GLOBAL CAMPAIGN FOR EDUCATION
www.campaignforeducation.org

Strengthening National Education Coalitions in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Middle East, Eastern Europe and Central Asia to Accelerate Progress towards EFA Targets of 2015

Proposal for the Board of the Global Partnership for Education
19th November 2012



GPE BOARD PAPER

- **A summary 8 page proposal is presented for a decision – the decision points are outlined at the end of the 8 page proposal.**
- **The detailed 32 page proposal is included for info for those who would like more detail. The specific proposal would be finalised with the agreed Supervising Entity bearing in mind any comments from the GPE Board**
- **Appendices on the project partners is attached for information. Appendices on the independent CSEF evaluation will be sent to GPE Board members once it is translated.**

This proposal is presented by GCE working in close partnership with: Africa Network Campaign for Education For All (ANCEFA), Asia- South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE), Arab Coalition for Education for All (ACEA), Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE), ActionAid International, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children International, VSO.

Contents

A. Summary Proposal **p3**

B. Main Proposal **p12**

1) Introduction p12
2) CSEF So Far p14
3) Approach/Activities p14
4) Project Objectives p18
5) Structure p21
6) Communications p22
7) Sustainability p23
8) Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning including timeline p24
9) Independent Evaluation of CSEF p29
10) Results Matrix p39
11) Proposed Budget p43

C. Appendices **p44**

I – The list of countries where national education civil society coalitions are participating (all GPE eligible countries) p43
II – Details on the Regional and Global partners p46
III- Independent CSEF evaluation (Concluding chapter) p56

A. Summary Proposal

Background to GPE's support for the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF)

The GPE has a strong emphasis on the inclusion of civil society in education sector dialogue, an emphasis evident both in stated policy and in approach. Recognising the contribution of civil society to ensuring the relevance, ownership and effectiveness of GPE-funded national education sector plans, GPE promotes civil society inclusion through reserving seats on the GPE Board, and in guidelines about country processes. But for civil society to participate meaningfully and effectively at the national level there is a need for more than just the opening of space. In recognition of this, the GPE has since 2009 been supporting the ***Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF)***, a low-cost but high-impact initiative to provide coalitions of civil society organisations and groups that are active in education with the financing and support to engage effectively in education sector policy dialogue at the national level, and to expand this dialogue by building the awareness and participation of citizens.

In late 2009 the CSEF project received its first grant for just over two years of capacity building and civil society education advocacy in 45 countries after the GPE Board allocated 17.1 m USD through the EPDF programme in response to an application made by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE). This completed at the end of 2011 and the Australian Government provided bridge funding for the project in 2012 to keep the momentum while the GPE-funded work was wrapped up and independently evaluated, and whilst the GPE clarified the delayed GRA processes, which were suggested as next source of funding for CSEF.

The closing reports and the external evaluation of this work highlight the significant impact that the CSEF has had in a very short space of time across the 45 countries. There has been a massive boost in capacity for national education coalitions to engage in GPE and wider national education reform processes, with greater and more diverse civil society membership, a big increase in the local and district presence of coalitions, increased participation of women in the leadership of coalitions and a greater number of coalitions engaged in formal spaces such as local education groups. The independent evaluation demonstrates that in just over 2 years this increased capacity and participation by civil society coalitions has led to a number of important policy and practice changes.

However this important work will end abruptly early next year unless the GPE Board meeting in Paris approves a new allocation for 2013-14.

What is being requested?

The Global Campaign for Education (GCE), together with its partners in this project (ActionAid International, ACEA, ANCEFA, ASPBAE, CLADE, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children International and VSO) are requesting 2 years of funding for 2013/2014 for $14.5 million. The GCE is also seeking an indication that the GPE Board views the support for national civil society education coalitions in partner countries as a core part of the GPE architecture.

Background to CSEF

The CSEF emerged from previous projects focusing on strengthening civil society participation and recommendations by a range of development partners, donors and INGOs. It is rooted in the understanding, shared by the GPE, that strong civil society participation – in planning, in monitoring of education service delivery, in ensuring accountability, in promoting the awareness and engagement of citizens in national education debates – is crucial to delivering the Education For All goals. In particular, it is crucial to reaching the most marginalised children who are currently excluded from school, to providing citizen feedback on the quality of education, and to strengthening education systems and the use of education financing through building greater accountability.

The CSEF promotes these functions through two interrelated approaches:

Direct funding to national civil society coalitions, made up of CSOs, parents' associations, community groups, teachers unions and other relevant civil society structures, to enable them to carry out the core functions of policy engagement, monitoring and awareness-raising.

Technical support to these coalitions, including through facilitating cross-country learning, provision of tools and information, direct training, and support to engage with civil society representatives.

The CSEF is coordinated globally by GCE, and regionally by the Arab Coalition on Education for All (ACEA), the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE), the Africa Network Campaign for Education for All (ANCEFA) and the Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE). Regional financial management is provided through Oxfam GB (Africa), Education International (Asia Pacific) and ActionAid (Latin America). Support and coordination of international INGOs will take place through an International Advisory Group whose current membership (still being finalised) is ActionAid International, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children Alliance, VSO and some individual experts.

What has CSEF achieved so far?

The CSEF made a significant impact in its first two years. It has provided an invaluable opportunity to support and strengthen civil society coalitions for mobilising citizen voice and public action to push for the attainment of the EFA goals and engage with governments and development partners, holding them to account on their commitments to education reforms and targets. There were significant achievements, which varied from country to country, from the strengthening of coalitions' institutional capacity and the building of broad-based memberships to extensive advocacy work to influence government spending, policies and legislative frameworks on education. Some key successes and achievements:

(i) Stronger and more broad-based civil society education coalitions worldwide

- Most coalitions are now legally registered, with strategic plans and sounder financial management systems in place, with enhanced representation on the ground and good recognition among decision-makers.
- CSEF supported the establishment of 9 new coalitions in its first two years, taking the number of CSEF-coalitions from 36 to 45.

- An enlarged and more diverse membership of civil society coalitions advocating on education in low income countries, with aggregate members' base of CSEF-funded coalitions increasing from 975 CSOs to 3375 during the course of the project.

(ii) Civil society networks with greater national reach to citizens

An increase in the local and district presence of coalitions to better ensure effective grassroots participation and an expansion of their co-ordinated work and practical engagement on the ground, with the number of these local structures increasing from 585 to 839 in two years.

(iii) Greater participation by women in the governance structures and leadership of coalitions

Most coalitions also saw a change in leadership through organising democratic elections and increased women's participation or assumption of leading roles. For example, in Asia the proportion of women on the Boards of National Education Coalitions increased from 29.6% to 42.3% in two years.

(iv) Increased level of civil society budget monitoring activities

Through the project period, a large number of civil society coalitions engaged their membership in budget tracking and 'Education Watch' tactics both at national and regional/district level, enabling civil society to influence the governance of national education sector activity. Several coalitions lobbied for enhanced budget allocation to education and in some situations this work helped to expose corruption and action being taken against mismanagement of sector resources.

(v) Strong engagement of coalitions in education sector planning and policy processes

Policy engagement by coalitions increased tremendously over the project period. Several coalitions were able to bring vital information and expertise into education sector policy dialogue through increased and more effective participation in LEGs, joint sector reviews and working groups. Many strengthened their ability to engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue, conduct policy analysis and formulate policy proposals. This increased capacity has translated into impact on policy and practice in a number of countries, with recognition of this by governments, parliamentarians and other partners, including, for example:

- **MEPT Mozambique:** Advocated for enhanced education for the vulnerable and neglected in the Education Sector Plan discussions, which was taken into account in the plan that was approved by GPE in 2010
- **CBDE Bolivia:** Influenced the new Education Law to take into consideration disabled people
- **COESI Solomon Islands:** Conducted comprehensive research on literacy and brought findings into discussions on new national literacy policy
- **Elimu Yetu Kenya:** Influenced major constitutional articles on the right to education in the constitutional amendment process
- **Foro Socioeducativo Dominican Republic:** Through budget watch uncovered government under-spending on education, which became centre of civil society campaign demanding accountability in spending

- **EFA-SL Sierra Leone:** Campaigns and lobbying work influenced government decision to increase education budget by almost 100%
- **COSYDEP, Senegal:** The coalition's role in mediating between the Ministry of Education and the teachers' unions has been recognised by the Minister as crucial in resolving disputes and strikes.
- **CAMPE Bangladesh:** Influenced the National Education Policy 2010 and raised collective voice for a comprehensive legislation to ensure right to education.

Overall, CSEF has provided an invaluable opportunity to support and strengthen civil society coalitions in mobilising citizens' voices in EFA debates, engaging with governments and development partners, and holding them to account for delivery of education services reforms.

CSEF Independent Evaluation

As part of the review of the first two years of the Civil Society Education Fund project, an independent evaluation was undertaken by a team led by the University of Barcelona. They were appointed in June and have recently completed their report. This will be circulated to the GPE Board once they complete translation in the second week in November. The concluding chapter is included as an appendix in the application and the last section is copied below. There are a number of key learning points from the evaluation and these points together with details of the changes being made in the project are included in the main proposal. In addition, there has been significant reflection and assessment at the national, regional and global level amongst those involved in CSEF and a further series of changes are proposed to improve the operation of the project.

> *"The CSEF programme has contributed to building stronger and more credible NECs [National Education Coalitions] in most countries that are part of the programme. Specifically, we have observed how NECs have improved substantially in terms of capacity building and advocacy, and have been able to design their own context-based strategy that, at the same time, is highly consistent with the global CSEF strategy. Furthermore, to a greater or lesser extent, coalitions have achieved political recognition in the contexts where they operate. However, the development of capacities in terms of research and knowledge management has been much more modest.*
>
> *The CSEF project was more consistently designed at the level of core processes (budget tracking, advocacy, etc.) than in terms of support processes (finance, human resources management, M&E, etc.). This made that several managerial issues that emerged while the project was being developed had to be solved ad hoc. Time constraints, uncertainty with the future of the programme and delays in funding delivery marked the trajectory of the project and, to some extent, the level of achievement of its goals.*
>
> *The institutional setting designed by the CSEF is sophisticated and could be set up in a very short time, despite the unfavorable circumstances just mentioned. The institutional design raised a set of principal-agent and coordination problems, many of which could be addressed during the project cycle through the proactive role and leadership of the regional organisations. Even then, these problems blurred the efforts to steer the whole organisation towards common objectives, especially in relation to those objectives that were more ambitious in nature like the establishment of national civil society funds.*
>
> *As this evaluation shows, the CSEF has contributed to civil society networks becoming key political agents in educational debates and have actively worked for the realisation of the right to*

'education for all', effecting significant national policy change in many world locations. However, the contribution of civil society to the EFA action framework does not need to be seen only in terms of aid effectiveness. Well-articulated and competent civil society networks can contribute to advance the EFA goals, but also to the democratisation of education politics at different levels. In relation to this, the CSEF has opened spaces for civil society organisations and individual citizens to have a say in education and to hold their governments to account.

The continuity of the CSEF programme should focus on developing capacities in terms of both advocacy and strategic management; strengthening and democratizing civil society networks; simplifying the (supra-national) institutional setting; promoting further international exchange and learning; and providing core financial support to NECs' strategies. "

Closing section of the final chapter on discussion and conclusions from the independent evaluation of CSEF

Key lessons learnt and changes to the project:

The revised proposal contains a number of changes to the project to address the points raised by the independent review and to address other learning from internal review processes. Key changes include:

A new Supervising Entity – we are presently in active discussions with GPE Board members who have indicated an interest in taking on the role of Supervising Entity for CSEF. We will update the Board on the status of this at the Board meeting in Paris.

Objectives more clearly aligned with the impact sought - The technical support and financing provided to national civil society through this project aims to achieve improvements in education policy, planning and delivery – ultimately getting more children into school, for a better education, including the most marginalised and vulnerable. Given this, it is felt that the project objectives and results matrix should more clearly focus and measure how civil society is trying to achieve this impact – through greater participation, public engagement, quality contributions, etc – rather than, as in the initial project, focussing and measuring the capacity-building and coalition strengthening in itself.

Stronger systems and wider partnerships at the global level - To enhance co-ordination and maximise support mechanisms to civil society we have created two stronger fora at the global level. An International Advisory Committee will constitute a wider range of international civil society organisations in this important project and we expect this to lead to greater INGO engagement and enhanced and more co-ordinated technical support to civil society, building on existing management and expertise. We are also envisaging that a greater diversity of actors will be engaged to take in or on the roles of Funding Committees and Regional Fund Management Agencies over time. The likely members of this International Committee are ActionAid International, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children International, VSO and also individual experts.

We have also created a separate global group of the GCE Board to oversee the programme on behalf of GCE, to ensure full separation from those who are potential beneficiaries as national or regional

partners and to provide an extra level of accountability on the regional partner reports and proposals.

Greater emphasis on monitoring, evaluation and learning – the new project has strategic objectives and detailed indicators elaborated and defined through consultations with all stakeholders involved in CSEF, including regional partners and national coalitions. This has resulted in a clearer and more measurable results matrix on which annual results report will be produced and published online.

Improved communications, south-south learning and collaboration – the new project includes enhanced human resources on communications and learning, boosted by an expanded budget. As well as an improved online presence, several new resources are being planned in the five languages CSEF works in (English, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Arabic). GCE will collaborate with the supervising entity to ensure that the GPE Board is kept regularly updated on the progress of the project.

To build capacity, alliances and partnerships, a greater emphasis has been put on regional advocacy events, capacity building activities and inter-regional activities and learning.

Greater emphasis on supporting civil society engagement in GPE processes and Local Education Groups– The focus on citizens' participation was always a key aspect to the original conception of CSEF. While some impressive results were recorded, it is clear that further capacity building and emphasis is needed in this area in a number of countries. Therefore, quality participation is an integral part of the objectives of CSEF. Building on some useful work this year through the CSEF Bridge funds and the GIZ *Back Up* initiative we plan to do more intensive work to support the engagement of coalitions in Local Education Groups and providing more direct assistance and facilitation to the elected GPE civil society representatives for developing countries to improve meaningful engagement from the national level.

A new proposal for sustainability – in line with feedback from the independent evaluation and the GPE Secretariat – we are proposing a revised and more realistic sustainability strategy that embeds CSEF in the architecture of GPE. In the past 3 years CSEF has helped to put GPE ahead of the curve compared to other global initiatives when looking at civil society engagement as conceived by the aid effectiveness agenda laid out in Paris, Accra and Busan. However, as highlighted by the evaluation, providing support to such work in the form of short term project funding creates many challenges and a longer term predictability of this support would lead to significant improvements. **We therefore propose that the GPE Board makes an indicative commitment of 1% of any future replenishment to guarantee effective and coordinated civil society engagement in GPE processes**. We commit to continuing critical review and independent evaluation of the CSEF mechanism to ensure that it is fit for purpose to deliver this effective engagement. We will also continue to support national education coalitions strengthen their ability to raise funds and develop quality fundraising strategies and plans.

Project objectives

The overall aim of the CSEF in 2013/2014 is **to advance the achievement of education goals by ensuring the effective participation of civil society in education reforms and sector planning and review.**

- Participation: stronger and better recognised civil society participation in official processes of education sector planning and monitoring
- Public awareness & engagement: widespread and grassroots citizen awareness of and engagement in education debates and processes
- Quality contributions: relevant and effective civil society research and analysis of current or proposed policies, financing and practice in the education sector
- Knowledge and networks: strong civil society engagement through cross-country learning, capacity-building, and linkages to global policy processes.

This leads to the following four specific objectives:

Objective 1: Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized. The CSEF project seeks to support coalitions to:

- Participate as full partners in LEGs, Coordinating Committee Meetings or similar multi-partner structures for planning and review in the education sector.
- Participate in and contribute to policy forums organized by the government or its technical and financial partners.
- Take part in education planning & review committees, education reform task forces, technical working groups, and joint partners review missions organized by LEGs together with other sector players, where decisions pertaining to education policy issues are discussed and agreed upon.
- Engage with individual parliamentarians and relevant parliamentary groups, including participation in parliamentary hearings, providing relevant information to parliamentarians, and supporting or coordinating parliamentary events.

Objective 2: National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate. In 2013-2014 coalitions plan to build on this through activities including:

- Public awareness campaigns on key aspects of education policy, including production of user-friendly guides, community-level meetings, mobilising social media and media campaigns with a focus on radio other audio-visual mechanisms and community engagement
- Budget awareness work, including publication of accessible guides to education budgets and coordinated work to track spending in practice
- Establishment or strengthening of provincial, county, district-level networks on EFA
- Stronger participation of marginalised groups in civil society coalitions
- Training sessions for CSO staff, community members, parents and students in education issues, social audits, budget tracking, etc
- Collaboration with other social movement groups

Objective 3: Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals. In 2013-2014, CSEF-funded coalitions plan to expand this through the following activities:

- Community-based research and analysis of trends, practices and gaps in education sector service delivery, budgets and resource allocation – including school and district-based performance cards and social audits

- Community-based analysis of education sector laws and policy frameworks, including relevance for different social groups
- District and national level surveys on education priorities
- Community-based monitoring of the allocation and use of donor support in the education sector
- Civil society tracking and reports on governance focused on transparency & accountability in the education sector.

Objective 4: The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes. This will include:

- Regional and global publications and toolkits documenting and sharing evidence and lessons of good practice from CSEF-funded coalitions
- Regular communication for all CSEF coalitions, sharing news from GPE and from other coalitions.
- Support for coalitions to share their information online and via publications
- Coordinated capacity-building support from regional secretariats, GCE and INGO and individual expert members of the International Advisory Committee, in response to coalitions' own stated needs.
- Global and regional learning platforms.
- Support to GPE civil society reps to consult effectively with CSEF-funded coalitions, in 5 languages.
- Learning visits and job shadowing
- Facilitate and influence EFA Post - 2015 Civil Society processes at country and regional levels and engagement in global initiatives like "Education First".

Project budget

The project seeks $14.5m for 2013 and 2014 – with $6.67m for Africa, $ 3.72m for the Asia-Pacific, $1.12m for Latin America, $1.33m for Middle East, Europe and Central Asia and $1.65m for global management, activities and inter-regional learning.

GPE BOARD DECISIONS REQUESTED:

1. The Board of Directors allocates US$14.5 million from the Global Partnership for Education Fund (the "GPE Fund") to a Managing Entity, to be appointed by end December 2012, for an implementation period of two years commencing in 2013, in order to support the work of national civil society education coalitions in countries eligible for program implementation grants from the GPE Fund, as set out in the proposal presented by civil society at the meeting of the Board of Directors on 19-20 November 2012. This allocation is not subject to the procedures approved in the Global and Regional Activities ("GRA") Operational Manual and shall be considered as:
Option 1: additional to the US$60 million currently projected for GRA program purposes over the 2012-2014 period; or
Option 2: part of the US$60 million that is currently projected for GRA program purposes over the 2012-2014 period.

2. The Board of Directors agrees that continuing support for strategic civil society engagement shall

be built into future replenishment of the GPE Fund, with an indicative amount of 1% of future funds being allocated for a civil society education fund.

B. MAIN PROPOSAL

1. Introduction

"The Global Partnership will support greater civil society, teaching profession, and private sector and private foundation involvement in LEGs and in policy dialogue at the country level."

GPE Strategic Plan 2012-2015

The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is a unique initiative. One, crucial, aspect in which it is unique is its full engagement of civil society alongside other partners in efforts to achieve Education For All. The GPE strategic plan, country level process guide and governing documents all make clear the necessity of including civil society in order to ensure the ownership and relevance of the national education sector plans supported by GPE partners. Despite the strong and coordinated efforts of GPE partners over 10 years, there are still 132 million children missing out on primary and lower secondary school, poor quality schooling which denies many millions more their right to education, and continued marginalization of vulnerable groups, including those in conflict-affected areas. Faced with these problems that have remained stubbornly resistant to global efforts so far, it is crucial that the voices of those affected are heard, and that they are able to express their priorities and their experiences in ways that are heard by policy makers. This requires broad-based and effective civil society participation.

The GPE has been working to ensure this participation through various means. It has done much to secure space for civil society in relevant processes both through inclusion of civil society representatives on the Board, and through guidelines about country processes. But for civil society to participate meaningfully and effectively, there is need for more than just the opening of space. In recognition of this, the GPE has since 2009 been supporting the Civil Society Education Fund, a low-cost but high-impact initiative to provide national civil society education coalitions with the financing and support to engage effectively in education sector policy dialogue, and to expand this dialogue by building the awareness and participation of citizens. . In response to a proposal submitted by the Global Campaign for Education in 2008, GPE (then FTI) allocated $17.1 million for support of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) through the previous Education Program Development Fund (EPDF), which began flowing in late 2009.

The CSEF has been managed as a joint project by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE), the Africa Network Campaign for Education For All (ANCEFA), the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE), the Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE), working with ActionAid International, Education International and Oxfam. In total, civil society coalitions in 45 FTI-eligible countries received funding and support through CSEF. The positive impact of CSEF-funded civil society engagement has been recognized by education ministries,

parliamentarians and other partners in, for example, Bangladesh, Mozambique, Papua New Guinea and Senegal. (See section 3 for more details).

After two and a half years of funding from the EPDF window of the FTI/GPE, AusAid, a member of the GPE partnership, stepped up to provide one year of bridge funding for CSEF to allow for civil society work to be sustained while the initial project underwent a thorough evaluation and the organisations involved in CSEF, together with other civil society partners, worked to produce a plan for the continuation of CSEF through 2013 and 2014. In light of the experience with CSEF since 2009, some structural changes have been proposed, including greater integration of INGO partners who are also working to strengthen civil society participation in policy processes and an additional committee performing project and financial oversight at the global level. The objectives and activities of the project have been realigned to goals and principles outlined in the GPE strategic plan 2012-2015, as well as based on broad-based consultation with national and regional actors involved in the project. The objectives focus on civil society participation, engagement of the grassroots, effective community-based research and analysis, and learning and sharing through cross-border partnerships. (See section 4 for more details.)

Given the centrality of civil society engagement in EFA and specifically in the work of GPE, we now propose that the CSEF be funded from GPE core funds over the next two years, with a total amount of $14.5 million for the period 2013-2014. We further recommend that the GPE Board agrees that continuing support for strategic civil society engagement should be built into future replenishment with an indicative amount of 1% of future funds being earmarked for a civil society education fund. Funding at this level represents a very small fraction of GPE's funds, but has an outsize impact in terms of fostering citizen engagement in the urgent challenges of getting every child into school, , ensuring a good quality education for all, and reaching the most marginalised.

Funding request to GPE:

GCE, together with its partners in this project (ActionAid International, ACEA, ANCEFA, ASPBAE, CLADE, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children International and VSO) are requesting 2 years of funding for CSEF in 2013/2014, amounting to $14.5 million. The GCE is also seeking an indication that the GPE Board views the support for national civil society education coalitions in partner countries as a core part of the GPE architecture.

2. The CSEF Approach

The CSEF approaches this work of stronger civil society engagement through two linked approaches:

Direct funding to national coalitions, made up of CSOs active in education, parents' associations, community groups, teachers' unions and other relevant civil society structures, to enable them to carry out the core functions of policy engagement, monitoring, and awareness-raising. Independent regional finance committees in each region decide the allocation of grants on the basis of the plans and performance of the national coalitions; grants are then managed by a Regional Financial Management Agency (a different INGO in each region with strong financial management capabilities).

Technical support to these coalitions, including through facilitating cross-country learning, provision of relevant tools and information to support national advocacy, direct training and capacity-building, and support to engage with civil society representatives on the GPE Board. This is coordinated internationally by GCE as the global secretariat together with the new International Advisory Committee (ActionAid, Education International, Ibis, Oxfam, Plan International, Save the Children and VSO) and led at regional level by the regional secretariats (ACEA, ANCEFA, ASPBAE, CLADE) working with members of the International Advisory Committee in their region where necessary, and coordinating with the Regional Fund Management Agency to build capacity on financial management.

The approach we are taking for civil society reflects the GPE emphasis on country-led processes and civil society values of national ownership, in that each coalition produces its own plans based on country need and context. Capacity building, technical support and accompaniment will also be tailored to national plans.

3. CSEF so far

Building on previous successful projects focusing on strengthening civil society participation as well as on recommendations made by a range of development partners, donors and INGOs, the GCE was encouraged to seek multilateral funding for its work building the capacity of civil society across Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. Funding was confirmed for the new Civil Society Education Funds in 2009. CSEF was established as a global initiative designed to ensure that civil society organisations can collectively and fully assume their rightful roles in in-country EFA processes as spelt out in the Dakar Framework for Action.

With a focus on FTI country processes, CSEF supported civil society in 45 countries from October 2009 to December 2011 to engage in dialogue with both governments and donors to influence national spending priorities and plans on education. Funded by the Fast Track Initiative (FTI), now the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), CSEF provided financial and technical support to

National Education Coalitions in low-income countries across Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America.

In 2012, GCE was granted a one-year bridge fund from AusAid , allowing coalitions to build on the momentum of their advocacy work until new and long-term multilateral funding for civil society advocacy work was agreed. During the course of 2012 the initial two and a quarter years of CSEF national activity was independently evaluated. This evaluation and the lessons learned during the initial implementation period have been used to adjust and strengthen the programme as it is set out in this proposal.

Over the first two years, CSEF has delivered significant impact and proven a considerable return on funds invested in civil society education advocacy. GCE wishes to build on this initial success and proposes that the principle of allocating a small proportion of GPE funds to civil society to help monitor and advocate on national government plans is included in the core architecture of the GPE.

The original CSEF objectives:

i. Building and strengthening the institutional capacity of broad-based and democratically run National Education Coalitions.
ii. Supporting the core work of National Education Coalitions so that civil society are enabled to effectively engage with and track national governments and donors in working towards Education For All.
iii. Supporting National Education Coalitions to set up credible and independent funding structures taking the shape of National Civil Society Education Funds.

Examples of CSEF successes and achievements:

The first phase of the CSEF project ("CSEF") provided an invaluable opportunity to support and strengthen civil society coalitions for mobilizing citizen voice and public action to push for the attainment of the EFA goals and engage with governments and development partners, holding them to account on their commitments to education reforms and targets. There were significant achievements, which varied from country to country, from the strengthening of coalitions' institutional capacity and the building of broad-based memberships to extensive advocacy work to influence government spending, policies and legislative frameworks on education. Some key successes and achievements:

(i) Stronger and more broad-based civil society education coalitions

A key aspect of CSEF was to build broad-based and credible coalitions. Through workshops, learning platforms, and field visits by regional secretariats, fund managers or GCE, coalition secretariats and members developed stronger capacity in areas such as monitoring and evaluation, financial management, policy advocacy, communication and resource mobilisation. Most coalitions are now legally registered, with strategic plans and sounder financial management systems in place. This has

led to more knowledgeable and credible movements with enhanced representation on the ground and recognition among decision-makers. **CSEF also supported the establishment of 9 new coalitions in its first two years**, taking the number of CSEF-coalitions from 36 to 45.

There was a substantial expansion of coalition memberships due to CSEF, in terms of numbers, the nature of organisations involved and the reach of these organisations to all regions and districts of the country. This has led to stronger and more vibrant civil society movements overall. Most civil society education coalitions now include in their memberships a variety of national NGOs, in some cases international NGOs, community/ district organisations, teacher unions, parents associations, women's groups, and activists. The table below paints a picture of commendable growth in the membership of coalitions, which overall more than doubled through the 2 year project period of CSEF.

Table 1: Growth in coalition breadth/membership

Country	Year of establishment	No. of members as at year of establishment	No. of members in 2011
Bangladesh	1999	15	234
Bolivia	2009	7	200
Cambodia	2001	17	160
Ghana	1999	10	300
Malawi	2000	7	75
All 45 coalitions	**-**	**975**	**3375**

(ii) Civil society networks with greater national reach

During the CSEF period, a good number of education coalitions established branches or formed local networks in order to ensure that they had effective grassroots engagement throughout the country, and a reach beyond capital cities. The table below demonstrates significant increases in the coverage of district and county level networks overall and for three sample countries. This increase in representation, led to greater participation and recognition of grassroots voices in debates on national policy issues. Many coalitions trained the members of these local networks in participatory budget and expenditure monitoring and analysis, which helped improving accountability in education programmes and school management at regional/community level.

Table 2. Number of district/provincial networks/branches of the coalition

NEC	Baseline (2009)	1 year (2010)	2 year (2011)
Kenya	15	21	27
Bolivia	0	2	6
Nepal	2	19	25
All 45 coalitions	**585**	**707**	**839**

(iii) Greater participation of women in civil society education coalitions, particularly in leadership positions

Through CSEF coalitions were supported to strengthen their governance structures, resulting in regular and frequent general assemblies, membership gatherings and board meetings, improved information-sharing and more inclusive decision-making processes with members. Most coalitions also saw a change in leadership through organizing democratic elections and more women participating in the coalitions' activities or taking on leadership roles. For example, **in Asia the proportion of women on the Boards of national civil society education coalitions increased from 29.6% to 42.3% in the first two years**.

(v) Increased level of civil society budget monitoring activities

Through the project period, a large number of civil society coalitions engaged their membership in budget tracking and 'Education Watch' tactics both at national and regional/district level, enabling civil society to influence the governance of national education sector activity. Several coalitions lobbied for enhanced budget allocation to education and in some situations this work helped to expose corruption and action being taken against mismanagement of sector resources.

(v) More effective engagement of national civil society in education sector planning and policy processes

Policy engagement by CSEF-funded coalitions increased tremendously over the project period. Several coalitions were able to bring vital information and expertise into education sector policy dialogue through increased and more effective participation in LEGs, joint reviews and working groups. Many strengthened their ability to engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue, conduct policy analysis and formulate policy proposals. These factors lead to a strengthened position with decision makers, which included in a number of cases the signing of formal MoUs with education ministries; contributions to significant policy and legislative change; and a boost in the debate on EFA through increased citizen participation. Several coalitions also launched 'watchdog' projects, through which they monitored government budgets, expenditure and implementation of programs, and used findings to argue for increased and enhanced spending on education.

The ultimate aim of strengthening civil society coalitions is to enable them to help secure policy and practice change. Through provision both of direct funding and of technical support and capacity-building, CSEF yielded numerous examples of policy influence by coalitions through CSEF, including:

- **CBDE, Bolivia:** Influenced the new Education Law to take into consideration disabled people
- **Foro Socioeducativo, Dominican Republic:** Through budget watch uncovered government underspending on education, which became centre of civil society campaign demanding accountability in spending
- **Elimu Yetu, Kenya:** Influenced major constitutional articles on the right to education in the constitutional amendment process

- **MEPT, Mozambique:** Advocated for enhanced education for the vulnerable and neglected in the Education Sector Plan discussions, which was taken into account in the plan that was approved by GPE in 2010
- **EFA-SL Sierra Leone:** Campaigns and lobbying work influenced government decision to increase education budget with almost 100%
- **COSYDEP, Senegal:** The coalition's role in mediating between the Ministry of Education and the teachers' unions has been recognized by the Minister as crucial in resolving disputes and strikes.
- **COESI, Solomon Islands:** Conducted comprehensive research on literacy and brought findings into discussions on new national literacy policy
- **CAMPE Bangladesh:** Influenced the National Education Policy 2010 and raised collective voice for a comprehensive legislation to ensure right to education.

4. Objectives and activities for 2013-2014

The overall aim of the CSEF is to advance the achievement of education goals by ensuring the effective participation of civil society – not just formal civil society organisations, but citizens more broadly – in education debates and sector planning and review.

- **Participation**: stronger and better recognized civil society participation in official processes of education sector planning and monitoring
- **Public awareness & engagement**: widespread and grassroots citizen awareness of and engagement in education debates and processes
- **High quality contributions**: relevant and effective civil society research and analysis of current or proposed policies, financing and practice in the education sector
- **Knowledge and networks**: strong civil society engagement through cross-country learning, capacity-building, and linkages to global policy processes

In producing this project outline, GCE requested coalitions in CSEF-eligible countries to give indications of planned activities and focus issues during the period 2013-2014. Their responses have been summarised to produce the planned activities indicated below.

Participation

"*The participation of all partners—including donors, multilateral agencies, civil society groups, and the private sector and private foundations—in developing the education plan is important so that it reflects common goals at the country level."*
GPE Strategic Plan 2012-2015

Objective 1: Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized.

Civil society engagement with policy-makers – elected officials, non-elected officials, parliamentarians and donor representatives – is crucial to ensuring that citizen voices are brought to bear in policy processes. This includes, but is not limited to, engagement with formal structures such

as Local Education Groups, Technical Working Groups, etc. During the course of CSEF so far, many coalitions have worked to establish credible, trusted and functional links with such structures, which has greatly advanced their ability to positively influence policy processes. However, there remains a long way to go in building a recognized role for civil society in formal planning processes, as well as strengthening links to parliamentarians. This is partly about the space allowed to civil society, but also about their capacity to engage. Through both the funding approach and the technical support approach, the CSEF project seeks to support coalitions to:

- Participate as full partners in LEGs, Coordinating Committee Meetings or similar multi-partner structures for planning and review in the education sector.
- Participate in and contribute to policy forums organized by the government or its technical and financial partners.
- Take part in education planning & review committees, education reform task forces, technical working groups, and joint partners review missions organized by LEGs together with other sector players, where decisions relating to education policy are discussed and agreed.
-
- Engage with individual parliamentarians and relevant parliamentary groups, including participation in parliamentary hearings, providing relevant information to parliamentarians, and supporting or coordinating parliamentary events.

Public awareness and engagement

"The meaningful inclusion of civil society, including international nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), local NGOs and associations, teacher unions, and community- based organisations and local stakeholder groups such as parents and students, will require greater and more timely participation of those partners in developing national education plans, program implementation grant applications, and joint sector reviews……Effective LEGs have goals agreed with developing country partner governments that are broadly supported by an informed public."
GPE Strategic Plan 2012-2015

Objective 2: National education coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate.

CSEF-funded coalitions include many members who are close to local communities and service users – particularly marginalised groups – enabling them to bring real-life stories, grassroots experiences and raw data to bear on national policy processes and planning debates. CSEF has so far enabled coalitions to strengthen these grassroots links, as well as improve interaction and collaboration between different CSO actors working on education issues, including teacher unions, parents' organisations, child rights organisations, and others, thus broadening participation. In 2013-2014 coalitions plan to build on this through activities including:

- Public awareness campaigns on key aspects of education policy, including production of user-friendly guides, community-level meetings, mobilising social media and media campaigns with a focus on radio, other audio-visual mechanisms and community engagement. Budget awareness

work, including publication of accessible guides to education budgets and coordinated work to track spending in practice.
- Establishment or strengthening of provincial, county district-level networks on EFA
- Stronger participation of marginalised groups in civil society coalitions
- Training sessions for CSO staff, community members, parents and students in education issues, social audits, budget tracking, etc.
- Collaboration with other social movement groups

High quality contributions

"The Global Partnership can help promote national education strategies that respond to community needs and that empower local actors to demand and monitor the implementation of quality education services."
GPE Strategic Plan 2012-2015

Objective 3: Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals.

It is not enough for civil society coalitions simply to build community awareness and facilitate community engagement: they must be able to use their network and their access to communities to produce effective, relevant and well-targeted research, policy analysis and proposals. The national presence of civil society groups, their links to communities and their role as citizen advocates places them uniquely well to complement the technical policy work of the government and its official partners with research and analysis rooted in social audits and community-based evaluation and monitoring. During the course of CSEF, the use of performance and accountability scorecards at school, district and national levels to track expenditure patterns and monitor actual service delivery has increased tremendously, proving to be a good way of collecting evidence for advocacy in Asia, Latin America and Africa. (Work done by Elimu Yetu and its members in Kenya is just one example.) In 2013-2014, CSEF-funded coalitions plan to expand this through the following activities:

- Community-based research and analysis of trends, practices and gaps in education sector service delivery, budgets and resource allocation – including school and district-based performance cards and social audits
- Community-based analysis of education sector laws and policy frameworks, including relevance for different social groups
- District and national level surveys on education priorities
- Community-based monitoring of the allocation and use of donor support in the education sector
- Civil society tracking and reports on governance focused on transparency & accountability in the education sector.

Knowledge and networks

"Overall greater focus will be placed on knowledge sharing and lessons learned."
GPE Strategic Plan 2012-2015

Objective 4: The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes.

To function effectively, national education coalitions cannot work in isolation. The sharing of experiences and best practice across borders has had a significant impact in improving practice during the course of CSEF so far. We are now seeking to build on this by better integrating support and accompaniment from INGO partners, and by better linking national coalitions to GPE and other policy processes at global level. This will include:

- Regional and global publications and toolkits documenting and sharing evidence and lessons of good practice from CSEF-funded coalitions.
- Regular communication for all CSEF coalitions, sharing news from GPE and from other coalitions.
- Support for coalitions to share their information online and via publications.
- Coordinated capacity-building support from regional secretariats, GCE, individual experts and INGO members of the International Advisory Committee, in response to coalitions' own stated needs.
- Global and regional learning platforms.
- Support to GPE civil society representatives to consult effectively with CSEF-funded coalitions, in 5 languages.
- Learning visits and job shadowing
- Facilitate and influence EFA Post - 2015 Civil Society processes at country and regional levels and engagement in global initiatives like "Education First".

5. Structure

The CSEF project aims to showcase a best practice approach of how civil society can manage projects in a transparent, organised and effective way.

Regional governance and management

The project is split up into four distinct regions (Africa, Asia –Pacific, Latin America and the Middle East, Europe and Central Asia) and within each region there are three main actors:

The **Regional Funding Committees** include independent experts on education and civil society in the region. This committee evaluates the quality of the proposals and reports from national education coalitions, and decides the allocation of grants accordingly.

The **Regional Financial Management Agencies** (one in each region) are international civil society agencies which have strong international financial systems in place. They manage the actual transfer of funds to the national level and are responsible for assessing the financial and audit reports before further payments are released. In coordination with Regional Secretariats, and as needed in each region, they also build the capacity of national coalitions in financial management.

The **Regional Secretariats** play a key capacity support role to national coalitions including assistance in developing strong national advocacy plans, coordinating capacity-building and knowledge-sharing

within their region, and undertaking some regional advocacy on Education for All. They are the main contacts for the national education coalitions and to review and assess national education plans. They act as the Secretariat for the Regional Funding Committee, but do not determine the level of the grant and do not transfer any funds.

Global governance and management

The **Global Secretariat** for the project is provided by GCE. It has responsibility at the global level for ensuring the project is running well, that reports are completed on time and to a high standard. It coordinates inter-regional learning and knowledge-sharing – including the provision of relevant tools and regular updates – and works with Regional Secretariats and INGO partners to assist with regional capacity building. In addition, GCE manages the monitoring and evaluation system, helps communicate the work of CSEF and compiles all of the different reports in to an annual overarching global report on progress for the Supervising Entity. GCE will act as the Secretariat for both the committees active at global level (the International Advisory Committee and the CSEF Coordination Group).

The **International Advisory Committee**, a new structure in this second phase, brings together a wider group of international NGOs and individual experts involved in education advocacy**.** Whilst the initial project bought together a broad range of civil society actors at the national level in 45 countries it did not involve many international civil society groups working on education. It is expected the committee will involve a broad range of international members including ActionAid International, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children International and VSO.

The **CSEF Co-ordination group**, also a new structure for this phase, is a structure comprised of those organisations on the GCE Board who do not receive funds through it, to ensure separation of responsibilities and a sufficient degree of checks and balances that eliminates (or minimises) potential conflicts of interest. They will provide project oversight, and lead on any financial decisions to ensure the GCE Global secretariat can focus on the capacity building and support for regional and national coalitions (another learning point from the reviews after the first phase of CSEF).

More details on all of the partners are provided in Appendix II.

6. Communications and learning

In line with the feedback from the GPE Secretariat and the independent evaluation, we are proposing an enhanced focus on communications, learning and knowledge-sharing in CSEF. There is the development of specific global capacity and an increase in the communications budget to ensure that the results and learning from the project is shared to the wider education community including other national education coalitions. CSEF aims to inspire, inform and share learning among a variety of stakeholders and as such we have incorporated communications into the new objectives for the project (*CSEF objective 4 – building the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the*

education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes) and the general strategies of the project.

CSEF communications approaches:

- *Strengthening of coalitions' communications strategies and skills* based on the recognition of communication as a vital advocacy tool, both in terms of effectively communicating information to decision-makers, increasing citizens' awareness, and facilitating public dialogue. Methods: Training and capacity building workshops, guidelines and toolkits, media engagement and radio programs.

- *South-south learning and collaboration* by taking advantage of the complexity of actors and organisations involved in CSEF and the variety of work they do, to draw lessons and examples of good practice for sharing among civil society partners across the world. In addition, the linkage of coalitions through joint campaigning and collaboration can facilitate exchange and strengthen the global EFA movement. Methods: Collaborative projects, strengthening joint campaigns, engagement in the GPE, online discussion forums and resource library, documentation/dissemination.

- *Highlighting the role of civil society engagement in policy development and implementation* as vital for educational development. Methods: Civil society advocacy initiatives for enhanced participation through strategic communication, alliances and dialogue with GPE, donors and INGOs, national, local/community based organisations and teacher unions.

- *External communication of results and impact* to create awareness, build partnerships, and ensure sustained financial support for civil society. Methods: Annual Impact Reports, Stakeholder analysis, donor meetings, presentation of achievements in strategic forums, production of publications and films, partnerships with INGOs and academic institutions/foundations, resource mobilisation plans.

- *Effective internal communication* is key for the internal running of coalitions as well as for the CSEF project as a whole. Methods: Information sharing, broad-based consultations, inclusive dialogue, participatory and transparent decision-making processes and online discussion forums.

7. Sustainability

Strong civil society engagement in education sector policy and monitoring processes in low-income countries is a vital part of achieving Education for All. In the past 3 years, CSEF – by both financing and building the capacity of collaborative civil society engagement in the education sector – has helped to put GPE ahead of the curve compared to other global initiatives in terms of civil society engagement as conceived by the aid effectiveness agenda laid out in Paris, Accra and Busan. Ongoing support to improve capacity for and sustain this engagement should be seen as a core part of the architecture of GPE.

However, as highlighted by the evaluation of the first two years of CSEF, supporting this kind of work through short-term project-style funding creates many challenges, particularly in relation to the impact of unpredictability on civil society capacity (including staffing) and approach, and the distorting of civil society objectives and workplans to fit short-term frameworks. The evaluation is clear that longer-term and more predictable support would lead to significant improvements.

We therefore propose that the GPE Board makes an indicative commitment of 1% of any future replenishment to guarantee effective and coordinated civil society engagement in GPE processes. This represents a very small proportion of GPE funding, in order to guarantee participation of an extremely important constituency in the collaborative work of achieving EFA.

As the civil society groups involved in managing CSEF, we commit to continuing critical review and independent evaluation of the CSEF mechanism to ensure that it is fit for purpose to deliver this effective engagement. Actual allocations to civil society engagement through the CSEF would be subject to review and periodic renewal, as with country grants. At the same time we will continue supporting national education coalitions to strengthen their ability to raise funds and to develop quality fundraising strategies and plans. A key lesson learned in the first phase of CSEF is that such efforts need to be tailored to individual country contexts, rather than through a particular model (eg the "National CSEFs" promoted in the first phase). Moreover, it has become clear that the clearest route to sustainability for coalitions is to support their further development as legitimate, effective and well-recognized actors, who are thus better able to raise funds independently.

The modelling around National Civil Society Education Funds was the least successful aspect of the original two years of the CSEF programme and we are proposing a different approach in 2013/14 based around the following three objectives:

- To support education advocacy coalitions to attract greater funds outside the CSEF project. As such one area in the results framework is to monitor the the percentage of funding CSEF provides to education coalitions over the next two years to ensure it does not increase and to try and reduce it gradually in countries where it is the highest.
- To ensure that the at least three new national education coalitions in countries emerging from conflict receive particular support to establish strong systems and a strong reputation to raise funds from alternative sources within two years of receiving funds through the CSEF programme.
- To undertake a special focus with the national education coalitions whose countries are likely to exit the eligibility of the CSEF by the end of 2014. This will ensure the coalition is able to maintain its engagement within national education processes after they leave the CSEF project in 2014. Several countries are leaving after the first phase of CSEF as their country is no longer GPE eligible and one of the lessons from the review of the first two years is that more needs to be done to prepare them for this situation.

8. Monitoring, Evaluation and learning including project timeline

The CSEF Monitoring and Evaluation framework aims to monitor performance and track progress towards results in line with the overall objectives of the project. The framework has a learning approach and aims at generating, capturing and disseminating achievements, challenges and knowledge, as well as to identify lessons and good practice for shared learning.

The CSEF M&E system is envisaged to work as an asset for coalitions to help them document and capture progress and challenges, on which to build and continue their advocacy work. M&E instruments in the form of guidelines and reporting templates will be made available for grant recipients. These aim to be flexible, adaptable and time-efficient so that they can be implemented

by a range of organisations, taking into account their varying nature and operational context. A capacity building mechanism will be incorporated into the implementation process of the M&E framework to ensure training of users in data collection, impact analysis and report writing.

GCE, as executing agency for CSEF, is accountable directly to the donors of the project, and has responsibility to ensure that the project is delivered within agreed parameters and that reporting requirements are adhered to. GCE commits to produce biannual progress reports to the donors, based on data collected from national and regional partners through various measurements (listed below). An end of project evaluation will be carried out at project closing based on a ToR agreed between GCE and the donors.

Results matrix

A results matrix has been developed based on CSEF objectives and expected results and will be utilised to measure progress accordingly. It contains performance indicators, some requiring baseline surveys, developed through consultations with a broad variety of stakeholders – most importantly the National Education Coalitions themselves. This helps to ensure that the expected results are tangible, measurable and realistic.

OVERALL AIM

The overall aim of the CSEF is to advance the achievement of education goals by ensuring the effective participation of civil society – not just formal civil society organisations, but citizens more broadly – in education debates and sector planning and review.

Objectives of the Civil Society Education Fund 2013/2014:

Objective 1: Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized

Expected result 1.1: Civil society participation in policy forums such as LEGs and TWGs increases in terms of country coverage, depth, quality and institutionalization. (Baseline required)

Expected result 1.2: There is a measurable increase in civil society engagement in parliamentary processes relating to education. (Baseline required)

Expected result 1.3: All coalitions are developing civil society policy proposals through inclusive and participatory consultations with full constituencies and widespread participation.

Objective 2: National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate

Expected result 2.1: All coalitions build and sustain public awareness on education rights, EFA goals and/or education policy and spending through debates, media work and campaigns.

Expected result 2.2: Coalitions are gaining specific technical knowledge and credibility of coalition staff, member CSOs and community leaders.

Expected result 2.3: There is an overall expansion in participation of grassroots based civil society actors in CSEF-funded National Education Coalitions, building or enhancing the representative function and impact of coalitions, and local level advocacy.

Expected result 2.4: All coalitions are ensuring legitimacy and building widespread, democratic participation through open, diverse and well-functioning governance structures.

Expected result 2.5: All coalitions are working to build the sustainability of collective citizen action in education through alliance-building and resource mobilization.

Objective 3: Civil society research, analysis and proposals effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals

Expected result 3.1: At least 16 national coalitions carry out advocacy which has an impact on budget and spending debates in the education sector, of which at least 6 contributing to specific increases/improved allocation/better use of education financing.

Expected result 3.2: At least 30 coalitions carrying out advocacy which has an impact on education policy debates, of which at least 8 contribute to specific changes in policy or legislation which further the achievement of education rights and one or more of the six EFA goals.

Expected results 3.3: At least 15 coalitions carrying out advocacy for enhanced governance, transparency and social accountability in the education sector, with at least 5 reporting subsequent changes in government processes and procedures.

Objective 4: The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes

Expected result 4.1: All regions and the global Secretariat work with coalitions to capture and exchange learning and good practice.

Expected result 4.2: All coalitions receiving some degree of technical support, based on expressed needs.

Expected result 4.3: All coalitions are contributing to and have the chance to participate in regional and global advocacy that builds on grassroots and national priorities. At least one interregional capacity building activity directed at globally co-ordinated advocacy action.

Measures to monitor and track progress, outcomes and impact, and evaluate and capture learning:

- CSEF M&E plan
- Project plans and budgets (National coalitions)
- Baseline surveys, where required (National coalitions)
- Narrative reports (National coalitions, regional secretariats and financial management agencies to GCE)
- Biannual results matrix (National coalitions to GCE, and GCE to donors)

- Biannual progress report (GCE to donors)
- Mid-term review (GCE to donors through stakeholder consultation process)
- Closing report (GCE)
- End of project evaluation (All)
- Quality review of reports and feedback to coalitions (Regional secretariats and coalitions)
- Visits to national education coalitions by regional and global staff
- Capacity building mechanisms including regional and global workshops and forums
- Regular coordination meetings (regional and global staff)
- Regular briefings to International Advisory Committee and GCE Board
- Documentation and dissemination of lessons and good practice through the production of various communication tools and capacity building materials to raise awareness of the CSEF approach at national, regional and international levels and to promote learning and inform future practices.

The annual progress reports will be made available to the public online.

Timeline

This proposal is a funding request for implementing CSEF phase II in national coalitions from January 1st 2013 to December 31st 2014. The project builds on the previous CSEF phase I (funded by FTI/GPE from 2009 to 2011), during which governance structures were established in the form of global and regional secretariats, fund managers and funding committees. This period also saw the establishment and strengthening of coalition secretariats, expansion and capacity building of memberships, and implementation of campaigns and advocacy plans. The current bridge period (funded by AusAid for 2012) has allowed coalitions to maintain the momentum of their work until a funding mechanism for a new CSEF phase is in place. Hence, as soon as funding for CSEF phase II is secured, national education coalitions' proposal development processes will be initiated.

Assuming that this proposal is approved in November/December 2012, calls for proposals from coalitions across Africa, Latin America, Middle East, Europe and Central Asiaand Asia and the Pacific will be issued immediately after. This will allow for submission and review of applications during January and February 2013 with final decisions on approvals and funding allocations taken by regional Funding Committees in March 2013. Implementation of country level activities is expected to commence in March 2013 and be completed by December 2014 in line with the current GPE grant limit.

While this proposal is a funding request for a two-year period, the CSEF is envisaged as a long-term approach, to allow for sustained support for civil society advocacy work, in order to influence lasting policy change in education.

GCE, as executing agency, commits to providing regular progress reports and updates to the supervising entity, to the GPE Board and interested entities. GCE requests that funds disbursement of this grant be made in 3 tranches, one at the beginning of the project and two mid-way.

9. Independent Evaluation of CSEF

The full evaluation is being distributed by the independent evaluators. The concluding chapter 6 is presented in Appendix III and we have produced the following table to detail the actions GCE is taking to address these recommendations.

Report Text	***Changes in CSEF 2013/2014***
Strategy	
Fitting global and national strategies together. When combining the CSEF with other global awareness campaigns also promoted by the GCE (like the Global Action Week or the 1Goal), leadership and management need to be strong to guarantee the consistency of the two approaches. The GCE board and secretariat need to make sure that the international campaigns feed the locally defined strategies of NECs (instead of interfering them) as well as that the international campaigns do not absorb an excessive capacity from the secretariat for it to support effectively the primary processes carried out at the national level in the context of the CSEF.	The GCE membership and Board had already recognised at the last GCE World Assembly (in February 2011) the need for greater coherence between cross-national and national campaigns, and had decided on an approach focused more on facilitating national work than international campaigns. Specifically, this involves: • A greater proportion of core Secretariat staff time devoted to CSEF, specifically in terms of facilitating knowledge-sharing, providing tools for national use, and provision of other capacity-building support. • All international campaign themes are chosen by the GCE membership (dominated by national coalitions) and for the period 2012-2015 have already been selected by the World Assembly. • Greater focus on supporting communities of practice/groups of coalitions with a shared interest in particular themes, rather than large-scale international campaigns.
Bottom-up approach. The CSEF should contribute to develop and strengthen a bottom-up approach within the GCE. CSEF needs to be flexible enough to allow for different project re-contextualisations according to the variety of	GCE and all partners involved in CSEF are extremely committed to the bottom-up, nationally-determined approach, complemented but not dominated by regional initiatives. We plan to address this through:

local realities in which the GCE operates, and according to the trajectory, capacities and strategies of the coalitions that are engaging with the programme. Thus, the value of the CSEF relies on its level of adaptation to the needs and strategies of the GCE members. To make this possible, a proper inception phase for the development of the national projects should be guaranteed.[1] Adopting a bottom-up approach is compatible with – and actually requires – the adoption of strong leadership from the center of the programme. *Regional advocacy.* CSEF II should think about the regional as a political space and, accordingly, guarantee sufficient resources to allow regional coalitions to play and develop advocacy initiatives at the regional scale.	• **Proposal development**: the current CSEF proposal has been developed through a 3-month consultation process, starting with consultation of national coalitions on their priorities, followed by discussion with regional secretariats on how to combine and synthesise these priorities into a coherent project, and finally sharing of the final proposal with the different stakeholders. This is a change from previous funding allocations. • **Defining objectives, results and indicators:** Through the process described above we have been able to develop our strategy for 2013/2014 based on objectives, indicators and expected results that reflects national coalitions' focus and interest areas. • **Timing**: We recognise the importance of setting timelines that allow proper time for coalitions to develop their plans and funding requests. However, with the current timeframe of 2 years we will need to make a dedicated effort to balance the importance of planning and allow sufficient time for implementation. • **Funding allocations**: CSEF processes are designed to maximise national ownership, allowing national education coalitions to apply for CSEF funds on the basis of their own nationally-determined priorities and plans. • **Technical support**: strong support will be given for those approaches most cited by coalitions during proposal development – engagement with national planning processes, budget- and expenditure-tracking, social audits etc – but no model of activity is required, given the need to be sensitive to local contacts and ownership. The past experience with CSEF has allowed these priority areas to be better identified.

	• **Regional advocacy**: Regional coalitions are recognised as vital players both in terms of supporting civil society advocacy work on the ground and to take advantages of political opportunities at regional level to strengthen education advocacy work. A specific budget is dedicated to ensure regions play this role, within the limitations of the overall grant amount and requirements.
CSEF opportunities for all. To avoid the exclusion of GCE members from funding opportunities and generating tensions within the GCE network, ideally, non GPE-eligible countries should be able to benefit from CSEF II. If GPE rules do not allow this possibility, compensation mechanisms should be explored. The Latin American experience shows that regional organisations may be very effective in attracting donors to fund NECs in countries with an intermediate level of human development.	GCE and other partners will continue to seek funding for coalitions in non-GPE-eligible countries from sources other than GPE, building on successful initiatives with AECID in Latin America and AusAid in the Philippines. We have also introduced a specific indicator on how well we prepare coalitions from countries that are likely to exit GPE eligibility in the next year.
Time availability. Time has been one of the main constraints in the development of the CSEF project. The parties involved in CSEF II would benefit from having more inception and execution time in the development of such an ambitious and pluri-scalar project modality. A funding cycle of around four years would allow for predictability, better planning (at all levels: human resources, capacity development, advocacy, research, etc.) and higher levels of institutional learning. It would also contribute to counteract problems like human resources turnover and the prevailing rush at the time of developing the most complex components of the project like the NCSEF one.	Four years of funding would be a vast improvement for this project. However, given the reality of GPE funding periods, we are currently applying for two years' worth of funding as according to GPE requirements. This in itself should be an improvement on past experiences, in which approvals generally came only for one year at a time. Still, we will continue to seek longer-term finance. We are hoping that this proposal will result in a full two-year funding period with reasonable advanced notice, as this would allow more time for preparation of national grants and workplans at national, regional and global level.
Institutional setting	
First, a single and global FMA could be in charge of the global CSEF finance	After discussion of this proposal, regional Secretariats and national

system as a way to simplify and harmonize procedures, finance reporting and audit systems. This agency should coordinate with the CSEF Global and regional secretariat, but be directly accountable to the supervisory entity. The organisation in charge of the global FMA could be an INGO. However, in case this organisation is directly related to the GCE or to its members (via a funding or membership relationship) clear mechanisms and rules should be in place to guarantee transparency in the procedures and to avoid that conflicts of interest emerge.	coalitions did not want to abolish the role of Regional Financial Management Agencies, thus losing all the benefits of knowledge of the region and easier communication (languages, time zones, etc). The proposal for a global FMA was extensively discussed but the GCE Board preferred a situation where the financial management supervision was led in the region by an entity present in the region. Once the supervising entity is confirmed we will discuss if there is any greater oversight they would like as we are keen for there to be external verification and oversight of this work in addition to the global international auditing firms. There was also a desire to introduce some external experts on to the new international advisory committee. In addition a number of changes have been made to guarantee transparency in the procedures and to avoid that conflicts of interest emerge; in particular a Global Coordination Group for the project has been established, comprising of GCE Board members who do not benefit from the project. Questions about overall budget allocations, re-allocations, financial oversight etc. will be managed by this group.
Second, financial reports and narrative reports should be better coordinated. The M&E system should be much more simplified since this is something that would liberate time of the CSEF secretariat to focus on programmatic work. At the same time, the M&E system should not only aim at external reporting, but also at internal learning and exchange. By introducing these changes in the M&E approach, the tasks of the regional CSEF secretariat would be more consistent with the tasks of the Regional Coalition (which focuses on programmatic and strategic aspects of coalition building and EFA advocacy). We develop this point further in the M&E section below.	The new CSEF Monitoring and Evaluation framework will monitor performance and track progress towards results in a useable fashion, whilst also including a learning approach. Specifically: • Expected results and indicators, against which national coalitions and regional and global Secretariats will report, have been developed through a consultative process, based on coalitions' own plans. • New M&E instruments in the form of guidelines and reporting templates will be made available for grant recipients. These aim to be flexible, adaptable and time-efficient so that they can be implemented by a range of organisations, taking into account their varying nature and operational context. • A capacity building mechanism will be incorporated into the

	implementation process of the M&E framework to ensure training of users in data collection, impact analysis and report writing. • Information gathered through monitoring will be used to identify and disseminate lessons and good practice for shared learning.
Third, the Funding Committee would benefit from being predominantly – and, preferably, completely - composed by external and independent persons. By doing so, there would be fewer chances that NECs confuse the role of regional coalitions with that of a donor agency, and that power relations between the regional and national organisations are altered. The CSEF regional secretariat should attend the FC meetings to provide information and support to the Committee members and to make sure that their recommendations are effectively transmitted to the NECs. However, the regional secretariat members should not take decisions concerning which are the proposals that can be funded or what is the level of funding they deserve. The FC independent members should receive an economic compensation for their participation. By doing so, we would expect that the level of absenteeism of FC members – which was especially high in some of the regions - would diminish, and that they prepare better for the Committee meetings – for instance, by reading the proposals and other documentation beforehand.	The membership of Funding Committees is being reviewed, and renewed guidelines for all regions agreed and circulated. Membership will exclude any organisation benefiting financially from CSEF (including Board members of such organisations), and will include experts and representatives of other organisations with first-hand knowledge of coalitions and/or the contexts in which they operate. Funding Committee members will not be paid – to avoid conflicts of interest – but flights and expenses will be covered. We will also continue the previous practice of ensuring regional secretariat and financial management agencies attending Funding Committee meetings as observers only.
Human resources management	
Strengthening of HR planning. CSEF II will require of a better planning of the human resources, to make sure that there are sufficient competent people to cover all the tasks that need to be done, that the capacity gaps at multiple levels are overcome, and that the key positions are created and covered on time. Vision and strategic framework on competency requirements and	Global and regional levels: HR planning has been incorporated into the initial proposal for the next round of CSEF, and will be further developed with clear role profiles. In particular, there is increased capacity to deliver coordination, capacity-building and learning and knowledge-sharing at the global level.

competency development should also be taken into account in the HR planning. The experience of the Capacity Support Plan in CSEF I should set the basis of future interventions in this terrain. However, again, sound coordination and leadership are important to make sure that these sorts of plans deploy their full potential.	National level: clear guidelines for HR planning will be included in advice to coalitions on developing national proposals for CSEF funding. Regional and global actors will also continue to support capacity building initiatives of staff at national level, including create linkages with INGOs based in project countries and identify and set up potential mentorship programs.
Facing the turnover. The turnover problem was already present in previous programmes like CEF and RWS, and seems to be a persistent problem for CSOs that operate in different policy fields. A plan or strategy to face the turnover problem should be adopted. Among other measures, equity in labour conditions within the CSEF framework should be guaranteed (i.e. similar salaries for similar job responsibilities)	National coalitions have their own HR structures and salary scales, and CSEF will not seek to interfere with this (outside the issue of unreasonably high or low salaries for CSEF-funded posts). However, a framework for equality in labour conditions is being developed for regional and global actors for implementation in the new project. Furthermore, with a 2 year project timeframe ensured, we expect staff turnover to be reduced with more long-term job security.
Organisational Assessment and Technical Assistance to Grant Management. An Organisational Assessment of the different technical needs would help to allocate resources and technical assistance according to the needs of the different contexts where the CSEF is implemented.	We are discussing with the evaluators the specific organisational assessment that they mean here. We plan to undertake one at the beginning of 2013/2014.
Gender approach	
In organisational terms, a systematic gender-mainstreaming approach is missing within the GCE/CSEF network. Thus, the CSEF would benefit from the adoption of a more explicit organisational gender approach. Gender power relations need to be understood as embedded and normalized within power structures and power relations. Transforming such embedded relations is often a daunting task. When related with internal and organisational aspects, challenging unequal gender relations needs a strong leadership and a clear political will. Some examples of gender fair practices	A gender policy is being developed for the CSEF project as a whole, including guidelines and minimum organisational requirements from all organisations receiving funding. This will also comprise management functions of the project as a whole, including global and regional level. In terms of project content, many organisations have a focus on gender in education, and this is being separately tracked through disaggregated data.

are: (a) Eliminate overt and covert biases in hiring, firing and promoting male and female employees; (b) Promote gender equality in access to opportunities for training, education, participation in decision making; (c) Develop organisational policies and personnel services that address gender issues (i.e. sexual harassment, harmonization of work and family life, etc.) (d) Sex disaggregation of data (e) Adoption of non-sexist practices (e.g. in language, inter-personal relations, communication) (f) Empower parents (mostly, mothers) so that they actively participate in school councils.	
Monitoring & Evaluation	
M&E approach.	The M&E approach is being revised to have more of a learning approach, The CSEF M&E system is envisaged to work as an asset for coalitions to help them document and capture progress and challenges, on which to build and continue their advocacy work.
Towards a new M&E platform linked with financial management	New M&E instruments in the form of guidelines and reporting templates which link narrative and financial reports will be made available for grant recipients. These aim to be flexible, adaptable and time-efficient so that they can be implemented by a range of organisations, taking into account their varying nature and operational context.
Planning M&E solutions in advance.	An M&E framework will be developed before project launch, on the basis of the objectives and results developed through consultation with national coalitions and regional Secretariats.
M&E training.	A capacity-building mechanism is being built in to the M&E framework to ensure that all parties involved have the appropriate knowledge and tools for using reporting and monitoring templates and for analysing progress and capture learning.

M&E and transparency. To enhance the transparency of the CSEF II, reports should be made available to the public as soon as the final version is ready. For the same purpose, minutes and key decisions of the Funding Committees would need to be available on a webpage as well.	Progress reports will be made available to the public through the GCE website. We will also aim to ensure key Funding Committee decisions are made available to the relevant parties involved.
M&E and Learning	
Learning	
GCE should take advantage of being a global network to play a more active support at promoting cross-fertilization of experiences and south-south collaboration. The creation of a Knowledge Platform is a positive step in this direction, but does not automatically conduct to effective information and knowledge sharing across different geographical contexts. A more clear focus on what to learn and what to share, as well as a proper assessment of the knowledge needs, its applicability and requirements are necessary. As mentioned above, the Knowledge Platform should be more clearly connected to the M&E platform and to strengthen learning processes, not only about advocacy, but also about organisational and operational issues. Technologies like KARL have the potential to facilitate learning and exchange of experiences among the CSEF participants in a cost-effective way. However, for these technologies to be appropriated by the participants, they will need of active coordination, at least at the initial stages. The linguistic diversity of the GCE network is also important to take into account when organizing learning process. Resources for translation need to be guaranteed.	The M&E approach is being revised to have more of a learning approach, The CSEF M&E system is envisaged to work as an asset for coalitions to help them document and capture progress and challenges, on which to build and continue their advocacy work. Lessons learned from the KARL experienced will be taken on board and incorporated into a user-friendly version in an online resource and discussion space linked to the GCE website. Learning and cross-country knowledge sharing is a major priority for CSEF from this point (and in fact, capacity on this has already been expanded in the last year). This includes 1 FTE at global level dedicated specifically to this function. Translation in 5 languages – Arabic, English, French, Portuguese, Spanish – will continue to be the standard for all CSEF communications and publications. This is included in the budget.
Processes at the country level	
The experience of the CSEF project at the country level has highlighted an	CSEF allocates funding on the basis of countries' own plans. In this round,

array of issues and challenges that suggest some recommendations: • In line with the 'budget support' idea that is becoming increasingly accepted by the international aid community, the CSEF should tend to support the strategies of coalitions (instead of requiring from coalitions to design 'projects' to be financially supported by the CSEF).	the entire proposal development process began with a consultation on national priorities, building this focus in from the beginning of the project.
• At the country level, transparency, improvement of labour standards, development of a strategy for communication, widening the approach to gender issues, and accurate M&E are likely to contribute to the sustainability of NECs over time and conversely, any shortcoming in these processes may compromise its future. On the other hand, more satisfied human resources are necessary so that current improvements become eventually institutionalised.	We don't believe CSEF should intervene extensively in national coalition processes or policies but we need a clear system to identify concerns in these areas and feed them into future proposal development It will be part of the next phase of CSEF to simplify and re-focus monitoring and evaluation, to improve communication, and to strengthen provision and coordination of capacity-building. These should all contribute to national coalition sustainability.
• To strengthen their research capacity, NECs should consider the inclusion or establishment of more stable partnerships with local scholars and universities.	This recommendation will be presented to national coalitions. At a global level, although outside the scope of CSEF funding, GCE is instituting an annual workshop in order to bring together academics and member coalitions, and build capacity for both doing and reading research on education.
• *Beyond resources related demands.*	National advocacy priorities are determined by coalitions and cover a range of resource- and non-resource-related issues.
• *Overcoming donor dependency.*	Civil society organisations active in managing CSEF are requesting core funds from GPE to sustain the project. The first phase of CSEF focused on supporting coalitions to build 'National CSEFs" as ongoing sources of

	funding. In this phase, we recognise that the best route to sustainability is supporting the development of legitimate and effective coalitions, who will find it easy to source funding from a variety of sources on the basis of the strength of their work. We have introduced some specific measures targeting fragile states, countries likely to exit GPE eligibility and the countries where the % of a coalition's funding coming from CSEF is at its highest.

.

10. Results Matrix

OVERALL GOAL: To contribute towards the provision of good quality education for all in GPE countries, regardless of status, identity and personal characteristics, by ensuring that civil society organisations are active and knowledgeable advocates and facilitators of citizen participation, with an impact on the quality and effective implementation of education policy.	
Expected results	**Indicators**
Objective 1: Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognized	
Expected result 1.1 Civil society participation in policy forums such as LEGs and TWGs increases in terms of country coverage, depth, quality and institutionalisation. (Baseline required)	# Advocacy initiatives for increased civil society participation in education sector planning, budgeting and management processes and committees at all levels # Coalitions and civil society coalition members with official seats on education sector planning groups, LEGs or equivalent (baseline & final #s) # Countries with formal ToRs for LEGs/education sector policy groups, including civil society participation. (baseline & final #s) # Civil society stakeholders engaged in dialogue on Education Sector Plans and policies (baseline and final #s) # Coalitions with active participation in technical committees and working groups (baseline and final #s) # Trained and experienced civil society representatives participating in LEGs/TWGs etc. (based on perceptions of coalitions, governments, donors? Stakeholder reports? Baseline & final #s)
Expected result 1.2 There is a measurable increase in civil society engagement in parliamentary processes relating to education (baseline required)	# Coalitions actively participating in Parliamentary hearings that draw on the competence and networks of CSOs in different parts of the country # Civil society work with Parliamentarians to input on new bills and legislation # Coalitions AND coalition member CSOs presenting relevant information to parliamentary committees or individual parliamentarians, to assist their work on education (# by country)
Expected result 1.3 All coalitions are developing civil society policy proposals through inclusive and participatory consultations with full constituencies and widespread participation	# Community-level civil society consultations held to build consensus and develop joint policy views and proposals to decision-makers (# countries, consultations, communities and individuals) # National civil society education forums (# countries, forums, participating CSOs)
Objective 2: National Education Coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge and skills, and opening opportunities to participate	
Expected result 2.1 All coalitions build and sustain public awareness of education rights, EFA goals and/or education policy and spending through debates, media work and campaigns	# Coalitions managing campaigns and mobilisation around citizen priorities (policy, budgets, transparency, post 2015 agenda, EFA agenda) (# coalitions & participating organisations) # Community meetings and workshops held for public awareness and engagement # Civil society engagement with media, including radio programmes

	# Guides and user-friendly reports on EFA, educational policy, legislative context and budget tracking produced and shared with the public
Expected result 2.2 Coalitions are gaining specific technical knowledge and credibility of coalition staff, member CSOs and community leaders.	# Training sessions for coalition staff, member CSOs, district networks and community members in areas such as education issues, policy analysis, research, advocacy, communication and management (# countries, training sessions, participating CSOs, participants) # Training sessions for coalition staff, member CSOs, district networks and community members in order to build capacity to conduct social audits and budget tracking at school, district, provincial and national level
Expected result 2.4 There is an overall expansion in participation of grass-roots based civil society actors in CSEF-funded National Education Coalitions, building or enhancing the representative function and impact of coalitions, and local level advocacy	# Established and strengthened provincial, county and district-level networks within coalitions, building EFA campaigns and education monitoring within communities (baseline and final #s, by country) # Coalition members who are CSOs and groups representing vulnerable people, marginalised groups and youths (baseline & final #s, by country) # Established and strengthened thematic groups within coalitions such as Technical Committees and Thematic Groups (baseline and final #s, by country)
Expected result 2.5 All coalitions are ensuring legitimacy and building widespread, democratic participation through open, diverse and well-functioning governance structures	# Coalitions with increased percentage of women in the governance and leadership structures # Coalitions with Strategic plan, endorsed by membership, in place # Coalitions with clear, written procedures for governance and democratic decision-making # Coalitions with published annual financial reports and audits # Coalitions with functional website
Expected result 2.6 All coalitions are working to build the sustainability of collective citizen action in education through alliance-building and resource mobilisation	# Strategic meetings held with donors # Linkages created with INGOs and other actors # Percentage of funding countries in GPE eligible countries secure from outside CSEF increases in the countries with the highest current % funding from CSEF. # Coalitions whose countries are likely to leave GPE at the end of 2014 have a special project to diversify their funding # 3 new Coalitions in fragile states are given particular support to establish strong systems and develop a good reputation amongst funders present in the country
Objective 3: Civil society research, analysis and proposals effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals	
Expected result 3.1: At least 16 national coalitions carry out advocacy which has an impact on budget and spending debates in the education	# Research and analysis of trends/practices/gaps in education sector planning, budgeting and resource allocation (# studies & countries)

sector, of which at least 6 contributing to specific increases/improved allocation/better use of education financing.	# Civil society budget and expenditure monitoring and analysis conducted at national level (# studies & countries) # Participatory budget and expenditure monitoring and analysis conducted at regional/community level (# studies & countries) # Civil society proposals and recommendations for budgetary/financing priorities and changes (# studies & countries) # Media articles/broadcasts citing civil society findings or recommendations on education budgets and spending (# citations & countries) # Politicians, parliamentarians, government officials or donor representatives using findings from civil society analysis or research in meetings/official documents etc. # Government increasing budgets for basic education, improving education budget allocations or improving education budget execution at least partly in response to citizen concerns expressed through advocacy on financing by CESF-funded coalitions
Expected result 3.2: At least 30 coalitions carrying out advocacy which has an impact on education policy debates, of which at least 8 contribute to specific changes in policy or legislation which further the achievement of education rights and one or more of the six EFA goals.	# Review and analysis of education sector laws, policy frameworks or policy/legislative needs and gaps (# studies & countries) # Civil society monitoring of implementation of education plans policies and laws, including impact of policy on different groups (# studies & countries) # Civil society policy proposals and recommendations on legislative or policy reform for the education sector (# submissions & countries) # Civil society using legal mechanisms to ensure existing constitutional and legal rights of the vulnerable and marginalised are implemented (#cases & countries) # Civil society recommendations taken into account in Education Sector Plans (# cases & countries) # Civil society recommendations influenced the initiation or completion of policy change (# cases & countries)
Expected results 3.3: At least 15 coalitions carrying out advocacy for enhanced governance, transparency and social accountability in the education sector, with at least 5 reporting subsequent changes in government processes and procedures.	# Civil society submissions, lobby meetings and public statements on the extent of transparency in the governance of education sector programs (& # countries) # Civil society monitoring, documenting and reporting on donor support processes (# reports & countries) # Establishment/strengthening of civil society education watch mechanisms and watchdog platforms to monitor service delivery, track education resources and lead local reform debates within the sector # Coalitions reporting that governments provide easy access to education sector budgets and policy documents (baseline and final #) # Coalitions reporting that donors provide easy access to education support programs (baseline and final #) # Governments publishing accessible annual reports on progress in the education sector, which respond to stated civil society concerns (in national languages)

	# Countries where donors are publishing accessible annual reports on contributions to the education sector, which respond to stated civil society concerns
Objective 4: The CSEF project builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global policy processes	
Expected result 4.1 All regions and the global Secretariat work with coalitions to capture and exchange learning and good practice	# Regional and global publications and toolkits documenting and sharing evidence of lessons and good practice from CSEF-funded coalitions (# by region and topic) # Bi-monthly bulletin sharing stories from coalitions disseminated to broad base of stakeholders # Coalitions posting information on the GCE website, southern civil society mail group and discussion forums
Expected result 4.2 All coalitions receiving some degree of technical support, based on expressed needs	# Coalitions that fill out initial survey on capacity-building needs (includes member needs) # Coalitions benefiting from bilateral or multilateral partnerships/communities of practice on thematic or functional priorities, facilitated by the global and regional Secretariats # Coalitions receiving technical support/accompaniment from INGO members of the international advisory committee on thematic or functional priorities, facilitated by the global and regional Secretariats # Coalitions participating in regional and global learning platforms
Expected result 4.3 All coalitions are contributing to and have the chance to participate in regional and global advocacy that builds on grassroots and national priorities. At least one interregional capacity building activity directed at globally co-ordinated advocacy action.	# Education advocacy publications by global and regional Secretariats and members of international advisory committee that draw on CSEF-funded reports, studies and analyses by national coalitions # Consultations of national coalitions by GPE civil society representatives # Coalitions & coalition members taking part in national or global consultations on post-2015 framework for education

11. Budget

	2013	2014
AFRICA		
National Grants	$ 2,320,000	$ 2,320,000
Regional Secretariat	$ 630,275	$ 840,367
Regional Fund Management Agency	$ 217,670	$ 228,553
Regional Funding Committee	$ 57,814	$ 57,814
Sub-Total Africa	**$ 3,225,759**	**$ 3,446,734**
ASIA	$ 1,290,000	$ 1,290,000
National Grants		
Regional Secretariat	$ 346,781	$ 476,365
Regional Fund Management Agency	$ 124,213	$ 130,423
Regional Funding Committee	$ 33,600	$ 33,600
Sub-Total Asia	**$ 1,794,594**	**$ 1,930,388**
LATIN AMERICA		
National Grants	$ 320,000	$ 320,000
Regional Secretariat	$ 111,750	$ 149,000
Regional Fund Management Agency	$ 91,669	$ 96,253
Regional Funding Committee	$ 16,000	$ 16,000
Sub-Total Latin America	**$ 539,419**	**$ 581,253**
MIDDLE EAST, EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA		
National Grants	$ 350,000	$ 500,000
Regional Secretariat	$ 123,390	$ 164,520
Regional Fund Management Agency	$ 82,502	$ 86,628
Regional Funding Committee	$ 16,000	$ 16,000
Sub-Total Middle East	**$ 571,892**	**$ 767,148**
GLOBAL		
Project Management & Administration	$ 302,421	$ 389,769
Global and Inter-regional activity and capacity building	$ 413,624	$ 400,742
Co-ordination Committee costs	*$ 76,390*	$ 76,390
Total Global	**$ 792,435**	**$ 866,901**
TOTAL	**$ 6,924,099**	**$ 7,592,423**

C. APPENDICES

APPENDIX I - List of participating countries by region

Africa region

- Angola*
- Benin*
- Burkina Faso*
- Burundi*
- Cameroon*
- Congo, DR*
- Cote d'Ivoire
- Djibouti*
- Ethiopia*
- Gambia, The*
- Ghana*
- Guinea-Bissau*
- Kenya*
- Lesotho*
- Liberia*
- Malawi*
- Mali*
- Mauritania*
- Mozambique*
- Niger*
- Nigeria*
- Rwanda
- Senegal*
- Sierra Leone*
- South Sudan
- Tanzania*
- Togo*
- Uganda*
- Zambia*
- Zimbabwe*

Asia Pacific region

- Bangladesh*
- Cambodia*
- India*
- Mongolia*
- Nepal*
- Pakistan*
- Papua New Guinea*
- Solomon Islands*
- Sri Lanka*
- Timor-Leste*
- Vanuatu*
- Vietnam*

Latin America

- Bolivia*
- Haiti*
- Honduras*
- Nicaragua*

Arab countries, Eastern Europe and Central Asia

- Albania *
- Georgia *
- Kyrgyz Republic * (might be included under Asia-Pacific region)
- Moldova *
- Somalia *
- Sudan *
- Tajikistan* (might be included under Asia-Pacific region)
- Yemen, Rep. *

We will try to work in additional GPE eligible countries if it is possible.

APPENDIX II- Details of Regional Partners including staffing details and regional funding committee make up

Regional Secretariats (ANCEFA, ASPBAE, CLADE, ACEA)

REGIONAL SECRETARIAT FUNCTION

The Global Campaign for Education will collaborate with four regional member coalitions, in the coordination of the project at regional level. These are experienced and established civil society networks who will host Regional Secretariats for the project, liaising with coalitions across Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America, and Middle East, Europe and Central Asia

These include

- Africa Network Campaign on Education for All (ANCEFA) for Africa
- Campaña Latinoamericana por el Derecho a la Educación (CLADE) for Latin America
- Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education (ASPBAE) for Asia and the Pacific
- Arab Coalition for Education for All (ACEA) for the Middle East, Europe and Central Asia

The Regional Secretariat will act as the implementing agencies, building capacity, preparing papers and documentation, supporting fundraising initiatives, and ensure monitoring, evaluation and learning. Specifically they are responsible for the following functions:

- Promoting the CSEF concept and assisting CSO groups and coalitions in financial sustainability activities
- Assisting national coalitions to develop advocacy strategies, M&E plans, proposals and project implementation
- Receiving and processing funding proposals
- Demand-led technical support and capacity building
- Liaising with Funding Committees and making preparations for meetings
- Research and documentation
- Coordinate with the financial management agency to help ensure sound financial management and reporting
- Sharing of good practice and learning
- Identifying campaigning opportunities and creating linkages at regional and international level

The Regional Secretariats will be accountable to GCE in ensuring that they perform and meet agreed tasks and outcomes. A formal contract will be drawn between regional secretariats and GCE to this effect.

AFRICA REGIONAL CSEF SECRETARIAT - ANCEFA

The Africa Network Campaign on Education for All (ANCEFA) emerged in 2000 following the World Education Summit in Dakar in April 2000. At the time it was recognised that coordination and articulation of national-led CSO advocacy in the region was lacking. This motivated civil society leaders to come together and begin to bring the voice of African civil

society together in an organized and coherent manner. ANCEFA has since grown to become an important civil society player in the African education scheme. ANCEFA's vision and mission entails fighting against illiteracy through a positive influence on educational policies and practices at national, regional and international levels. It exists to promote, enable and build capacity of African civil society to advocate and campaign for access to free quality education for all, through coordination, facilitation and advocacy support. Today, ANCEFA has offices and staff in Dakar, Lome and Nairobi, and work with national coalitions from 34 African countries engaged in education and human rights. It serves as African civil society focal point in various international forums such as the UN, the World Bank, the African Union, ECOWAS and SADEC. ANCEFA led the Africa Education Watch since 2006, coordinated the Africa branch of the Real World Strategies and has played the role as Africa Regional Secretariat for CSEF, funded by the GPE between 2009 and 2012.

ANCEFA achieves its objectives through a range of activities including:

- Consultations and consensus-building among African civil society on advocacy issues
- Advocacy, lobbying and citizen participation
- Networking and partnership-building
- Technical support and capacity building
- Research and documentation
- Monitoring and evaluation of the achievements of EFA targets
- Pushing for funding towards government and civil society organisations in Sub-Saharan Africa towards the achievement of EFA targets

In order to play the role as Regional Secretariat for Africa in 2013/2014 ANCEFA will aim to put in place a professional team of highly experienced, motivated and committed individuals to fulfil required roles and tasks:

- Regional Coordinator
- Program Officers (5)
- Policy and Advocacy Manager
- Project Communication Officer
- Project Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
- Project Accountant/ Administration Officer

The project will also be supported by other ANCEFA staff, including the ANCEFA Coordinator, the Finance and Admin Manager and the Program Assistant.

All Regional Secretariat Project staff will be accountable to the ANCEFA Regional coordinator.

ASIA AND PACIFIC REGIONAL CSEF SECRETARIAT - ASPBAE

The Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) was established in 1964 working to promote quality education and transformative lifelong learning for all, and it sees education as an empowering tool for combating poverty and discrimination, pursuing sustainable development, and for enabling meaningful participation of citizens in governance. ASPBAE is a not-for-profit regional association of more than 200 organisations and individuals

across 30 countries, dedicated to mobilising and supporting community and people's organisations, national education coalitions, teachers' unions, campaign networks and other civil society groups in holding governments and the international donor community accountable in meeting education targets and commitments, and ensuring the right of all to education.

In order to play the role as Regional Secretariat for Asia and the Pacific in 2013/2014 ASPBAE will aim to put in place a professional team of highly experienced, motivated and committed individuals to fulfil required roles and tasks. Consistent with the multi-country staff structure of ASPBAE, the Asia Pacific Regional Secretariat for this project is envisaged to have a decentralized location of staff, steered by a regional centre. It is also envisaged to operate within the existing work centres and staff structures of ASPBAE to ensure coherence and complementation with ASPBAE's ongoing capacity-development work with and for the national education coalitions, and to optimize the possibilities for ASPBAE's institutional competencies to bear on and support this initiative.

The Regional Secretariat project staff positions proposed are:

- Regional Coordinator (Canberra, Australia)
    - Provides over-all supervision and coordination of the project at regional basis
    - Provides support, supervision and programmatic guidance to the regional project staff team
    - Coordinates the provision of capacity development support to national education coalitions
    - Coordinates the assessment process for coalition funding proposals and the servicing of the Regional Funding Committee
    - Coordinates closely with the Global Project Coordinator at the GCE in meeting reportorial obligations, and in facilitating shared learning and interaction with other Regional Project Coordinators and offices
- Capacity Development and Advocacy Support Officer (1 based in Canberra, Australia; 1 based in Dhaka, Bangladesh; 2 based in Manila, Philippines):
    - Provides capacity development support to national education coalitions in given countries in planning and conducting effective education advocacy.
    - Assists these coalitions in developing strong and viable funding proposals.
    - Ensures national education coalitions develop and maintain sound administrative and financial management and reporting systems.
    - Provides other capacity support as needed in relation to matters such as governance and resource mobilization
    - Monitoring, evaluation and learning
- Finance and Administrative Assistants (1 in Manila and 1 in Canberra):
    - Assisting the CDA in reviewing and tracking coalition spending and acquittals, offer clerical and documentation/filing support to the Regional Coordinators and the CDAs and assist in logistical demands of the work
- Bookkeeper (Mumbai):
    - Keeps track of secretariat finances, assists in reviewing proposed budgets and finance reports of the coalitions and prepares the finance reports of the Regional Secretariat for the project

All Regional Secretariat project staff will be accountable to the ASPBAE Secretary General.

LATIN AMERICA REGIONAL CSEF SECRETARIAT - CLADE

The Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE) is abroad network that formally began to take shape in 2003. It is a plural network of civil society organisations, which acts in the defense and promotion of the right to free public quality education for all, as a responsibility of the State, based on the principles of availability, accessibility, acceptability, adaptability and accountability. It aims to contribute to the debate and development of a Latin American education agenda, as well as carrying out advocacy strategies targeting educational policies of Latin American countries and of the region as a whole. It seeks to promote a transformation towards the implementation of a new development model that fulfils the Andean 'living well' concept, social justice, human dignity and the harmonious relationship with the environment in Latin American and Caribbean countries. CLADE's aim is to contribute to the effective implementation of the right to quality education, strengthening the national and regional spheres of civil society, so as to foster changes in educational policies, through demanding:

- That education, being a fundamental human right and public good, be guaranteed by the State rather than be considered as merchandise;
- That the regional educational policies express an inter-departmental and broad vision of education throughout life, as is highlighted by the Education World Summits of Jomtien and Dakar;
- That the States of the region have an integral approach towards Basic Education, articulating all its levels, from Early Childhood Education to the end of Secondary Education;
- That Adult Education, including literacy processes, be given priority in the agenda of the countries, with an inter-departmental approach;
- That the States guarantee adequate and protected financing for a quality education;
- That equity is perceived as a fundamental dimension of educational quality, being the right to education guaranteed by the enrolment, permanence and learning of all in a context that celebrates diversity;
- That the teachers and other educational professionals be valued and dignified, with salaries, career plans and working conditions to match the responsibilities they hold;
- That educational policies be the result of permanent dialogue and debate between civil society and governments.

CLADE operates through its secretariat in Sao Paulo with regional networks and national coalitions across Latin America. Key activities include organizing workshops, producing publications and carrying out advocacy activities, as well as supporting national coalitions in their advocacy work and foster interaction and joint activities between forums. CLADE has strategic partnerships with UNESCO, The Special Rapporteur for the Right to Education, CEJIL, ONU High Commissioner for the Right to Education in Chile and Guatemala, and several Human Rights NGOs.

In order to play the role as Regional Secretariat for Latin America in 2013/2014 CLADE will aim to put in place a professional team of highly experienced, motivated and committed individuals:

- Regional Coordinator

    - Responsible for ensuring the flow of communication among all stakeholders, supporting the national education coalitions, to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the project, develop regional activities, elaborate narrative reports, to support planning and management, and organize the field visits
- Program assistant
    - Supports the memory of the project and shares learning, elaborates minutes of meetings, support the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the project
- Trainee
    - Supports communication and logistics, maintains the physical and virtual archive of the project organized
- Strategic communication
    - Responsible for the memory of the project and sharing learning, elaboration of public materials and other communication products

The project will also be supported by other CLADE staff including the CLADE Regional Coordinator, the Administrative Assistant and the Administrative/Financial Coordinator.

All Regional Secretariat Project staff are accountable to the CLADE Coordinator.

MIDDLE EAST, EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIAREGIONAL CSEF SECRETARIAT - ACEA

The Arab Campaign for Education for All (ACEA) is a newly-established, not-for-profit network which works to ensure the realisation of the right to education in Middle East, Europe and Central Asia countries.

In order to play the role as Regional Secretariat for the Middle East, Europe and Central Asia in 2013/2014 ACEA will aim to put in place a professional team of highly experienced, motivated and committed individuals:

- Regional Project Coordinator
- Communication & campaigning officer
- Documentation, Monitoring & Evaluation Officer
- Accountant
- Administrative Assistant

The project will also be supported by further current ACEA staff.

All Regional Secretariat Project staff will be accountable to the ACEA Coordinator.

Regional Financial Management Agencies

The regional Financial Management Agencies yield control of the financial transactions – receiving and dispensing funds, monitoring the use of funds and accounting for all income and expenses. This role is undertaken by an international civil society organisation with a strong reputation as a well-managed, fiscally responsible and transparent body. The financial

management agency has an accountant solely dedicated to management of the CSEF funds. The salary for this position will come from CSEF funding, but the hiring and management of the position will be the responsibility of the financial management agency alone. No personnel decisions regarding the financial management of the CSEF are taken by the CSEF secretariat or board

The Financial Management Agency for the Middle East is being finalised.

Africa CSEF Financial Management Agency

The **Africa CSEF Fund Manager** is planned to be hosted and managed by **Oxfam Great Britain (OGB) West Africa**, based in Senegal. OGB is accountable to GCE in ensuring that the Regional CSEF Fund Manager performs its agreed tasks and meets the agreed outcomes. A formal contract is drawn between OGB and GCE to this effect.OGB has a reputation as a well-managed, transparent organisation and is accustomed to handling large money transfers.

The Africa CSEF Fund Manager: 1) receives and manage the Regional CSEF funds to be disbursed as grants to the national education campaign coalitions; 2) transfers funds to the coalitions on the instructions of the Regional Funding Committee and within the norms and procedures established by GCE for this project; 3) maintains all financial records of the Regional CSEF grants; 4) prepares periodic Regional CSEF fund utilization reports as required by GCE; 5) organizes the accounts audit of the Regional CSEF funds as required by GCE and the donors; 6) Can withhold transfer if financial reporting is insufficient.

The Fund Manager has the right to withhold funds to countries if there are problems with financial transparency, auditing or reporting at the country level. If this happens they need to notify in writing the Funding Committee, the Secretariat, GCE and the country concerned detailing the reasons. The ANCEFA Coordinator, as host of the Secretariat; the Oxfam GB Coordinator as the Africa Regional CSEF Fund Manager; the Africa CSEF Project Coordinator as head of the Regional CSEF Secretariat; the Chair of the CSEF Funding Committee; and the GCE Global CSEF Coordinator would then meet to discuss the matter within a month.

Oxfam GB will maintain a distinct bank account for the Regional CSEF grant in USD located in Dakar, Senegal.

OGB West Africa has an accountant to manage the regional fund. The Fund Manager works closely with the Regional CSEF Secretariat in liaising with the national education coalition recipients of the Fund's grants; and with the Global CSEF Secretariat's accountant. The Fund Manager staff is accountable to the Chief Coordinator of OGB.

GCE will cover, through the grant, the costs of the Africa Regional CSEF Fund Manager to include staff salaries, travel, communications, office maintenance costs and audit fees.

The Africa CSEF **Fund Manager**	• receives and manage the Regional CSEF funds to be disbursed as grants to the national education campaign coalitions; • transfers funds to the coalitions on the instructions of the Regional Funding Committee and within the norms and procedures established by GCE for this project; • maintains all financial records of the Regional CSEF grants; • prepares periodic Regional CSEF fund utilization reports as required by GCE; • organizes the accounts audit of the Regional CSEF funds as required by GCE and the donors. • Can withhold transfer if financial reporting is insufficient.	Oxfam GB – *accountable to GCE through Global Coordinator*	Accountant *CSEF Fund Manager staff accountable to OGB chief Coordinator*

Financial Management Agency for the Asia Pacific CSEF

The **Asia Pacific CSEF Fund Manager** is planned to be hosted and managed by the **Education International Asia Pacific Office (EIAP**). EIAP is accountable to GCE in ensuring that the Regional CSEF Fund Manager performs its agreed tasks and meets the agreed outcomes. A formal contract is drawn between EIAP and GCE to this effect.

The EIAP is a well managed, highly efficient organisation, with a reputation for maintaining high accountability and transparency standards. As coordination centre of teachers union members of EI in the whole region, EIAP is well experienced in managing and disbursing sizeable funds to its members and projects in multiple countries in the Asia Pacific; and in efficiently and responsibly acquitting its uses. The office is located in Kuala Lumpur, a city with a well developed and efficient communication and banking system thus providing the necessary infrastructure for effective management of this Fund. Malaysia also has a relatively more liberal regime in foreign currency transactions enabling easy transfers of grants from KL to different countries in the region.

The Asia Pacific CSEF Fund Manager: 1) receives and manage the Regional CSEF funds to be disbursed as grants to the national education campaign coalitions; 2) transfers funds to the coalitions on the instructions of the Regional Funding Committee and within the norms and procedures established by GCE for this project; 3) maintains all financial records of the Regional CSEF grants; 4) prepares periodic Regional CSEF fund utilization reports as required by GCE; 5) organizes the accounts audit of the Regional CSEF funds as required by GCE and the donors; 6) Can withhold transfer if financial reporting is insufficient.

The Fund Manager has the right to withhold funds to countries if there are problems with financial transparency, auditing or reporting at the country level. If this happens they will need to notify in writing the regional CSEF Co-ordinating Committee and the country concerned detailing the reasons. The Coordinating Committee would then meet to discuss the matter within a month.

EIAP maintains a distinct bank account for the Regional CSEF grant in USD.

EIAP has an accountant and an accounts assistant to manage the regional fund. The Fund Manager works closely with the Regional CSEF Secretariat in liaising with the national education coalition recipients of the Fund's grants; and with the Global CSEF Secretariat's accountant. The Fund Manager staff are accountable to the Chief Coordinator of EIAP.

GCE will cover, through the grant, the costs of the Asia Pacific Regional CSEF Fund Manager to include staff salaries, travel, communications, office maintenance costs and audit fees.

EIAP will be represented in the Regional Funding Committee by its Chief Regional Coordinator, Aloysius Mathews.

The Asia Pacific CSEF **Fund Manager**	• receives and manage the Regional CSEF funds to be disbursed as grants to the national education campaign coalitions; • transfers funds to the coalitions on the instructions of the Regional Funding Committee and within the norms and procedures established by GCE for this project; • maintains all financial records of the Regional CSEF grants; • prepares periodic Regional CSEF fund utilization reports as required by GCE; • organizes the accounts audit of the Regional CSEF funds as required by GCE and the donors. • Can withhold transfer if financial reporting is insufficient.	EIAP – *accountable to GCE through Global Coordinator*	Accountant Accounts Assistant *CSEF Fund Manager staff accountable to EIAP Chief Coordinator*

Financial Management Agency for the Latin American CSEF

The **Latin America CSEF Fund Manager** is planned to be hosted and managed by ActionAid Americas. ActionAid Americas is accountable to GCE in ensuring that the Regional CSEF Fund Manager performs its agreed tasks and meets the agreed outcomes. A formal contract is drawn between ActionAid Americas and GCE to this effect.

ActionAid Americas has earned a reputation as a well-managed, transparent organisation and is accustomed to handling large money transfers.

The Latin American CSEF Fund Manager: 1) receives and manage the Regional CSEF funds to be disbursed as grants to the national education campaign coalitions; 2) transfers funds to the coalitions on the instructions of the Regional Funding Committee and within the norms and procedures established by GCE for this project; 3) maintains all financial records of the Regional CSEF grants; 4) prepares periodic Regional CSEF fund utilization reports as required by GCE; 5) organizes the accounts audit of the Regional CSEF funds as required by GCE and the donors; 6) Can withhold transfer if financial reporting is insufficient.

The Fund Manager has the right to withhold funds to countries if there are problems with

financial transparency, auditing or reporting at the country level. If this happens they will need to notify in writing the Funding Committee, the Secretariat, GCE and the country concerned detailing the reasons. The CLADE General Coordinator, as host of the Secretariat; the ActionAid Americas Coordinator as the Latin America Regional CSEF Fund Manager; the Latin America CSEF Project Coordinator as head of the Regional CSEF Secretariat; the Chair of the CSEF Funding Committee; and the GCE Global CSEF Coordinator would then meet to discuss the matter within a month.

ActionAid Americas maintains a distinct bank account for the Regional CSEF grant in USD, located in Sao Paulo.

ActionAid Americas has an accountant and an accounts assistant to manage the regional fund. The Fund Manager is envisaged to work closely with the Regional CSEF Secretariat in liaising with the national education coalition recipients of the Fund's grants; and with the Global CSEF Secretariat's accountant. The Fund Manager staff is accountable to the Chief Coordinator of ActionAid Americas.

GCE will cover, through the EPDF grant, the costs of the Latin America Regional CSEF Fund Manager to include staff salaries, travel, communications, office maintenance costs and audit fees.

The Latin America CSEF **Fund Manager**	• receives and manage the Regional CSEF funds to be disbursed as grants to the national education campaign coalitions; • transfers funds to the coalitions on the instructions of the Regional Funding Committee and within the norms and procedures established by GCE for this project; • maintains all financial records of the Regional CSEF grants; • prepare periodic Regional CSEF fund utilization reports as required by GCE; • organizes the accounts audit of the Regional CSEF funds as required by GCE and the donors. • Can withhold transfer if financial reporting is insufficient.	ActionAid Americas – *accountable to GCE through Global Coordinator*	Accountant *CSEF Fund Manager staff accountable to ActionAid Americas Chief Coordinator*

Regional Funding Committee

The makeup of the Regional Funding Committees are being reviewed given the recommendations of the independent evaluation. These will be finalised later in November.

International Advisory Committee

The work at the global level will be complimented by an International Advisory Committee.

Though the project brings together most of the civil society groups working on education advocacy in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East, only a few international members of GCE have been involved directly in the project so far. We know that a growing number of international members are involved in this type of capacity-building work for national education coalitions in low income countries and, in CSEF for 2013/ 2014 we will be establishing an international advisory committee for CSEF in 2013/2014 so that international members can be more involved in the project and in order to improve the co-ordination of the capacity-building efforts international members are making.

The committee will work as a sub-group of the GCE Board, which is the overall body legally responsible for the project. This committee will advise the GCE on the strategy for coalition capacity building, documentation and communications. Committee members will be able to make suggestions for the project, for example on Local Education Group engagement, or how to better support GPE Board reps engaging wider civil society in relevant GPE consultations.

The GCE Global Secretariat will update the international committee on developments in the project so they are fully informed. Committee members will also help discuss the results of the project with GPE Board members. The committee will also help to create links and partnerships at the national level, using the recently developed guidelines relating to how INGOs should engage appropriately with national education coalitions.

The committee will also support regional and global work when requested and help to co-ordinate, support and potentially negotiate between members should any challenges arise. If national or regional coalitions have issues they wish to raise with international members (for example, an opportunity to engage on a campaign issue or any challenging behaviour of INGOs in their country) then this can also be considered in the committee.

The GCE Secretariat will work with the committee to help strengthen the CSEF's fundraising strategy and increase sustainability of the project so that we can secure more predictable long term financing both through and alongside this project.

The membership of the committee is still being finalised and it is expected to include ActionAid International, Education International, IBIS, Oxfam International, Plan International, Save the Children International and, Education International, IBIS, VSO and individual experts.

APPENDIX III – Independent CSEF Evaluation

This will be sent as soon as the final translated version is available from the evaluators in the second week of November. They have supplied the following summary in advance in English.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1. Introduction

The main objective of this concluding chapter is to put the pieces of the CSEF evaluation puzzle together. As we have seen, these pieces deal with a variety of issues: results, primary processes, systems‟ architecture, strategy, operational management, etc. and relate to what different actors have been doing - and how - at a range of territorial scales: from the global to the local.

According to the realistic and systemic approach in which this evaluation is based, this chapter is organized in three main parts. In the first one we (re)construct the theory of change of the CSEF project (i.e. the causal relations required to bring about the CSEF long-term goal). In the second part we test whether the causal-relations and other links included within the CSEF‟s theory of change are sufficiently strong on the basis of the collected data and other sources of evidence available. We will devote the third and last part of the evaluation to present a list of policy recommendations on the basis of the results obtained. This chapter can be read as a synthesis of the main results of the evaluation, but its main objective consists on reconstructing and testing the CSEF theory of change and, by doing so, identifying lessons that can be learned for future initiatives.

6.2. Reconstructing the CSEF theory of change

The 'theory of change' (ToC) behind the CSEF says something like: *if international donors support the constitution and strengthening of broad and inclusive NECs, civil society will be able to participate proactively in education policy debates and to monitor and influence the formulation and implementation of educational policies (including National Education Plans) and, by doing so, civil society will contribute to the achievement of the Education for All goals.*

The **long-term goal** of the GCE/CSEF is to achieve – by working in a partnership with governments, donors and other key stakeholders - the EFA goals. Such a goal needs to be achieved in a context where the commitment of the international community and country governments towards the goals is not sufficient yet – and, in fact, is declining (Legault 2012)-, and where civil society is not yet strongly articulated and capable to advocate strongly education progress everywhere. To overcome these and other problems, according to the CSEF project, the achievement of the two following **intermediate goals** is necessary that (GCE 2009):

> *1.NECs become fully engaged with national governments and local donor groups in working towards the EFA goals, specifically, in respect to the Global Partnership for Education country-level processes.*
>
> *2. NECs become effective, independent and sustained social change agents and are able to attract in country donor support via National Funds or other financial mechanisms*

The CSEF core strategy to achieve these goals consists of supporting and strengthening the advocacy, research and managerial capacity of the NECs via capacity building, training, human and economic resources. Such a support should be mostly organized and provided from the regional organisations" members of the GCE (GCE 2009). Specifically, as a result of the project, and as reflected in the CSEF Results Framework (GCE 2010b), coalitions should be able to:

- Fully engage with national governments and local donor groups in working towards the EFA goals.
- Attract in country donor support via National Funds or other financial mechanisms.
- Become broad and inclusive, with a growing membership and with a strengthened governance and staff development.
- Acquire the skills to place their messages in the media and to raise the profile of the education debate among the public opinion, and as such have the ability to generate public support and public pressure on decision makers.
- Have a credible financial management, budget monitoring and control systems, and as such demonstrate legitimacy and credibility to government and society.
- Have a strengthened advocacy and policy capacity, and therefore the ability to monitor and influence international, regional and national policies and practices.

A range of more or less explicit **assumptions** (or intermediate causal-relations within the CSEF ToC) can be identified and inferred when analyzing the CSEF at multiple scales and through different data sources (interviews, plans, progress reports, website, etc.). They are:

- In a globalized world, civil society politics will be more effective if organized supra-nationally. The regional scale is the most appropriate to organize such a strategy

- Regional organisations have the capacity to support the NECs, on the one hand, at the level of advocacy and policy capacity and, on the other, at the level of organisational management.
- Evidence based advocacy is the most strategic way of conducting advocacy campaigns for EFA.
- Getting an increasing number of resources - and managing them effectively - will contribute to NECs becoming credible interlocutors in education policy related debates at a range of scales (global, regional and national).
- To become credible interlocutors, NECs need to be as inclusive and broad as possible, with special attention to the participation of teachers" unions and women.
- National Education Plans and Local Education Groups are key policy instruments when it comes to the development of the EFA goals at the country level.
- Tracking the governmental educational budget is an effective way to avoid financial mismanagement by government agencies and to make the education system more transparent and accountable to the public.
- Governments take seriously evidence, media debates and the public opinion when it comes to frame education policies and priorities.
- If NCSEFs were created, CSO would be able to catalyze much more support for their advocacy tasks.
- Donors" action would be more effective if they coordinate better at the country level. They are willing to enhance their coordination within the education sector by supporting NCSEFs (or related mechanisms) and hence use their resources more effectively.
- Nationally coordinated funds will allow CSOs to be better informed, to organize and align more effectively and carry out a more independent advocacy work.
- A Favourable political environment is conducive to policy reforms, transparency and accountability

Table 6.1 presents the CSEF ToC by putting the above-mentioned elements (problems, strategies, goals and assumptions) in relation. As we can observe, two different types of assumptions can be differentiated according to whether they relate more directly to the achievement of the intermediate goals (assumptions A) or to the achievement of the long-term goal (assumptions B).

Table 6.1. CSEF Global Theory of Change: Main Components

Source: authors

2009-2011 CSEF programme scope – causal attribution framework (ToC)				**GCE/CSEF contribution process to long term impact**	
PROBLEMS	**STRATEGIES**	**ASSUMPTIONS (A)**	**MID-TERM GOALS**	**ASSUMPTIONS (B)**	**LONG-TERM GOAL**
a. Governments' lack of transparency and accountability in budgetary procedures *b. Education financing is insufficient to meet the EFA goals* *c. Education policies are not accurate to implement the EFA goals*	S1. A strengthened advocacy and policy capacity through regionally coordinated actions and capacity building support from regional organisations, and therefore acquiring the ability to monitor and influence international and regional policies and practices. By: *a. Budget tracking research on resource allocation; b. Provide evidences of effective budget utilization; c. Evidence dissemination strategy and validation; d. Advocacy campaigns on transparency and accountability in education service delivery at local level with School Management Committees; e. Lobbying meetings with policy decision-making actors at national and local level*	A1. Evidence based advocacy is the most strategic way of conducting advocacy campaigns for EFA. A2. Governments take seriously evidence, media debates and the public opinion when it comes to frame education policies and priorities. A3. In a globalized world, civil society politics will be more effective if organized supra-nationally. The regional scale is the most appropriate to organize such a strategy A4. Regional organisations have the capacity and resources to support the NECs primary and support process	G1. To provide support to the core work of NECs so that they can more fully engage with national governments and local donor groups in working towards the EFA goals (specifically, in respect to the Global Partnership for Education country-	B1. Favourable political environment is conducive to policy reforms, transparency and accountability B2. National Education Plans and Local Education Groups are key policy instruments when it comes to the development of the EFA goals at the country level. B3. Tracking the governmental educational budget is an effective way to avoid financial mismanagement by government agencies B4. Political space and recognition influences governmental behaviour/ decision-making	**The GCE contributes towards the attainment of the EFA goals (in 45 countries)**

d. NEC's do not exist or do not have sufficient scope (in terms of territory and membership) *e. NEC's are not recognized as a non state actor with political voice* *f. Donors (financial) commitment towards civil society advocacy is insufficient* *g. Governments not sufficiently open to CSOs participation*	S2. NEC"s become broad and inclusive, with a growing membership and with a strengthened governance and staff development. By: *a. Adopting democratic governance rules; b. Openness to new members, with a focus on unions and women; c. Broader territorial scope* S3. NEC"s develop the skills and necessary alliances to place their messages in the media and to raise the profile of the education debate among the public opinion, and as such have the ability generate public support and public pressure on decision makers improving and extending political space for dialogue. By: *a. Meetings with members/allies; b. Research/ Advocacy material developed; c. Political opportunity plan; d. Media engagement* S4. To ensure a credible financial management, budget monitoring and control systems, and as such demonstrate legitimacy and credibility. By: *a. Capacity Building Action Plan; b. Stable and committed governance/management and*	A5. To become credible interlocutors, NECs need to be as inclusive and broad as possible, with special attention to the participation of teachers" unions and women A6. Capacity building and an effective use of resources (human, technical, knowledge and methodological) enhances the credibility of CSOs A7. Global/regional organizations have the capacity and resources to support NECs at the management level (support processes) A8. Nationally coordinated funds will allow CSOs to be better informed, to organize and align more effectively and carry out a more independent advocacy work.	level processes). G2. NECs become effective, independent and sustained social change agents and are able to attract in country donor support via National Funds or other financial mechanisms	B5. Getting more resources (and its effective management) is a necessary condition to NECs becoming credible interlocutors in education policy related debates at a range of scales (global, regional and national). B6. Donors would be more effective if they coordinate better at the country level. A) They are willing to enhance their coordination within the education sector by supporting National Education CS Funds (or related mechanisms) and hence use their resources more effectively. B) If funds like this were created, CSO would be able to catalyze much more support for their advocacy tasks.	

	structure S5. Bring donors together to support CSO advocacy in a coordinated way by: *a. Organising NCSEF pilot projects; b. Establishing alliances with donors that can act as champions of the proposal*				

6.3. Analysis of the CSEF ToC

The analysis that follows focuses on the existing relations within the CSEF theory of change included in Table 6.1. The analysis is structured according to three main relations: problems and strategies, strategies and middle term goals, and strategies/middle term goals and long term goals). The last two relations are explored through the analysis of the validity of the assumptions identified (Assumptions A and B), which, to a great extent, work as the coalitional glue of the theory of change. It needs to be acknowledged that the causal attribution of the CSEF can be more clearly isolated in relation to assumptions A than in relation to assumptions B. Nevertheless, both of them are equally important pieces in the CSEF ToC.

As suggested in Mayne (2008), the analysis of the CSEF theory of change will be guided by the following questions: Which (causal) links in the CSEF ToC are strong/consistent and which ones are weak/non-consistent? [2] Are key assumptions validated? Does the pattern of results and links validate the results chain? Do key stakeholders agree with the story behind the ToC?

First relational dimension: Problems – Strategy

Regarding the relationship between the existing problems and the strategy designed in the context of the CSEF to address them, our main observations are:

- The strategy is consistent with the problems identified in the EFA field. Specifically, advocacy for introducing policy changes in education and increasing educational budgets is consistent with *problems a, b, c* included in Table 6.1.
- There is a broad consensus among the international community about the key role that civil society should play in the achievement of EFA. This consensus has been materialized in the EFA framework of action and in the last GPE Strategic Plan where the key advocacy role that civil society could play is acknowledged and supported (World Education Forum 2000, GPE 2012). The capacity and articulation of civil societies advocating EFA worldwide is still weak in many countries, reason why, again the CSEF strategy of strengthening civil society coalitions in multiple dimensions (policy, articulation, knowledge, management, etc.) is consistent with the existing problems civil society faces in most countries (*problems d, e*).
- To many CSOs and CSO networks, especially those that are not into service delivery activities, but have a high advocacy profile, the sustainability of their funding is a challenge. Many bilateral donors, governments and international organisations do not

[2] Criteria to decide if a link is strong are: good evidence available, strong logic, low risk, and/or wide acceptance. Criteria to decide whether a link is weak are: little evidence available, weak logic, high risk, and/or little agreement among stakeholders.

see the need to coordinate themselves to support independent and quality advocacy coalitions. Therefore, the CSEF strategy to coordinate donors is necessary to face another of the problems identified (*problem f*).

- Overall, the organisation of a pluri-scalar civil society network - to which the CSEF directly contributes - is consistent with the globalization of educational politics, in which supra-national actors like international organisations and bilateral donors are shaping global education agendas and framing countries‟ education policy priorities.

Second relational dimension: Strategy – Middle term goals

In general terms, it can be considered that **middle term goal 1** –building strong credible NECs- has advanced in those countries that are part of the project, reason why we can consider that the strategies (and according primary processes) have been adequate. Specifically, we have observed how all NECs have improved substantially in terms of capacity building and advocacy, they have designed their own context-based strategy that, at the same time, is highly consistent with the global CSEF strategy, and have achieved political recognition. However, the development of capacities in terms of research, training and knowledge management has been much more variable. In some countries the evolution of NECs in this terrain has been quite substantive, and in other countries has been more modest.

Middle term goal 2 – on national funds - has only advanced substantially in one country (Mozambique). The fact that the NCESF component has provoked substantive impact in, at least, one country shows that the idea is feasible. However, further attention needs to be given to the contextual and institutional conditions of project adoption and implementation if the project has to be scaled-up. Among other inconveniences, NECs were expected to implement the NCSEFs component in a relatively short time, which was definitely insufficient for developing such a complex institutional design. Furthermore, NECs would have needed more time to appropriate and adapt the NCSEF component to the very diverse political and economic realities where they operate. We develop further arguments in this respect below.

In the following table (Table 6.2), we use the *Assumptions A* as the mediating analytical device to explore more in deep the relationship between strategy and middle term goals. The data we use for the analysis is a combination of the results of the evaluation, evidence retrieved, perceptions of key stakeholders and academic research available.

Table 6.2. Testing assumptions A

Source: authors

STRENGHTS	WEAKNESSES
A1. Evidence based advocacy is the most strategic way of conducting advocacy campaigns for EFA	
Broad consensus among GCE members about the importance of adopting an evidence based advocacy approach Research points out to a combination of principled beliefs and evidence based arguments as the most strategic way of conducting advocacy (Keck and Sikkink 1999) Many coalitions produce „education reports" and other research products	An excessive focus on evidence based arguments could undermine the key master frame of the GCE (*'education as a human right'*) Low profile of training initiatives on research, data management and knowledge production within the CSEF Low level of involvement of local universities and scholars in NECs
A2. Governments take seriously evidence, media debates and the public opinion when it comes to frame education policies and priorities	
Media sources are a key instrument to amplify the messages of civil society campaigns and, this way, to transmit them to public opinion and decision-makers (McAdam 2001). Most NECs try to influence the media for advocacy purposes, and many of them have elaborated a communication plan.	Government ideologies mediate the validity of this assumption. Quite often, GCE (as well as the int'l donors) has a flat understanding of „governments" and do not sufficiently adapt their strategies to the different political programmes of governments. In some countries, education is not at the centre of the agenda of the media, which makes it more difficult for NECs" to influence in the media terrain.
A3. In a globalized world, civil society politics will be more effective if organized supra-nationally. The regional scale is the most appropriate to organize such a strategy	
Education agendas are settled globally (Dale 2005), and the global organisation of civil society is a necessary condition to influence in these agendas The GCE develops global awareness campaigns with the potential to reinforce and legitimate local advocacy strategies Effort to adopt bottom-up and participatory approaches in the context of the CSEF	Global campaigns/strategies do not always fit in the priorities and agendas of national coalitions. Leadership and strategic management have not been sufficiently effective to make that both the GCE global awareness campaigns and the CSEF feed each other. Except for Latin America, CSEF funds have not been used to organize advocacy initiatives of a regional scope
A4. Regional organisations have the capacity and resources to support the NECs" primary processes	
Regional coalitions have a long tradition and experienced staff in capacity matters (especially ASPBAE and CLADE) Regional coalitions have played an active role in capacity building activities related to advocacy (especially budget tracking) They have played an active role when it comes to promote mutual learning between NECs" experiences (at the regional level)	Knowledge exchange at the advocacy level has not cross-fertilized beyond regions Regional coalitions perceived as donors by many NECs instead of as political partners. This is something that may undermine the support of RC to NEC"s primary processes.

A5. To become credible interlocutors, NECs need to be as inclusive and broad as possible, with special attention to the participation of teachers" unions and women	
Most coalitions have widened their membership and their territorial scope with the CSEF resources (and, by doing so, have decentralized the coalition and expanded the network beyond the country"s capital) Most coalitions have established more clear rules of the game, democratic decision-making procedures and carried out more internal meetings An increasing number of teacher unions are involved in NECs and, in some cases, are even taking key responsibilities within the coalition	Growth of NECs has not always been sustainable and has brought destabilization to some coalitions (there is a fragile equilibrium between membership expansion and internal cohesion) The participation of women movement organisations is still a challenge in most NECs. There is no gender mainstreaming approach within the CSEF. Relationship between teachers unions and NGOs is not an easy one due to: a. misunderstandings on the political weight teachers unions should have within the NEC; b. lack of tuning of agendas and priorities; c. lack of tuning of approaches to advocacy (unions being more confrontational and NGOs more pro-dialogue) (Verger and Novelli 2012; country reports in this evaluation). Internal communication problems due to the difficulty of some NECs coordinator to spread up-to-date information to all the members
A6. Capacity building and an effective use of resources (human, technical, knowledge and methodological) enhances the credibility of CSOs	
The CSEF has contributed to build new advocacy coalitions in countries where this type of actors did not exist before Most NECs have become credible political actors and are highly present in governmental and donor-driven consultative bodies	When the CSEF started, NECs had low managerial skills and lack of a M&E culture
A7. Global and regional organisations have the capacity and resources to support the NECs at the management level (support processes)	
FMAs have worked intensively in building the financial management capacities of NECs Needs at the managerial level were assessed and a Capacity Support Plan (CSP) was designed and – to a great extent - executed Many of the communication problems between the three regional agencies have been addressed via coordination committees (or ad hoc mechanisms)	Absence of a HR plan when the project started. Turnover of managerial positions at all scales (global, national and regional), especially at the last stage of the project Communication and coordination problems between the three regional agencies were common Risk of conflict of interests and confusion of functions due to duplication of roles by the same persons Regional FMAs have not communicated between them globally The adoption of a CSP was a response to donor demands rather than a result of internal reflexivity. M&E implementation was not harmonized and the levels of precision and understanding of key concepts in the reporting was very diverse. The three steps included in

	the „CSEF M&E Plan" did not feed each other sufficiently.
A8. Nationally coordinated funds will allow CSOs to be better informed, to organize and align more effectively and carry out a more independent advocacy work	
[This assumption cannot be empirically tested yet] The implementation of NCSEFs has the potential to overcome project-like funding modalities that usually bring coalitions out of their strategic focus.	Several internal and external sources of resistance to the NCSEF idea have been identified (Kamera 2010)

Third relational dimension: strategy/middle term goals - long term goals

In this section, the relationship between the strategy/middle term and the long-term goals is analyzed by testing the intermediate assumptions (Assumptions B). The long term-goals in the CSEF ToC consist on the achievement of the „EFA goals", with a focus on the countries where the CSEF project is being implemented.

2015 is the deadline for most of the Education for All (EFA) goals and, even when we are getting very close to this date, many countries in the world are still far behind from their achievement. In fact, as stated in the last EFA Global Monitoring Report, "progress towards many of the goals is slowing down, and most EFA goals are unlikely to be met" (UNESCO 2012: 34). However, it also needs to be acknowledged that, at the same time, a lot of advances have been produced in this terrain in the last decade:

> The number of children out of school is falling, gender gaps are narrowing and more children are moving from primary school to secondary education and beyond. Some of the world"s poorest countries have registered impressive gains, demonstrating that low income is not an automatic barrier to accelerated progress. (UNESCO 2011, p. 4)

Since its inception, civil society has been a key partner in the global EFA action framework and, consequently, it can be considered it that has contributed importantly to the (more-or-less modest) progress towards the achievement of most of the goals. Nevertheless, as we have insisted in this report, it is not easy to attribute causality to particular civil society groups and/or actions in this terrain. Such an attribution of causality is even more difficult to establish when analysing particular projects like the CSEF that, even when they have mobilized an important number of resources at a big scale, have been implemented in a very short period.

Thus, at the point of analysing the relationship between middle term and long term goals of the CSEF, the level of attribution of the project needs to be seen as lower than in relation to the type of relations explored above. Here, our analysis focuses on the strengths and

weaknesses of Assumptions B (see Table 6.3). As in the previous section, the data we use for the analysis is a combination of the results of the evaluation, evidence retrieved, perceptions of key stakeholders and academic research, when available.

Table 6.3. Testing B Assumptions

Source: authors

STRENGHTS	**WEAKNESSES**
B1. Favourable political environment conducive to policy reforms, transparency and accountability	
Most coalitions operate in contexts where laws on freedom of association have been enacted Several NECs have contributed to introduce policy changes even in political contexts that were not apparently favourable	
B2. National Education Plans and Local Education Groups are key policy instruments when it comes to the development of the EFA goals at the country level	
Most NECs are part of their country"s LEG. The CSEF has become a platform to inform NECs about GPE related processes and to make them more aware about the importance of getting involved in them	In many countries LEGs are not central actors or spaces in national educational politics yet. In several LEGs, NECs are not the main voice representing civil society concerns and proposals
B3. Tracking the governmental educational budget is an effective way to avoid financial mismanagement by government agencies	
Most NECs have received training on budget tracking and many of them have implemented budget tracking mechanisms (especially in Africa) Via budget tracking, several NECs have detected financial mismanagement of educational budgets by the Ministry and guaranteed that public funding reaches the most needed areas	For budget tracking to become effective, it needs to operate at the district and school levels. In most countries, such a level of decentralization in budget tracking initiatives has not happened due to the fact that most activities of NECs are still highly centralized in the capital.
B4. Political space and recognition influence governmental behaviours/decision-making	
Most case studies document the achievement of political impact by NECs in terms of educational reform and legislative change in the period in which the CSEF has been implemented Many governments, which traditionally perceived civil society as an obstacle for policy-making, conceive now NECs as partners in education policy processes	Risk of co-optation and attenuation of confrontational action repertoires that in some political contexts may be necessary, and even more effective than dialogue (Giugni et al. 1999)

B.5. Getting more resources (and its effective management) is a necessary condition to NECs becoming credible interlocutors in education policy related debates at a range of scales (global, regional and national).	
In most coalitions, the CSEF grant represents more than 50% of the total budget (see Table 5.3) In most countries, the CSEF has clearly impacted in reinforcing the visibility of NECs in society and their political recognition by governments and other stakeholders In most cases, managerial challenges have been addressed via effective control mechanisms and a capacity building strategy	When the CSEF is too central in NECs" finances, it can generate economic dependence Not all regional organisations have taken advantage of the CSEF to raise their advocacy strategy at the regional level Increasing funding has generated management challenges and, occasionally, confronted mismanagement issues
B6a. Donors would be more effective if they coordinate better at the country level. They are willing to enhance their coordination within the education sector by supporting National CSEF (or related mechanisms) and hence use their resources more effectively	
Some donors have championed the NCSEF initiative in countries like Mozambique The NCSEF initiative directly engages with some of the core principles of the Paris Declaration (aid coordination, ownership, harmonization), which have been embraced by most international donors	In several countries where the CSEF operates donors have supported other civil society funds and are not willing to duplicate A needs assessment was not done before the project was designed to find out about donor coordination in different contexts Private/corporate donors are not so willing to go for budget support because they usually need to associate their brand to aid flows (Van Fleet 2012). Most donors have so far demonstrated low commitment to making the necessary changes to adapt aid delivery to the Paris Declaration principles (Woods et al 2012)
B6b. If funds like the NCSEF were created, CSO would be able to catalyze much more support for their advocacy tasks	
Increasing and upward trend in the NECs capacity to mobilize resources has been identified CSEF funds have raised the credibility of NECs and their capacity to attract other funds and new partners A NCSEF could help to harmonize funding procedures, and to introduce efficiency gains in M&E	Since the NCSEF could not be implemented, this assumption cannot be assessed empirically. The planned pilot experiences could not be developed Some NECs feel that a single fund could have the opposite effect: a lower level of resources available in aggregated terms

6.3. Recommendations

As observed in the analysis presented above, the CSEF theory of change, in the way it has been conceived and brought into practice, counts on numerous strengths. These strengths have contributed to important progress in the achievement of the CSEF project goals and, more indirectly, to the advancement of the EFA goals in many countries. However, several weaknesses in the way the CSEF has been constructed and executed have been also identified (see Tables 6.2. and 6.3). The following recommendations are an attempt to address some of these weaknesses in an eventual second stage of the project (CSEF II).

The recommendations are organized according to the main themes covered in this evaluation: strategy, national funds, institutional setting, human resources management, gender approach, M&E, financial management, learning, and processes at the country level.

Strategy

Fitting global and national strategies together. When combining the CSEF with other global awareness campaigns also promoted by the GCE (like the GAW or the 1Goal), leadership and management need to be strong to guarantee the consistency of the two approaches. The GCE board and secretariat need to make sure that the international campaigns feed the locally defined strategies of NECs (instead of interfering them) as well as that the international campaigns do not absorb an excessive capacity from the secretariat for it to support effectively the primary processes carried out at the national level in the context of the CSEF.

Bottom-up approach. The CSEF should contribute to develop and strengthen a bottom-up approach within the GCE. CSEF needs to be flexible enough to allow for different project re-contextualizations according to the variety of local realities in which the GCE operates, and according to the trajectory, capacities and strategies of the coalitions that are engaging with the programme. Thus, the value of the CSEF relies on its level of adaptation to the needs and strategies of the GCE members. To make this possible, a proper inception phase for the development of the national projects should be guaranteed.[3] Adopting a bottom-up approach is compatible with – and actually requires – the adoption of strong leadership from the center of the programme.

Regional advocacy. CSEF II should think about the regional as a political space and, accordingly, guarantee sufficient resources to allow regional coalitions to play and develop advocacy initiatives at the regional scale.

CSEF opportunities for all. To avoid the exclusion of GCE members from funding opportunities and generating tensions within the GCE network, ideally, non GPE-eligible countries should be able to benefit from CSEF II. If GPE rules do not allow this possibility, compensation mechanisms should be explored. The Latin American experience shows that regional organisations may be very effective in attracting donors to fund NECs in countries

[3] In general, an important inception phase might be strongly considered to be in place if CSEF continues with a second phase. This will allow to put the learning systematisation and software in place, and also allows clear common understanding by the NEC"s on the system and the concepts, through on-line training, visits and, if necessary, in-person seminars.

with an intermediate level of human development.

Time availability. Time has been one of the main constraints in the development of the CSEF project. The parties involved in CSEF II would benefit from having more inception and execution time in the development of such an ambitious and pluri-scalar project modality. A funding cycle of around four years would allow for predictability, better planning (at all levels: human resources, capacity development, advocacy, research, etc.) and higher levels of institutional learning. It would also contribute to counteract problems like human resources turnover and the prevailing rush at the time of developing the most complex components of the project like the NCSEF one.

National funds

The NCSEF idea has the potential to promote the adoption and development of more sustainable advocacy strategies in the context of NECS, and to avoid NECs having to implement donor funded projects that so often bring them out of their focus. NCSEF could be seen as a process for "pressing" donor to finance civil society under „budget support" modalities and harmonizing M&E frameworks and requirements.

Actually, NCSEFs have not been implemented widely due to a number of contextual and organisational factors. Contextual particularities really matter here, but difficulties of a more internal nature to design and organise such type of fund have also become apparent. The NCSEF idea could be re-considered in the CSEF II, but should not respond to a blueprint schema. The NCSEF might work in some countries where, for instance, there is room for improvement in donor coordination and might not be taken up in countries in which donors have built another civil society fund – since they will feel they are duplicating efforts. Different funding mechanisms might be considered in countries without a strong presence of international donors. It might be also the case that NCSEFs do not develop into a concrete and legalized fund, but into the supporting of consistent fundraising strategies by NECS.

Achieving national CSEFs (or similar funding mechanisms) will require leadership and dedication at global, regional and country level. A NCSEF should be independent and separate from the NECs, to avoid coalitions becoming fund managers and allow for a mechanism that successfully supports civil society and meets the challenges of resource mobilization.

Institutional setting

The CSEF architecture responded to a very new institutional design. It meant the creation of new bodies and committees and the adoption of new roles and functions by many agents involved. At the initial stage a lot of energies had to be put in setting up the architecture. With the passage of time, the agents involved learned many lessons from the experience, and communication and cooperation between agencies improved substantially. However, several changes could be introduced to improve the effectiveness and coherence in the CSEF architecture.

First, a single and global FMA could be in charge of the global CSEF finance system as a way to simplify and harmonize procedures, finance reporting and audit systems. This agency should coordinate with the CSEF Global and regional secretariat, but be directly accountable to the supervisory entity. The organisation in charge of the global FMA could be an INGO. However, in case this organisation is directly related to the GCE or to its members (via a funding or membership relationship) clear mechanisms and rules should be in place to guarantee transparency in the procedures and to avoid that conflicts of interest emerge.

Second, financial reports and narrative reports should be better coordinated. The M&E system should be much more simplified since this is something that would liberate time of the CSEF secretariat to focus on programmatic work. At the same time, the M&E system should not only aim at external reporting, but also at internal learning and exchange. By introducing these changes in the M&E approach, the tasks of the regional CSEF secretariat would be more consistent with the tasks of the Regional Coalition (which focuses on programmatic and strategic aspects of coalition building and EFA advocacy). We develop this point further in the M&E section below.

Third, the Funding Committee would benefit from being predominantly – and, preferably, completely - composed by external and independent persons. By doing so, there would be fewer chances that NECs confuse the role of regional coalitions with that of a donor agency, and that power relations between the regional and national organisations are altered. The CSEF regional secretariat should attend the FC meetings to provide information and support to the Committee members and to make sure that their recommendations are effectively transmitted to the NECs. However, the regional secretariat members should not take decisions concerning which are the proposals that can be funded or what is the level of funding they deserve. The FC independent members should receive an economic compensation for their participation. By doing so, we would expect that the level of absenteeism of FC members – which was especially high in some of the regions - would diminish, and that they prepare better for the Committee meetings – for instance, by reading the proposals and other documentation beforehand.

Human resources management

Strengthening of HR planning. CSEF II will require of a better planning of the human resources, to make sure that there are sufficient competent people to cover all the tasks that need to be done, that the capacity gaps at multiple levels are overcome, and that the key positions are created and covered on time. Vision and strategic framework on competency requirements and competency development should also be taken into account in the HR planning. The experience of the Capacity Support Plan in CSEF I should set the basis of future interventions in this terrain. However, again, sound coordination and leadership are important to make sure that these sorts of plans deploy their full potential.

Facing the turnover. The turnover problem was already present in previous programmes like CEF and RWS, and seems to be a persistent problem for CSOs that operate in different

policy fields. A plan or strategy to face the turnover problem should be adopted. Among other measures, equity in labour conditions within the CSEF framework should be guaranteed (i.e. similar salaries for similar job responsibilities).

Organisational Assessment and Technical Assistance to Grant Management. An Organisational Assessment of the different technical needs would help to allocate resources and technical assistance according to the needs of the different contexts where the CSEF is implemented.

Gender approach

In organisational terms, a systematic gender-mainstreaming approach is missing within the GCE/CSEF network. Thus, the CSEF would benefit from the adoption of a more explicit organisational gender approach. Gender power relations need to be understood as embedded and normalized within power structures and power relations. Transforming such embedded relations is often a daunting task. When related with internal and organisational aspects, challenging unequal gender relations needs a strong leadership and a clear political will. Some examples of gender fair practices are: (a) Eliminate overt and covert biases in hiring, firing and promoting male and female employees; (b) Promote gender equality in access to opportunities for training, education, participation in decision making; (c) Develop organisational policies and personnel services that address gender issues (i.e. sexual harassment, harmonization of work and family life, etc.) (d) Sex disaggregation of data (e) Adoption of non-sexist practices (e.g. in language, inter-personal relations, communication) (f) Empower parents (mostly, mothers) so that they actively participate in school councils.

Monitoring & Evaluation

M&E approach. Ideally, M&E instruments should be sufficiently flexible and adaptable to the needs of the core processes, and this might be the unique way that the different strategies of the organisations could be implemented, consuming the minimum resources. M&E should be a tool for internal learning, reflection and acceleration of positive change, instead of being seen as a burden. But for this to happen, more agile tools need to be designed. A stronger focus on Management for Results (cf *Reuber and Haas 2009*) instead of Project Logframe implementation, could be considered. In the future any fund addressed to engage civil society organisations in education advocacy should endeavour to produce more precise benchmarks of progress in terms of primary processes and expected synergies between them (mostly, between research and advocacy, and capacity, training and innovation).

*Towards a new M&E platform linked with financial management*Ideally, M&E instruments and reports should be better coordinated with the financial reports. The M&E system should be much more simplified since this is something that would liberate time of the CSEF secretariats (at global, regional and national levels) to focus on programmatic work. At the same time, the M&E system should not only aim at external reporting, but also at internal learning and exchange. This would allow fulfilling the accountability requirements of donors,

without consuming so much time as the previous system. This is something that, at the same time, would contribute to improve the organisation efficiency and reduce costs. The M&E platform should be user-friendly and, preferably, developed through free software and open licences. This ICT tool might be connected with the existing Community Learning/Knowledge platform through some interfaces. By introducing these „technical" changes in M&E procedures, the tasks of the regional CSEF secretariat would be more consistent with the tasks of the Regional Coalition (which focuses on programmatic and strategic aspects of coalition building and EFA advocacy).

Planning M&E solutions in advance. Overcoming accountability issues (including M&E and financial management reporting issues) requires of a more proactive direction and guiding process, and the planning of solutions in advance. It is important to plan and identify alternative solutions to disbursement delays, cash-flow problems or lack of financial management capacity at different levels, especially the national one, to make sure that managerial and financial issues do not affect the core processes of CSEF II.

One recommendation in this respect would consist on the M&E and the FMA externally contracting technical support to an organisation with no membership relation (even without a funding relation) with the GCE and their members, to avoid organisational inconsistencies that appeared with the former FMA"s, as well as potential conflict of interest. We also recommend the constitution of a Collaborative Team group or Task Force to create the basis for a unified software application to be used for project management and for accounting purposes.

M&E training. More intensive training to those that are going to be in charge of M&E procedures at the country level would be needed. Among others, the M&E training should attempt to achieve the following objectives:

- Clarification of concepts (*campaign, advocacy, lobbying, workshop, organisation, branch*, meeting, etc.) in order to avoid ambiguity or a wide variety of interpretations depending on the coalition.

- Learning to write for an international audience (especially those reports that are going to be public available, like the completion reports). This means making explicit what (local) acronyms mean, doing short definitions of the key institutions/organisations that are mentioned, background data policies or laws, monetary amounts in USD, etc.

- Ensure that NECs have in place the adequate data collection skills to fulfil the quantitative data required.

During the project cycle, more feedback should be given to reports from central and regional structures to make reporting more consistent and useful for NECs.

M&E and transparency. To enhance the transparency of the CSEF II, reports should be made available to the public as soon as the final version is ready. For the same purpose, minutes and key decisions of the Funding Committees would need to be available on a webpage as well.

M&E and Learning. The M&E system should not only aim at external reporting, but also at internal learning and exchange. By introducing these changes in the M&E approach, the tasks of the regional CSEF secretariat would be more consistent with the tasks of the Regional Coalition (which focuses on programmatic and strategic aspects of coalition building and EFA advocacy). At the same time, a more clear connection and synergies between core and support processes would be established:

> In the context of Theory of Change, core processes are also cooperation and learning processes. In traditional Project Management, a supportive role is normally ascribed to theses processes. In TC contexts, projects operate as cooperation networks and are geared toward learning. As well as the output processes designed to achieve the project objectives and results, cooperation processes (moderation of a large number of actors) and learning processes (i.e. capacity development) should therefore also be considered core processes (GTZ, 2009: 177)

Learning

GCE should take advantage of being a global network to play a more active support at promoting cross-fertilization of experiences and south-south collaboration. The creation of a Knowledge Platform is a positive step in this direction, but does not automatically conduct to effective information and knowledge sharing across different geographical contexts. A more clear focus on what to learn and what to share, as well as a proper assessment of the knowledge needs, its applicability and requirements are necessary. As mentioned above, the Knowledge Platform should be more clearly connected to the M&E platform and to strengthen learning processes, not only about advocacy, but also about organisational and operational issues. Technologies like KARL have the potential to facilitate learning and exchange of experiences among the CSEF participants in a cost-effective way. However, for these technologies to be appropriated by the participants, they will need of active coordination, at least at the initial stages.

The linguistic diversity of the GCE network is also important to take into account when organizing learning process. Resources for translation need to be guaranteed.

Supervising entity and the role of the GPE

First, the CSEF II will need of a supervisory entity that wants and can play the supervising role in a proactive manner. The World Bank has (self)discarded itself to assume this function, and the GPE secretariat would prefer not relating to the GCE as a supervisory entity in *strictu sensu*. In CSEF II, a bilateral donor (preferably a member of the GPE board) could play this role. This entity should engage in virtually every stage of programme development and offer assistance when grants run into difficulties or delays.

The GPE secretariat has not always felt comfortable with the role they had to play within the CSEF structure in the past. They wanted to become a proper partner of civil society, but they ended up working as a *de facto* supervisory entity, monitoring progress and providing technical assistance. Definitely, within CSEF II, GPE might play a supervisory role at the normative level, but not at the technical one. In other words, in the future, the GPE should engage with the CSEF in a different way. Instead of „one more project" being funded by them, the GPE should incorporate the CSEF into its strategy and, accordingly, into its everyday operations at both the international and country levels. The last GPE strategy plan and, specifically, its „Strategy to Support Civil Society Participation" represent good steps in this terrain (GPE 2012a, GPE 2012c).

Processes at the country level

The experience of the CSEF project at the country level has highlighted an array of issues and challenges that suggest some recommendations:

- In line with the „budget support" idea that is becoming increasingly accepted by the international aid community, the CSEF should tend to support the strategies of coalitions (instead of requiring from coalitions to design „projects" to be financially supported by the CSEF).
- At the country level, transparency, improvement of labour standards, development of a strategy for communication, widening the approach to gender issues, and accurate M&E are likely to contribute to the sustainability of NECs over time. On the one hand, transparent management, effective communication, a subtle gender approach which is aware of participation at the local level, and a clearer M&E scheme may underpin public trust in the NEC, and conversely, any shortcoming in these processes may compromise its future. On the other hand, more satisfied human resources are necessary so that current improvements become eventually institutionalised.
- To strengthen their research capacity, NECs should consider the inclusion or establishment of more stable partnerships with local scholars and universities. To do so in a more organic way, they may consider introducing higher education themes into the coalitions" agendas, even when they are not directly related to the EFA goals.
- *Beyond resources related demands.* In poorest countries, demanding more resources is a necessary condition to achieve the EFA goals. However, the EFA programme also opens several debates on education policy reform, which are very political and contentious in nature, such as: what are the key policies that can contribute to the EFA goals? How should teachers be trained and what should be

their professional status? How to promote education equity and quality at the same time? Should low-cost fee schools be considered an ally or an obstacle for education quality for all? Etc. Through the development of the research and knowledge management capacities of civil society that CSEF II should aim to, NECs may be more able to engage further in this type of education policy debates.

- *Overcoming donor dependency.* The GCE and their members need to continue putting pressure on the donor community to fulfill their international commitments with the EFA action framework. However, the global financial crisis, which is contributing to a donors‟ decline in educational spending, is urging NECs to engage in debates on alternative forms of education funding, such as debt conversion development bonds, the Tobin tax or diaspora bonds. Alliances with tax justice movements and demands related to progressive tax reforms can contribute to generating the necessary resources to finance EFA from exogenous and endogenous sources.

6.4. Closing words

The CSEF programme has contributed to building stronger and more credible NECs in most countries that are part of the programme. Specifically, we have observed how NECs have improved substantially in terms of capacity building and advocacy, and have been able to design their own context-based strategy that, at the same time, is highly consistent with the global CSEF strategy. Furthermore, to a greater or lesser extent, coalitions have achieved political recognition in the contexts where they operate. However, the development of capacities in terms of research and knowledge management has been much more modest.

The CSEF project was more consistently designed at the level of core processes (budget tracking, advocacy, etc.) than in terms of support processes (finance, human resources management, M&E, etc.). This made that several managerial issues that emerged while the project was being developed had to be solved *ad hoc*. Time constraints, uncertainty with the future of the programme and delays in funding delivery marked the trajectory of the project and, to some extent, the level of achievement of its goals.

The institutional setting designed by the CSEF is sophisticated and could be set up in a very short time, despite the unfavorable circumstances just mentioned. The institutional design raised a set of principal-agent and coordination problems, many of which could be addressed during the project cycle through the proactive role and leadership of the regional organisations. Even then, these problems blurred the efforts to steer the whole organisation towards common objectives, especially in relation to those objectives that were more ambitious in nature like the establishment of national civil society funds.

As this evaluation shows, the CSEF has contributed to civil society networks becoming key political agents in educational debates and have actively worked for the realization of the right to „education for all‟, effecting significant national policy change in many world locations. However, the contribution of civil society to the EFA action framework does not need to be seen only in terms of aid effectiveness. Well-articulated and competent civil society networks can contribute to advance the EFA goals, but also to the democratization of education politics at different levels. In relation to this, the CSEF has

opened spaces for civil society organisations and individual citizens to have a say in education and to hold their governments to account.

The continuity of the CSEF programme should focus on developing capacities in terms of both advocacy and strategic management; strengthening and democratizing civil society networks; simplifying the (supra-national) institutional setting; promoting further international exchange and learning; and providing core financial support to NECs‟ strategies.