants.

2.3. The Logic Model
A key tool for the evaluation was the Uganda Logic Model (See Annex 8) derived from the current UNGEI Work Plan 2010 – 2014. The model shows how UNGEI expects to reach its goals. It links outcomes (short and long-term) to activities (the results chain) and to the vision and goals of the partnership. Since the evaluation aimed at assessing the extent to which UNGEI’s outcomes have been achieved, the Logic Model provided guidance.
2.4. **Data Collection Methods**

The UNGEI Evaluation Framework, modified for the Uganda context (see Annex 7) was used to obtain detailed information from members of the partnership.

Data collection involved critically examining UNGEI partners’ involvement and operational efficiency in the partnership activities. The study adopted interactive stakeholder-engagement approaches to data collection including:

- **Interviews:** Face to face interviews were held with UNICEF staff, Officials from the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, and district education officials, FAWEU officials. Interviews provided a unique opportunity to delve deeper and get clarifications on the lead aspects of UNGEI Uganda including its design, programming, TORs, work plans, achievements and challenges to date (see Annex 6 for list of those who participated in the evaluation). The interview guide focused on partners’ contributions to girls’ education, to the partnership, their perceptions about the impacts and effectiveness of the partnership as well as the challenges.

- **Focus group discussions:** These were held with UNGEI district and sub county committee members, pupils and teachers. FGDs afforded the consultant the chance to listen to the voices of the beneficiaries of the UNGEI, regarding their candid assessments of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability as well as shortcomings of the UNGEI process.

- **Formal desk review:** Documentary analysis of UNGEI work plans, minutes of meetings, progress reports, research findings and other materials provided additional information crucial for evidence-based reporting. The main focus of this review process was directed at ascertaining the status of girls’ education, UNGEI’s contribution to the broad educational policy, policy on the re-entry of pregnant girls to school, identification and sharing of good practices, and effective partnership in girls’ education.

2.5. **Sampling Frame**

UNGEI Uganda is composed of many organizations namely, UN family, NGOs, CBOs, teacher education institutions, civil society, private sectors and communities. Data was collected from all these categories. Specifically the following participated in the study:

1. Government agencies – Ministry of Education and Sport and Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development
2. Members of the UN family – UNICEF.
3. Donors – Irish Aid
4. FAWEU
5. Civil society organizations – KALI, KIND Uganda, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association and Bwimaniro Women’s Group, Kasese
6. Beneficiaries of the programme at the community and school level. These included pupils and students.
7. UNGEI committees at the district level

Apart from the teachers and pupils, all the participants from UNGEI partnership at national, district, and sub A county/community were purposively sampled.

The districts were selected purposively to ensure representativeness in terms of:

a) Their categorization as having ‘well’ functioning or ‘poorly’ functioning UNGEI committees (based on UNGEI reports of 2010);

b) Their efforts to roll out UNGEI to the sub county and lower levels; and

c) Regional location.

Basing on the above criteria, the districts of Abim, (in the North East with ‘well’ functioning committees), Lira (in the North with ‘poorly’ functioning committees), and Kyenjojo as well as Kasese (in the West with ‘well’ functioning committees and have rolled out UNGEI to the sub county level) were selected. Such purposive sampling allowed for differential analysis of UNGEI’s performance across the districts and between the districts and national level UNGEI partnerships.

The list of organizations and individual respondents who were interviewed and with whom Focus Group Sessions were held is shown in Annex 3.

2.6. Field Work

The data collection process progressed as shown below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Data Collection Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 16th – Tuesday 22nd March 2011</td>
<td>National level data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 28th March to 1st April</td>
<td>District level data collection (Kasese and Kyenjojo districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 4th April to 8th April</td>
<td>National level data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 11th to 15th April</td>
<td>District level data collection (Abim and Lira districts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 18th to 22nd April</td>
<td>National level data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>Regional level data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first half of the first week of data collection, the consultant was accompanied by the International Consultant. Thereafter the consultant collected data from the remaining stakeholders. At the district level the consultant met district education officials, women groups, teachers, head teachers and pupils.

2.7. Data Analysis

Content analysis technique involving line by line perusal of the field notes, transcribed interviews and focus group discussions was applied. Data was coded with a view to generating patterns, categories or generalizations regarding UNGEI’s contribution to the formulation of more gender responsive educational policies, policy for the readmission
of pregnant girls/child mothers, identification and dissemination of good practices for girls' education and enhancing partnership in girls' education and gender equality. Constant Comparative Methods whereby discrete pieces of data are continually perused and compared with a view to generating patterns, categories or generalizations was also used particularly to get a better understanding of the effectiveness of the partnership, factors responsible for the differential impact of UNGEI between the “strong” and “weak” UNGEI districts, national, district and sub county level UNGEI. A comparative analysis of the dichotomous results obtained helped to better the understanding of what works and what doesn’t work in as far as promotion of gender parity/equality in education is concerned

**Quality assurance:** Continuous review by the officer from Social Policy and Evaluation UNICEF, the reference group and the international consultant helped to moderate the data collection and analysis and to ensure overall quality reporting.

### 2.8. Methodology Limitations

Interpretation of this evaluation results should be done within the context of the following caveats:

- **Lack of objective measures of UNGEI outcomes:** While evidence-based reporting is necessary, it was statistically difficult to quantify desirable outcomes of UNGEI activities. For instance, if, as a result of a particular UNGEI intervention, girls learn to say “no” to early marriage, this attitudinal change cannot be precisely quantified in numerical terms. Hence the need to view UNGEI as a social movement that addresses issues of social change whose contribution and successes can only be measured subjectively.

- **Unreliability of the national statistics:** The use of aggregate national education statistics to try to monitor and decipher the impact of UNGEI’s activities in Uganda encounters two major problems: First, the few districts in which UNGEI is concentrating its work are those with the lowest education performance indicators in the country. They are not reflective of the situation in the country as a whole. This undermines the comparability of the evaluation findings. Second, even when UNGEI could have brought about improvement in girls’ access to and achievement in education in these few disadvantaged target districts, that impact cannot be noticeable at national level. Third, and lastly data on pregnant girls and child mother who have returned to school are not available even at the district level, apart from few isolated school level data. This makes it difficult to ascertain the impact UNGEI could be making in this area.

- **Inadequate records:** The desk review was constrained by poor record keeping. Record from the time UNGEI was launched was difficult to obtain. The few, mainly of 2008 that were available were obtained from some of the partner organizations. Although mapping of all the organizations focusing on girls’ education were undertaken, no report on this was available.
• *High staff turnover:* In all the UNGEI partner organizations, the staff that was on the ground when UNGEI was launched had all left those institutions. As a result it was not easy to access them. This together with inadequate records created difficulties in piecing together UNGEI activities at the national level.
3. Context – Uganda: Background and the Education sector

This chapter provides brief background information on Uganda, as well as a concise overview of the education sector and the progress towards girls' education and gender equality. Key issues affecting girls' education and gender equality are also highlighted.

3.1. Uganda: Background

Socio-economic profile: According to the Human Development Index, Uganda is classified at 143 out of 169 countries. Countries characterized by wide regional and gender disparities in poverty levels, feeble human capital base, and high degree of economic vulnerability (World Bank, 2009). Worse still, its population growth rate of 3.2% is among the highest in the world (UBOS, 2007). Majority of the population is female (51%) and falls within the lower than 15 years of age bracket. The dependency ratio (i.e. the share of those aged 0 – 14 and 65+ as a share of those aged 15 – 64) is, once again, among the highest in the world. This overstretches government in its bid to provide basic social services, education inclusive. Yet, not all is lost. Ugandan economy has transformed remarkably in recent years following a series of reforms that have restored macro-economic stability and marked reductions in poverty levels. Uganda is actually on track to meeting the MDG of halving poverty by 2015 (NDP 2010).

Governance and women’s empowerment: In 2006, Uganda reintroduced a multi-party political dispensation after nearly two decades of no-party democratic model of the National Resistance Movement (NRM) government. The constitution of Uganda recognizes women’s right to political participation. The Equal Opportunities Act of 2007 and the Uganda Gender policy provide a legal framework for inclusiveness and representation in all public offices. These have steadily increased the share of women who take part in political decision-making at all levels of society. The share of women in the national parliament has, for instance, increased from 18% in 2000 to 33.2% in the 8th parliament (2006 – May 2011). The numbers of women in the current cabinet increased from 15 in the last parliament to 24 (The Monitor Newspaper 2/June 2011).

3.2. Uganda’s Education Sector

Policy profile: Uganda’s education is divided into 3 levels, namely; primary (7 years), secondary (lower – 4years and upper, 2 years), and tertiary and university (2 – 5 years). GoU launched a policy of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997, and Universal Post Primary Education and Training (UPPET) as a major policy initiative in 2006. In 1998, the MoES developed and launched ESIP 1998 – 2003 as its development framework for education, with UPE as the primary focus. The ESSP 2004 – 2015, prepared in 2003, and revised twice to ESSP 2010-2015 is the current government strategy for education. ESSP commits government to ensure that universal access to primary education is the highest sector priority. It targets the removal of financial impediments to that objective, and it focuses attention on improving regional and gender equity (Magona, 2009).
Institutional framework: The key decision-making body is the MoES Top Management Meeting (TMM), which has exclusive MoES participation and provides oversight and assurance for the ESIP/ESSP. The Education Sector Consultative Committee/Group (ESCC) provides the main consultative forum on education strategy, policy and financing. It meets every two months and has participation of MoES, MoFPED, Ministry of Public Service (MoPS), Ministry of Local Government (MoLG), the main education institutions, Education Development Partners (EDPs), civil society and private sector (MoES, 2009) and is chaired by the Permanent Secretary. The MoES Planning Department provides the secretariat function. The third level consists of a series of Technical Working Groups (TWGs) which relate to the education sub-sectors and to cross-cutting issues (e.g. financial management, sector policy and management, monitoring and evaluation) and which provide technical inputs to the work of the ESCC. These mechanisms have also been the basis for donor coordination through the Education Development Partners (EDPs).

Trends in resource inflows: Education sector expenditures have increased substantially since 1997. Increment was especially evident following the launch of UPE in 1997, at an average of 17% of yearly government expenditure in real terms and with the introduction of UPPET in 2006, allocations to the education sector increased by 33% over two financial years. In nominal terms, the increases in education appear particularly dramatic – with allocations increasing from Ug shs 250 bn in 1997/98 to Ug shs 900 bn in 2008/09 (ODI, 2008).

Despite this increase, Education Sector expenditures have declined as a share of government expenditure over the last 12 years, initially from 24% in 1997/98 to 22% in 1999/2000. Until 2005/06, the share remained stable at between 21% and 22%. Since 2006/07, despite the introduction of USE, the share of education spending has fallen to 17% as the overall priority of government has shifted towards productive sectors (ODI, 2008).

Four major weaknesses in operational efficiency persist. Leakages of resources between central government and schools (e.g. ghost teachers, misuse of UPE grants to districts); leakages of resources within schools (e.g. high rates of absenteeism by pupils, teachers and head teachers); deployment of teachers across districts in a way which is unrelated to measures of need; and inefficient allocation of resources within government schools (e.g. large class sizes in early grades and lower sizes at higher grades) (ODA, 2008).

3.3. Girls’ Education in Uganda

The introduction of UPE in 1997 significantly increased access to primary education for both boys and girls. The total enrolment tripled from about 2.7 million in 1996 to 8.2 million in 2009. The Net Enrolment Rate (NER) also progressed from 86% (89% for boys, 82% for girls) in 2000 to 93% (96% for boys, 90% for girls) in 2009 (See Table 1 below) (NDP, 2010). This is an increase of 8% in the NER of girls.
Table 1: Selected Performance Indicators for Primary Education in Uganda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate (GER)</td>
<td>128%</td>
<td>132%</td>
<td>124%</td>
<td>115.1%</td>
<td>118.1%</td>
<td>112.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate (NER)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Rate to P7</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Rate from P7 to S1</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NDP, 2010

In the same way, the introduction of USE/UPPET in 2007 increased secondary school enrolment (S1 – S6) by 25% from 814,087 in 2006 to 1,165,355 students in 2009 with girls constituting 45.6% of the total enrolment. This also raised the GER at secondary school level from 21% in 2000 to 29% in 2008, and the transition rate from P7 to S1 from 56.3 (56% male, 56.6 female) in 2000 to 62% (64% male, 60% female) in 2009. The transition rate from S4 to S5 also rose by 9 percentage points from 39% to 48% in 2000 and 2009 respectively (MoES, 2009).

Similarly, between 2006 and 2009, enrolment in Business Technical Vocational education and Training (BTVET) institutions increased by 14.5% from 25,682 (25% female, and 75% male) to 30,000 (39% female, 61% male) respectively. Likewise, the student enrolment in higher education (universities and non-university) institutions has risen from 10,000 in 2000 to about 180,000 in 2009 (EMIS, 2009) with females making up about 45% of the total student population at Makerere University.

However, completion rates remain low overall, and lower for girls. For instance, just one-third of the girls compared to half of the boys who enrolled in primary were still in school at the age of 18 (UDHS 2006; EMIS 2008; MGLSD 2008). Again Table 1 clearly illustrates this. For instance, there was a decline in completion rates in primary from 63% (71% male, 55% female) in 2001 to 52% (55% male, 48% female) in 2009. Thus what Margaret Nserekko, the then Assistant Commissioner for primary education stated in 2004 remains very instructive. She said "If you take gender parity to mean numbers, then we are not doing very badly. But it is not just numbers. It is about access, retention and completion. While enrolment figures are high, our major challenge remains how to get and keep especially the girl-child in school as well as enhance her learning achievement" (UNICEF, 2004). The statement is an allusion to the evident gender disparities in Uganda’s education system.

Girls constitute the largest proportion of out-of-school children in the population (UBOS, 2010) and lag behind boys in performance in national examinations. The dwindling
completion rate is attributed to class repetition estimated at 11% and school drop outs at 6.7%.

Additionally, the recently conducted impact evaluation of primary education in Uganda (MoES/IOB, 2008) shows that gender parity patterns vary according to districts, with the districts of Moroto, Lira, Nebbi, Kotido, Katakwi, Kyenjojo, Masindi, Gulu and Kitgum having the lowest enrolment for girls.

Girls’ education in Uganda is beset with many limitations such as low completion rate and poor performance. Key causes of low completion amongst girls includes: early pregnancy (MoES, 2011), sexual harassment, early marriage, female genital mutilation, lack of sanitation facilities in schools (MGLSD, 2008) and long distance to school (World Bank, 2008). In addition, gender bias and stereotypes in textbooks, teaching-learning processes and teachers’ attitudes towards girls have been reported to negatively impact girls’ participation and learning achievement (Wright, 2008; Kakuru, 2006; Chege, 2004; Arnot, 2004). In addition, the following factors also affect girls’ completion ad performance; hostile learning environment, shortage of trained female teachers to provide the role model image and improve girls’ lesson uptake and negative societal attitudes towards girls’ education (Ejangu, 2004; Chelimo, 2003). The AIDS pandemic, conflict and its aftermath also compound girls’ access to schooling in Uganda.

Moreover girls encounter learning problems because of low expectations teachers have regarding their intellectual abilities and the attendant low level of feedback from teachers. This is exacerbated by girls’ low valuation of their own abilities and lack of female teachers in “high status” subjects such as Mathematics and Sciences (Aikman and Unterhalter, 2007). Textbooks also reinforce the low expectations of women and girls, as do curriculum and examination materials. And the overall school environment is not “girl-child friendly” and gender equitable (Ward et al, 2006). The AIDS pandemic (which sometimes precipitate girls’ absenteeism as they stay home to look after sick parents), conflict and its aftermath also disproportionately undermine girls’ participation in education in Uganda. Not surprisingly therefore, school completion and transition to secondary school remain a major challenge for mostly girls (UNGEI 2007).
4. Establishment and Evolution of UNGEI in Uganda

This chapter provides an overview of the establishment and evolution of UNGEI in Uganda. It outlines the objectives and structures, various levels of operation, and outlines its key strategies, priorities and activities.

Globally, UNGEI was instituted by the Secretary General, Kofi Annan in 2000. The UNGEI vision, mission, purpose, objectives, operative strategies and principles are summarized in Box 1

Box 1: UNGEI vision and Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNGEI’s Vision</th>
<th>A world where all girls and boys will have equal access to free, quality education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>UNGEI is a pressure group whose mission is to ensure that the EFA goals on gender equality in education are met through collaborative efforts among UN agencies, civil society, governments and donor agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>The main aim of UNGEI is to get actors in girls’ education thinking collectively about the different types of barriers/constraints to achieving gender parity and possible strategies for overcoming them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>The central purpose of UNGEI is to enable all partners to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Identify ways in which development NGOs and their organizations can contribute to accelerate progress towards gender equality in education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Determine how agencies and other organizations and the UNGEI can work together at international and country levels to assist countries to meet the MDGs related to education to which they have committed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Better understand the fit between UNGEI and agencies and other organizations’ ways of working with regard to action on girls’ education at the country level; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contribute to shaping strategic direction and activities of the UNGEI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI Strategies</td>
<td>- Act as an honest power broker between donors, governments and NGOs and holding them accountable and urging them to action;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promote sharing of good practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support the inclusion of girls in advocacy for provision of education;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feed into existing partnerships and structures and only lead where no structure exists/share organizational and management support;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Training a critical mass at all levels to focus on mainstreaming girls in all aspects of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNICEF, 2004
4.1 Establishment of UNGEI

In Uganda, UNGEI was launched in December 2004 by the Minister of Education and Sports. The launch attracted 90 participants from different institutions and donor community including some UN agencies, government ministries, NGOs, private sector, local artistes, and young people represented by GEM. The Vision and goal of UNGEI Uganda is shown in the Logic Model in Annex...

UNGEI was first launched at that national level and progressively expanded to districts from 2006 starting with Northern Uganda which was then affected by war. Thereafter UNGEI was introduced in Eastern Uganda and then Western Uganda. By 2006 UNGEI had been rolled out to 14 districts and 23 sub counties (UNICEF, 2007). Hitherto, UNGEI has been launched in districts where UNICEF focuses its efforts. In each district, UNGEI district committee ensured its expansion throughout the district by instituting sub county committees. According to the officials from UNICEF, the initial expansion of UNGEI to ‘UNICEF district’ was partly due to lack of funds for other partners to continue with implementation of UNGEI activities and partly because in line with UNGEI strategies, UNICEF opted and was in better position to conduct the activity.
4.2 Structure and Membership of UNGEI in Uganda

UNGEI Uganda is a multi-sector partnership forum under the MoES with a three tier structure consisting of national, district and sub county managerial levels. In addition UNGEI Uganda is linked to the UNGEI at Regional and Global Level. The Uganda structure is shown below.

**National Level membership**

UN agencies, NGOs, government ministries, a teacher training institution, donors, media, local artistes, private sector and children and young people/GEM

**District Level membership**

Local government, (Education Department), Politicians, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Religious organizations, chair persons of women organizations, female role models, district speakers

**Sub County Level**

Parish leadership, Religious leaders, model parents (parents who have sent children to school), teachers and chairperson of women groups

**Figure 1: UNGEI Structure in Uganda**

As seen from the Figure 1, at the national level, UNGEI partners are drawn from a wide range of stakeholder. At the time of its launch, UNGEI membership at the national level included; MoES, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, (MoGLSD), Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Health, World Bank, UNICEF, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), United Nations Development Program (UNDP), UNESCO, World Food Program (WFP), FAWEU, Action Aid, African Development Bank (AfDB), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), DANIDA, European Union (EU), DfID, France, Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Ireland Aid, Japan International Cooperation
Agency (JICA), the Netherlands, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD), Save the Children Uganda, Youth Alive, GEM, Kyambogo University (representing teacher training institution), DES (Directorate of Education Standards), NCDC (National Curriculum Development Centre), MISR / Makerere University, UNITY / USAID, Netherlands’ Embassy, GEM, Straight Talk Foundation, and World Vision (UNGEI TOR, 2004). Such multi-stakeholder involvement allowed for a rich knowledge mix, inclusiveness and fruitful discourse.

**UNGEI at District Level:** The process of rolling out UNGEI to the districts was spearheaded by UNICEF and MoES in 2005 in the Northern Ugandan districts of Gulu, Kitgum and Lira. These districts, located in the war torn region of Northern Uganda had the lowest education indicators in the country. UNGEI was initially introduced in what came to be known as ‘UNICEF districts’. As a matter of policy, UNICEF previously prioritized the most resource poor, hard to reach/stay districts of Uganda for its interventionist activities. Each district adopted an area-specific label, for instance Kasese Girls Education Initiative (KAGEI) in Kasese, Abim Initiative for Girls Education (ADIGE) in Abim, Kyenjojo Girls Education Initiative (KYGEI) in Kyenjojo, Kitgum Initiative for Girls’ Education (KIGE) in Kitgum. Each developed a TORs and work plans which they proceeded to implement.

Membership at the district level included Local government (education department), Religious organisations, Community base organizations, politicians and role models. By the time of this evaluation, UNGEI Committee members in Kasese district were District Inspector of Schools (Chairperson), KALI, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association, Bwimaniro Women’s Group, representation of the Catholic Church, Muslim community, Seventh Day Adventist Church and Church of Uganda, Director Rock Primary School (role model), Woman member of Parliament (role model). In Kasese, members included District Education Officer (Chairperson), KIND Uganda, Dorcus Vocational Institute, Chief Administrative Officer, Woman Member of Parliament, retired teacher (role models). Abim district did not have CBOs in its membership instead members were drawn from among role models and sub counties.

**UNGEI at Sub County / Community Level:** In the then conflict prone areas of northern Uganda, (War in Northern lasted from 1986 to 2007) UNGEI network made use of the Camp Education Committees (CECs). The CEC membership typically consists of a camp leader, a head teacher, a GEM representative and a member of the local government. In non conflict areas, the sub county UNGEI is comprised of representatives of the parish leadership, religious leaders, model parents (parents who have sent children to school), teachers and women groups.

### 4.3 UNGEI Coordination / Management in Uganda

**National level coordination:** According to documentary review, at national level, UNGEI was supposed to be steered by an advisory committee of 25 members drawn from partner institutions (UNGEI, 2005). However, this coordination structure was not implemented. Instead, a Gender Task Force (GTF) was established at the MoES, to
provide strategic guidance at the national level on all issue related to girls’ education (Draft UNGEI TOR 2004). With specific reference to UNGEI, the GTF was tasked to:

a) Set the national agenda for the infant UNGEI;
b) Identify key actors through partnership mapping;
c) Generate and develop consensus on national TORs;
d) Set up advocacy and communication network;
e) Ensure that gender equality takes center place in UNGEI’s action plans;
f) Agree on bottom-up strategies for gender sensitization campaigns; and

g) Draft UNGEI action plans in tandem with the PRSP process so as to ensure a policy fit.

The chairperson of the GTF is from the MoES (the Department of Pre-primary and Primary education). FAWEU was elected co-chair and UNICEF Uganda, the convener. The co-chair’s main function is to ensure active participation of all the members during meetings and to help oversee and monitor the implementation of the UNGEI process. Members of the GTF are drawn from the organization focusing on girls’ education, most of whom are actually members of UNGEI partnership. It is this team that plans for UNGEI activities at the national level

District Level: The topmost management organ at this level is referred to as the District Advisory Committee (DAC). A working group is established within the DAC to handle the administrative work of the district partnership. A district local government official is the chair of the partnership, while the co-chair is selected from a local NGO. The office of the DEO provides technical support.

Sub County / Community Level: At the Sub county level, UNGEI chairperson is elected from among the parish leaders. In line with UNGEI goals and tradition, the committee is chaired by a woman. In total 13 members are in charge of steering UNGEI at this level.

4.4 Key Strategies and Activities of UNGEI in Uganda

Priorities: In a speech by UNICEF Representative in Uganda, at the launch of UNGEI in 2004, UNGEI priorities were spelt out as:
a) Putting in place short and medium term measurable actions that guarantee access to, and completion of quality education for boys and girls in the conflict affected areas,
b) Sustaining and improving the level of equality in educational access that has been achieved and eliminating all forms of discrimination against girls as provided for in the 1995 Constitution of Uganda, and international norms and standards of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW),
c) Ensuring gender equality and sensitivity in all aspects of education (including enrolment policies and practices, curriculum, teacher behaviour and attitudes, equity in teaching force, learning environments, pupils’ safety, access to
information and skills that enable girls to make positive life choices in areas such as reproductive health and HIV prevention, and the use of new technologies;

d) Building partnerships that consist of political and resource commitments at the highest levels, to ensure that another generation of girls is not lost to illiteracy;

e) Sharing information, networking and funding for improved coordination and collaboration on girls’ education and UNGEI.

These priorities guided UNGEI strategies and activities.

**Strategies:** UNGEI strategies, in essence, imply bringing the voice of development partners, national and local NGOs to the planning table; generating work plans and developing a strategy for a multi-organizational partnership. This ensures that the UNGEI structure is responsive to gender equality issues and participatory; ensuring that gender equity takes center place in UNGEI’s action plans. UNGEI is guided by the principle of “division of labor” basing on the comparative advantage or area of strength of a particular partner to implement these strategies and work plan.

The UNGEI activities include conducting media campaigns, advocacy such as need for targeted deployment of female teachers to hard to reach areas; and gender sensitization, remedial teaching of science and mathematics, child profiling; peer counseling; life skills, sexual maturation and HIV/AIDS education; (UNGEI, 2010). In addition UNGEI conducts activities that strengthen partnerships and promote community and youth participation.

### 4.5 Vibrancy of UNGEI Uganda

A trend analysis of UNGEI’s vibrancy at national level reveals 3 distinct phases, namely; the very active phase (2004 – 2006); the slow down period (2007 – 2008) and the recuperation phase (2008 – 2010). This analysis is based on the numbers of activities undertaken, numbers of partners involved, coverage and pace of the activities with which they were undertaken and. This is discussed below

a) the very active stage (2004-2006): During this phase, national level UNGEI actively participated in;
   - Mapping partners engage in girls’ education and gender equality
   - Developing TOR both at national district levels
   - Rolling out UNGEI to the district level. During this period the focus was Northern Uganda, which due to war had very low enrolment, retention and completion especially of girls. UNGEI was introduced in the districts of Gulu, Kitgum, Lira, Katakwi, Kaberamaido, Abim and Kotido among others during this phase.
   - Advocated for targeted deployment of female teachers in hard to reach areas
   - Conducting research to informed policy. For instance a study on Female Primary Teachers training, recruitment and deployment in Uganda
- Participating in policy dialogue
- Launched ‘Go to school, back to school, stay in school’ campaign in February 2007 in Kotido district. During this campaign partners who attended included; Ministry of Education and Sports, Ministry of Gender Labour and Social development, local government of Kotido, UNICEF, WFP, Save the Children Uganda, the Uganda chapter of the African Network for the Prevention and Protection of Children against Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN) which are promoting the concept of ‘safe and protective schools’; as well as school-based Girls’ Education Movement (GEM). The campaign was designed to benefit approximately 1.3 million children in and out of school, as well as 13,000 teachers in 1,600 schools in 18 districts of North and North Eastern Uganda (Abim, Amolatar, Amuria, Amuru, Apac, Dokolo, Gulu, Kaabong, Kaberamaido, Katakwi, Kitgum, Kotido, Lira, Moroto, Nakapiripirit, Oyam, Pader and Soroti).

b) The slowdown period (2007-2008): In the second phase, expansion work continued to the district in Western Uganda (Kasese and Kyenjojo) but at a slower pace, with diminishing support and monitoring of established UNGEI district committees. UNICEF remained the only active UN agency in the partnership, others having dropped off.

c) The recuperation phase (2008 – 2010): The third and current phase of UNGEI’s evolutionary process in Uganda coincided with the 2008 review of the Gender in Education Policy which marked the commencement of UNGEI’s revivalist activities including;

i) the organization of Girl Child Education week in 2009,
ii) a study on ‘good practices’ by partner institutions,
iii) research on pregnancy in schools and
iv) Beginning to draft the policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools.

4.6. UNGEI Uganda relationship with the Regional and Global Office

Finding showed the Regional office has worked with the UNGEI Uganda to;

a) Set up UNGEI task force, and
b) Developed tools for the gender audit

In addition, the Regional office;

a) Hire the consultant to undertake the gender audit which allowed for an in-depth analysis of the Ugandan situation
b) Provided financial support to initiate workshops, write TORs, and conduct the gender audit
c) Provided a forum and opportunity for sharing good practices. For example Uganda attended a meeting in Nairobi and Nepal in which it shared the good practices.

The Regional office links the Country to the Global level by providing a systematic update on gender issues to the Global UNGEI office and also providing feedback to the country. However, the close relationship was only at the early phase of UNGEI. Responses from the current officials among the partner institutions showed deterioration in this close relationship. For instance one of the officials explained thus, ‘they only call us when they want something’.

The main challenge between Country, Regional and Global is the use of UNICEF. This makes it difficult to separate UNGEI from UNICEF because the Regional focal points is a UNICEF staff, it is possibly due to this that many of the partners were not aware of any close working relationship between Regional and Ugandan UNGEI.
5. Findings with Respect to UNGEI Outcomes

This chapter presents the evaluation findings for the four outcome areas of UNGEI Uganda namely:

i) Ensuring that policies promote girls’ education and gender equality;
ii) Formulating a policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers;
iii) Reviewing and identification of progress, documentation and dissemination of ‘good practices’; and
iv) Strengthening partnership in girls’ education.

In order to get a feel of UNGEI Uganda contributions to these outcomes, contribution analysis approach was used. This involved

i) Outlining the situation with respect to the outcome area before UNGEI,
ii) Describing the situation today (changes since UNGEI),
iii) Assessing the impact of the changes that took place;
iv) Identifying the inputs and contribution of UNGEI to the area, and
v) Making an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI’s involvement.

Data is presenting in the order of contribution analysis described above. However, in order to avoid repetition, data on the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency UNGEI is making is presented in Section 6.

5.1. Outcome 1 - Policies Promoting Girls’ Education and Gender Equality are in Existence

5.1.1. Before UNGEI

Nearly all the major policy drivers aimed at improving girls’ education in Uganda pre-dated the launch of UNGEI in the country in 2004. They include:

i) The 1995 Constitution of Uganda which guarantees the right to education to all children irrespective of gender;
ii) Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997 which aimed at improving access of boys and girls to education;
iii) Affirmative Action admission policy by which all female applicants to public universities (beginning with the 1990/1991 academic year) are awarded 1.5 bonus points
iv) Other policies aimed at enhancing access include The Complementary Opportunity for Education (COPE), the Alternative Basic Education for Karamoja (ABEK), the Basic Education for Urban Poor Areas (BEUPA) and
Special Needs Education (SNE) programs which address the educational needs of marginalized communities.

v) Girls Education Movement (GEM) 2001

In addition to the national policies, Uganda embraced EFA and education-related MDGs by 2015.

From these policies, there is a conspicuous focus on the need to ensure gender parity and equality in education. In that sense therefore, these government led educational policies (with a pro-girls stance) were "pre-emptive" of UNGEI's value addition intent (Purcell 2010). For instance, the impact of UPE program in 1997 on girls’ school enrolment was particularly immediate and dramatic as illustrated in Table 1.

5.1.2. Situation in 2011/changes since UNGEI

Notwithstanding these initiatives, girls’ participation in education continued to lag behind that of their male counterparts. Gender disparity was most noticeable in completion rates (see Table 1 and 2). So high was the rate of wastage at primary education level in 2003 (a year to the launch of UNGEI) that, one informant remarked thus: ‘We had expected about 1 million to complete primary cycle but only about 200,000 did. Those who completed did not do well. Girls’ dropout rate outstripped that of the boys. From the first cohort of UPE who graduated at the time of UNGEI launch in 2004, it was evident that many had dropped out.

As a result, after the launch of UNGEI in 2004, more policies aimed at accelerating girls’ education have been passed. These include;

(i) National Gender Policy of 2007;
(ii) Gender in Education Policy which was passed in 2009 and launched in November 2010
(iii) USE/UPPET policy 2007;
(iv) The 2008 Education Bill which made education compulsory
(v) The Equal Opportunity Commission (EOC) Act of 2007 which gave the commission powers to issue and enforce recommendations on equalization of opportunities between males and females within the education sector;
(vi) The commencement of the process of formulating a policy for re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school in 2008.

Similar policy initiatives are being undertaken at the district and lower levels. For example, a by-law on defilement and early marriage was passed in Abim district in 2008 and while another, in Kasese district on child protection against early marriage, child labour and sale of alcohol to children is in the process of being placed in the gazette.

In Gulu district, the “Safe School Contracts” a contracts drawn between the teachers and the satellite communities by which teachers undertake not to be involved in acts
of sexual harassment or elopement with school girls were crafted and implemented by
the camp education committees in partnership with the Girls Education Movement
(GEM). These signed documents are displayed in easily accessible locations for publicity
purposes. Similarly, the “Safe Community Contracts” commit local leaders to the
promotion of the right of the girl-child to education. These are signed between the local
leaders and GEM. There are also deliberate efforts to organize child-mothers, pregnant
girls or rape victims into groups within the school to combat stigmatization.

Further, failure to achieve gender equity during pre UNGEI period led to initiation of a
series of activities aimed at enhancing implementation of policies. For instance;

a) The introduction of the Promotion of Girls’ Education (PGE) scheme designed to
enhance girl-child retention and performance at the primary level;
b) The implementation of Equity in the Classroom (EIC) program aimed at
facilitating equal participation of girls and boys in the classroom;
c) Introduction of the Focusing Resources for Effective School Health (FRESH)
project which focuses on provision of safe water and sanitation to schools,
provision of washrooms for girls, urinals for boys, and separate latrines for girls;
d) the development of the ToRs for a study on Female Primary Teachers training,
recruitment and deployment in Uganda

e) The development and roll out of national communication strategies that address
girls’ education and awareness raising campaigns in Uganda.

Above all, a Gender Desk was established in 2007 in the MoES with a brief to ensure the
following:
- Equitable access to basic education;
- Increased girls’ retention in school;
- Improved girls’ performance especially in science and mathematics;
- Protection of girls against child abuse and other forms of molestation;
- Curriculum reform to make it more gender sensitive;
- Making educational facilities more conducive particularly to girls and other
disadvantaged children; and
- Training and re-training of teachers (particularly senior women/men teachers
and career teachers) in gender responsive methodology and practice.

5.1.3. Impact of changes

Increase enrollment remained the main impact of post UNGEI period. Completion
remained low as shown in Figure 1.
Despite the low completion, transition to secondary level improved 59% (57% for boys and 63% girls) in 2003 to 69% in 2005 (69% boys and 70% girls). This is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Transition and completion rates for primary and secondary (2000-2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition rate to S1</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Boys</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Girls</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion rate Senior 4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Boys</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Girls</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EMIS

Evident in Table 2 is progressive increase in completion rate at Senior 4 from 18% for boys and 14% for girls to 35% boys and 28% girls in 2007.

In addition, parents are better informed about the importance of girls’ education. In Kasese district, improvement in girls’ attendance in one of the secondary was attributed to increased commitment of parents to ensure adequate provision of sanitary pads for their daughters. The sub-counties of Kyarumba and Maliba had...
established girls’ education committees whose other brief is to strengthen sensitization on girls’ education at the sub-county level.

Similarly, at the university level, Affirmative Action admission policy increased female student population at Makerere University to 45% in 2008 (compared to 23% in 1989).

Girls Education Movement (GEM) clubs have been introduced in 30% of the primary schools in 14 districts (UNICEF, 2010). Further, GEM has enabled girls who had dropped out to return to schools (Naalawanga, 2005; Nassimbwa, 2004) in addition to improving menstruation management. Many of the GEM clubs sensitize the school community through posters and writings as the one shown below

Photograph 1: Sensitizations messages on rocks at Rock Primary School, Kasese

5.1.4. Contribution by UNGEI

Education policy making or review process is initiated by the relevant sections in the MOES. For instance, policies related to the primary education sub-sector are prompted by the Department of Pre-primary and Primary Education, and then reviewed by the GTF for inclusion of gender issues. Thereafter the policies are submitted to the relevant organs of the ministry most especially the TMM and ESCC. In this process, UNGEI’s contribution is evident in the review of policy. Representation of the UNGEI partnership in key decision making organs of the MoES further improves UNGEI participation in
policy reviews ensuring that, girls’ education agenda is always highlighted. For instance, UNICEF – a lead agency of UNGEI - is a member of the Education Sector Consultative Committee (ESCC), which is a de facto policy making powerhouse in the sector.

Furthermore, it is the launch of UNGEI in 2004 that led to the institutionalization of the GTF in the MoES. Members of the GTF are drawn from UNGEI partners (all the organizations with an interest on gender). The GTF became the lead advisor to the MoES on all gender-related issues. It directly participates in policy dialogues and acts as a mouthpiece on gender related issues. This makes UNGEI a major driver of gender-related education in Uganda. For instance, a concept paper on the Sector Policy on pregnancies in schools was drafted and discussed during the UNGEI meeting of the 5th November 2008 and in May 2011. FAWEU as an UNGEI partner has been tasked to conduct a study whose findings would inform the policy on readmission of pregnant school girls. It is also possible that without UNGEI, the GTF would have not been institutionalized in the MoES or would have been institutionalized later.

Although UNGEI’s net contribution to policy reform needs to be viewed against the backdrop of the government-led policy shift towards gender-consciousness in all development planning, faster implementation of these policies are partly UNGEI’s contributions. For instance, in order to improve access and retention, UNGEI both at national, district and sub-county levels actively participated in:

a) “Go to School, Back to School, Stay in School” campaign of 2007.

b) UNGEI also advocated for the mainstreaming of the Child Friendly School (CFS) program as an integral element of the Basic Requirements and Minimum Standards (BRMS) for all Educational institutions by the MoES in 2007. CFS aims at promoting girls’ education in an especially girl-child friendly environment at all levels.

c) Further UNGEI campaigned for the rationalization of the School Facilities Grants (SFG) to include funds for compulsory provision of separate latrines with doors, for girls and boys. The grant also operates through a ranking system which prioritizes poorest schools and rewards schools with 48% or more girls’ enrolment.

Increase in enrollment was also attributed to UNGEI by some respondents. For instance, the DEO of Kyenjojo asserted that,

*We attribute girls coming back to school to UNGEI. Previously it was education for all but girls were not emphasized. The training of senior woman teachers and senior man teachers has helped them to appreciate challenges of the girl child*

In addition, policy dissemination in order to create awareness among stakeholder expected to implement them has been undertaken by UNGEI. For instance, by the time of this study the Gender in Education Policy had already been disseminated in Central, Eastern and the North Western Region of Uganda. Plan to disseminate to other regions had also been finalized. The participants during dissemination include local leaders at
the sub-county and parish levels, religious leaders, head teachers, NGOs and CBOs in education sectors among others. This ensures that all stakeholders not only understand the policies but commit themselves to its implementation.

5.2. **Outcome 2 - Policy promoting re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school in Existence**

5.2.1. **Before UNGEI**

Prior to the launch of UNGEI in Uganda, not only was there lack of an official policy pertaining to the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school, but there was also no serious and sustained move by the government to counter the surging problem of early pregnancy-induced drop out of girls from school. Indeed, Kasente (2003) identified early pregnancy as the biggest hindrance to girls’ education in Uganda. This was exacerbated by the perception of such early pregnancies by both the school authorities and the wider community as a punishable immorality. The expulsion of girls, who conceived while still pursuing schooling, was therefore being seen as a morally justifiable decision.

Some few interventions by various providers, to address the compounding effect of high incidence of early pregnancy on gender disparities in education were albeit discrete and uncoordinated. They include:

- a) The “abstinence-until-marriage” campaign conducted by several non-state actors;
- b) The production of educational materials on reproduction health for the primary schools by UNICEF and other providers;
- c) The inclusion by the MoES of HIV/AIDS and life skills education in the school curriculum since 1993, and on the prompting of some development partners such as UNICEF;
- d) The UNICEF-led Sara Communication Initiative, translated in some Ugandan languages and serialized in local newspapers provided educational messages on not only how to avoid pregnancy but also the importance of returning to school.

Despite these, the majority of head teachers adamantly continued to deny pregnant girls an opportunity to remain in school and sit their examinations. Moreover, the MoES itself did not put in place a strong mechanism for sanctioning such head teachers.

5.2.2. **Situation in 2011/changes since UNGEI**

The teenage pregnancy rate in Uganda of 31% is the highest in Sub-Saharan Africa (Yolisigira Yazid in The Monitor Newspaper 28/09/2010; 2006 UNFPA Report). Approximately 21% of the children in Uganda are sexually active by age 11 and about 70% by age 19. Almost 12% of the girls aged 15 – 19 were pregnant, while 19% had
already given birth in 2008 (minutes of the UNGEI meeting held on the 5th November 2008).

Post UNGEI period is characterized by constant reminder to head teachers to permit pregnant girls back to school. For instance,

i) Since 2007 MoES has been writing circulars to schools urging head teachers not to expel pregnant girls and to allow child mothers sit for National PLE, ‘O’ and ‘A’ level examinations;

ii) Further, the process of formulating an official policy for re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school has stated and is expected to be complete by October 2011.

As the policy formulation is in progress, sensitization is ongoing using a multi-pronged community sensitization strategy involving ‘School walk’, Radio Talk shows and multi-stakeholder workshops that bring together girls, parents, Sub-county chiefs, CDOs, secretaries for education, LCs, FBOs and the wider community membership. The participation of many stakeholders in the workshops guarantees wider social-buy in. There have also been school level meetings with SWT, SMT PTA chairs, SMC chairs and head girls to ensure that gender issues are addressed in the school development plans.

5.2.3. Impact of changes

Although a policy aimed at promoting the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school is yet to be tabled, advocacy and sensitization efforts seem to be paying off as evidenced in the:

**Improved community awareness about the importance of sending back child mothers to school:** Although the pregnancy rate among girls remains high, there is willingness among parents to return the girls to school. The testimonies given by the beneficiary girls and letters from parents to UNGEI district chair person which the consultant had access to attest to this emerging shift in community attitudes. For example, one of the girls revealed thus:

“I became pregnant when in P.6 but I feared to go back to school. My parents encouraged me but I refused and got married. I stayed in the marriage for 7 years but the man was mistreating me, and he got other wives. All my friends encouraged me to go back to my parents. My parents accepted to look after my three children”

As shown in the Figure below, the community has accepted girls who attend schools with their children unlike in the previous years, when one had to leave the children behind.
Increasing numbers of child mothers going back to school: Although there is no reliable national statistical evidence regarding the numbers of child mothers who have hitherto returned to school, individual school-based data shows significant numbers of such “returnees”. For instance, in 2006 at St Martin’s PS in Gulu district, 26 child mothers were in school (UNICEF, 2006). At the time of this study, 16 child mothers were enrolled in Abim S.S. Similarly, 10 pregnant girls from one sub-county in Kasese district were allowed to sit the 2010 final national examinations (PLE).

Increased alternative learning pathways for child mothers: In addition, to formal schools, there are several programmes for child mothers and other girls who have dropped out of the formal school system. For example, the Bwimaniro Women Group started a project in 2008 for out of school girls and child mothers that offered courses in nursery teaching, hair dressing, tailoring, poultry and handcraft. They are envisaging introducing bakery in 2012. The project also doubles as micro-finance institution from which members can borrow and save money. By the time of this evaluation, 160
parents were saving with them. In Kyenjojo, Dorcus Vocational Institute also provides similar opportunities. Some of the courses provided are reflected in the photograph 3 below.

Photograph 3: Dorcus Vocational Institute providing alternative education for child mothers

5.2.4. Contribution by UNGEI

The burgeoning nature of early pregnancy problem in Uganda together with the continued denial of pregnant girls and child mothers’ access to schools motivated UNGEI Uganda to focus more on advocacy for a policy aimed at promoting the re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to school and to sensitize the community to return child mothers to schools.

It is UNGEI chairperson together with UNICEF who drafted the concept note on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers before passing it to other UNGEI partners during the GTF meeting, for their input. UNGEI meeting of the 5th November 2008 discussed the draft and during the meeting the need for a comprehensive study on teenage pregnancy to inform the proposed readmission to school policy was recommended. FAWEU, an UNGEI partner was assigned the task of undertaking the study.
Straight Talk, another UNGEI partner, is directly combating the teenage pregnancy predicament by periodically visiting schools to talk to the girls about abstinence, while cautioning them against the dangers of ‘sugar daddies’.

Similarly, district UNGEI Committees make periodic visits to schools to sensitize children on various issues relating to girls’ education. In Kasese, for instance, the district UNGEI Committee visited all the schools in the municipality in 2010. Several KAGEI/KALI-supported training workshops were conducted for PTAs and SMCs in 2010 in 21 out of the 28 sub-counties. In Kyenjojo the Committee identified girls who had dropped out due to pregnancy and advocated for their return to school. And, during the recent launch of girls’ education programme in May 2011 sponsored by DfID, former child mothers from different districts were given opportunity to share and learn from each others’ experiences.

Further, District and Sub-county UNGEI committees together with the district education office mobilized and participated in the ‘Go Back to School Walks. This is described in Box 1.

**Box 1 School Walk**

School Walk initiative employed in Abim district aims at countering children’s and even teacher’s reluctance to observe timely return to school at the start of each school term. School walk is also intended to sensitize key members of the community on the importance of girls’ education and mobilized them to support policies and programmes that will ensure quality education for girls and other vulnerable children. It is also aimed at encouraging girls who have dropped out of schools to return to school.

School Walk is typically undertaken a week to the commencement of every school term. It is organized by the district education office in collaboration with UNGEI District and Sub-county UNGEI committees. Mobilization of the community is undertaken by UNGEI committee while the school community is mobilized by District Education office. In addition political leaders also participants in the School Walk. A band is hired to lead the walk. By using a band both children and adults are attracted to the walk.

During the walk children carry placards with messages such as ‘send your daughter to school’, ‘school starts on Monday’, ‘school is good’ to mention but a few.

The walk starts from any selected central point, passes through the surrounding villages and ends at a venue where district education officials, politicians, NGOs address the people. During the rally, pupils present songs, plays and drama. The key message in all the presentations is the importance of education and the need to send both boys and girls to school.

Further through mobilization by district UNGEI committee, the returnee child mothers are now actively involved in counseling and encouraging the other colleagues who dropped out to return to school. This is through radio talk shows as described below.
Box 2: Radio Talk shows

This is one of an avenue for reaching out to the community in hard-to-reach areas such as mountainous areas characterized by poor and sometimes impassible roads. It is also one way of reaching many people at a minimal cost. It is being used in Kasese district in Western Uganda.

The talk shows are organized by District UNGEI committee using the local area FM Radio Stations. It is facilitated by child “returnees” or female role models from the community or UNGEI District Committee members. The women groups are frequently invited to talk to the girls. Examples of topics discussed include ‘return girls to school after pregnancy’, ‘what to do when your daughter is defiled’, ‘why educating girls is important’ etc.

Through the talk shows child mothers share their experiences with others and in so doing they encourage girls who have dropped out due to early pregnancy to return to school.

The talk show typically starts with information on the topic of the day, followed question and answer session in which the community is permitted to interact with the presenters through telephone calls. In this way answers to the community’s questions are provided. In addition problems affecting education of the girl child are passed to the radio presenters.

In this way, the evaluation finds that UNGEI has deepened the community’s understanding of the socio-economic value of girls’ education. The community is now able to identify hurdles as well as key intervention points to improve girls’ access to education (MoES, 2007).

5.3. Outcome 3 – UNGEI’s contribution to the Regular review of progress and good practices

5.3.1. Before UNGEI

Although there were several good practice aspects in the delivery of education service in general and girls’ education in particular even prior to the launch of UNGEI in Uganda, there was no systematic endeavour to document, disseminate and institutionalize them. For example, for some time the following remained “stand alone” projects with minimal spillover effects.

a) the Child Friendly School concept of FAWEU (2001)  
b) The Breakthrough to Literacy Campaign, of FAWEU (2001)  
c) The 2 generation approach of URDT primary and secondary school which started in Kibaale in 2000. The ‘two generation approach’ involves joint sensitization of parents together with their daughters on issues of common interest.  
d) Girls’ Education Movement (GEM) in 2001
5.3.2. Situation in 2011/changes since UNGEI

The evaluation showed that the following have been identified and documented as good practice.

i) **GEM**: GEM Uganda is deemed to be a “composite” good practice essentially because of its composition and activities which are replicable, sustainable, adaptable and cost-effective. For instance GEM **Child-led outreach and advocacy** places the girl child in the “driver’s seat” which represents a striking departure from the previously “expert-led” initiatives (Ward et al, 2006); In addition, GEM **inclusion of boys** as strategic allies has helped to convert them from their previous stance as bullies to active supporters of girls.

**School mapping** is another revolutionary GEM initiative in which children document the total number of school-age children with a breakdown by gender; the number of non-schooling girls; and the barriers that prevent girls from getting an education. The data so generated has proved to be handy to local government for planning purposes. **Peer guidance, counseling, and mentoring** in which children, especially those in leadership avail themselves to others as counselors. Girls who need counseling on sensitive issues like menstruation, for example, find a willing ear in their peers (Herz, 2004). Older children have also taken on the responsibility of mentoring younger children, helping them cope with situations that would otherwise be hard for them to deal with. Schools are now sensitive to the special needs of girls. Children, through their GEM clubs also discuss how to keep their toilets clean;

**GEM income generating activities** has encouraged participation of children in growing of vegetables, which they sell to get money to support their club activities. They also stage drama and music performances for the communities and these too earn them some income. This was evident in Kittojo Primary School and Nyakishenyi Primary School in Kyenjojo District. Money generated is used to buy scholastic materials for ‘returnees’ brought back by GEM club members.

ii) **The two generational approach**: The ‘two generation is conducted in the first week of Term 1. Among other things, the training introduces parents and their daughters to differential analysis by,

i) asking them to jointly draw their perceived ideal home;

ii) Establish the status of their existent homes;

iii) Determine development gap that needs to be closed; and

iv) Lastly, to formulate strategies for closing the identified development gap.

A second workshop is again organized at the end of the term in which girls are expected to share with the parents their school experiences including the skills and knowledge they have acquired. Both the girl and parent are subsequently tasked to go back to their respective homes to implement the new skills and
ideas. This is referred to as ‘back home’ project. Community Development Officers then closely monitor the implementation process.

Intergenerational interaction helps parents to fully appreciate the virtue of educating girls while simultaneously enhancing the communication skills and assertiveness of the girl-child.

iii) Promotion of the Child Friendly School (CFS) concept: This is a whole school improvement program spearheaded by FAWE which aims at transforming the ethos and culture of the school by establishing conditions for qualitative changes in teaching and learning. A CFS is one which:

a) Respects the rights of the child,
b) Is effective and efficient,
c) Is gender-sensitive,
d) Is healthy, and
e) Is a safe and protective place.

The pupils are involved in the CFS by evaluating school environmental factors - such as sanitation, safety, gender-sensitivity, health and extra-curricular activities – that impact on a child’s school attendance and retention (UNESCO, 2007).

5.3.3. Impact of changes

The sharing of GEM as a good practices GEM led to its expansion in schools. By 2010, GEM covered 23 districts with approximately over 903 school-based clubs and an estimated membership of 356,701 - which translates into coverage of 22% of the children in 31% of the primary schools in the 23 districts (UNICEF, 2010), thus making it one of the most popular clubs in primary school in Uganda. GEM has made it possible for children across Uganda to actively participate in charting their nation’s progress toward EFA.

The return of girls to school, improvements in girls’ enrolment, attendance, completion and transition rates; better menstruation management; school mapping, and the emergent “breaking the silence” poise of the girl-child are all resulting from implementation of the good practices such as GEM. This now contrasts with the pre-UNGEI period in Uganda typified by;

a) Minimal involvement of children and the youth in educational policy formulation, planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation activities;
b) Near gender blindness in almost all aspects of education service delivery including classroom processes, infrastructure and management practices; and
c) The unofficial designation of girls and women as the voiceless people.

Further, GEM Uganda is now a fully registered NGO whose mission is to promote gender equality in quality education thus a member of the GTF in its own right.
As a result of the sharing of good practices, Uganda is well known in the region as one of the countries whose efforts towards gender equality are paying off. This is turn has attracted countries within the regional to learn from Uganda’s experiences. For instance, Rwanda FAWE and UNICEF visited Uganda in May 2011 to learn how GEM operates.

5.3.4. Contribution by UNGEI

With the advent of UNGEI, the process of identification, documentation, dissemination and institutionalization of “good practices” became more purposeful and scaled up as an integral aspect of UNGEI’s agenda. It is the one area in which UNGEI’s contribution is most noticeable. Particular mention needs to be made of the especially the following examples:

**Mentoring of GEM:** Since its launch, UNGEI Uganda has mentored GEM, provided a voice for it in policy dialogue meetings and advocated for its registration as an NGO which was achieved early 2011. The decision to mentor GEM is perhaps the single most important move which produced several examples of good practice in the delivery of girls’ education. UNGEI has supported the expansion of GEM in schools. For instance, in Kasese district, GEM was introduced by UNICEF in only 2 sub counties but the district UNGEI committee promoted its expansion to all the Sub counties. In fact the evaluation showed that GEM clubs were stronger in districts with vibrant UNGEI committees than in those with weaker UNGEI committees. In Kyenjojo district GEM clubs is active in about 90% of the primary schools compare to Lira district where GEM is only in about 20%.

**Provision of format for documenting good practice:** Through publication of Guidelines for Documentation of Best Practices in Girls’ Education in 2007 (UNICEF, 2008), UNGEI has provided the partners with the format for documenting good practices. In this way UNGEI has promoted documentation of good practice by each partner institution.

**Research and Publications:** The evaluation finds that UNGEI has also filled existent knowledge and information gaps through its publications. In addition to Guidelines for documentation of best practices in Girls’ Education, there is already a rich variety of UNGEI resource packages including:

a) Facilitators’ guides,
b) Community training manuals 2007, as well as UNGEI monitoring tools for the districts and sub counties.
c) the concept paper on post primary education, which has become a key document on education for adolescent girls (Karega and Chege, 2006);
d) the Gender Responsive Pedagogy Handbook for teachers;
5.4. Outcome 4 – UNGEI’s contribution to the Strengthening of partnership in girls’ education

5.4.1. Before UNGEI

Uganda’s education SWAp was developed in the second half of the 1990s (Eilor, 2004). It was described by the 2003 joint evaluation of aid to basic education as “perhaps the most highly developed example of a SWAp in the education sector to be found anywhere” (IOB, 2003). The framework for dialogue between MoES and donors was formalized with a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1999. The government’s position on Official Development Assistance (ODA) has been set out in the Partnership Principles between GoU and its DPs of 2003. Furthermore, Uganda and its main DPs are signatories to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action (2008). All these were and still are the principle mechanisms governing the partnership process in key government sectors, including education.

Another partnership that was established in the pre UNGEI period in 2001 is Forum For Education NGOs In Uganda (FENU). FENU membership includes a whole range of national and international NGOs, faith-based organisations, Uganda National Teachers Union, the women’s movements, child-rights campaigners, the, HIV/AIDS activists and even a network of women’ lawyers (FIDA Uganda) and individual educationists.

The Mission of FENU is to provide a forum to all stakeholders for networking, capacity building and advocacy on education policy and practice. FENU works towards improvement in the quality, access, equity and sustainability of education for all”. Specifically FENU’s objectives includes,

- To facilitate and co-ordinate networking and information sharing among education NGOs and CBO
- To strengthen the partnership between NGOs, CBO5 and the MoES, donors and other education stakeholders
- To participate in education policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation
- To maintain a data bank on all NGOs directly involved in education service provision in Uganda
- To continually give valuable input to the improvement of curriculum, especially regarding its relevancy to the socio-economic priorities of the country and empowerment of the individual.
- To create and maintain awareness of members about Government education policies and their impact on the education system and service delivery.

FENU activities include:

a) Raising awareness and creating debate on various policy developments in relation to the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP)
b) Training in policy analysis and advocacy skills;

c) Advocating for the passing and implementation of the Education Policy for Disadvantaged groups

d) Mobilisation of the district level networks;

e) Working with the membership to promote community participation and local accountability in education;

f) Participation in the review of the primary school curriculum;

Creation and support of two district resource centres in Mbale and Masindi.

However, all the pre-UNGEI collaboration in education sector was general without specific focus on gender. There was no formalized partnership in the education that had girls’ education as its pivotal agenda. Gender featured as a cross cutting issue that required integration in all educational policy making, planning, programming, implementation, monitoring and evaluation activities.

5.4.2. Situation in 2011/changes since UNGEI

Despite existence of these pre UNGEI partnerships, NGOs and agencies in education sector continue to implement isolated programmes often duplicating each other. Yet Post UNGEI period did not witness establishment of many partnerships. The few that were set up include:

a) UNGEI in 2004: UNGEI partnership got formalized with the production of a strategy paper entitled “Achieving Gender Parity in Education in Uganda: A Strategy Paper and Framework for Action” in June 2005. This document provided guidelines for coordination of efforts by the different players in the country to achieve gender related MDGs.

b) Education in emergency working group.

c) Partnerships either among NGO and NGOs or NGO and CBO have mushroomed. In addition twinnings among schools and institutions have become common. These are usually limited to two organizations. For instance, Tullow Oil and Link Community Development Uganda formed the Tullow Oil Link Community Development Schools Improvement Project (TOLSIP). The project aims to improve the quality of education provided to pupils attending eight selected schools in the Tullow Oil area of operation in Hoima and Buliisa Districts. The project also aims at providing a model for corporate social responsibility in support of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Uganda. The activities carried out under the project included:

- The School Performance Review
- Training of lower primary teachers in Literacy
- Training of School Management Committees (SMCs) in Enhanced Community Participation in Education
- District capacity building, training and support.

In addition, SWAp continues to bring together donors and development partners focusing on education in general while and FENU brings together all the NGOs with a focus on education and for education in conflict areas brought together NGOs supporting education in conflict areas of Northern Uganda.

5.4.3. Impact of changes

For many years education policy in Uganda has been set by the Ministry of Education and Sports in consultation with a handful of powerful bilateral and multi-lateral donors under the Education Funding Group (EFAG). The move away from separate donor projects towards multi-donor sector-wide programmes and budget support has increased the power of these donors.

Hence the establishment of other partnerships has influence the Education Sector Review (ESR) and processes. For instance the processes that fed into the Education Sector Investment Plan (ESIP) II and the education elements within the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) - Uganda’s PRSP. Such partnership have worked hard to ensure that core positions are agreed in advance of key meetings, so that representatives inside the meetings can speak to an agreed platform rather than speaking for themselves.

Consequently, partners that participate in the EFAG speak on behalf of others. In this way the bilateral and multilateral agencies, major power brokers in shaping aid to education, through SWAP, PEAP, HIPC, PAF, FTI or other mechanisms (Ward, 2006) support the leverage aid for gender mainstreaming and other important measures for girls’ education in Uganda.

FENU actively influence the Education Sector Review (ESR) and processes that will feed into the Education Sector Investment Plan (ESIP) II and the education elements within the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) - Uganda’s PRSP. As far as possible FENU place emphasis on bringing grass-root voices to the forefront – the FENU secretariat invites activists and officials from remote districts to speak directly at national meetings. FENU members have worked hard to ensure representatives speak to an agreed platform rather than speaking for themselves. This was very evident during the May 2003 ESR workshop. By prioritising issues collectively and working in close coordination, FENU has succeeded in influencing change.

Supported by Action Aid, Save the Children US, Save the Children Norway and GTZ, FENU’s Non Formal Education (NFE) have been effective in reaching some of the 15% of Ugandan children who still fail to access government schools (in spite of the Universal Primary Education policy of the government) in the district of Mubende and Masindi, Nakasongola, Moroto and Kotido, and Kampala.
This twining among schools has also enhanced infrastructure development. In Ruhira there was internet connectivity that has enabled the school to participate in the ‘School 2 School’ program, an online video-partnership. It also enables the Community Health Workers to contact the project ambulance at a moment’s notice should a mother go into unexpected or complicated labour, enabling her to reach the hospital for a safe, midwife-assisted delivery. It is also providing scholarship to girls. In 2009 it provides eleven scholarships.

Similarly the TOLSIP project has directly benefited 5,000 pupils in Kaiso, Kyehooro, Nkondo, Toonya Primary schools in Hoima district, and Bugana, Butiaba, Kakooora and Avogera Primary Schools in Buliisa district. The other beneficiaries from the project included: School Management Committee members (72), head teachers and deputy head teachers (16), Lower Primary school teachers (16) and District officials.

Further, post UNGEI period is characterized by less duplication and pulling of resources among NGOs and CBOs.

5.4.4. Contribution by UNGEI

The advent of UNGEI in 2004 marks an important point of departure in as far as partnership in girls’ education is concerned. This is because UNGEI became the pioneer partnership whose mandate had an exclusive focus on girls’ education.

The evaluation found that the UNGEI partnership is uniquely gifted in more than one way.

a) Its very launch brought together a wide range of NGOs, UN agencies, parents, local governments, CSOs, CBOs, FBOs, artistes, private sector, bilateral and multilateral donors, government ministries most especially MoES, MoFPED, MoH as well as MGLSD and other actors in girls’ education with a rich mix of experiences and competencies (Minutes of UNGEI pioneer meeting, 2004). These partners bring their comparative vantage points to the UNGEI planning table where the harnessing of synergy is facilitated.

The CSO, FBOs, CBOs and NGOs (acting within the UNGEI framework) has been very instrumental in the identification, documentation, institutionalization and scaling up of good practices. The CSOs, NGOs and CBOs bought the grassroots perspective from different parts of the country to the partnership (Williamson, 2008).

b) UNGEI uses strategies that yield sufficient synergy to enable each partner derive adequate sense of achievement as they work towards achieving gender parity. This means UNGEI does not remove the partners’ independence in decision-making, but it does ensure they consult more systematically on key decisions on girls’ education and work more effectively together in promotion of girls’
education. Hence, their continuous sharing and networking on issues pertaining to girls’ education.

c) At the district level, District and Sub County UNGEI Committees have participated in data collection on school age children in the community under their jurisdiction. This data feeds into the district planning process as by one of the education officers explained, ‘when ADIGE brings reports, we hold a review meeting and we look at the challenges and chat a way forward. When girls are defiled, members of the committee are informed and they in turn inform us and we take action’.
6. **Overall Assessment of the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of UNGEI Partnership**

A working definition of a partnership is “a collaborative relationship between entities to work toward shared objectives through a mutually agreed division of labour” (World Bank, 1998, cited in Axelrod, 2001). Given this definition, this Chapter will examine how effective and efficient the UNGEI partnership has been in relation to each of the four outcome areas. Thereafter, overall assessment of UNGEI strengths, weakness, as well as the opportunities and threats facing the UNGEI partnership is presented.

6.1. Assessment of Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency of UNGEI

**Inputs to the four outcome areas**

A thematic synthesis of the findings of this evaluation is presented in Annex 8 as a summary of UNGEI’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The key highlights of this overall evaluation results are as follows:

**Relevance:** UNGEI’s education policy aims are consistent with those set by Uganda government in its target of achieving UPE by 2015. The early trainings and community sensitization provided by UNGEI partners was important in improving the domestic capacity and standards of implementation of UPE and USE in the education sector in general and girls education in particular. However overall, UNGEI is not viewed as a high profile network in Uganda, partly because the existing sector plans (ESIP and ESSP) already include UNGEI objectives.

A few examples will help to illustrate the relevance of the UNGEI. Thus:

I. Taking Uganda’s national development plan, the PEAP/NDP as well as the EFA and MDGs, the UNGEI agenda is broadly in line with the priorities expressed in these documents;

II. And from the perspective of the UNGEI itself and other stakeholders, the network responds to a real demand for assistance in girls’ education, especially within the context of resource deficient post-conflict districts of Uganda, and the scale of gender issues in education in Uganda;

III. The UNGEI aims to better harmonize the assistance provided by the different development partners and to align it with the national and sub-national priorities developed after extensive and intensive consultation with a wide spectrum of stakeholders.

IV. There are linkages and complementaries between UNGEI’s focal intervention areas i.e education, food security, health including HIV/AIDS, water and sanitation, school feeding, e.t.c. For instance, UNGEI’s school feeding program and the containment of HIV/AIDS among the learners have supported the strategy to increase access, retention and completion of primary education cycle. Similarly, through lobbying and community mobilization, the UNGEI has
empowered the local communities to demand for and support girls’ education; and

V. The UNGEI fits into and works through existing local government structures and partners with different NGOs to collaboratively contribute to the development of girls’ education in Uganda.

Further, the uncoordinated and lack of sharing of good practice that characterized pre UNGEI period makes UNGEI efforts in identification and dissemination of good practice of utmost relevance. This is because trying out what has been tested in the Ugandan or similar context are more likely to succeed than new things. This makes replication of such good practice cost effective.

The documentation of good practices allows UNGEI partners and other stakeholders to learn from experience, to understand what works (and does not work), how, why and in what conditions.

Effectiveness: The term effectiveness is understood in the context of this study to refer to whether the UNGEI is achieving its intended outcomes.

Basing on anecdotal information which the consultant cross-checked to the extent that was possible in the context of this evaluation, the UNGEI is, generally speaking, “doing things right” especially when one looks at the demand for girls’ education in Uganda, the competence and motivation of the UNGEI committee members.

The client communities in the districts where UNGEI are operational, consider the UNGEI to have been effective in:

- Identifying and disseminating good practice around girls education and gender equality
- Improve policy making and implementation through;
  - Equipping the UNGEI partners, MoES staff with the skills for effective performance of their planning, policy analysis, management, implementation, information processing, M&E responsibilities;
  - Through their participation in the gender audits and annual education sector reviews, UNGEI partners have raised the level of the debate on girls’ education to a higher pedestal. This has deepened the understanding of the MoES of issues related to girls’ education which, in turn, enabled them to identify hurdles as well as key intervention points to improve girls’ access to quality education in a rights-based, child-friendly and gender-sensitive environment (MoES, 2007).
  - It has also contributed to the revitalization of the Gender Desk at the MoES and the position of the Senior Woman teacher in schools.
  - creation and facilitation of a standby stock of specially trained and inducted cadre of teachers, who are conversant with gender sensitive delivery modalities;
Increasing the responsiveness of the school communities to girls’ educational initiatives and endeavours within their localities;

- The upgrading of the managerial skills among primary school head teachers, members of the School Management Committees (SMCs), and some district level staff using a multi-faceted strategy involving study tours, short face to face training, workshops

- Collection of data to inform policy

Promoting the return of child mothers to school

Through advocacy and dialogue with the central as well as local governments and by interfacing with the local communities, UNGEI has influenced the direction and content of gender in education policy. UNGEI’s direct and continuing contacts at the district, sub-county and community levels through its offshoots gives its members a depth of crucial knowledge about conditions, trends and issues pertaining to girls’ education which, in turn, gives them considerable credibility in policy discourse. UNGEI partners therefore have an edge during policy discussions as they are able to engage in policy conversations and debates at a more technical level (ODI, 2008).

In addition through the use of multiple communication strategy such as workshops, seminars, radio talk shows, Girls’ Education Weeks, School Walks, and publications including brochures, posters and charts UNGEI has created awareness about importance of girls’ education. UNGEI has judiciously utilized the workshop process as a platform for knowledge-sharing and country level planning of strategies for accelerating girls’ education. Cases in point include the stakeholder workshops, held in Kampala in 2008 and 5th November 2010. A girls’ education week was also been organized in 2009 which showcased a series of activities including presentations on ‘good practices’. In this way, attitudes of both head teachers and parents towards pregnancy are beginning as more girls are being allowed to return to school.

**Efficiency:** UNGEI taps into the vast pool of partner’s experiences and skills by emphasizing division of labor based on the principle of comparative advantage (UNGEI, 2005). UNGEI recognizes the fact that, for some of its partners, girls’ education is an entry point for getting water and sanitation into communities. For others, girls’ education is seen as a means for creating a captive clientele for improved nutritional status of children; or for combating the spread of HIV; or even for safeguarding children against various forms of abuse. And from the broader development perspective, girls’ education is seen by development partners as an instrument that can bring about wider societal change.

With regards to the efficiency of the UNGEI, its cascading organizational set up allows for prudent utilization of resources and reciprocal relationship patterns between the constituent management levels. It also empowers the voiceless poor to influence policy; facilitates a two-way communication flow pattern; enhances both vertical and horizontal accountability; minimizes role conflicts; provides for in-built checks and balances and promotes customized as well as expedited decision making.
UNGEI has improved both allocative and technical efficiency by maintaining a link between its expenditure and results; strengthening regulations and compliance; ensuring increased human resource productivity through trainings; reducing bureaucratic red tape; eradicating corruption; and reducing duplication of functions through coordination.

6.2. Sustainability of the UNGEI results

The sustainability of the results achieved through the UNGEI interventions is difficult to determine, partly because of the fact that the UNGEI continues to receive external financial assistance, and also due to the “intangibility” of some of the UNGEI impacts. For instance, it is difficult to accurately gauge the extent to which it has influenced the knowledge, attitudes and skills of some people.

In addition, the evaluation has established that there are some effective UNGEI-related interventions (such as returning girls to schools, radio talk shows, community visits, school walk), which are relatively too expensive, in the sense that, they are not likely to be sustained by the beneficiary communities or local governments without further external support;

Nevertheless, the evaluation finds that there are several reasons for optimism about the sustainability of the UNGEI process, even after the gradual withdrawal of external funding. They include:

i. First, the groundbreaking success of the UNGEI, especially at the grassroots level, has helped to achieve buy in by local community, local governments as well as donors;

ii. Second, UNGEI’s involvement of some of the largest, most stable and most extensively dispersed NGOs and CSOs is strategically important. The FBOs in particular are respected within the local communities and have existing resources, structures and systems upon which to build. They can undertake their actions in a very cost-effective manner due to their ability to leverage volunteers and other resources with minimal effort.

iii. Third, most of UNGEI partners are excellent implementing partners because of their dedication to results, their ability to reach the grassroots of society and their capacity to mobilize societies for positive change.

iv. In addition, the UNGEI now enjoys stronger partnership with the MoES. The ministry now recognizes the competence and potency of the UNGEI and the value of its educational contribution to the national effort. The UNGEI, for its part, recognizes the role of government policy design and evaluation.

v. Lastly UNGEI structures at the community level is recognized and used by government organs to mobilize the community.

6.3. Strengths of UNGEI Partnership

Basing on the information captured, UNGEI’s partnership process in Uganda, can be credited for the leveraging of both the central and district level governments; intensifying advocacy for girls’ education, raising the visibility of girls’ education in
national policy debates, galvanizing the efforts of the previously disunited actors in girls’ education, pressurizing the political leadership and policy makers, and using role models to advance girls’ education.

UNGEI strength is evident in the following:

**Inclusiveness of UNGEI partnership**: UNGEI partnership draws from a wide range of stakeholders including government ministries, UN Family, NGOs, among others. In the Gulu launch, UNGEI tapped the commitment of creative local artistes and other prominent personalities to “give back to the community” particularly in support of girls’ education (Gulu UNGEI TORs, 2005). UNGEI promotes greater involvement of boys as strategic allies and encourages the participation of prominent men (in addition to women) as role models.

**Allowing partners do what they do best**: UNGEI’s partnership principle of comparative advantage is designed to enable one or two of the partners to carry out an activity which they are best suited to perform on behalf of UNGEI. UNICEF, for instance, utilizes the experience it has accumulated over the years in monitoring and evaluation, to commission many analytical studies to review existing situations, identify and document good practices and offer innovative solutions. The publication of these documented good practices and evaluation study reports has triggered off debate and broken new ground for policy solutions in girls’ education. They have also heightened the demand for mainstreaming of gender and gender budgeting into the education SWAp and sector improvement programs. Similarly, the findings from studies on violence in educational settings, with a special focus on gender-based violence funded by Irish Aid, have been used to inform policy and practice. UNGEI partners have also participated in gender audits whose results were instrumental in the review of the Gender Policy (Kariuki, 2007). And, a concept paper on post-primary education, drafted by UNGEI partnering organizations provided the basis for policy discussions on the education of the adolescent girls.

**Use of the existing government structures and systems**: The UNGEI partnership makes use of existing structures not only to facilitate institutional buy-in, but also to cut down on operational costs. For example in Northern Uganda, UNGEI adopted the camp structures. In non conflict areas, UNGEI too used the local government structure. The use of existing structures ensures that UNGEI activities are aligned to government priorities. In addition it enhances sustainability.

**UNGEI Structure**: With a structure, fanning out from top policy makers deep down to grassroots communities, UNGEI had a well laid out management framework for effective communication flow. And because of this, the guidelines provided by the national level could be promptly implemented by the district and community level structures (Kaluba, 2004). This decentralized structure also creates effective grassroots channels for addressing socio-cultural factors that negatively affect girls’ education. Moreover, the multi-stakeholder involvement allowed for a rich knowledge mix and
discourse. UNGEI structure also ensures that funds mobilized under UNGEI reach the community for the sole purpose of implementing activities.

Moreover resource limitations are addressed by engaging technical persons from government ministries, UN agencies and NGOs. Since their salaries are covered by their respective employers UNGEI is able to cut down costs (Lister, 2006).

Inferential analysis traces the partial success of this collaborative effort to UNGEI’s ability to:

- Provide a platform for bringing the pluralist voices of its partners to a common planning table;
- Utilize the national EFA action plans along with the PRSP (PEAP), CCA and UNDAF processes to ensure a policy fit.
- Have well spelt out TORs and work plan for its involvement in girls’ education;
- Conduct advocacy and communication in such a way that leads to a bottom-up build up of a social movement for girls’ education;

6.4. Weaknesses of UNGEI Partnership

Judging from the opinions expressed by a cross section of the informants and the evidence adduced from various documents, UNGEI Uganda falls short of these benchmarks.

Declining visibility of UNGEI in Uganda: Although UNGEI started as a rather vibrant partnership due to commitment of partners, over time UNGEI Uganda’s influence in girls’ education appears to have faded (minutes of UNGEI meeting held 8th April 2008. This diminishing visibility was, inter alia, being attributed to:

a) Failure to regularize UNGEI partnership: Although at the initiation of UNGEI Uganda, mapping of all the partners were made, TORs formulated, it has been left to subsist as a ‘loose arrangement’. To date, the network’s membership remains unclear as several “partners” were non-committal in declaring whether or not they are in the partnership. Although, at the launch, UNGEI Uganda seemed to have started off with 17 member organizations less than 10 of these could confirm their membership during the time of this evaluation.

Low commitment of the partners to the partnership: Some basic building blocks for a strong partnership appear to be missing, such as agreeing to a common MoU. The partnership’s decisions too seem not to be binding and the “partners” do not feel obliged to attend UNGEI meetings. Apart from UNICEF, FAWEU, GEM, MoGLSD, and MOES, the attendance of meetings by the other partners is very irregular. An earlier UNICEF (2006) study had actually noted that, UNGEI partnership needed to be formally institutionalized so that it can better coordinate the activities of the constituent members and engage more effectively in national education discourse.
Further, the disintegration of the CECs in the north following the return of IDPs to their original homes is indicative of the powerlessness and the unsustainability of the UNGEI as a galvanizing forum for girls’ education in the country.

Moreover, not all partners mobilize the requisite resources for translating its action plans into a reality. As a result, many of the partners look to UNICEF as the lead financier. One respondent did concede that ‘if UNICEF does not fund their planned activity, that marks the end and the activity is just shelved’. A proposal was for instance drafted by FAWEU in 2008 to revamp UNGEI but it was shelved because of lack of funds.

In addition there is a low sense of ownership and collegiality among some of the “non-core” partnering organizations. The “non-core” now appears to prefer to sit back and let UNICEF run much of the show! This denies UNGEI the requisite cohesiveness and status of a high profile partnership in the country.

In fact at the district level, UNICEF role is so dominant that the image and activities of the UNGEI appear to get subsumed in the broader UNICEF agenda. And to most of the frontline officials in the districts, the activities of the two are indistinguishable! Indeed it was UNICEF that introduced UNGEI to the districts. The slow roll out of UNGEI to the rest of the districts in Uganda after a period of 7 years can, at least partially, be attributed to this disjuncture in the partnership process.

High turnover of staff: Given the soaring turnover of staff among partner institutions, the current members of the partnership appear unclear about the concrete goals of the partnership and the strategy for their accomplishment. The new staff lacked knowledge about UNGEI, an indication of a lapse in the vibrancy of UNGEI.

b) With time UNGEI has failed to retain some of its influential partner entities. For instance, by the time of this evaluation, only UNICEF from among the UN Family remained in the UNGEI partnership. Attempts to get UNESCO fully on board have hitherto proved unsuccessful. And although the WFP was initially very active in UNGEI partnership, it has since left. However the focus of UNGEI on pregnancy has helped in drawing in UNFPA to the partnership. Even then, the two (UNGEI and UNFPA) have differing policy perspectives on the issue of girls’ pregnancy. While UNGEI is preoccupied with what to do when a girl gets pregnant, UNFPA has a proactive focus on how to ‘stop teenage pregnancy’ in the first place.

Lack of a Secretariat: UNGEI lacks a secretariat and physical office space of its own and continues to rely on UNICEF to provide secretarial back up. One has to either go to the country UNICEF offices or to the MoES’ head quarters whenever consulting about UNGEI issues. As a result of this vacuum, there is now a problem of divided loyalties among the partners. Some are of the view that, UNICEF rather than the MoES, would
offer better leadership and coordination function if it had been mandated. This is because; UNICEF is seen to be the one pushing for follow up meetings. A few of the partners attributed the polarization of UNGEI activities in the country to lack of elective and rotational office bearers.

**Inadequate Funding:** perhaps one of the most daunting challenges of UNGEI partnership is inadequate funding of the planned activities. In Uganda, gender is considered a cross cutting issue that is not allocated a specific budget line but is expected to be intergraded in all activities. Moreover many of the partners seem not to be doing enough to mobilize funds. Nevertheless, all is not lost since districts are beginning to budget for girls’ education. In Kasese district for example, provision for ‘girls’ education and HIV/AIDS’ has been made in the current annual budget.

**Limited sharing and exchange of information at the district level:** While there has been sharing of ‘good practices’ for partners at the national level, this is not being replicated at the district and grassroots levels.

**Concentration of UNGEI efforts majorly in the primary education sub-sector:** The main thrust of UNGEI interventions remains confined to the pre-primary and primary sub-sector. This exacerbates the “bottleneck effects” at the higher level transition points. Save for UNICEF’s/FAWEU’s scholarships, SMT program, menstruation management and a few other initiatives, UNGEI is largely invisible at secondary, tertiary and higher education levels. The mismatched prioritization of UPE and USE programs has disturbed the articulation between primary and post primary education. In fact there was a strong demand for a more comprehensive UNGEI approach at the district level.

### 6.5. Opportunities for UNGEI Partnership

Despite many weaknesses, there are many opportunities that UNGEI could exploit, namely:

**Continued low completion of education:** It is clear the in spite of the policies such as UPE and USE, many girls and boys still do not complete school. For instance in Table 2, it can also be seen that, the completion rate to S4, while improving from 16% (18% for boys and 14% for girls) in 2000 to 31% (35% for boys and 28% for girls) in 2007, is ever skewed against the girls. The situation among the pastoral and fishing communities is even worse. UNGEI could play an advocacy role for compulsory education up to the age of 18. There strong feeling among the community that boys have lost out could be exploited by UNGEI too.

**Continuing resistance by head teachers and local community for child mothers to return to school:** The evaluation has shown that many head teachers are still inherently opposed to the readmission of pregnant girls or child mothers to school. One such a case in which 5 girls in Pokot S.S were recently denied the chance to sit their end of Term 1 (January – April 2011) examinations because of their pregnancy status was
reported in one of the local newspapers (Arlong, 2011). As one head teacher bluntly put it; “It is school policy not to readmit those who become pregnant. However, we recommend them for admission to other schools”

**Increased cases of pregnancy:** Newspapers continue to report high cases of pregnancy-induced school dropout among the girls. For instance, The Daily Monitor of Wednesday 20\(^{th}\) April 2011 reported that 65 girls of Kitodha P.S in Bugiri district had dropped out owing to their pregnancy. Kasese district alone had registered a staggering total of 203 cases of pregnancies in 2010 in both primary and secondary school levels. Increase cases of pregnancy calls for proactive responses to curb the increase. Instead of addressing the pregnancy problem, UNGEI could focus on preventing early pregnancy through sex education. Senior Woman Teachers could be train to provide such trainings.

**Stigma and bullying of child mothers:** The continuing bullying of child mothers who choose to return to school by fellow school goers and some members of the local community remains the biggest hindrance to the “return to school” campaign. One girl’s admission that, “the boys abuse me and call me mama late, because my child died at birth” was very revealing. This is an area that UNGEI could get involved in, particularly sensitization of the school community especially boys.

### 6.6. Threats to UNGEI Partnership

**Weak follow up on agreed action areas:** There is low follow up of resolutions from UNGEI national meetings and activities district level UNGEI. As one of the district officials remarked, “district UNGEIs were initially active but their enthusiasm has gradually waned with the growing weakening of central level guidance and supervision. Weak follow up in turn affected adherence to joint work plans (UNGEI 2010; UNICEF 2007) because participation in the shared development of UNGEI work plans and activities is viewed by some partners as an additional burden since each of them has its separate annual work plan (UNICEF, 2007; UNICEF 2004; Ejangu, 2004, MoES/UNEC 2007).

Weak relationship between national and district level UNGEI: The growing disconnect between the national level UNGEI and the satellite district UNGEIs was also highlighted during the network’s meeting held in Kampala (Minutes of the UNGEI meeting of 8\(^{th}\) April 2008) in Kampala.

**Lack of child support:** Lack of support services for child mothers, including waiting rooms to house their baby sitters and the attendant washrooms, is making it difficult for many of the child mothers to go back to school.

**Failure to integrate UNGEI activities in each partner’s work plan** It is clear from this evaluation that many partners have ceased integrating UNGEI activities in their work plan. Consequently, the newly recruited staff lacked information about UNGEI. This is
likely to weaken UNGEI further as many of the new staff will fail to provide information but would membership of UNGEI.

**Poor record keeping:** Although according to document, MoES chairs UNGEI, FAWEU co-chairs, and UNICEF is the convener, no mention is made of the organization in charge of taking minutes, compiling and keeping other records and reports. Consequently minutes on UNGEI meetings, other records such as the report on the mapping exercise of 2005, among others were not available.
7. Conclusions

This concluding chapter assesses the partnership’s activities and achievements. Although is difficult to isolate and measure the impact of UNGEI process in the promotion of girls’ education since it complements the efforts of a myriad other providers, evidence point to strong influence as in the outcome on identifying and disseminating good practice, fairly strong influence on policy on gender equality, and modest influence on strengthening partnership. Although there is still no policy on re-entry of pregnant girls to schools, some of UNGEI activities have led to the return of girls to school.

7.1. UNGEI’s Activities and Objectives

UNGEI’s activities rotate around enhancing achievements of the 4 outcomes as shown in the Logic Model (Annex 8). The activities include advocacy, sensitization and dissemination of good practice through workshops, radio talk shows and School Walk.

It is in the execution and scale up of good practices that the partnership principle of division of labor basing on the logic of comparative advantage is being best demonstrated. For example, while the UNICEF supported GEM is now the unofficial champion of the girl-child managed, school/community-based initiatives, FAWEU is more adept with issues concerning CFS, gender responsive pedagogy especially girl-child friendly SMT delivery approaches and cost-saving measures in girls’ education. UNICEF is particularly conversant with the crafting of contextualized and locale-specific educational programs for resource-deficient “hard to reach/stay” areas including the fragile conflict/post-conflict settings. Such capability-based division of labor promotes efficiency and sustainability of the good practices in girls’ education. The major challenge for UNGEI remains shortage of funding for scaling up purposes.

7.2. Progress Toward the Achievement of UNGEI’s Expected Outcomes

Policy formulation: UNGEI’s catalytic role in the drafting the Gender in Education Policy of 2008 underscored the need to emphasize the use of a “gender lens” when pursuing progress towards EFA. It is UNGEI that enriched the rights-based logic of government’s policy with the emphasis on the need for a gender perspective in educational policy, planning and programming. UNGEI has played a facilitative role in scaling up girls’ education, especially at the primary school level. However implementation of these policies so as to achieve gender equality still remains a challenge.

Policy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers: A Policy permitting child mothers return to school is still lacking. This policy gap is being exploited by some head teachers to deny girls opportunity to complete school. However, UNGEI’s advocacy work has enabled some pregnant girls and child mothers to re-enter school. And preparations by the MoES – in collaboration with UNGEI partnership - to finalize the formulation of a formal policy on the readmission of pregnant girls/child mothers to school are at advanced stage.
Identification and dissemination of good practices in girls’ education: This is an area in which UNGEI’s value added outcome is perhaps decisively most conspicuous. Through the Guidelines for Documentation of Best Practices in Girls’ Education there is consensus that, the UNGEI in Uganda has succeeded in creating a viable framework for a wide range of partners to identify good practices in girls’ education; to advocate for embedding them in education system reform processes; and to harness the resources necessary to expand key interventions in girls’ education. More specifically, UNGEI has through its espousal of the efficacy of collaborative interventions, provided a forum for partners:

- To share information on a select set of identified good practices in girls’ education that is considered to be prime candidates for scaling up. Best practice documents and practices are exchanged among partners; For instance, as Achieving Gender Parity in Education in Uganda: A Strategy Paper and Framework for Action in 2005; the Training Guide for community groups in 2007.
- To explore issues, factors and conditions that promote or constrain the scaling up of good practices, with the goal of developing and recommending strategies and models identified for scaling up good practices in girls’ education; and
- On the basis of the outcomes of these two preceding objectives, to prepare key elements of an appropriate advocacy campaign.

Strengthening partnership in girl’s education: UNGEI has strengthened the capacity of its partners especially at the district and sub county/community level to protect and advance the gains made in girls’ education thus far. The achievement of “community buy in” through grass root mobilization, radio talk shows, sharing of good practice through workshops and School Walk are breakthrough initiatives. At the national level however, UNGEI remains a loose amalgam of like-minded organizations but of questionable commitment to the network. In addition, UNICEF’s/FAWEU’s influence could inadvertently be eclipsing the statures of the other less visible partners - thereby impairing their commitment to UNGEI.

7.3. Contribution of UNGEI to Changes around Girls’ Education

UNGEI partnership responds to a real demand for assistance in girls’ education, especially within the context of resource deficient post-conflict and hard to reach areas and districts of Uganda. Focusing on policy dissemination eases government efforts of implementing policies aimed at achieving MDG 3.

7.4. Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency of UNGEI

Relevance of UNGEI partnership in Uganda
UNGEI’s education policy aims are consistent with those set by Uganda government in its target of achieving UPE by 2015. The early trainings and community sensitization
provided by UNGEI partners was important in improving the domestic capacity and standards of implementation of UPE and USE in the education sector in general and girls education in particular. UNGEI agenda is broadly in line with Uganda’s national development plan, the PEAP/NDP as well as the EFA and MDGs.

Indeed, UNGEI Uganda provides a model for multi-stakeholder ownership and management of girls’ education, whereby the school community has been firmly placed “in the driver’s seat”. The school communities are directly consulted on matters relating to their priority needs and perceptions about the quality of education service delivery. The findings from such consultative efforts are factored into the work plans and are used to inform resource allocation decision-making. As a result, there is now increased prioritization of school community-specific interventions and raised grassroots’ consciousness.

**Effectiveness of UNGEI**

UNGEI has been effective in engagement in policy dialogue, provision of technical advice, facilitation of reform (as in the introduction of gender sensitive classroom teaching and learning as well as in the provision of support supervision and school inspection), buffering (e.g in the protection of the interests and concerns of the girl-child, orphans and other vulnerable children) and gap-filling and Promoting the return of child mothers to school.

**Efficiency**

UNGEI efficiency is most pronounced in its emphasis on division of labor based on the principle of comparative advantage (UNGEI, 2005). This in turn reduced duplication and conflict. Through its partners UNGEI has an effective monitoring system is established within UNGEI to track and evaluate its expenditures vis-a-vis the intended results; and strengthening empirical research to form the basis for UNGEI spending. Some of the UNGEI’s value for money measures taken includes ensuring that, its expenditures are based on credible work plans; an effective monitoring system is established within UNGEI to track and evaluate its expenditures vis-a-vis the intended results; and strengthening empirical research to form the basis for UNGEI spending.

### 7.5. Relationship with the regional level of UNGEI

Generally the relationship between the regional and Uganda UNGEI is not very close as it was when UNGEI had just been launch. Moreover, since the Regional focal person is a UNICEF staff makes it difficult for UNGEI Regional level to communicate directly to the chair person of UNGEI Uganda.

### 7.7. Relationship with the global level of UNGEI

Just like the regional level, relationship between the Global and UNGEI Uganda remains weak. Existing relationship appears to be on demand for either reports or research/study or sharing good practices.
8. **Lessons learned**

A set of lessons learned can be gleaned from the information obtained as follows:

8.1. **Overall lessons around girls’ education and gender equality**

Promotion of girls’ education requires multi-faceted/multi-sectoral level interventions, since many problems related to girls’ education in particular lie outside the education sector, and since multi-sectoral strategies have been shown to improve girls’ education;

The issues around girls’ education and UNGEI pushes one to look beyond education alone to include human development more comprehensively: For example, there are ongoing efforts to develop parental education that stresses early childhood care and development from a gender perspective. Modules and materials are also being developed in life skills education.

The gender equity (parity) approach is necessary but not sufficient. It needs to be complemented by approaches that emphasize girls’ and women’s empowerment and full participation through gender mainstreaming. This calls for contextual analysis of gender roles and responsibilities and the need to link girls’ education to a human rights-based approach to programming.

The linkages between access and quality have become clearer: With regard to gender equality in quality education, it is now clear that broader learning environments are critical, particularly the need to link schools with the local community and the donor constituency to ensure sustainability in terms of both participatory monitoring and funding of service delivery.

Adaptation of broader UNGEI strategies to local contexts especially in conflict/post-conflict, pastoralist nomadic or emergency situations is a pre-condition for success of intervention measures in girls’ education. This implies the development of tailored UNGEI resource packages/community training guides. UNGEI lessons have reinforced the wisdom of development practice gained through the years. For example, although the district UNGEI and GEM clubs are excellent models for girls’ empowerment, they have not been equally successful in all of the districts where they are operational. For example, anecdotal evidence from the informants seems to point to the relatively superior effectiveness of the Kasese and Kyenjojo district UNGEI over their counterpart in Lira. This illustrates the fact that, good project or program design is important, but successful implementation depends on local leadership and other environmental factors.

Girls can do it! Given the required support, children and especially girls can work to address issues that affect them. Boys need to remain as strategic allies and be mobilized to give space to the girls. Support by school management is critical. Where the head teachers and teachers are available, accommodative and flexible, GEM has
had success. Management needs to be convinced that children can also develop strategies and produce results to improve their learning environments.

Evidence has shown that, children can be important actors on gender issues given their natural drive towards learning and demonstrating their knowledge within the family and the community context. Through GEM and anti-AIDS clubs, girls’ education has moved from issues of access to empowerment. The young are key partners, and need to be involved and encouraged to participate. There is need to invest more in them for capacity building and sustainability.

8.2. Lessons for UNGEI partnership

Scaling up also calls for development of a social marketing strategy (advocacy and communication) to overcome resistance to change and create receptivity for social change; integration of monitoring and evaluation into the project design; greater injections of human, financial and material resources for accelerated drive towards meeting the MDG and EFA goals of 2015.

Political commitment is critical for scaling up good practices in girls’ education. Political commitment and newly created policies have given rise to increased access for girls and improvement in the quality of education for all children. The highest political office in Uganda launched GEM. Political will is still an important ingredient for success of any grassroots intervention.

Without follow up and support supervision, implementation can be a problem. Schools that are not monitored tend to have poorly constructed installations/facilities; weak GEM clubs and the teachers who were trained never implement what they have learnt in the workshops. In fact GEM is strong where there is frequent monitoring by UNGEI UNGEI structure, fanning out from top policy makers down to grassroots communities eases communication flow, implementation and monitoring of activities.

The limited external resources seem to have a better catalytic effect when utilized at local/community levels than at national level launches. The district launches have strengthened mobilization and ensured the continuation of the roll-out process.

Partnerships with the private sector are still under explored. As was during the initial phase, there is need to tap the commitment of creative artistes/prominent personalities to give back to the community especially, in support of girls’ education/empowerment.

There is almost an infinite scope for the formation of partnerships required to support and scale up girl’s education because girls’ education is everybody’s business! This includes partnerships at the village, sub-county, and district and national levels. Stakeholders need to be involved at all levels.
With regard to partnerships, advocacy and networking, UNGEI have put gender on the agenda whenever policy makers meet to discuss sector-wide approaches and sector investment programs.

Management for results remains a major challenge. There is hitherto, a growing commitment to monitoring girls' education processes and outputs but with less attention being paid to outcomes and impact that can be directly attributed to UNGEI. Results continue to be advanced in terms of (i) commitment of stakeholders; (ii) processes such as community participation at the investment stage; and (iii) direct project outputs such as girls' and boys' access and retention rates. Less interest has been directed to outcomes such as (a) community participation at the operational/implementation stage; and (b) the effects of training on actual teaching practices and how girls experience school differently as a result of teachers' training. Strong beliefs in UNGEI's effectiveness are thus not always backed by strong objective evidence. Monitoring data concerning the numbers of teachers trained or about girls' enrolment and attendance per se, does not in itself satisfy the requirements of program monitoring and evaluation needed for accountability and for measuring impact. Mechanisms and factors that contribute to the success of specific UNGEI interventions and effects on gender equity and equality also need to be captured and documented.
9. **Recommendations**

9.1. **Sustaining UNGEI**

Although at the initiation of UNGEI Uganda, mapping of all the partners were made and TORs formulated TORs, UNGEI was left to subsist as a ‘loose arrangement’. UNGEI should regularize its partnership so as to improve on the commitment of the partners.

In addition, the linkages between national and district level UNGEI was found to be weak. It is critical that, UNGEI at the national level consciously liaise with the district and sub county level UNGEI Committees so as to reach the grassroots.

The evaluation has established that some UNGEI interventions such as returning girls to schools, radio talk shows, community visits, are relatively too expensive and therefore difficult to sustain. UNGEI could form partnership with the radio owners to support such programs. It could also advocate for scholarships such as those by FAWE for ‘returnee’ child mothers. Expanding partnership would make it easy for UNGEI to adopt a multi-sectoral mitigation measures to improve gender equality. For instance, a partner could handle poverty alleviation while another deals with health and hygiene.

In addition, UNGEI should continue to conduct research to inform policy. Such research could be directed at:

(i) Collecting comparable education data from all districts

(ii) Tracking girls receiving scholarships over time to examine family dynamics that such support creates to enable girls to attend and remain in school; and

(iii) Carrying out case studies to identify obstacles to the implementation of progressive educational policies that seek to promote girl-friendly environments and to change the social relations of gender. Among other things, this would lead to the development and implementation of school policies that do not expel pregnant girls, but rather enable them to complete their studies.

9.2. **Monitoring/Dissemination of UNGEI Activities**

There have been many dissemination workshops but all at national level, majority in Kampala. There is need to improve on knowledge sharing among the different district and sub county UNGEI committees.

9.3. **Scaling Up UNGEI to Non-participating Districts**

So far in Uganda, UNGEI has focused on primary schools. The shift of government priority to secondary education (USE) doesn’t seem to have resonated with those of UNGEI. There is need for UNGEI to shift to a broader more coherent perspective of the
challenges across the entire sector. For instance there are more child mothers at the secondary school level who require encouragement so as to return to school.

Moreover, child mothers constitute nearly half of all maternal deaths in Uganda, due to an increased risk of complications in pregnancy, which in turn, leads to obstetric fistula. There were 17 cases of child-maternal deaths in only one sub-county of Kasese district in 2010! It would therefore appear that, UNGEI’s preoccupation hitherto with simply getting the policy on re-entry of pregnant girls passed, without addressing the root causes of early/unwanted pregnancies is a necessary but not sufficient strategy. Through its committees at the district level, UNGEI should provide sex education to school children.

This evaluation has shown that cases of child mothers returning to schools are higher in districts where UNGEI is operational. It is therefore important that UNGEI expands its activities to other districts.

9.4. Expanding Funding Sources

So far UNGEI partners in Uganda appear to be relying on UNICEF for most of their funding. It is important that all the partners mobilize funds from other sources for implementation of the activities.
ANNEXES

4. ANNEX 1: ABBREVIATED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FORMATIVE EVALUATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GIRLS EDUCATION INITIATIVE (UNGEI)

Purpose of the Evaluation: This evaluation aims at exploring the extent to which the UNGEI partnership is achieving its intended outcomes at the country level, and the extent to which the global efforts are contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the UNGEI partnership. The outcomes are:

Outcome 1 – Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

Country partnerships:
   a. What does the UNGEI partnership at the country level look like? (This is a more in-depth description of the country partnership, formed from desk review and in-country, also answering the questions of whether there are TORs for the partnership, whether there is an annual work plan, and the process that is typically undertaken to come up with an annual work plan for the partnership.)
   b. Is there agreement among partners about the proposed UNGEI results framework?
   c. Does the UNGEI coordination mechanism and activities of partners at the country level contribute to national policies promoting girls’ education and gender equality?
   d. What constitutes the full UNGEI country-level partnership)? This macro-level mapping of the partnership will ask the following questions for the national partnerships not participating in the exercise: Is there a formalized partnership with TOR? Is there an agreed annual work plan (AWP)? If so, (a) describe the partnership’s main activities and (b) are the AWP results reported annually to the UNGEI Regional Focal Point?

Outcome 2 – Best practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality are known and institutionalized

Country partnerships:
   a. Does the country partnership have access to best knowledge, policies, and practices in facilitating girls’ education and gender equality from sources attributable to the partnership?
   b. What effort has the partnership made to ensure that this knowledge is applied?

Outcome 3 – UNGEI facilitates an effective partnership for girls’ education and gender equality
Country partnerships:

a. What is the added value of UNGEI (i.e., what are some of your achievements that were made possible as a result of working under the partnership)?
b. Does the country coordination mechanism promote measuring and achieving results?
c. Does the country coordination mechanism work in a manner that enhances the effectiveness of UNGEI?

**METHODOLOGY**
The evaluation study will be mainly a mixed-method study. Data will be collected from multiple sources: a formal desk review, interviews of key/elite informants, interviews and/or focus groups of important groups of beneficiaries, self-administered surveys, and direct observations of activities with beneficiaries wherever possible.

**RESPONSIBILITIES AND MANAGEMENT**
The consultancy will be jointly supervised by the UNGEI National Chairperson at the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) and Rosemary Rugamba-Rwanyange, Education Specialist (UNICEF - KCL). Margo O’Sullivan, Chief of Education, (KCL) will provide the overall oversight on the implementation of this study.

**Reference Group:** A reference group for the UNGEI evaluation will be established in Uganda comprising up to seven members each. The national district partnerships will be representative of the composition of different partners in the MoES and Development partners, ensuring appropriate representation from the partnership’s constituencies.

The Reference Group Chair will be responsible for oversight of evaluation activities, while members will advise on the following:

- Consultant’s terms of reference and work plan, including any adjustments required at inception or other phases
- Approval of all evaluation products, including the final report
- Decision on a post-evaluation management response, action plan and dissemination strategy, and a consideration of how the evaluation findings are to be utilized.

**National consultant** (NC) in Uganda will be contracted by UNICEF Uganda Office to perform the following tasks:

- assist in setting up reference group for stakeholders in consultation with UNGEI focal point in the MoES and/or Chief of Education and Education Specialist UNICEF Uganda;
- customize, review and validate data collection tools, (questionnaires, interview questions and protocols);
- supervise data collection and data processing;
- design and facilitate consultative workshops and meetings;
• preparation of country reports - draft and final reports, and develop PowerPoint presentations; and,
• ensure that the evaluation manager is regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation and possible causes of delays and issues to resolve.

Payment:
Payment will be made in three installments of 30% on receipt of the first Report of the Egypt Meeting and the Inception Report, 40% on presentation of draft report and findings of the field trips and 30% on satisfactory completion and submission of deliverables approved by MOES and the Chief, KCL, UNICEF.

**DELIVERABLES FOR UGANDA CONSULTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Anticipated delivery date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparations for consultation workshop</td>
<td>20th January 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inception Report and report of the Consultation workshop</td>
<td>25th February 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Data collection, analysis and other field activities (consultative workshops/meetings)</td>
<td>22nd April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Submit first draft of country report</td>
<td>13th May 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Submit final country report</td>
<td>15th June 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total working days**  43

The Inception report, detailing evaluation activities for Uganda be 15-20 pages, including the TOR and work plan, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the in-country reference group or global reference group.

The final report will not exceed 80 pages, including the executive summary and appendixes. Appendixes will include the TOR, description of methodology, list of background materials used, list of people interviewed, PowerPoint presentations, and workshop materials.
5. ANNEX 2: BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A Key Note Address by the Resident Country Representative UNICEF at the launch of the UNGEI in Uganda 2nd December 2004
15. Gulu District Local Government GEM Implementation Report, June-August 2005
40. MoES: Uganda National Education Center (UNESC) 2007 report on education
44. MoES (2011): Concept for developing policy guidelines of Teenage Pregnancy and Motherhood in Schools
57. Taking Stock of UNGEI at country level The Case of Uganda, A Presentation to Education Network Meeting, 2005
61. Uganda Bureau of Statistics and Macro International Inc. (2007): Key Findings From the 2006 UDHS: A Gender Perspective, Kampala, Uganda and CALVERTON, Maryland USA
68. UNGEI Brochure (Undated): United Nations Education Initiatives. Regional Updates: Girls Too, Education For All
69. UNGEI Kasese District Chapter (2008): Minutes of the meeting held on 6/03/2008
70. UNGEI (2010) Equity and Inclusion in Education. A Guide to support education sector plan preparation, revision and appraisal
71. UNGEI (2010): UNGEI at 10: A Journey to Gender Equality in Education
72. UNGEI, Uganda Work plan 2010 -2014
75. UNICEF (2005): Gender Achievements and Prospects in Education. The GAP Report, Part 1
76. UNICEF (2006) Achieving Gender Parity in Education. Initiatives and Strategies that work: Progress and Results of the Gender Parity Campaign
6. ANNEX 3: UNGEI FORMATIVE EVALUATION – COMPOSITION OF THE REFERENCE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rita Kyeyune</td>
<td>MoES and chair person GTF and UNGEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Rwanyange</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Muhwezi</td>
<td>FaweU (Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Benipool</td>
<td>Straight Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Kego</td>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. ANNEX 4: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SELECTED PARTICIPANTS AT FOCUS GROUP SESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function/Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16/03/2011</td>
<td>Margo O’Sullivan</td>
<td>Convener UNGEI &amp; In Charge, Education UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/03/2011</td>
<td>Rosemary Rugamba Rwanyange</td>
<td>Education Section UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/03/2011</td>
<td>Rita Kyeyune</td>
<td>Chair, GTF/UNGEI and Assistant Commissioner Basic Education, Ministry of Education &amp; Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/2011</td>
<td>Martha Muhwezi</td>
<td>Co-chair, UNGEI and Director, FAWEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/03/2011</td>
<td>Josephine Pedun</td>
<td>Program Officer, FAWEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/04/2011</td>
<td>Florence Kanyike</td>
<td>Former Director FAWEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/04/2011</td>
<td>Margaret Kakande</td>
<td>MoFPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2011</td>
<td>Carol Laker</td>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Ernest Mainja</td>
<td>DEO Kasese Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Erna Thabugha</td>
<td>Senior Inspector of Schools Kasese Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Kulthum Masika Mosh</td>
<td>Chairperson KAGEI &amp; Inspector of Schools (SNE) Kasese Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Mbambu Naome</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Nduhukire Charity</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Miriam Dambya</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee representing Church of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Teddy Sanza</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee representing Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Sheik Kengele Suwed</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee representing Muslims Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Muhindo Irene</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Kamashamba Jane</td>
<td>Director Rock P.S &amp; Member KAGEI District Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Kambala Joshua</td>
<td>Head teacher, Rock P.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Birigwa Florence</td>
<td>Teacher, Rock P.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/03/2011</td>
<td>Ithungu Mary Gorret</td>
<td>Teacher, Rock P.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Francis Happy</td>
<td>Program Officer, Kasese Action for life Improvement (KAGEI partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Jimmy Odyek</td>
<td>Program Volunteer, Kasese Action for life Improvement (KAGEI partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Micha</td>
<td>Finance Assistant Kasese Action for life Improvement (KAGEI partner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Bwambale Godfrey Bwere</td>
<td>Chairperson, KAGEI Kyarumba Sub County Committee, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Florence Musaka</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson, KAGEI Kyarumba Sub County Committee, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Bikoba M. Jesreeh</td>
<td>Secretary, KAGEI Kyarumba Sub County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Function/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Bwambale Bahati Ali</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI Kyarumba Sub County Committee representing Muslims Community, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Kyana Steven</td>
<td>Member, KAGEI Kyarumba Sub County Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Miriam Bafera</td>
<td>Chairperson, Bwimaniro Women’s Group -KAGEI partner, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Bwambale Ronald</td>
<td>Volunteer, Bwimaniro Women’s Group, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Swale Batuli</td>
<td>Secretary, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association –KAGEI partner, Bwera Sub county, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Mrs Mupendo</td>
<td>Member, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association –KAGEI partner, Bwera Sub county, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Biira Muzayina</td>
<td>Chairperson, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association –KAGEI partner, Bwera Sub county, Kasese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/03/2011</td>
<td>Assimwe, R</td>
<td>Member, Mpondwe Moslem Women Association –KAGEI partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Kabugho Enid</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Biira Joeline</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Mosomboli Janet</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Biira Agnes</td>
<td>Student, Rwenzori Girls S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Tumusiime Agatha</td>
<td>A Teacher, Rwenzori Girls S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Muthahinga Moses</td>
<td>A Teacher, Rwenzori Girls S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Muhindo Josephine</td>
<td>Deputy Head teacher, Rwenzori Girls S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>Getrude Tibakanya</td>
<td>DEO and Chair KYEGEI, Kyenjojo District local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/2011</td>
<td>Kabanyobo Stella</td>
<td>Inspector of Schools, Kyenjojo District local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2011</td>
<td>Timigamba Linda</td>
<td>Woman MP and Secretary KYEGEI Committee, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2011</td>
<td>Faith Kunihira</td>
<td>Member KYEGEI Committee, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2011</td>
<td>Keziah Ruharuza</td>
<td>Retired teacher and member KYEGEI Committee, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2011</td>
<td>Kyaligonza Patrick</td>
<td>Principal, Dorcus Vocational Institute, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/2011</td>
<td>Amanya Ivan</td>
<td>Public Relation Officer KIND Uganda (KYEGEI partner) Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/2011</td>
<td>Conrad Katandwe</td>
<td>Team Leader, KIND Uganda, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2011</td>
<td>Mary Muyenyi</td>
<td>Head teacher, Nyakasheniyi P.S, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/03/2011</td>
<td>GEM Club members</td>
<td>8 pupils, Nyakasheniyi P.S, Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/2011</td>
<td>John Bright</td>
<td>Head teacher, Kisojo P.S Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/04/2011</td>
<td>GEM Matron</td>
<td>GEM Matron, Kisojo P.S Kyenjojo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Function/Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2011</td>
<td>Joel Okidi</td>
<td>Inspector of School (in charge sports) Abim District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2011</td>
<td>George Walter Ochero</td>
<td>District Inspector of Schools, and Acting DEO Abim District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/04/2011</td>
<td>Lily Adong</td>
<td>Deputy Head teacher, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Okello Proscovia Daphine</td>
<td>SWT, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Awili Esther Ruth</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Abalo Ruth</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Apeyok Susan Ochan</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Akech Prossy</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Asero Susan</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Abonyo Alice Norah</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Akech Joyce Betty</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Akongo Filder Rose Otto</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Awili Milly Grace</td>
<td>Student, Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2011</td>
<td>Acen Kevin</td>
<td>Member, ADIGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2011</td>
<td>Obin Ayen Godfrey</td>
<td>Secretary, ADIGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2011</td>
<td>Awor Esther</td>
<td>Member, Morulem Sub County ADIGE member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2011</td>
<td>Ataa Jennifer</td>
<td>Member, Morulem Sub County ADIGE member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/2011</td>
<td>Awori Jennifer</td>
<td>SWT Abim S.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/04/2011</td>
<td>Bwonyo Bosco</td>
<td>DIS Lirs District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2011</td>
<td>Hon Ayena</td>
<td>LCV Secretary for Education, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2011</td>
<td>Jane Nyakecho</td>
<td>Plan International, WASH officer, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/04/2011</td>
<td>Stella Ogwang</td>
<td>Probation Officer, Lira District Local Government, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Regina Betty Okwir</td>
<td>Head teacher, Ngetta Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Jolly Acen</td>
<td>Community Development Officer Lira District Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Kerwegi Anthony</td>
<td>Executive Director, Concerned Parents Association, Lira District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Apoi Joan</td>
<td>GEM patron and SWT, Ngetta Boys P S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Alobo Shollom</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Adong Wisdom</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Awio Andrew</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Okabo James</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/04/2011</td>
<td>Atim Flavia</td>
<td>GEM members, Ngetta Boys P S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/07/2011</td>
<td>Aster Haregot</td>
<td>UNICEF Regional office Nairobi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 8. ANNEX 5: TIMELINE OF UNGEI EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>International Context</th>
<th>Uganda Context</th>
<th>Education Policy in Uganda</th>
<th>UNGEI in Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>The Addisababa conference on education in Africa. Urges African governments to provide education for all</td>
<td>1962 – Uganda gains Independence with Milton Obote as prime minister. Uganda is characterized by good growth, low inflation and balanced current accounts.</td>
<td>Uganda’s education sector was also in good shape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1966: Abrogation of the 1962 constitution and its replacement by a republican constitution</td>
<td>1963: The Castle Education Commission is appointed to review the education system in order to meet the challenges of newly independent Uganda.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission places a strong emphasis on quality education and argues for expansion of girls’ education, and provision of adult education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The commission changed the structure of education to the current 7:4:2: (2-5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1963: Education Act passed. It put all schools under government control. It also encourage promotion of Ugandan unity and development of a curriculum that reflect African identity and African Personality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1971: Milton Obote is toppled in coup led by Idi Amin. Uganda under military dictatorship. Rule of law ceased. There is endless civil unrest, insecurity and economic ruin.</td>
<td>1970: Education Act Passed. The Act provided guidelines for management of schools, operation of private schools, teachers’ welfare,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1972: Amin orders Asians out of Uganda</td>
<td>1977: Education Policy Review appointed but due to the overthrow of government in 1979, its report was not passed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education lost value, educated people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International Context</td>
<td>Uganda Context</td>
<td>Education Policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1978: Uganda invades Tanzania with a view to annexing Kagera region.</td>
<td>felt unsafe and many fled the county</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1979: Tanzania invades Uganda, unifying the various anti-Amin forces under the Uganda National liberation Front and Amin is overthrown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Economy remains weak and instability continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td></td>
<td>1986: the National Resistance Movement comes to power under Museveni.</td>
<td>Political instability led to deteriorated physical infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NRM adopts SAP aimed to restore fiscal discipline, monetary stability, and rehabilitating infrastructure (economic, social and institutional).</td>
<td>Text books, instructional materials almost non-existent in most schools, making teaching and learning extremely difficult.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAP involved trade liberalization, privatization, divestiture of public enterprises, civil service reforms, reorganization of tax revenue collection etc. The economy responds favorably to measures under SAP.</td>
<td>Lack of textbooks created a culture of writing of pamphlets which replaced textbooks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The few remaining teachers who did not flee the country during repression are underpaid, under trained and demoralized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) Establishes UPE as a goal and determines strategies to achieve it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) emphasized education of marginalized groups including girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International Context</td>
<td>Uganda Context</td>
<td>Education Policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adopt the World Declaration on Education for All, which states that all have a right to education.</td>
<td>activity. With regards to education, the constitution states that—<em>all persons have a right to education</em></td>
<td>The White Paper emphasizes the importance of equal access to education, regardless of social status, sex, and ethnicity. Confirms UPE Fees payment in primary schools stopped. Massive increase in enrollment (additional 2.3 million children (1.1 m girls &amp; 1.2 m boys) bringing enrolment to 5.7 million in 1997.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>First presidential elections. Museveni resumes offices.</td>
<td>1996: Poverty Eradication Action Plan: Following concerns about equitable growth, household poverty, and poor social sector services, the GOU re-orientated the development programme towards poverty reduction and improvement in social services. Within the PEAP framework, the government adopts SWAs to address specific constraints. In education, this is known as the Education Strategic Investment Plan (ESIP) 1997: Local Government Act Decentralisation of basic service delivery to Districts, including primary and education.</td>
<td>Acute shortage classrooms, overcrowding, a decline in teaching quality, and insufficient materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997: Poverty Eradication Action Plan: Following concerns about equitable growth, household poverty, and poor social sector services, the GOU re-orientated the development programme towards poverty reduction and improvement in social services. Within the PEAP framework, the government adopts SWAs to address specific constraints. In education, this is known as the Education Strategic Investment Plan (ESIP) 1997: Local Government Act Decentralisation of basic service delivery to Districts, including primary and education.</td>
<td>1997: Poverty Eradication Action Plan: Following concerns about equitable growth, household poverty, and poor social sector services, the GOU re-orientated the development programme towards poverty reduction and improvement in social services. Within the PEAP framework, the government adopts SWAs to address specific constraints. In education, this is known as the Education Strategic Investment Plan (ESIP) 1997: Local Government Act Decentralisation of basic service delivery to Districts, including primary and education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998: Education Strategy Investment Plan (ESIP) (1989–2003) developed to (a) enhance equitable access to education across income groups and gender; (b) improving quality of education, (c) enhancing the management of education service delivery at all levels;</td>
<td>1998/99: Launching of Schools Facilities Grant (SFG), a decentralised modality for constructing and completing primary classrooms 1999: Launching of new Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Education For All (EFA) Assessment 1999–2000, involving six regional conferences, reveals that the EFA agenda has been neglected.</td>
<td>1998/99: Launching of Schools Facilities Grant (SFG), a decentralised modality for constructing and completing primary classrooms 1999: Launching of new Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International Context</td>
<td>Uganda Context</td>
<td>Education Policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>UN Millennium Summit in <strong>2000</strong>: 189 world leaders agree to meet the Millennium Development Goals. World Education Forum: 164 governments adopt the Dakar Framework for Action in which they promise to commit the necessary resources and effort to create a comprehensive and inclusive education system for all. UNGEI instituted by the Secretary General in 2000 with a vision of ‘A world where all girls and boys will have equal access to free, quality education’.</td>
<td><strong>2000</strong> - Ugandans vote against multi-party politics.</td>
<td><strong>2000</strong>: In support of UPE, the Government of Uganda (GOU) increases the funding for education from 2.6% of GNP in 1996 to 4% in 2000. By 2001, 32% of the total discretionary recurrent budget is allocated to education (up from 24% in 1996) and, within it, the share of primary education reaches 70%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td><strong>G8 Washington, DC USA.</strong> <strong>April 2002</strong>: The Development Committee</td>
<td><strong>2002 June</strong>: Uganda invited to join the FTI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International Context</td>
<td>Uganda Context</td>
<td>Education Policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 April</td>
<td>Education for All (EFA) Amsterdam, Netherlands. Developing countries and their external partners agree at a Dutch-World Bank sponsored conference on broad principles for scaling up EFA efforts; the Netherlands commits 135 million Euro to set the process in motion.</td>
<td>2002 July 17th: Uganda accepts invitation to participate in the FTI.</td>
<td>2002 September: Draft FTI Country proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G8 Kananaskis, Canada. June 2002: agreement to increase bilateral assistance for the achievement of EFA and to work with bilateral and multilateral agencies to ensure implementation of the FTI.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFA Global Monitoring Report established to monitor progress towards the six EFA goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 Feb</td>
<td>Rome Declaration on the harmonisation of aid FTI Donors Meeting - Paris, March 2003: Donors agree on operation plan for FTI The FTI Catalytic Fund (CF) is</td>
<td>2003 April 25th –FTI Uganda next steps letter*. Uganda receives letter outlining the next steps for Uganda in order to be included in the FTI.</td>
<td>The Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2004–15. The ESSP commits government to priorities universal access to primary education. It also focuses attention on improving regional and gender equity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International Context</td>
<td>Uganda Context</td>
<td>Education Policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>to enable countries lacking resources to scale up the implementation of FTI plans. Agreement to open FTI to all low income countries.</td>
<td>Education Programme Development Fund (EPDF) established in <strong>November 2004</strong> under the FTI to support education planning and development in low income countries. FTI Partnership Meeting, <strong>Nov 2004</strong>, Brasilia, Brazil, Agreement on the FTI Framework document and Assessment Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2004 UNGEI launched in Uganda by the Minster of Education and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td><strong>March 2005</strong>, Paris Declaration endorsed by over one hundred countries to increase efforts in the harmonisation, alignment and management of aid</td>
<td><strong>2005 July</strong> Voters in a referendum overwhelmingly back a return to multi-party politics. <strong>2006 February</strong> – President Museveni wins multi-party elections,</td>
<td>The President of Uganda, Mr Museveni, in his 2006 Election Manifesto, declares that Universal Secondary Education (USE) would be expanded to Universal Post Primary Education and Training (UPPET). UPPET policy formulated in the context of the: UPPET has four purposes: - increasing equitable access to post primary education and training (PPET); - assuring achievement of the MDG of Gender parity in education delivery by 2015; - enhancing sustainability of the universal primary education (UPE);</td>
<td>UNGEI is launched in the districts of Gulu and Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td><strong>September 2006</strong>, Singapore. The meeting focused on the progress to achieve the education millennium development goals. <strong>FTI Catalytic Fund Strategy Committee meeting Cairo on 12th November 2006</strong> eligibility criteria of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>International Context</td>
<td>Uganda Context</td>
<td>Education Policy in Uganda</td>
<td>UNGEI in Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>accessing the Fund are changed, allowing countries with large number of in-country donors, to qualify</td>
<td>EPDF to provide financial and technical support towards the preparation of Education Sector Plan (USD 250,000).</td>
<td>- reducing the high costs of PPET.</td>
<td>UNGEI launched in the Eastern Uganda in the districts of Katakwi, Soroti, Kaberamaido, Abim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2007, Brussels, organised by the EC, the UK and the World Bank. To review and gain commitment to achieve full primary education by 2015.</td>
<td>December 2007: EPDF funds a capacity development workshop on country leadership and implementation for results in the EFA – FTI partnership held in Cape Town in which Uganda participated. EPDF also funds two World Bank institute courses. Uganda participates in second course titled —Accountability, Governance, and Quality of Decentralized Education in Africa</td>
<td>A revised and re-costed ESSP 2007-15 is developed by MoES to make it compliant with EFA FTI goals, plan to introduce local language, ensure access to post primary, strengthen science and technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2007, International forum on Capacity Development for Education recommend strategic use of the EPDF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>September 2008, Accra summit on aid effectiveness, Donor countries agree to end the fragmentation of aid and donate half of aid directly to governments of low-income countries, rather than to individual projects. April 22, 2008: Catalytic Fund’s Strategy Committee meeting, Tokyo.</td>
<td>Government launches a pilot Quality Education Initiative (QEI); in 12 districts, in response to the poor learning outcomes of UPE.</td>
<td>UNGEI launched in the Western Uganda in the districts of Kasese and Kyenjojo.</td>
<td>UNGEI strengthens advocacy on re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools and UNGEI starts the process of drafting a policy on re-entry of pregnant girls to school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 9. ANNEX 6: THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

### CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero? What was happening in country before UNGEI?

1. What policy interventions to address challenges affecting girls’ education were in place before the establishment of UNGEI in Uganda?
2. Who initiated these policy interventions?
3. Which organizations supported these interventions?
4. Did any partnerships that support girls’ education exist during this period, if so which ones?
5. What were their achievements?
6. What gaps still existed despite the interventions of such partnerships?

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them?

1. What triggered the establishment of UNGEI in Uganda?
2. How did the members come together?
3. Who were UNGEI members when it was launched in 2004?
   1. What activities are UNGEI involved in?
   2. How are UNGEI activities decided?
   3. Does your organization have any UNGEI work plan?

### Relevance - Were the objectives of UNGEI relevant? Was the design and management structure of UNGEI appropriate?

### Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy expenditure and service delivery)

#### Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to improving education sector policies, planning, data, budgeting, level of finance, delivery, monitoring and evaluation and aid effectiveness?

#### Efficiency - How economically was UNGEI support translated into results?
Comment on the suitability of UNGEI's work plans in achieving its stated objectives?
Are UNGEI's priorities in line with what is reflected in the national policy development frameworks? Explain your response?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes:</th>
<th>What has been the effect on quantity, quality, access and sustainability of primary education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What tangible improvements have occurred since the inception of UNGEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What role did UNGEI play in these improvements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability:** Are the changes that took place in policy and planning, interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?
How sustainable are UNGEI activities?

**OUTCOME 1: Policy and Planning**

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero with respect to policy and planning? What was happening in the country before UNGEI?

| 1.       | What policies have been put in place since the launch of UNGEI |
| 2.       | Who initiated those policies? |

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non
1. What role did UNGEI play in these policies formulation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance - Were the objectives of UNGEI support to policy and planning relevant? Was the design appropriate?</th>
<th>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to developing policies and plans for girls’ education? To what extent did UNGEI contribute to implementation of sector policies?</td>
<td>Efficiency - How economically was UNGEI support to country level policy and planning translated into results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How relevant were UNGEI activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How effective has been UNGEI contribution to policy formulation</th>
<th>In your view, how efficient have been UNGEI’s inputs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Besides UNGEI which other organizations contributed to the achievements of the outcomes on Policy formulation on gender equality? What tangible improvements have occurred since the inception of UNGEI with regard to Policy changes concerning girls’ education and gender equality in education What role did UNGEI play in these improvements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainability: Are the changes that took place in policy and planning interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks? Comment on the sustainability of the partnership participation in policy formulation
**OUTCOME 2: Policy of re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers**

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero with respect to education finance? What was happening in country before UNGEI?

1. Was there a policy on re-entry of pregnancy girls to school?
2. Who initiated the policy?
3. How were schools handling cases of pregnant girls?

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-UNGEI inputs and processes took place over the same period?

1. Is there any policy on re-entry of pregnant girls since the launch on UNGEI?
2. What role did UNGEI play in the formulation of that policy?
3. What other activities has UNGEI undertaken to address the issue of pregnancy and re-entry of child mothers to school?

**Relevance** - Were the objectives of UNGEI support to education Finance relevant? Was the design appropriate?

**Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes:** What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)

**Effectiveness** – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to the return of pregnant girls to school?

**Efficiency** - How economically was UNGEI support the formulation of policy on re-entry of pregnant girls?

**How relevant were UNGEI inputs and activities?**

**To what extent did UNGEI contribute to the return of pregnant girls to school?**

**How economically was UNGEI support the formulation of policy on re-entry of pregnant girls?**

**Sustainability:** Are the changes that took place in the education budget process and the level of finance for primary education likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?
### OUTCOME 3: Good practices in girls’ education

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero with respect to some aspects of good practice in girls’ education? What was happening in country before UNGEI?

- What good practices existed in the education girls and gender equality?
- Were these good practices known?
- Who identified the good practices?
- Were they shared with others? If so, who?
- Were they documented and institutionalized? Please explain.

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-UNGEI inputs and processes took place over the same period?

- What good practices have been identified since the launch of UNGEI?
- Who identified them?
- What role has UNGEI played in the identification?
- Have the good practices been shared? Who have they been shared with?

**Relevance** - Were the good practices identified, documented, implemented, scaled up and institutionalized by UNGEI relevant and appropriate for girls’ education?

**Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes:** What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)

- **Effectiveness** – To what extent did the good practices promoted under the UNGEI umbrella contribute to improved delivery of girls’ education?
- **Efficiency** - How economically worthwhile were the UNGEI-led good practices in girls’ education?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were the good practices identified by UNGEI relevant and appropriate for girls’ education?</th>
<th>To what extent are the good practices known by different stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the scaling up in line with government priorities?</td>
<td>To what extent have the good practices been scaled up?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability:** Are the good practices in girls’ education that have been implemented sustainable? How resilient are they to risks?

---

**OUTCOME 4: Effective Partnership – including capacity building, M&E**

**Context:** What was the situation at level zero with respect to aid/partnership effectiveness, capacity building and M&E? What was happening in the sector before UNGEI? How effective was the sector partnership, capacity building efforts and monitoring and evaluation?

1. What partnership in education existed before UNGEI?
2. Who were the members of that partnership?
3. What was their focus?

**Inputs:** What did UNGEI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-UNGEI inputs and processes took place over the same period?

1. What did UNGEI do to establish its partnership?
2. What were the members of UNGEI partnership during the launch?
3. Who are the current members? If some members dropped off, why did they?
4. How did UNGEI devolve from national to community level?
5. How do the national, district/sub county chapters of UNGEI relate?
6. What role has UNGEI played in strengthening the partnership on girls’ education and gender equality?
7. Besides UNGEI, which other organizations contributed to the strengthening of the partnership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance - Were the objectives of UNGEI support relevant to enhancement of aid management, partnership, capacity building, data and M&amp;E needs? Was the design appropriate?</th>
<th>Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong> – To what extent did UNGEI contribute to improved partnership, aid management, capacity, collection of data and better information services? To what extent is there better use of data to inform policy and funding?</td>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong> - How economically was improved aid flow, partnership, capacity and support to country data and M&amp;E translated into results?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment on the status of implementation of the UNGEI agenda at the district/community levels? Would you say it has been largely successful?

1. What factors account for this success, if any?

What tangible improvements have occurred since the inception of UNGEI with regard to strengthening of the partnership process for the furtherance of girls’ education? Compared to other partnerships, how do you rate UNGEI (in terms of strength and weaknesses)

What makes UNGEI strong/weak?

Does the UNGEI partnership add something that would not be possible without it? Explain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What lessons have you learnt by being involved in the UNGEI partnership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does your organization feel a sense of ownership of those activities and their outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How does the global, regional and national chapters of UNGEI relate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. ANNEX 7: THE LOGIC MODEL FOR UNGEI EVALUATION IN UGANDA

**Vision:** Girls and boys in Uganda accessing and completing a quality Education cycle at all levels of Education and contributing to a transformed and developed society

**Goal:** Achieve gender equality in education through strong partnerships and advocacy at global, regional and country level

**Outcome 1:** Policies promote girls’ education and gender equality

**Output 1.1** Strategic reviews of existing laws and policies on girls’ education and gender equality to update and inform policy decisions

**Output 1.2** Capacity of national education systems to ensure effective and sustainable girls’ education and gender equality strengthened

**Output 1.3** Monitoring of policies and laws promoting girls’ education and gender equality among different stakeholders strengthened

**Inputs from the UNGEI Global, Regional and UNGEI Uganda partnership**

**Inputs from Uganda government**

**Inputs from communities**

**Inputs from multilateral partners**

**Inputs from bilateral agencies**

**Inputs from NGOs, private sector etc.**

**Outcome 2:** A Policy on re-entry to school for pregnant girls and child mothers

**Output 2.1** Current situation of pregnant girls and child mothers reviewed

**Output 2.2** Educational policies reviewed to enhance re-entry of pregnant girls and child mothers to schools

**Outcome 3:** Strengthened partnership in promotion of Girl Child education

**Output 3.1** Partners focusing on girls’ education and gender equality identified and their capacity strengthened

**Output 3.2** Coordination of different intervention on girls’ education and gender equality improved

**Outcome 4:** Regular Review of progress and good practices

**Output 4.1** Good practices on girls’ education and gender equality identified and documented

**Output 4.2** Good practices disseminated and utilization

**Inputs from the UNGEI Global, Regional and UNGEI Uganda partnership**

**Inputs from Uganda government**

**Inputs from communities**

**Inputs from multilateral partners**

**Inputs from bilateral agencies**

**Inputs from NGOs, private sector etc.**

**Monitoring criteria**

**Criteria for M&E of UNGEI Goals:**
- Number of girls and boys out of school
- Number of girls and boys completing primary education
- Numbers of girls and boys transiting to secondary

**Criteria for M&E Outcome 1:**
- Evidence of gender responsive education policies
- Availability of policy frameworks that support girls education
- Budgets allocated to improve participation of girls in school

**Criteria for M&E Outcome 2:**
- Number of pregnant girls and child mothers back to school
- Evidence of policy that allow child mothers back to school

**Criteria for M&E Outcome 3:**
- Evidence of:
  - Numbers of organizations actively involved in UNGEI partnership
  - Evidence of concerted efforts to address barriers to girls’ education
  - Degree of satisfaction of member organizations

**Criteria for M&E Outcome 4:**
- Frequency of workshops to disseminate good practice
- Numbers of publications on good practice
- Schools with separate toilets
- Gender-responsive materials, curriculum and teaching guides
- Financial incentives to reduce barriers to girls education
- Measures for safety for girls going to school
- Strategies to curb and handle sexual harassment/violence
- Numbers of teachers and school managers trained in gender
12. ANNEX 8: EDUCATION STATISTICS


![Trends in Primary School Enrolment](image)

*Source: EMIS*

Table 2: Enrolment trends in primary and secondary education by gender (1996 - 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary School Enrolments</th>
<th>Secondary School Enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,068,625</td>
<td>1,647,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,303,561</td>
<td>2,832,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,806,385</td>
<td>3,061,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6,288,239</td>
<td>3,301,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6,559,013</td>
<td>3,395,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6,900,916</td>
<td>3,528,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7,354,153</td>
<td>3,721,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,633,314</td>
<td>3,872,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6,707,845</td>
<td>3,397,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7,223,879</td>
<td>3,642,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,362,938</td>
<td>3,692,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7,537,971</td>
<td>3,779,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Compiled using the Departmental records and educational statistical abstracts*
### 13. ANNEX 9: UGANDA’S PROGRESS TOWARDS MDGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar</td>
<td><strong>ON TRACK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.B: Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 1.C: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger</td>
<td><strong>NO TARGET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 2.A: Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling</td>
<td><strong>SLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 3.A: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015</td>
<td><strong>ON TRACK</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4: Reduce child mortality</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 4.A: Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate</td>
<td><strong>SLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 5: Improve maternal health</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 5.A: Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio</td>
<td><strong>SLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 5.B: Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.A: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS</td>
<td><strong>REVERSAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.B: Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it</td>
<td><strong>ON TRACK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 6.C: Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases</td>
<td><strong>SLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.A: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources</td>
<td><strong>SLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.B: Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss</td>
<td><strong>SLOW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.C: Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation</td>
<td><strong>ON TRACK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 7.D: By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers</td>
<td><strong>NO TARGET</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 8: Develop a global partnership for development</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.A: Address the special needs of the least developed countries</td>
<td><strong>REVERSAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.B: Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term</td>
<td><strong>ACHEIVED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.C: In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries</td>
<td><strong>STAGNANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target 8.D: In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications</td>
<td><strong>ON TRACK</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UBOS 2011