Steps to success
Learning from the Girls’ Education Challenge 2012-2017
“There is no ‘silver bullet’ for success but a combination of factors were found to improve girls’ outcomes.”
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Executive summary

Steps to success is a practical exploration of the meaning of success within the first phase of the Girls’ Education Challenge (GEC), based on data collected between 2012 and 2017, including the endline reports and evaluations of all 37 projects.

Our analysis aims to answer the following questions:
• What worked for projects in the GEC to get girls into school, keep them there and improve their learning?
• What works to ensure lasting change?

This paper takes examples from a group of projects that were successful at improving one or more of the following: girls’ learning outcomes, measured through literacy and numeracy tests; inclusion, measured by attendance and retention; and sustainability, which creates lasting change and means girls are able to access a full cycle of education. It then looks for patterns and common interventions amongst the most successful projects.

Rather than revealing a ‘silver bullet’ for success, a combination of factors were found to improve outcomes for girls:
• Regular in-school coaching for teachers to improve their practice, coupled with structured teaching and learning materials.
• Extracurricular activities such as girls’ and boys’ clubs to improve girls’ motivation and self-esteem.
• Regular collation of data on girls’ learning and participation which is then used to make programmatic decisions.
• Recognition of the need to work with boys and men.
• Engagement at three levels – with communities, school governance and national policymakers – to promote change.

Learning
Successful projects recognised that teachers need support and coaching. They worked with teachers in a structured way to reflect on their practice, and they introduced new facilitation and teaching skills. They coached them through a process of embedding and practising these skills within a supportive school environment and with appropriate teaching and learning materials. Successful projects also introduced teaching and learning materials to support the teaching process and encouraged teachers to work together to solve the problems they encountered. School-based support was more effective than taking teachers out of the classroom to participate in workshops. All successful projects implemented some form of extracurricular activity (such as boys’ and girls’ clubs) to enhance learning and promote girls’ self-esteem. Successful projects also included an element of infrastructure or upgrading which was a necessary but not sufficient condition for improving learning outcomes.

Inclusion
Projects which increased attendance and retention of girls in education were those that took the time and developed methods to understand their beneficiaries well and adapted their interventions to reflect this. They collected data throughout the project that alerted them to incentives and motivation for girls’ participation or non-participation and adapted their interventions accordingly. Some worked on girls’ empowerment, self confidence and self-esteem which seems to have had a positive effect on attendance. They also recognised that to work effectively to improve girls’ learning and retention it was imperative that they also worked with boys and men, encouraging them to change their attitudes and behaviours, as well as with the girls themselves and their female family members. Only two projects worked primarily with girls with disabilities and these highlighted the importance of working simultaneously on three fronts: with the girls and their families; at school level with teachers and students; and with the education authorities at county and national levels.

Sustainability
Sustainability was expressed as ensuring a full cycle of education for GEC girls and measured additionally through the securing of match funding. Although the majority of projects were unlikely to have continued without further external input, there were elements of change which projects succeeded in establishing and which will increase the likelihood of GEC girls completing their education.

Projects which were successful in these three respects worked at three levels. Firstly, they promoted behaviour change in communities which actively promoted ‘voice and choice’ for girls. Secondly, they worked to improve school governance by engaging with School Management Committees or Parent Teacher Associations. Finally, they worked at the system level to get buy-in from partner governments and demonstrate the effectiveness of their approaches. They recognised the necessity of working to change, improve or advocate for more funding for national policies which impacted on girls’ abilities to attend school regularly and benefit from learning opportunities. Additionally, these projects worked at the national level with governments and other allies to achieve this.

Areas for further research
There is still much learning to be gleaned from such a rich source of information and the last part of this paper introduces some areas which have not as yet been fully explored. These are: researching appropriate parameters for working within or alongside government systems; learning from atypical GEC projects; the best ways to link into wider social protection interventions so that girls and their families can afford the real and opportunity costs of school in a way that can be sustained; and finally how working with schools, communities and governments to address child safeguarding and protection can best be done and the subsequent effects that this may have on girls’ learning.
Introduction

The Girls’ Education Challenge (GEC) was launched in 2012 as the largest donor-funded girls’ education programme in the world in response to the fact that:

“...39 million girls remain out of even primary level education and a much larger number are dropping out without basic literacy and numeracy skills... In order to address this problem, marginalised girls need to participate in education and they need to become numerate and literate. These things are essential for girls to access the right health, economic, and social opportunities.”

GEC Business Case 2012

Thirty-seven projects were supported across 18 countries, which implemented a diverse range of interventions. Project activities included teacher training, mentoring and catch-up classes for girls, extracurricular clubs, school governance and educational technology, amongst others. Each project had an independent evaluator who provided data and evidence about the girls at baseline, midline and endline.

The GEC has been collecting data on all projects since 2012 and now has an extensive database of qualitative and quantitative information covering project profiles (contexts, results, delivery, financial management, degrees of marginalisation, intervention types employed) as well as their processes for child protection, the potential for transforming attitudes to gender roles, the importance of educating girls, and sustainability (see Annexes for details on the methodology and datasets used on which this paper is based). After four years of implementation, the GEC has learned much that is useful about girls’ education in developing countries. An evaluation of each of the three windows of the programme (Step Change, Innovation and Strategic Partnerships) was carried out by Coffey Ltd and their final report is available online.

This paper complements Coffey’s findings and, combined with projects’ endline evaluations, it offers a practical exploration of the meaning of success in the GEC. It uses outcome data and project management data from across the entire life of the programme to draw lessons from commonalities of successful projects. It is intended to be used by practitioners (GEC and beyond), the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and other funders and policy makers to inform and shape current and future policy and programming.

This analysis aims to answer the following questions:

• What worked for projects in the GEC to get girls into school, keep them there and improve their learning?
• What works to ensure lasting change?

It also draws attention to areas where further exploration could be useful.

The next section highlights the common features of the projects which demonstrated good practice.
Learning and inclusion

This section identifies interventions in projects that were associated with an improvement in learning, measured against literacy and numeracy targets, and also those that were associated with inclusion, measured by attendance and the extent to which projects successfully addressed gender issues.

Projects were assessed at midline and given the opportunity to adjust their programming, so it has not been possible to state that a definitive set of interventions over a certain time period contributed to success in learning. However, there are commonalities from which useful lessons can be drawn.

Those projects that succeeded in increasing both learning and inclusion seem to have focused on three categories of interventions:

1. working with teachers
2. provision of learning materials
3. establishing extracurricular activities

Within these three categories a number of lessons emerged, as detailed below.

Teachers and inclusion

It may seem odd now, but many of the initial proposals for GEC did not include specific work with teachers in the classroom. Instead they assumed that once girls were in school then they would learn. It was not until after the baselines (2013) had demonstrated how low girls’ learning levels were that many projects adjusted their approach to include purposeful intervention in the classroom with teachers.

Successful projects promoted teacher self and peer reflection about how to ensure equal participation of girls in the classroom and trained teachers in inclusive education approaches. This included identification and support for children with disabilities such as those with visual and hearing difficulties, focusing in some cases on sign language and the provision of hearing aids. Teachers reflected on how to offer customised teaching to different children where appropriate.

Activities focused on planning lessons with an equal participation in mind, ensuring that girls, including those with disabilities were equally called upon to answer questions and were placed in leadership positions at the same rate as boys. Important principles of effective teaching were also emphasised, which included assessment for learning, training teachers to check understanding before moving on.

The example below highlights Link Community Development’s approach.

Focusing on gender to improve teaching: Link Community Development, Ethiopia

Link Community Development exceeded their numeracy, literacy and attendance targets in their project in Ethiopia. Teachers benefitted from gender responsive pedagogical training and so planned participation for both sexes during lesson plans. They introduced a Gender Audit for all teachers which highlighted areas where teachers may be behaving in a biased way towards girls or boys. It included classroom observations of teachers’ teaching behaviour to assess whether their learning materials and teaching styles were gender sensitive and not based on stereotypes. Six variables were observed in classes including:

• teachers’ ability to involve boys and girls in the lesson
• girls’ involvement in class
• girls’ interest in class
• the use of examples and illustrations relevant for girls
• application of study material relevant for boys and girls
• completeness of girls’ assignments and classwork books.
Another aspect of inclusion which went beyond the school and teachers was evident in Camfed International’s approach in Zimbabwe and Tanzania. They tracked each girl and developed a personal relationship with each of them. They had high expectations of them and treated them as individuals with potential.

**Working at different levels to be inclusive**

Two projects worked primarily with girls with disabilities. One of these was Leonard Cheshire in Kenya. They worked successfully to bring girls with disabilities into schools, keep them there and improve their learning. Their inclusive approach worked on three fronts: with the girls and their families; at school level with teachers and students; and with the education authorities at county and national levels to embed the changes they made into practice more widely.

**A four-tiered approach: Leonard Cheshire, Kenya**

At the individual level, girls with disabilities were identified by Leonard Cheshire trained community resource workers and referred to the (already existing) government Education Assessment and Resource Centres (EARC). The EARC staff assessed the girls to determine their needs, and where required provided them with assistive devices or referred them on to medical services. Vulnerable households were supported with bedding and mosquito nets. Girls were enrolled in the closest mainstream school. Community Resource Workers (CRWs) made contact with the girls at school and in the community and offered psycho-social support to the girls and their families. CRWs also engaged in other community activities to increase awareness of disability issues. The project trained men to be male mentors to their peers and to encourage men to take a proactive role in the education of their girls with disabilities.

The school-level interventions were designed to ensure that girls with disabilities would study in an accessible and inclusive environment throughout the three years of the project. This involved: training teachers and school managers in inclusive education approaches and resource mobilisation; modifying school infrastructure to make them conducive to the needs of children with disabilities; provision of appropriate teaching and learning materials; and provision of sanitary towels. An important feature was the formation of child-to-child clubs which brought children with and without disabilities to work with and learn from each other, advocate for each other and participate in extracurricular activities together.

The county-level activities included spearheading four county working groups. These were made up of key representatives from civil society organisations, faith-based organisations and disabled people’s organisations. They specifically advocate for and process legislation on disability, early childhood development and bursary in the four sub-counties: Siaya, Migoro, Kisumu and Homa Bay.

The community level focused on sensitising the community and family members. In particular by engaging local government in addressing child protection issues, and engaging male family members as mentors to promote positive attitudes towards disability.

“Successful projects promoted teacher self and peer reflection about how to ensure equal participation of girls in the classroom and trained teachers in inclusive education approaches.”
Lesson planning, coaching and assessment

Amongst projects that succeeded in improving learning there was concentrated work with teachers on improving their practice. Teachers were supported to take what was often referred to as a ‘learner-centred approach’ to their teaching. This did not generally mean that they adopted discovery-based learning methods, rather they considered the impact of their teaching on girls’ learning. Teachers were encouraged to shift from a teacher focused “chalk and talk” approach towards deeper engagement with students as learners, enabling more interaction with and more listening to students.

In the best examples of teacher support, teachers were given very concrete assistance to plan their lessons, systematically considering gender and other diversities in the classroom. In order to embed and ‘normalise’ the new techniques, they were coached by more experienced teachers and trainers, for example, on using sample lesson plans with teaching and learning objectives, suggestions for different types of learning activity and different ways in which to present new information, along with formative assessment techniques. This coaching model included lesson observations followed by constructive feedback to teachers on their performance against different aspects of their teaching practice. The impact of this approach is shown in girls’ responses from the STAGES project in Afghanistan.

Changes in teachers: STAGES, Afghanistan

STAGES (A consortium-run project in Afghanistan) reported the efficacy of encouraging teachers to share their experience and learn from each other: ‘...focus groups with girls consistently revealed perceptions that the quality of teaching had improved since midline, with many references made to teachers having more confidence and using more methods such as role play and group work. Interviews with teachers also revealed several examples of encouraging informal mentoring, particularly in community-based education classes. For example, teachers referred to seating weaker students with better performing students so that they could seek assistance during lessons. Some teachers also referred to ensuring that a mix of weaker and better performing students teamed up during group work exercises, with weaker girls sometimes encouraged to lead the group work exercise with the assistance and guidance of stronger students in order to build their confidence.’

Teacher observation was important, as was feedback to teachers on these observations, as it helped to consolidate positive changes and highlighted and discourage less useful practices (see Annex 4 for an example of areas observed).

The best projects took a progressive approach, helping to give teachers a gender perspective, which translated into transformational practices in the classroom. For example, effective teachers were seen as role models who broke down harmful stereotypes and championed gender equality and greater ambition for girls. Teachers’ and school feedback was sought on this training, for example, on content, trainers, the need for follow up, and how the training has or has not helped in their work. This feedback was actively integrated into improvements in the delivery and content of the training.

School support training and supervision: PEAS, Uganda

PEAS in Uganda held annual school inspections to assess whether schools are becoming more gender-responsive through consulting with female students and teachers and making recommendations for improvement to school leadership teams. Through the package of girl-focused school support, training and supervision interventions that have been implemented in PEAS schools over the last several years, school leaders, staff, and male students have become more aware of and sensitive to girls’ needs, and have notably changed their behaviour towards girls as a result. Across the board, focus groups with girls in PEAS schools noted female students reporting that they feel safe at school, and that their teachers support them as much as boys to succeed in their studies. There is much anecdotal evidence from PEAS staff about school leaders speaking openly about the girls’ progress in their schools and asking what else they can do to support them. There are also examples of boys in classrooms reminding their teachers to call on girls as much as the boys. As one headteacher explained, “The girls’ policy has made girls go forward. They are very sure everyone is concerned about them.”

Although most projects concentrated on general teaching methodologies and classroom practice, some also specifically worked with teachers to assist them in gaining skills for teaching basic literacy and numeracy. In Kenya the Education Development Trust introduced elements of Direct Instructional Methodology to teach reading in a very structured way at upper primary, extending work that was rolled out across the whole country in the early grades through TUSOME, a Ministry of Education-led reform.

Reinforcement of these new classroom and teaching techniques through frequent in-school training and support from their peers was important in relation to observed improvements...
in learning outcomes. Some projects formed communities of practice amongst teachers in the same school or even across a network of schools, where teachers reflected together on how practice was changing and how results could be improved.

Cluster Meetings: Education Development Trust, Kenya

Education Development Trust introduced ‘cluster meetings’ which bring teachers to an experience sharing forum. The main objective is to enhance the capacity of teachers in curriculum delivery. Cluster meetings are conducted once every term for the ‘focus teachers’ from all schools within the cluster. They play a major role in helping the teachers find solutions to some of the problems they encounter as they carry out their work.

Projects reported that school-based professional development training, where teachers could make improvements to their practice in real time and receive immediate feedback and learn more quickly, were much more effective than external workshop-based models. Embedding new approaches and changing classroom practice in the school, rather than just in the teacher, was key for many successful projects. Successful projects often collected gender-disaggregated data on teachers undergoing training, and on their perceptions and feedback in relation to gender training modules. Projects also collected data from boys and girls on teachers’ practices for example, whether teachers supported equal participation of girls and boys, or their encouragement of girls and boys to pursue their chosen career path and feed this back to teachers.

Some projects which were successful in increasing learning also encouraged frequent use of formative assessment techniques. Projects in Ethiopia and Afghanistan reported that teachers participating in their projects conducted daily in-class assessment as part of instruction to identify problem areas for students and help teachers understand which areas needed additional focus.

Provision of teaching and learning materials

The development and distribution of materials, usually addressing a perceived gap or seeking to improve the quality of learning resources available, was an important element of some interventions. Several projects developed specific courses or curricula to supplement the school curriculum. In some cases these were accompanied by new resources developed as part of the project, using locally available resources, for example, Camfed International’s life skills curriculum and subject-specific study guides and Viva/CRANE’s early literacy resources. In project contexts where a significant challenge relating to language of instruction was identified, projects produced local language resources to assist the teaching and learning process.

Some projects included new teaching and learning materials specifically for literacy and numeracy in their suite of interventions. In some cases, these made up for a dearth of existing teaching and learning materials and, in others, they provided the materials through which mentors or classmates could assist learners to revise sections of the curriculum or practice regularly in their own time. In some cases, these supplementary materials were added in response to midline surveys which showed that there was not sufficient improvement in either literacy or numeracy learning. The required in-depth data is not available to say whether these had a definitive effect on learning in all cases as many other changes were also made at midline. However, Camfed International reported that the ‘use of the study guides in mathematics, English and science was statistically associated with higher attainment in mathematics and English in both Tanzania and Zimbabwe’. 

Specific numeracy and literacy learning materials: Camfed International, Tanzania and Zimbabwe

Camfed International introduced a series of study guides in mathematics, English, science and, in Tanzania, How to Learn English. These were welcomed by both students and teachers for their use of simple, clear language and pertinent examples. The guides were designed to follow the national curriculum in both countries. They also formed the core resources of the study groups that were led by Teacher Mentors and Learner Guides, young women school graduates trained by the project to support girls in school. Teachers welcomed the synergy between the study guides and classroom teaching, and said the materials enabled them to move faster through topics as the students had access to worked examples with answers and so were learning more.

Projects led by organisations including Discovery Learning Alliance (Discovery Project), Avanti Communications (iMlango) and the Varkey Foundation (Making Ghanaian Girls’ Great) used technology to support teaching and learning. The Discovery Project provided teacher training and educational videos for use in the classroom. iMlango uses a virtual on-line tutor to provide individualised learning delivered through Avanti’s satellite internet service. The Varkey Foundation used satellite technology to transmit model lessons into rural classrooms.
Extracurricular activities
Almost all projects had some element of extracurricular activity based in clubs or with peers to reinforce or assist with learning and build girls’ self-confidence and self-esteem. These were central in the Theories of Change of many projects that improved learning outcomes.

In many cases, girls were given the opportunity to review work done in lessons, ask questions, and/or practise topics such as number work or reading. This was often in a girl-only space and assisted by their peers or trusted, specially trained volunteer teachers. Girls seemed to not only value these opportunities but also benefitted in terms of improved learning outcomes. The example below shows how a project in Afghanistan introduced peer mentors to encourage attendance, develop leadership potential and increase learning outcomes.

The mentoring programme focused on developing girls’ interest and involvement in extracurricular activities, especially in debating, creative writing and maths competitions, by creating an environment where weaker students got support from their mentors and teachers.

Girls’ clubs also gave girls a mechanism through which they could voice their needs, be heard, and participate in decisions relating to their education.”

Life skills and confidence: Camfed International, Tanzania and Zimbabwe
‘The My Better World curriculum has had a statistically significant impact on girls’ enjoyment of school and confidence in their academic progress in both countries and made them feel more integrated in society. The ‘My Better World’ life skills programme builds confidence, encourages goal-setting and helps students to recognise the importance of academic achievement in achieving their goals. In particular, the programme was found to help empower marginalised girls, increase their self-awareness and build self-esteem. The qualitative research repeatedly notes girls and boys in both countries referring to improved self-confidence, self-awareness, and ability to make choices…. However, the statistical models at evaluation only partially support this’. 

Girls’ clubs also gave girls a mechanism through which they could voice their needs, be heard, and participate in decisions relating to their education. The best of these collected data on attendance of different subgroups of girls at club meetings, and regularly collected participatory data about how the club was being implemented (including timing, duration and key activities). They made sure that information about the clubs was freely accessible.

1 GEC Thematic Paper on Self-Esteem, June 2018
to different groups of girls including those who could not read. Project staff followed up and engaged with girls who did not or could not attend. This enabled them to articulate the motivations and incentives for girls and their parents for participation in the groups or clubs, and adapted their practice to take these into account. The excerpt below is taken from the endline report from PEAS on the effect of girls’ clubs.

**Supporting girls and boys:**

WUSC, Kenya

WUSC’s KEEP project operating in the refugee camps of Kakuma and Dadaab in Kenya set up clubs for girls and boys together. These are observations from two girls in their schools.

“Actually in our class we live by a motto that we move together. We are saying move together both boys and girls. We have discussion groups with which before it was like let’s leave the boys to study, it is their duty to study. But we have come up with some methods which can assist both of us and we are forming a very competitive environment which is helping us in our class” – Kakuma Refugee Secondary School, Kakuma camps, Turkana County

“I am in a club for boys and girls where we talk about healthy relationships between us and the teachers and also our parents and ourselves … This club has helped because girls are now empowered and report those involved in inappropriate behaviour” – Fuji Primary School, Turkana

---

**Girls’ Clubs: PEAS, Uganda**

‘... the extracurricular programming introduced to improve girls’ enjoyment and experience of school has had a highly positive effect in encouraging girls to remain in school. Specifically, the introduction of girls’ clubs and the income generation activities and/or business club activities have been well received by the schools and garnered positive reactions from girls and boys alike.’

In many cases projects found that if they had not introduced them at the beginning of the project, they had to introduce boys’ clubs too to avoid any potential backlash from boys feeling that they had been left out. In the best examples, the boys’ clubs promoted positive behaviour and met together periodically with the girls’ clubs to discuss common issues and to begin to address how girls and boys relate to each other on a more equal footing. Help a Child in South Sudan describe how their life skills training cycles from the start explicitly targeted boys and girls and were conducted with groups of 30 learners per school. Through the 16 sessions they learned how to work together, how to deal with emotions and how to prevent and deal with conflicts. The KEEP project, operated by WUSC in refugee camps and host communities in Northern Kenya, included both girls and boys in school-based clubs that provided a platform to discuss issues such as prevention of bullying and advocating for child rights.
The external evaluation of GEC found that ‘activities aimed at improving learning directly, such as tutoring clubs or accelerated learning programmes, have had a larger positive effect on girls’ learning than ‘indirect’ activities such as scholarships or community-based activities focused on the benefits of staying in school’. There is not a great deal of detail available from project documents which differentiates between the impact of various activities carried out in clubs (for example, study groups, life skills acquisition and counselling), but there are some positive accounts of extra-curricular learning activities in particular: BRAC Tanzania introduced community study groups for girls which proved to be particularly useful in improving out of school girls’ use of English. Similarly, Link Community Development found that girls who attended extracurricular reading clubs improved both their literacy scores and their attendance.

Use of the GEC Gender Equality and Social Inclusion scale

The projects which addressed boys’ masculinity and promoted girls’ and boys’ joint discussion on girls’ education issues were moving out of what might be termed gender ‘accommodating’ whereby project activities acknowledge but work around gender, disability or other social differences and inequalities, towards ‘transformative’, where the project actively seeks to transform inequalities in the long term for all children despite gender, disability or other characteristics. The GEC has developed a Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) scale and monitoring tool to help projects assess their approach.

The GEC projects are on a journey to becoming transformative, in terms of gender or disability, the GESI assessment tool, which assisted in identifying positive attributes, will be widely used by projects in the next phase of the GEC to inform their design and practice.

Infrastructure

Successful projects also provided a school or an educational setting that was girl-friendly and that was seen as a safe place in which girls could be educated. This was done by providing schools and classrooms where there had previously not been any provision, for instance in remote areas of Afghanistan, upgrading school infrastructure to include permanent classrooms and water and sanitation (WASH) facilities, and improving school grounds so that parents perceived them to be safer.

Mercy Corps in Nepal worked with School Management Committees to upgrade school infrastructure and increase attendance.

Upgrading infrastructure: Mercy Corps, Nepal

Upgrade awards motivated schools to improve certain criteria in order to get infrastructure support from the project. The provision of better water, sanitation and hygiene facilities has created an environment which encourages girls to attend school more regularly. The attendance of girls at the project schools at the end of the project was 3.9% higher than non-project schools.

Nevertheless, GEC findings indicate that infrastructural improvements (or provision where there was previously nothing) are a necessary but not a sufficient requirement for improving learning outcomes. Projects that were successful in this aspect did not necessarily improve learning outcomes.
“Successful projects also provided a school or an educational setting that was girl-friendly and that was seen as a safe place...”
The GEC’s sustainability outcome was articulated as:
1. leveraging additional funds
2. ensuring mechanisms for girls to complete a cycle of education

As the GEC progressed it became evident that if it was going to be possible to learn lessons about how to make interventions sustainable, then a more robust description of sustainability was needed. This needed to be tailored to different contexts and encourage projects to plan for sustainability from the start of their implementation. The GEC developed a sustainability framework that explored indicators at the school, community and system level that would need to be present for the positive impact of projects to be sustained after project funding and intervention ceased. The framework sets out five levels of sustainability: Negligible (no or negative change), Latent (changes in attitude), Emerging (changes in behaviour), Becoming established (critical mass of stakeholders change behaviour) and Established (changes are institutionalised). In general, projects in the first phase of the GEC tended to show characteristics of either latent or emerging sustainability. This is probably because there was insufficient emphasis on sustainability on the part of projects in the early stages of implementation. Furthermore, the urgency and pressures of delivering outcomes meant that in practice there was a trade-off between sustainability and achieving short term results. Consequently, as the first phase of GEC concluded there were few examples of projects which were successful in fully establishing their approaches and demonstrating that changes made have become institutionalised and fully resourced. But there are several examples of elements that were becoming established in the sense that they had succeeded in gaining a critical mass of stakeholders who had changed their attitudes and behaviour towards girls’ education and were beginning to mobilise financial and human resources to continue project activities at either the school, community or system level.

© Camfed International

2 GEC Educational Marginalisation Framework
School and community level: changing attitudes and behaviours

The foundation of sustaining any kind of successful intervention related to girls’ education is the ability to change, where needed, attitudes and behaviours of girls (and boys), schools, communities and education systems so that these foster better learning and inclusion. Behaviour change in an educational context is a process and requires going beyond, for example, establishing a curriculum for community meetings about girls’ education that is centred around key arguments such as ‘educated girls make better brides’. Behaviour change needs to actively promote ‘voice and choice’ for girls and women, and have high ambition for and expectations of what girls can achieve. The STAGES project in Afghanistan found that representation was not enough. As a result, STAGES is now re-engaging with men and women involved in shuras to understand how the benefits of women’s involvement can be maximised.

Representation is not enough: STAGES, Afghanistan

Although there are a substantial number of women participating in school shuras (school committees), including in all-female shuras, findings suggest that women are not necessarily being empowered to make key decisions to support the maintenance and continuity of classes. This is partly due to their continuing lack of mobility and wider community perceptions that certain types of tasks (such as raising funds, implementing infrastructure, and mobilising government support) are better done by men.

It is not surprising therefore that not all projects that succeeded in improving learning also managed to establish new attitudes and practices that would sustain that learning after the project concluded. However, projects that have begun to show results in this area all developed a deep understanding of the context of their work and acknowledged that differing contexts, even within a small geographical area, require differing, adapted approaches. These successful projects worked to secure commitments from girls, communities and schools by engaging them as agents of change within their own communities. Link Community Development, working in Ethiopia, involved girls in project design from the beginning.

Girls as agents of change: Link Community Development, Ethiopia

The project is built on an understanding of girls’ needs and suggestions girls made to change their situation. For example, the supply of sanitary pads, decreasing of domestic workload, and tutorial classes were suggested by girls in focus group discussions before the project started. This approach was extremely effective because the participants had already bought into the interventions.

Camfed International, in their Tanzania and Zimbabwe, not only involved girls before the project to support more sustainable activities, they also supported girls to form a new group of female leaders prepared to support girls in the future to gain an education and become empowered young women.

Learner Guides: Camfed International, Tanzania and Zimbabwe

Camfed International introduced a new group of activists – their Learner Guides. Learner Guides are young women who have previously been supported by Camfed to progress successfully through school and are now trained to support the welfare and learning of marginalised children in their communities. A micro-loan scheme has enabled Camfed to offer interest-free loans to this network of women, with their volunteering valued as ‘social interest’. There is potential for a major scale-up of this model, which is highly sustainable.

“The foundation of sustaining any kind of successful intervention related to girls’ education is the ability to change, where needed, attitudes and behaviours of girls (and boys), schools, communities and education systems...”
A number of projects which succeeded in changing attitudes and, therefore, increasing enrolment and attendance in school put this down to successful media campaigns. In Sierra Leone, Plan International mounted a national radio campaign aimed at getting girls to go back to school and in Afghanistan more localised campaigns were run. Education Development Trust in Kenya worked to change attitudes to girls’ learning.

**School management and governance:**
Successful projects included an element of working with specific groups of parents (women’s groups or mothers’ groups, as well as mixed parents’ groups) to influence attitudes towards more sustained support for girls’ education or introduce new ways to be inclusive and effective.

**Community conversations:**
Education Development Trust used Community Conversations to ensure that communities support the education of girls. The project aimed to change the attitudes, perceptions and knowledge of communities about the education of girls. From baseline to endline there is evidence of progressive change. For example, pastoralist communities that are strongly attached to livestock were beginning to barter them for girls’ education, more community leaders agreed that it is important to send girls to school and there were reported delays in ‘marrying off girls’. This is gradual change but demonstrates a breakthrough in community perceptions about girls’ education.

**School mothers:**
The work of ‘school mothers’ (nominated community members) helped to reduce the barrier of inadequate support and follow up for girls. School mothers reduced the gap caused by absence of female teachers in school by: conducting roll calls in schools (three times a week); conducting weekly meetings to address emerging challenges to girls’ attendance; engaging parents to ensure that girls get back to school; monthly reports on emerging issues for follow up; and mentoring girls on personal hygiene. Consequently, girls were able to get to school early, maintain personal hygiene and restart school for those who had dropped out. The aforementioned benefits consequently increased enrolment and retention of girls in school.

**School general assembly and parents’ committees:**
International Rescue Committee reinvigorated the School General Assembly and Parents’ Committees (COPAS). COPAS members’ capacities were strengthened throughout the implementation of the project to allow them to be better involved in school management during and after the project. They now participate effectively and will continue even after the project to participate in the determination of schools’ needs and management as many of the members testified during monitoring visits undertaken by project staffs. COPAS have been able to lead general assemblies to identify the needs of the school and acquired relevant skills that will be useful to them in their long-term involvement.
Working at system level

Working with girls, their communities and their schools from the beginning of the project with the aim of sustaining supportive activities needs to be complemented by work at system level if interventions to encourage and improve girls’ education are to be sustainable. This entails working to understand the political economy of support to education and girls’ empowerment, and working to address the appropriate players at the right time to influence this.

Working with government: If governments and local authorities are to be expected to sustain project approaches and, therefore, the gains achieved, they need to be able to replicate these approaches using their own systems and resources. A number of projects, for example, Education Development Trust and International Rescue Committee, worked through government systems to introduce essential elements such as new teaching approaches, instead of setting up their own parallel systems.

Influencing Policy: Some of the successful projects succeeded in proving the efficacy of a set of interventions on a small scale and then working to influence policy as a means of scaling up those interventions. Working closely with governments to influence policy was an essential element of Leonard Cheshire’s project in Kenya.

Working with government to influence policy: Leonard Cheshire, Kenya

Leonard Cheshire is leading on promoting inclusive education and has been instrumental in influencing the government to introduce three county bills critical to inclusive education (Bursary Bill, Disability Act and Early Childhood Education Bill). They have directly contributed to the integration of disability indicators into the government’s education monitoring system for decision making and resource allocation. They have contributed to the content and the orientation of training for new teachers, ensuring that an inclusive education component is included. At the national level, Leonard Cheshire has influenced and supported the development of the content of the National Sector Policy on Learners with Disability.

They have also contributed to the broadening of the mandate and resources of a Special Needs Directorate within the Ministry of Education. Leonard Cheshire attributes the success of their advocacy and sustainability approach to genuine and intentional engagement right from the start of the project, and to the clear aims it set out to achieve. The organisation describes ‘pushing on a half-open door’ and notes that its voice is one among several calling for change in this area, and actively seeks collaboration for maximum effectiveness.

However, even working closely with governments and local authorities, convincing them of the efficacy of a new approach and training their employees to use the approach is sometimes still not enough to ensure sustainability. As Link Community Development put it: “Some of the activities will be sustained by the educational authorities, because the project was embedded in the policy and structures of the Ministry of Education. This also allowed for scaling up where appropriate. However, the largest barrier in sustainable implementation of the project activities is limited funding to support future implementation and follow-up training.”

Endline report, Link Community Development

In Afghanistan, all of the GEC projects found that although the government was initially optimistic that they could take over project interventions this changed midway through the project, with the government informing projects that despite ‘a clear commitment of the Ministry of Education (MoE) to take over classes, and a clear handover process developed with the MoE’, the MoE would not be taking over the community-based education (CBE) classes in the foreseeable future. This was because the unit costs for the type of interventions that the projects were proposing were still too high for the government to take on. However, by working together as a group of GEC projects, supported by DFID advisers and the local donor group, projects in Afghanistan succeeded in influencing government policy around CBEs which sets out a framework and process for the institutionalisation of CBE in the long term. They also gained support from USAID which is contributing to funding of the next phase of GEC in Afghanistan. It is still to be seen whether projects can tailor their approach so that it can eventually come within the means of the Afghan government to take over.

Making girls’ education interventions sustainable means making them affordable, both for the girls and their families, and also for the government which ultimately has to provide the service. This often means working at levels which can influence fiscal space, budget allocation and budget utilisation. Although many of the GEC projects worked closely with government authorities, working at this level was only possible where there was close collaboration with DFID or other in-country donors who had possibilities to influence at that level.
"The most successful projects were open to constant learning from all of their stakeholders and ready to adapt using the lessons from that learning."
Conclusions

‘Success’ in the first phase of the GEC is represented by a range of different factors.

A completely successful project might be described as one which raised girls’ learning outcomes in both literacy and numeracy, increased girls’ attendance and retention in school, and put in place structures and resources that could sustain the gains made for the girls themselves and those that came after them. The projects included in this report were successful in some but not all of these areas.

Because of the different contexts and age ranges that were used across the GEC it is not possible to say definitively that what worked in one instance would necessarily have worked or would work in another. But there are enough instances where projects carried out similar activities and found similar effects to say that there are some common approaches which were successful and could likely be replicated and result in positive gains elsewhere.

Girls’ education is about what happens both in and out of school. Girls need teachers who are knowledgeable about their subject matter – what they have to teach – and about pedagogy – how to teach it best, and are also sensitive to the girls’ specific circumstances and how to be inclusive. Teachers themselves are key and need to be supported. Materials used for teaching and learning need to be appropriate, of high quality and kept relevant to girls’ and teachers’ circumstances. Communities, families and girls themselves should be encouraged and assisted to be agents of their own change. In general, successful projects manifest a desire to see girls educated to a good standard and thriving. Reforming education systems to be more aware of gender inequalities and able to address them is a ‘team sport’ and requires working in partnership at all levels from the girls themselves to policymakers. It also requires an awareness of the constraints at every level.

Perhaps the most important observation from examination of these projects is that the most successful ones were open to constant learning from all of their stakeholders and ready to adapt using the lessons from that learning. The challenge now is to design a system of support for these self-reflective, learning organisations that encourages adaptation without penalising ‘useful’ failure. This is a challenge as, at the same time, policymakers need to retain a high level of accountability to protect all stakeholders.

“Girls’ education is about what happens both in and out of school. Girls need teachers who are knowledgeable about their subject matter – what they have to teach – and about pedagogy – how to teach it best, and are also sensitive to the girls’ specific circumstances and how to be inclusive.”
Areas for further research

This exercise has been illuminating but as is often the case it has also raised more questions, some of which are listed below, and could be explored in the next phase of the GEC.

What can we learn from atypical GEC projects?
Two projects in the top six stood out as having increased learning and both were rated highly in their potential for sustainability. These were both atypical GEC projects due to the context in which they worked. Camfed International worked mainly at secondary level unlike most other GEC projects which tended to concentrate at primary. Leonard Cheshire was one of only two projects which worked primarily with girls with disabilities. Much has been learned from their experiences, but further research here would be useful to tease out why their approaches were particularly successful.

How best to tackle economic barriers to participation?
All projects within the GEC operated with girls whose families were poor. In a number of countries where GEC operated, school fees at primary level have been abolished. In some countries this also applies at secondary. In countries where school fees were officially applied, there needs to be a minimum provision for families to be able to afford the financial and opportunity costs of girls’ attending school and being educated. Many successful projects included an element of economic support in their interventions. Loans and savings clubs, various income generating activities and cash transfers were used. Some projects found these successful but not generally sustainable and many stated that the administration of these types of projects was outside of their experience. It would be useful to look further into some of the arguments which refute the appropriateness of an education project alone tackling poverty and to identify potential pathways to linking into wider social protection or livelihoods schemes, which would maximise education providers’ expertise and co-opt expertise in other areas as needed.

For a full discussion on poverty and its effects on the girls within the GEC, see the Evaluation Manager’s final report.

How best to tackle violence against girls and child protection?
Activities designed to address violence against children featured strongly amongst projects successful at raising attainment. However, in most cases, these activities were not seen as the main drivers of the Theory of Change and were classed in the interventions mapping as supplementary. Many projects added this aspect during the life of the project in response to baseline survey results or as a result of Fund Manager led reviews of their child protection policies and implementation. The activities concentrated on raising awareness amongst communities of the extent and types of violence against children, and in setting up mechanisms for reporting and referral for girls (and boys). Given that the process of maximising the safeguarding of children has evolved during the life of GEC, with many organisations not initially fulfilling GEC Minimum Standards for Child Protection, it is difficult to say with any conviction that these activities have been effective at increasing attendance and learning, despite some project reports beginning to point to this as a possibility.

On the whole, increasing access to education provides protection for vulnerable girls. However, there are specific circumstances in which girls must place themselves at greater risk in order to attend school, for example, if they have to board or if they have to lodge within the community close to their school in order to attend. Given the centrality of the need for child safeguarding and the high incidence of reported violence found at baseline against girls in school, whilst boarding, on the way to school and within the community, finding effective ways to address these should be a priority in work in the next phase of the GEC.

Did the successful projects in Afghanistan have the right combination of interventions in their particular context or was the fact that they largely operated outside of the government systems an important factor in their success?
Four out of the six projects which featured at the top of most analysis rankings (i.e. they raised learning outcomes in learning, increased attendance and scored well on the GESI continuum) were not seen as having established sustainable structures at school, community or system levels. These projects were all in Afghanistan and reasons for their lack of sustainability have been mentioned earlier. But it is worth noting that these projects all attained high learning outcomes for the girls they worked with.

They mostly operated outside government systems, introducing community-based education provision addressing the barriers of distance, insecurity and perceived low quality teaching in government schools. The organisations implementing these projects selected their own teachers, trained them using their own methods, supervised them themselves and apart from reporting regularly to government authorities, were less burdened by many of the constraints that other projects working inside government systems were sometimes subject to: poorly motivated and poorly trained teachers, low quality infrastructure, lack of teaching and learning materials etc. Full control over their own interventions may be the reason for the success of some projects and further research in this area would be useful to determine whether that is the case or whether it is their combination of interventions and their approaches that were the determining factor.
Annexes
### Annex 1: GEC phase one dataset drawn on in the paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead organisation(s)</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Funding window</th>
<th>Type of organisation</th>
<th>Number of beneficiary girls</th>
<th>Level of Schooling</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTED (Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development)</strong></td>
<td>Empowering Marginalised Girls in Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>15,024</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fragile state and low income country: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGES Consortium</strong></td>
<td>Steps Towards Afghan Girls’ Education Stages</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>Consortia</td>
<td>38,199</td>
<td>Pre-primary, primary and secondary</td>
<td>Fragile state and low income country: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avanti Communications</strong></td>
<td>The iMlango Project</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>56,561</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Lower-middle income country: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-Based Education for Marginalised Girls in Afghanistan</strong></td>
<td>Community-Based Education for Marginalised Girls in Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>150,100</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Fragile state and low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAC</strong></td>
<td>A Community-Based Approach: Supporting Retention, Re-entry and Improving Learning</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>15,314</td>
<td>Upper primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camfed International (Campaign for Female Education)</strong></td>
<td>Child Centred Schooling: Innovation for the Improvement of Learning Outcomes for Marginalised Girls in Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>6,967</td>
<td>Upper primary</td>
<td>Lower middle income: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camfed International (Campaign for Female Education)</strong></td>
<td>A New ’Equilibrium’ for Girls, Camfed International</td>
<td>Tanzania, Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>171,640</td>
<td>Lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income countries: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARE International (Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere)</strong></td>
<td>Kocabinta W waxbarashada Gadbaha – Somali Girls Education Promotion Programme (SOMGEP)</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>28,865</td>
<td>Primary and lower and upper secondary</td>
<td>Fragile state: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ChildFund International</strong></td>
<td>Equal Access to Education for Nomadic Populations in Northern Afghanistan</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>Lower primary</td>
<td>Fragile state and low income country: rural (nomadic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ChildHope</strong></td>
<td>Securing Access and Retention into Good Quality Transformative Education</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>17,773</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Coca-Cola company</strong></td>
<td>Educating Nigerian Girls in New Enterprises (ENGINE)</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>21,162</td>
<td>Upper secondary and vocational training</td>
<td>Low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheshire Services Uganda</strong></td>
<td>Supporting Slum and Homeless Street Girls with Disabilities in Kampala City to access quality Primary Education</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>Upper and lower primary</td>
<td>Low income country: urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery Learning Alliance</strong></td>
<td>Discovery Project</td>
<td>Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria</td>
<td>Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>302,627</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Lower middle income: mixed, ASAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eco-Fuel Africa</strong></td>
<td>Keeping Marginalised Girls in School by Economically Empowering their Parents</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>20,634</td>
<td>Lower and upper primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Development Trust</strong></td>
<td>Wasiichana Wote wasome (WWW- Let All Girls Read)</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>88,921</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Lower-middle income country: ASAL &amp; urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ericsson</strong></td>
<td>Mobile Broadband and Education</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>11,432</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Fragile, Low middle income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Poverty Action</strong></td>
<td>Rwandan Girls’ Education and Advancement Programme (REAP)</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>18,781</td>
<td>Upper and lower primary and secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: rural and peri-urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Help a Child</strong></td>
<td>What’s Up Girls!!</td>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>Lower and upper primary</td>
<td>Fragile state: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead organisation(s)</td>
<td>Project name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Funding window</td>
<td>Type of organisation</td>
<td>Number of beneficiary girls</td>
<td>Level of Schooling</td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Choose Life</td>
<td>Improved School Attendance and Learning for Vulnerable Kenyan Girls through an Integrated Intervention</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>47,236</td>
<td>Upper and lower primary and secondary</td>
<td>Lower-middle income country: rural &amp; urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Valorisation de la Scholarisation de la Fille (VAS-Y Fille!)</td>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>109,577</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Fragile state: rural and semi-urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link Community Development</td>
<td>Life Skills and Literacy for Improved Girls Learning in Rural/Wolaita Zone</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>51,801</td>
<td>Lower and upper primary</td>
<td>Low income country: rural, ASAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>Supporting the Education of Marginalised Girls in Kailali (STEM)</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>Upper primary and lower and upper secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity International</td>
<td>Innovating in Uganda to Support Educational Continuation by Marginalised Girls in relevant Primary and Secondary Education</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>INGO/Private sector approach</td>
<td>20,679</td>
<td>Primary and secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAS (Promoting Equality in African Schools)</td>
<td>Girls’ Enrolment, Access, Retention and Results (GEARR)</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO/network/social enterprise</td>
<td>6,760</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>Supporting Marginalised Girls in Sierra Leone to Complete Basic Education with Improved Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Sierraleone</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>18,139</td>
<td>Upper primary and lower secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising Voices</td>
<td>Good School Toolkit: Creating a Violence-Free and Gender Equitable learning Environment at School</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>17,280</td>
<td>Upper and lower primary</td>
<td>Low middle income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief International</td>
<td>Educate Girls, End Poverty</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>47,236</td>
<td>Lower and upper primary and secondary</td>
<td>Fragile state: mixed/ASAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save The Children UK</td>
<td>Pastoralist Afar Girls’ Education Support Projects (PAGES)</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>12,479</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Low income country: ASAL &amp; rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save The Children UK</td>
<td>Promoting Advancement of Girls’ Education in Mozambique (PAGE-M)</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>45,423</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Fragile, low income country: rural, ASAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre for a Change</td>
<td>Empowering Young Female Teachers to Create Inclusive Learning Environments for Marginalised Girls</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Upper primary</td>
<td>Low income country: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varkey Foundation</td>
<td>MCGcubed (Making Ghana Girls Great!)</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Foundation/Private Sector</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Low middle income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viva / CRANE</td>
<td>Creative Learning Centres (CLCs) for Girls aged 10-18 in Greater Kampala</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>7,481</td>
<td>Upper primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO (Voluntary Services Overseas)</td>
<td>The Business of Girls’ Education</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>Upper primary</td>
<td>Fragile, low income country: rural, ASAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO (Voluntary Services Overseas)</td>
<td>Sisters for Sisters’ Education in Nepal</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>9,404</td>
<td>Lower and upper primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>Improving Girls’ Access through Transforming Education (IGATE)</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>45,859</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Low income country: rural, ASAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUSC (World University Service of Canada)</td>
<td>Kenya Equity in Education Project (KEEP)</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Step Change</td>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>Primary and lower secondary</td>
<td>Lower middle income country: ASAL &amp; refugee camps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Methodology for this paper

Data for this paper were collected by the GEC from projects formally at baseline, midline and endline and between these formal points at quarterly intervals throughout the life of the projects as part of the regular monitoring process.

For this paper, project data was collated and analysed on:

- attainment in literacy, numeracy and attendance
- the degree to which projects had addressed gender issues
- the potential for sustainability of project gains.

Tools which had been developed for the second phase of GEC for organisations to assess their projects in terms of gender responsiveness and sustainability were used to inform this analysis. Commonalities are illustrated with examples from GEC projects.

There was a wide array of elements of success: Projects in which girls learned the most and which achieved significantly higher than their targets in literacy did not necessarily have the same achievements in numeracy and vice versa, and some projects succeeded in raising attendance but not learning. Some projects showed promising elements of work to transform gender relations but may have not met their targets for learning. Similarly there were some projects which set in place structures to sustain project interventions but did not meet all of their learning targets.

In order to identify what was successful, projects were scored against the following domains: literacy, numeracy, attendance, marginalisation, gender, sustainability and child protection. The literacy, numeracy and attendance scores were taken from the final evaluations. Projects were also scored against the GEC’s Gender and Social Inclusion and Sustainability frameworks. Eighteen projects emerged from this exercise as showing examples of good practice in one or more of these domains. Additionally, although there was no analysis on these in this paper, the domains of value for money which in the GEC includes equity, child protection, financial management and delivery (defined by average milestone achievement) are also considered.
Annex 3: Graph showing range of numeracy and literacy achievement

Each circle represents a GEC project. The size of each circle is proportionate to the number of project beneficiaries.
### Annex 4: Simulated example of a classroom observation schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Practice</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lesson Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Proportion of time teacher talking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Level of language used by teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ability to check understanding of students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Student Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Level of Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Use of teaching resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Punctuality of teacher and full use of lesson period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Appropriateness of language used</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Use of corporal punishment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Ability to maintain discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Equitable engagement of all students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Preparation for lesson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Knowledge of subject</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Ability to handle questions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Use of a variety of question techniques</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Level and appropriateness of questions asked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Marking and grading of homework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative score (out of 90)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% score</td>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Communities, families and girls themselves should be encouraged and assisted to be agents of their own change.”