Results Agreement with UNICEF on School Related Gender Based Violence under the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program

Date: 30.03.2014

1. Thematic Area¹
Learning Outcomes and Systems Improvement

2. Subtheme
Related to SO2: All girls in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment

3. Managing Entity Contact Information
(Program manager)
UNICEF
3 UN Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017
Tel: +1 212 824 6012
Changu Mannathoko, Senior Education Adviser (cmannathoko@unicef.org) &
Aarti Saihjee, Education Specialist (asaihjee@unicef.org)

4. Amount out of GPE Fund
$US 800,000 (out of which agency fee US$ 64,000)

5. Proposed Start Date/End Dates
2014 –2017 (to be initiated when funds received)

6. Reporting on Implementation
Monitoring reports due June 30 and December 31; completion report due within 3 months after end date of implementation

7. Regional Focus/Beneficiary Countries
a) Regional Focus:
• Western and Central Africa (Togo & Cote d’Ivoire)
• Eastern and Southern Africa (Ethiopia & Zambia)
b) Global Relevance:
School related gender-based violence (SRGBV) is a global phenomenon, albeit its nature and incidence may vary between regions/countries and within countries. Despite the regional focus, the process and outcome of the initiative is expected to have global relevance.

8. Knowledge/Capacity Gap to be Addressed (in very brief form)
Knowledge Gap: a) Lack of a consolidated evidence base on effective strategies to address SRGBV; b) Low awareness, understanding, and recognition among educators and managers of the nature and scope of SRGBV and how it affects boys and girls differently;
Capacity Gap: Limited capacity of education sector to design, implement and monitor SRGBV strategies – which are holistic and context-specific;
Implementation Gap: a) Lack of monitoring systems that can track incidence of SRGBVs regularly; b) Limited spaces and platforms for civil society participation and systematic inputs;

¹ The information under 1 – 9 should be taken from Form A of the final GRA program proposal and be updated where necessary
9. Results Expected (in very brief form; see also detailed Table below)

10. Readjustment and Mid-term Review

If the Managing Entity sees a need for a change amounting to more than 20% of the grant allocation, a request can be sent to the Secretariat for consideration. Based on the monitoring results of the implementation the Secretariat can propose changes too.

The Secretariat will conduct a mid-term review in February 2015 which aims at ensuring that the activity stays on track and relevant to GPE strategic objectives. This may lead to adjustments in the activity.
**Detailed Expected Results, Outcomes and Outputs (Please see the Instructions in the Annex):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goal to which program will contribute: Girls complete primary school and transition to secondary education within a safe and supportive learning environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Indicator 1:** % increase in incidence of reporting and action against school related GBV in target country program areas

**Indicator 2:** Gender parity in transition to secondary education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes (What will be delivered?)</th>
<th>Indicators, timescales, milestones and targets for expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Program Outputs (Program Deliverables) with indicators and targets</th>
<th>Activities (planned to obtain or to contribute to achieving stated outcomes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Outcome 1:** Project countries are knowledgeable about the nature and incidence of SRGBV in schools; and use evidence based policies and strategies to address SRGBV

**Indicator 1:** Number of countries with an available global and national evidence base on effective strategies to address SRGBV

**Timescale/Milestone:** Country Reports at end of project/2 countries by mid-point

**Target:** 5 (4 project countries + 1 global)

**Indicator 2:** Number of countries, where the LEG systematically address SRGBV and safe schools as part of monitoring & development of education sector plans

**Timescale/Milestone(s):** End of project evaluation/4 groups by mid-point

**Target:** 4 (project countries) +

**Output 1:** Country-baselines on nature and incidence of SRGBV completed;

**Indicator:** Number of country-specific baselines completed

**Target:** 5 (4 countries + 1 global baseline)

**Output 2:** Robust M&E framework developed and operationalized for cross-country analysis of SRGBV and “safe” schools;

**Indicator 1:** # of countries monitoring identified indicators at program level;

**Target:** 4

1.1. Global and regional mechanism established to lead cross-country analysis, M&E and program coordination and consolidation (including recruitment of institution(s) and individuals at HQ and ROs)

1.2. Systematic review of literature on effective interventions and good practices in addressing SRGBV globally

1.3. Conduct/update country-baselines, including situational analysis, stakeholder analysis and sector problem analysis to identify incidence of SRGBV, existing policies and mechanisms, monitoring systems and programs designed to prevent and/or redress SRGBV.

1.4. Regional workshops to plan and roll out program conducted bi-annually; and followed through national workshops;

1.5. Develop country-specific work plans including participatory M&E frameworks involving community level monitoring of gender based violence in schools

1.6. Develop and pilot a small survey on assessing the incidence of SRGBV in each country with a view to have

---

2 Inclusion of SRGBV/safe schools in education sector plans is only relevant if the country in question is in the process of developing the plans during the course of the project;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2:</th>
<th>Partners in project countries have increased institutional and technical capacity to design, implement and monitor SRGBV interventions, based on global best practice and country level learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Indicator 1:** Number of key stakeholders\(^3\) using gender responsive program design and delivery processes within education plans,  
*Timescale/Milestone:* End of project evaluation/16 groups at midpoint  
*Target:* 8 across each of the 4 project countries; | **Output 1:** Gender responsive program planning tools developed to enable context specific response to SRGBV  
*Indicator 1:* # of gender sensitive program planning tools used  
*Target:* 4  
**Indicator 2:** # of metrics and indicators developed to measure GBV within schools  
*Target:* 4 |
| **Output 2:** Innovative interventions addressing SRGBV at the school level identified and included within country level program plans;  
*Indicator 1:* # of interventions being implemented in |  
2. 1 Workshop to promote common understanding of SRGBV and establish parameters for responses and interventions that address GBV in schools  
2. 2 Conduct country level review workshops to support planning and implementation of SRGBV activities  
2. 3 Develop training guides and manuals field tested for Francophone and Anglophone users  
2. 4 Conduct staff training and/or technical assistance to enhance understanding of gender dimensions of education  
2. 5 Develop community level M&E framework to track program progress and draw timely lessons to enable course correction  
2. 6 Maintain data base of good programming practices, data and tools within countries  
2. 7 Social Mobilization of national teams, local education groups and local communities (teachers, parents, children and adolescents, local authorities) against GBV in schools  
2. 8 Establish dialogue fora between adolescents, school |

---

\(^3\) Teachers and education authorities, community members, CSOs and CBOs, LEGs and Ministries of Education, development partners, children and adolescents, technical institutions, non-education government authorities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1</th>
<th>Output 2: # of participating schools in the project countries; <strong>Indicator 2:</strong> # of schools, teachers and children being reached by the interventions; <strong>Target:</strong> 10 interventions (minimum of 2-3 interventions across the 4 participating countries);</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3:</strong> Capacity building strategy rolled out at different levels  <strong>Indicator 1:</strong> # of capacity building activities conducted with staff, partners and school personnel, children and adolescents  <strong>Indicator 2:</strong> # of teachers, children and community members (50% girls and women) participating in activities  <strong>Target:</strong> 20 activities; (minimum of 5 across each country;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4:</strong> “Communities of Learning” established in target intervention areas to facilitate peer to peer learning on gender dynamics, violence and education  <strong>Indicator 1:</strong> # of groups actively personnel, community members and relevant stakeholders to address issues of gender and violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Build on CFS as a model for participation to strengthen adolescent girls’ voices within and outside schools.
| **Outcome 3:** Global and regional actors actively engage with the issue of SRGBV to improve multi-level and multi-sectoral action against SRGBV | **Indicator 1:** Number of global fora and mechanisms facilitated to address SRGBV;  
*Timescale/Milestone:* End of project evaluation/3 at midpoint  
*Target:* 6 | **Output 1:** Global Community of Practice on SRGBV developed and facilitated for the period of the project;  
*Indicator 1:* # of participants active in the Community of Practice  
*Target:* 75-100  
**Output 2:** Global learning workshop/s organized and conducted for GPE countries (in partnership with GPE Secretariat);  
*Indicator 1:* No. of GPE countries participating in the workshop;  
*Target:* 30 | 3. 1 Global management and coordination mechanisms as outlined in the proposal set-up;  
3. 2 Establish online portal, technical working groups, common metrics and tools of data collection, and peer review processes where relevant;  
3. 3 Consolidate and document the knowledge generated by participating countries along with a repository of tools and country specific reports  
3. 4 Publication of reports, guidance documents and policy briefs highlighting key findings and best practices  
3. 5 Develop and implement communication and advocacy strategy, including organization of regional and global workshops/conference for dissemination;  
**Indicator 2:** Number of non-project GPE countries aware and using the tools and guidance developed  
*Timescale/Milestone:* End of project & beyond  
*Target:* 10 | **Output 3:** Practical and accessible guidance and tools for assessing, designing and implementing SRGBV programming developed and shared |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1: # of reports, tools and guidance shared in academic fora and among partner and GPE countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Annex: Information and Instructions for the detailed table on outputs, outcomes/results:

1. Definitions:

- **Overall program goal** (mauve shaded row): Higher level goal (impact) to which the program will contribute.

- **Outcomes**: Expected demand-side behavioral responses by the direct beneficiaries outside the control of the managing/implementing partner that demonstrate uptake, adoption and use of the project outputs, Example: New practices adopted, children in school, reduction in absenteeism, students show improved reading performance, Governments use new databases. The **focus should be on outcome(s) that the program is reasonably expected to lead to but are not directly within its control**.

- **Indicators**: Indicators are statements of measure: E.g. Number or Percentage of something which improve / increase / decrease. They are meant to verify an expected result is achieved, but they do not themselves express the result. E.g. "Annual training takes place on how to run parenting groups" is the result and not an indicator, while number or percentage of parenting groups trained per year could be the indicator. The indicators should be **SMART**: Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic and relevant, Time-bound, meaning they can be measured, and have baselines, milestones and targets. Example: in follow up survey, X% staff use concepts/skills from learning activity, stakeholder consultations held, feedback reflected in revision of education sector policy, network of official formed after participation in program/workshop, meet regularly etc.

The indicators for the **overall goal** (in the mauve shaded row) should be publicly measurable and tracked. When formulating the **indicators for the outcomes** please ensure they can be measured by someone involved in the project including how the information will be gathered, processed and reported. Preferably the outcome indicators should not be all end of project indicators, sequencing is recommended.

- **Outputs**: Program deliverables (on the supply side) within the control of the managing/implanting partner; tangible products of services that can be counted. Examples: Training plan completed, local staff trained, report completed, new curriculum materials developed, school built, etc. For the outputs indicators and targets should be provided as well including planned dates for completion (e.g. indicate how many staff will be trained and by when).
• Activities: Action taken or work performed by which inputs are converted into specific outputs to achieve or to contribute to the achievement of the expected outcomes listed under the first column Training, study, workshop etc.).

2. Guidance:

• Start with providing a clear statement what is the program’s overall goal (changes in institutional performance or behavior / practices of target groups) along with 1 - 3 key indicators to measure this goal. These indicators should be publicly measurable and tracked. They should be at a higher level and relate to the MDGs and/or the GPE strategic goals and objectives the program will contribute to.

• Then list the major expected program outcomes in the rose colored column 1. Please make sure to clearly define what is intended to be achieved as a result of the interventions (activities) and avoid stating deliverables (which are outputs) under outcomes. Example: “Teachers trained” is an output. The respective outcome could be “students show improved reading performance”. The higher level goal (overall program goal) in this example would be “literacy rates increase”. There should be not more than 3 major outcomes for the whole program. Please make sure that you keep this limit unless the complexity of the program absolutely requires an exception.

• The number of key indicators per outcome should also be limited to a maximum of 3 per outcome so that the monitoring and reporting efforts don’t become too complicated. The same applies for the indicators per output. In many cases just one indicator might be sufficient. Please also inform on the data resources which will be used to help insure that the indicators are measurable.