



**Commonwealth Education Fund - Kenya (CEFK)**

**End of Project Evaluation  
Report**

**By  
John Mwendwa, Jane Munene and Alice Kibui  
Iceberg Africa**

**September, 2008**

## Table of content

<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATION AND ACRONYMS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.0 BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.0 OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE END OF PROJECT EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.0 CEFK END OF PROJECT EVALUATION FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>14</b>
3.2 OBJECTIVE ONE: STRENGTHENING CSOS PARTICIPATION .....	15
3.3 OBJECTIVE TWO: SUPPORTING LOCAL COMMUNITIES .....	22
3.4 OBJECTIVE THREE: SUPPORTING INNOVATIVE APPROACHES . .....	25
3.5 INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION AND MANAGEMENT.....	30
3.5.1 CEFK MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE.....	30
3.5.2 ANALYSIS OF COST AND BUDGET UTILIZATION BY CEFK PARTNERS .....	32
TABLE 1: UTILIZATION OF BUDGETS BY PARTNERS 2003-2008 .....	32
<b>4.0 CEFK ISSUES AND CHALLENGES .....</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1 LESSONS LEARNT AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	35
<b>APPENDIX 1: CEF COUNTRY SUMMARY TEMPLATE.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: TOR .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES .....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>APPENDIX 5: EVALUATION WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>52</b>

## List of abbreviation and acronyms

<b>AACC</b>	All Africa Conference of Churches
<b>AGM</b>	Annual General Meeting
<b>ASAL</b>	Arid and Semi-Arid Land
<b>ASOK</b>	Autism Society of Kenya
<b>BTL</b>	Bible Translation and Literacy
<b>CADEC</b>	Cancel Debt for the Child Campaign
<b>CDF</b>	Constituency Development Fund
<b>CDFT</b>	Community Development Trust Fund
<b>CEF</b>	Commonwealth Education Fund
<b>CEFK</b>	Commonwealth Education Fund – Kenya
<b>CRS</b>	Catholic Relief Services
<b>CSOs</b>	Civil Society Organizations
<b>ECD</b>	Early Childhood Education
<b>EFA</b>	Education for All
<b>EKWVC</b>	Elimu Kwa Wana Vijiji Coalition
<b>EYC</b>	Elimu Yetu Coalition
<b>FPE</b>	Free Primary Education
<b>GCN</b>	Girl Child Network
<b>GEP</b>	Gender Equality in Education Programme
<b>GOK</b>	Government of Kenya
<b>KAACR</b>	Kenya Alliance for Advancement of Child Rights
<b>KANNET</b>	Kakamega Non-formal Education Network
<b>KIE</b>	Kenya Institute of Education
<b>KNAP</b>	Kenya National Association of Parents
<b>KSMH</b>	Kenya Society for the Mentally Handicapped
<b>LIFA</b>	Literacy for All
<b>MAAIP</b>	Maasai Aids Awareness Programme
<b>MOE</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>MOH</b>	Ministry of Health
<b>MET</b>	Mother Tongue Education
<b>NCCK</b>	National Council of Churches of Kenya
<b>NFE</b>	Non-formal Education
<b>NGOs</b>	Non-Governmental Organizations
<b>OVCs</b>	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
<b>PTA</b>	Parents Teachers Association
<b>SMC</b>	School Management Committees
<b>TOTs</b>	Trainers of Trainers
<b>TSC</b>	Teachers Service Commission
<b>WERK-</b>	Women Education Researchers of Kenya

## **Acknowledgements**

The success of this end of project evaluation is attributed to the participation of key respondents that included CEF Kenya Coordinator, AAK/CEF Accountant, and representatives of CEFK partner organizations, key stakeholders working in education and GOK officials. We thank each one of them most sincerely for their commitment, insightfulness and frankness. We would like to also thank all those who participated in the assessment and validation workshop for their contribution. Special thanks go to CEFK Coordinator and AAK for the logistical support accorded to the evaluation team and the partners and associates we evaluated in the six districts visited during the field visits.

## **Executive Summary**

### **Context**

The Common Wealth Education Fund Kenya (CEFK) was part of the global Common Wealth Education Fund (CEF) project based in the UK that was implemented in 17 poorest countries including Kenya. The focus was to strengthen Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) input into the Education for All (EFA) process through advocacy and campaign work in education across CSOs in the 17 countries.

CEF Kenya worked with 13 partners thus, Elimu Yetu Coalition (EYC), Kenya Alliance for Advancement of Children Rights (KAACR), Girl Child Network (GCN), Literacy for All (LIFA), Cancel Debt for the Child Campaign (CADEC), Dupoto – e – Maa, National Council of Churches of Kenya, Bible Translation and Literacy (BTL), Women Education Researchers of Kenya (WERK), Elimu Kwa Wana Vijiji Coalition (EKWVC), Kenya National Association of Parents (KNAP), Autism Society of Kenya (ASOK), Kenya Society for The Mentally Handicapped (KSMH).

The Common Wealth Education Fund (Kenya) (CEFK) was officially launched on the 13<sup>th</sup> August 2002. Through a participatory and consultative process, a strategic plan for the period 2000 – 2005 was developed and submitted to CEF UK for approval. The project was not completed in 2005 as initially planned. This was mainly due to the delay in starting the project as a result of the inherent slow process of recruiting CSO partners. Implementation of the CEF strategic plan 2002 – 2005 was completed in the first half of 2008. It is from this context that CEF commissioned the end of project evaluation. The purpose of this evaluation was to account and share learning from achievements and failures and ascertain views of beneficiaries on the conduct of the project.

The methodology used in the end of project evaluation was inclusive and participatory involving CEFK partners, government officials, children beneficiaries, parents and teachers. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected and analyzed. The approaches used and activities carried out included; review of CEFK documents and partners' reports, one day workshop with CEFK partners, focus group discussions with beneficiaries, formal interviews with partner representatives and their beneficiaries, email questionnaires and telephone interviews and field visits to CEFK partners in seven districts.

### **Synopsis of end of project evaluation findings**

#### ***Strengthening CSOs participation***

The first objective for the project was to strengthen civil society participation in the design and implementation of national and local education plans and frameworks. This objective represented the majority focus of the CEFK programme activities taking 48% of budget allocation. Achievements included:

##### *a. Coalitions, Alliances/Linkages and Networks.*

Many of the CEFK programme activities were implemented around coalitions, alliances and networks which brought together CSOs with the intention of influencing policy, sharing

information for mutual benefit and undertaking advocacy activities. These were strengthened and new ones emerged at national, regional, local and in a few cases international level. Examples of these include the following:

The Cancel Debt for the Child Campaign (CADEC) formed alliances with 22 CSO members to spearhead the campaign for debt cancellation. With CEF support, CADEC conducted advocacy and lobbying, established support groups as a tool for institutionalizing the campaign. This set in motion the process of developing a legal and policy framework for managing resources saved from debt relief in support of free primary education.

Kakamega non-formal education network (KANNET) was formed in Kakamega through the initiative of Literacy for All (LIFA). The purpose of the network was to advocate for NFE policy and influence practice at the local level. Dupoto e Maa, a membership NGO formed by the Maasai Community, formed alliances at local level to advocate for formulation of pastoralist friendly education policies.

Autism Society of Kenya (AOSK) formed alliances with the Ministry of Education (MOE), Ministry of Health (MOH), Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) and parents of autism children and Nairobi City Council.

Elimu Yetu Coalition (EYC) formed alliances through public forums on budget allocation for the MOE and linked organizations from poor and marginalized regions seeking for recognition and increased government budgetary support to adult education.

*b. Influencing government policy and practice*

A good measure of success as a result of strengthening CSOs was influence on government policy at national and local levels. The achievements were:

Girl Child Network (GCN) in collaboration with other CSOs, succeeded in having the Ministry of Education formulate the gender policy in education published in 2007. GCN has also developed international and national linkages in different regions which include Kenya, Uganda and Dakar aimed at replicating its sanitary towel campaign.

GCN has worked with communities in Kajiado District to build girl friendly latrines in schools. This initiative has influenced MoE and other stakeholders to replicate the project in other areas.

GCN is at the forefront in lobbying the government to allocate budget provision to support provision of sanitary towels to girls in schools. This resulted in allocation of Ksh 165,000 (about 2300 US dollars) towards the provision of sanitary towels to girls in schools in 2007/2008 by government.

Dupoto e Maa managed to influence the government to allocate a budget for boarding schools in ASAL areas to enable children to learn in a stable environment when parents move due to the nomadic practices of pastoral communities.

EYC alongside other actors made efforts to advocate for inclusion of Early Childhood Education (ECD) in Free Primary Education (FPE). They also advocated for an increase in

budget allocation to adult education and recognition of Non-Formal Education (NFE). Among the achievements are that the inclusion of ECD in FPE is under consideration by the government and the government made a minimal increase in budget allocation to adult education. Also children from NFE centers have been officially allowed to link up with the formal education system.

*c. CSOs Support and capacity building*

CEFK undertook much work to build and support existing coalitions and networks. These were provided with financial, capacity building and advisory support. The CSOs accessed money to implement CEFK project activities which in turn raised the profile of the organizations at national, regional and in some cases international levels. For example, GCN that attracted funding for programmes as a result of the findings of the research that had been funded by CEFK.

The CSOs staff and board members also attended several capacity building training workshops that were organized by CEF focusing on governance for NGO Boards, financial management, advocacy and lobbying and gender. Sharing and learning forums were also held. The outcomes of these interventions can be summed up by the following comment made by a partner representative during the 2005 CEFK mid term review:

*. It is encouraging to note that, the organizations brought on board had minimal experience in lobbying and advocacy for EFA. We, the partners, are unanimous that CEF was a necessary intervention that has strengthened our capacities and made us more focused, committed and even well perceived by communities and MoE.'*

*d. Research and documentation of critical issues in education*

Through CEFK support, partners carried out research, produced reports and disseminated findings to influence policy and practice on education issues. They also produced and or published several documents for use in the appropriate areas of practice. For example, EYC initiated and commissioned a study on "monitoring the FPE and establishing unit cost of primary education in Kenya in 2004". GCN conducted a national research on the status of gender equity and equality in primary education in Kenya. The report was disseminated in a national stakeholders' forum and in different regions.

*e. Raising Awareness*

Significant achievements reported by most partners include increased awareness as a result of publicity campaigns by the project. National and local level sensitization forums, the use of media, distribution of information, education and communication materials, meetings and training workshops were all evidence of increased capacity and efficacy of CSOs.

### **Supporting local communities to monitor Spending on Education**

The second objective for the project was to enable local communities to monitor government spending on education, both at the national and local levels. Most partners recorded success in the achievement of this objective. These successes are categorized under the headings hereunder.

*a. Community involvement in budget tracking at local level*

Parents and the community in general have become more aware of school budget allocation by the government and are now actively involved in decision making and budget tracking. For example EYC that has influenced local communities and education officials in supporting the development of education in their areas.

*b. Improved accountability and usage of school funds*

The involvement of parents, community and the district monitors in budget tracking was reported to have resulted in improved usage of school funds in a number of schools. Communities were reported to have demanded accountability for education funds delivered to schools.

*c. Children participation in decision making in schools*

Children participation in management of schools was reported as an achievement that contributed to improved usage of school funds. Many schools were reported to have involved children in decision making in some schools through children representation in SMCs.

*d. Gender incorporated in budget tracking and gender equity in schools*

In Kajiado and Kuria districts, Dupoto e Maa and Kenya Alliance for the Advancement of Child Rights (KAACR) reported that there was increased enrolment and improved gender equity in schools where general enrolment previously stood at 4:1 for boys and girls respectively.

### **Support to innovative approaches for educating the most marginalized children**

The third objective for the project was to support innovative ways for civil society to ensure that all children, especially girls and the most vulnerable are able to access quality education. Autism Society of Kenya has been able to ‘convince’ the MOE to recognize autistic children who have now been identified and placed appropriately in units for autistic children which are different from those for the mentally handicapped

KAACR and GCN have gone a long way in making sure that girls not only have access to education but they are also retained in schools. This was achieved through the improvement of learning environments and addressing female genital mutilation (FGM) and other cultural practices that affect girls’ education.

NFE has been recognized and so far 63 children have been accepted in secondary schools in Kakamega district. The NFE has helped in ensuring that children from poor and disadvantaged families, who have been unable to fit in FPE, have access to education. For instance, it was reported that since the inception of CEFK activities, over 1,500 children who were not schooling have accessed schools in Kakamega district.

### **Interagency collaboration and management**

The fourth objective for the project focused on strengthening inter-agency collaboration and internal functioning of the CEFK.

According to the CEFK mid term evaluation report, in the first 3 years, the management and implementation of CEFK was undertaken in a participatory manner that included AAK, Oxfam GB and Save the children UK. According to the CEF global agreement, the three organizations were charged with the responsibility of managing CEFK project. A seven (7) person's management committee was formed at the beginning of the program, comprising of two representatives (the Country Director and the Education Manager/Officer) from each organizations' country office and the CEFK Coordinator. In Kenya CEFK was located within the offices of Action Aid Kenya, who provided the coordination office with space and other logistical support.

The assessment of the management arrangement for the first three years was positive. This was due to the historical focus, reputation and acceptance of the three international organizations in Kenya. There was 'cross fertilization' of strengths (education focus, professionalism, technical support, efficiency, advocacy and lobbying skills, and so on.) of the three organizations' in overseeing the Fund.

During the last two years of the project, only AAK was left of the three organizations that managed CEFK. Save the children UK and Oxfam had pulled out. The reasons cited by those who were interviewed during this evaluation indicated that Save the children UK relocated their operations from Kenya and Oxfam GB had ceased to focus on education as a priority due to shift in their strategy.

There were challenges experienced in this inter agency collaboration arrangement. For example, the respective CEOs and the education programme officers had full time responsibilities in their organizations. This meant that, managing CEFK was an additional workload. Thus, getting the representatives of the three organizations to share a common forum was a challenge and in some cases decisions were made by e-mails or telephone.

The arrangement that CEFK was located within Action Aid Kenya offices at times created some logistical challenges to the efficient management and operation of the fund. Generally, the Fund through the Coordinator had to operate under the rules and regulations set by AAK and this sometimes caused delays and tension. However, there were some advantages as reported during this evaluation; for example, location within AAK offices afforded the project an already established structure of operation.

### **Issues and challenges**

The evaluators noted that some of the district monitors did not perform their work beyond visiting two to three schools. In one case the monitor carried out activities only in the school where he/she was teaching during the two or so years. The second example was a monitor who visited three schools in two years. In the third case, the monitor had visited a few schools but did not submit a report to his/her organization because the organization had failed to pay him/her the monthly stipend. Some district monitors reported that they were not paid the total amount of money allocated for their transport. An example was one monitor who was paid as little as Ksh 6,000 (about 85 US dollars) and not the Ksh 90,000

(about 1267 US dollars) that was allocated for each monitor in the agreement signed with CEFK.

Although some of the CEFK activities carried out by partners are potentially sustainable e.g. budget tracking by community action groups in Kajiado and the trained SMCs in different schools, some are unsustainable. These include those where the communities were not actively involved in the planning and implementation undermining sense of ownership. One category of these include the training forums for stakeholders who were trained on budget monitoring at district level without any follow up and were not linked to any specific community. The activities of the district monitors may not be sustainable without the support for logistics.

The regional structures of the CSO coalitions and networks were reported to be weak in terms of cohesiveness among members, resources, facilities and programmes. They have not formed and evolved strongly and depend on the national secretariats for direction, support and resource, for example, the GCN chapters. The national secretariats on the other hand, were strong with facilities, resources and controlled the programmes. The major decisions, in most cases, were made by the national secretariats except the election of officials which was done at the annual general meetings. The CEFK interventions did not shift the status quo. Majority of the interventions carried out by the regional structures under CEFK were not followed up due to lack of resources. The regional structures raised concern over the amount of resources that reached them. They recommended that in future the majority of funds should go to regional and grass root structures directly since that was “where the point of pain was”.

### **Lessons learnt and recommendations**

Among the key lessons that also form the recommendations for future programmes, which were identified with regard to the implementation of CEFK project, include:

Increased community awareness, skills and capacity is more likely to lead to change in policy. Also, in order to achieve the sharing of best practices within coalitions, alliances and networks, the capacity of CSOs involved need to be enhanced so they are able to engage in policy formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

There is a great deal to learn from those programmes that have made steps towards securing their longer-term sustainability. Also, in many cases capacity building, both for individual organizations and networks is essential to achieve effectiveness in delivering intended results.

### **Conclusion**

Overall, CEFK has made significant contributions to FPE in terms of improving policy and practice, better allocation and utilization of government education funds and in supporting access and retention of marginalized children in schools. Its priorities and objectives are relevant in the national and wider EFA context. Besides, there are practices happening in the communities and schools, for example budget tracking, change of negative cultural practices and creation of conducive learning environment for girls in schools. However, some initiatives needed further support for fuller fruition of the benefits accruing from the project, for example, those implemented for two to three years. The project was largely successful and most initiatives have the potential to continue beyond the CEFK funding particularly

those that actively involved the community and other stakeholders in the implementation. A few, however, are not sustainable without further donor support and close follow up.

## 1.0 Background

Common Wealth Education Fund Kenya (CEFUK) was part of the global Common Wealth Education Fund (CEF) project based in the UK which was implemented in 17 common wealth countries including Kenya. The countries chosen were among the poorest. The global focus of the CEF was to strengthen Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) input into the Education for All (EFA) process and raise EFA profile, especially through advocacy and campaign work in education across CSO in the 17 countries. The overall implementation strategy of CEF project was to work through and strengthen local CSO partners that were active in advocacy and policy influencing focusing on education.

The Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) project was based at Action Aid Kenya offices. It was established through the collaborative efforts of Oxfam GB, Save the Children UK and Action Aid International. It was designed to be managed through an inter-agency structure of the three organizations with Action Aid acting as the lead agency and the host of the CEF project in Kenya.

CEFUK was officially launched on the 13<sup>th</sup> August 2002. Through a participatory and consultative process, a strategic plan for the period 2000 – 2005 was developed and submitted to CEF UK for approval. The project was not completed in 2005 as initially planned. This was mainly due to the delay in starting the project as a result of the inherent slow process of recruiting CSO partners. Implementation of the CEF strategic plan 2002 – 2005 was completed in the first half of 2008. It is from this context that CEF commissioned the end of project evaluation. The purpose of this evaluation was to account and share learning from achievements and failures and ascertains views of beneficiaries on the conduct of the project. After about 5 years of project implementation there was need to evaluate the CEF objectives as reflected in the project strategy (2002 – 2005) and reviewed in the mid term review (2005) to assess performance / results against these frameworks.

CEFUK has supported CSOs whose activities rotate around advocacy work in establishing education policies such as National Education policy, National Education Gender Policy, Non-Formal Education Policy, reviewing the Education Act and ensuring implementation of developed policies among many more.

The objectives of the CEFUK project were:-

- i. To strengthen civil society participation in the design and implementation of national and local education plans especially through the support for broad based national alliances and coalitions.
- ii. To enable local communities to monitor spending on education both at national and local levels.
- iii. To support the development of innovative approaches to education of the most marginalized children (especially girls and the most vulnerable in a way that influences a wider policy and practice.
- iv. To strengthen inter-agency collaboration and functioning of the CEFUK.

CEF Kenya worked with 13 partners to implement the three project objectives. These were: Elimu Yetu Coalition (EYC), Kenya Alliance for Advancement of Children Rights

(KAACR), Girl Child Network (GCN), Literacy for All (LIFA), Cancel Debt for the Child Campaign (CADEC), Dupoto – e – Maa, National Council of Churches of Kenya, Bible Translation and Literacy (BTL), Women Education Researchers of Kenya (WERK), Elimu Kwa Wana Vijiji Coalition (EKWVC), Kenya National Association of Parents (KNAP), Autism Society of Kenya (ASOK), Kenya Society for The Mentally Handicapped (KSMH).

## **2.0 Objectives and methodology of the end of project evaluation**

### **2.1 The evaluation objectives**

The purpose of the end of project evaluation was to assess performance and results against the CEFK objectives as defined in its strategic plan 2002 - 2005 and to identify lessons learnt to improve future work. It was also to inform the overall global CEF end of project report covering the sixteen other countries where CEF worked.

The specific objectives of the end of project evaluation as defined in the evaluation's TOR were:

- a. To account, learn and share learning from achievements and failures in order to meet statutory requirements of donors, share experiences generated and leading to "good practices" and leaving a legacy.
- b. To Share with others the project aims, achievements as well as challenges.
- c. To allow internal and external stakeholders to explore the CEFK work and help to assess impact, achievements and learning. (This was expected to help increase synergy across CEFK's work.)
- d. To increase CEFK's accountability to its internal peers and external partners.

### **2.2 Methodology**

The methodology used in the end of project evaluation was inclusive and participatory involving CEFK partners, government officials, children beneficiaries', parents and teachers. Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected and analyzed. The approaches used and activities carried out included the following:

- i. Review of CEFK documents including CEFK mid term review report, partners' quarterly reports, minutes of CEFK Management meetings, annual plans and budgets, financial reports, CEF midterm global MT report among other documents and MoE policy documents. We also reviewed partners' generated documents e.g. quarterly reports and research reports. We analyzed and summarized key issues and themes identifying links with CEFK partners' work.
- ii. A one day workshop held on 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 2008 at AACC conference center in Nairobi attended by CEFK partners, CEFK coordinator, and CEFK gender mentor. The list of participants is included in the appendices to this report.
- iii. Formal interviews with CEFK coordinator, staff of CEFK partners, Teachers, MoE officers at district and divisional levels and GOK district children officers, where CEFK partners had interventions and staff in charge of two non formal education centers in Kakamega District.

- iv. Focus group discussion with a group of girl - child beneficiaries and members of GCN in Mt Kenya region.
- v. Email questionnaires and telephone interviews with coordinators of EYC Regional chapters and KNAP monitors District monitors.
- vi. Field visits to seven districts where CEFK partners had programme activities. These included Nairobi, Kajiado, Nyeri, Kuria, Kakamega North, Shinyalu and Tharaka districts. The purpose of the field visits was to carry on site interviews and group discussions as well as make observations on project work carried out by CEFK partners. The partner organizations visited during field visits were EYC head office and Kakamega regional chapter, Dupoto e Maa, KAACR, KNAP, WERK, Autism Society of Kenya, BTL Nairobi and Tharaka, offices LIFA and GCN head office, GCN Mt. Kenya regional chapter and GCN Kajiado Project.

**Evaluation constraints:**

The end of project evaluation took 30 days. This was a short time for a project that is spread out in most parts of Kenya and considering the methodology used. This short duration limited the breadth and depth of the field visits, particularly with regard to interaction with schools and the target beneficiaries of CEFK project.

The other constraint was delay in getting inputs from the former members of CEFK management committee, most of who had left employment with the inter-agency member organizations that managed the CEFK project. This led to delay in finalizing this evaluation report. We were obliged to compile this report without the inputs from the members of CEFK management committee.

**3.0 CEFK end of project evaluation findings**

**3.1 The CEF Project Priorities**

The CEFK strategy 2002-2005 articulates CEFK’s priority areas of focus under four objectives that were agreed upon during the national stakeholders’ workshop in 2002. These priorities define what CEFK set out to achieve during the project life. The activities of CEFK reviewed in this report are based on what was done towards achieving the objectives in the CEF strategy. The four priorities/ objectives are restated hereunder:

1. Priority/ objective one was to strengthen civil society participation in the design and implementation of national and local education plans and frameworks.
2. Priority/objective two was to enable local communities to monitor government spending on education, both at the national and local levels.
3. Priority/objective three was to support innovative ways for civil society to ensure that all children, especially girls and the most vulnerable and disadvantaged are able to access quality education.
4. Priority/ objective four focused on Strengthening inter-agency collaboration and internal functioning of the CEFK.

Below, we present our findings on achievements, issues, challenges and lessons learnt per each project objective:

### **3.2 Objective one: Strengthening CSOs Participation in the design and implementation of national and local education plans**

#### ***3.2.1 Achievements and outcomes***

The process of strengthening Civil Society Organizations started from the recruitment of CEF partners. As the mid-term review indicated through a rigorous selection process, CEF management and coordinator identified and brought on board CSO partners including coalitions, NGOs and networks who work in the education sector in Kenya. Some of the CEFK partners worked towards the realization of more than one objective. The partners whose work contributed towards the accomplishment of this objective were GCN, EYC, KNAP and Dupoto, KSMH, BTL and AOSK.

Objective one represents majority focus of the CEFK programme activities taking 48% of budget allocation. There are a wide range of achievements and outcomes attained under this objective. The notable successes under this objective include the formation of networks, alliances/linkages or coalitions that brought together CSOs and other stakeholders. Other achievements include provision of support to both the CSOs and the communities they work for which recorded benefits in terms of school performance, and raised awareness and enhanced empowerment within communities. Additional successes have been noted in terms of advocacy and ultimately influence of government policy on education through strengthened CSO/NGO and networks.

Significant issues and challenges were experienced in the CEFK project, most notably minimal implementation of activities after the first 2 years at the regional and local levels and some ineffective coalitions/ networks. These and the lessons learnt are discussed under the section on issues, challenges and lessons.

The major achievements and outcomes in this objective are grouped under various subheadings described hereunder.

#### **a. Coalitions, Alliances/Linkages and Networks.**

Many of the CEFK programme activities were implemented around coalitions, alliances and networks which brought together CSOs with the intention of influencing policy, sharing information for mutual benefit and undertaking advocacy activities. Under CEFK support, coalitions, alliances/linkages and networks were strengthened and new ones emerged at national, regional, local and in a few cases international level. The successes achieved are illustrated by the examples described hereunder:

The Cancel Debts for the Child Campaign (CADEC) formed alliances with 22 CSO members to spearhead the campaign for debt cancellation. With CEF support, CADEC conducted advocacy and lobbying, established support groups as a tool for institutionalizing the campaign. This set in motion the process of developing a legal and policy framework for managing resources saved from debt relief in support of free primary education. The campaign formed a parliamentary support group to lobby for enactment of relevant statute that would ensure that the benefits of debt cancellation would be used to finance FPE.

CADEC also presented its propositions at UN forums. The outcomes of these campaigns were not evident at the time of conducting this evaluation.

EYC formed alliances through public forums on budget allocation for the MoE and linked organizations from poor and marginalized regions. Together with Daraja Kenya, EYC launched an adult education thematic network known as Kenya Chapter of pamoja Africa. The aim of the network was to advocate for recognition and increased government budgetary support to adult education. EYC reported that the government had accepted to increase budget support to adult education and that this already happened though minimally in 2008/2009 annual budget. EYC also launched regional chapters in 6 provinces (Nyanza, Western, and Rift valley, Coast, Mt Kenya and North Eastern).

Kakamega non-formal education network (KANNET) was formed in Kakamega through the initiative of LIFA. The purpose of the network was to advocate for NFE policy and influence practice at the local level. KANNET was inactive at the time of conducting this evaluation. The reason given by some of the members for this status was lack of resources.

Dupoto formed alliances at local level with partners such as Kajiado Women Lobby group, Maasai Aids Awareness Programme (MAAP) and Neighbors Initiative Alliance to advocate for formulation of pastoralist friendly education policies. Emphasis was laid on government support to boarding primary schools that would be appropriate to nomadic lifestyle of the pastoral community.

Autism Society of Kenya (AOSK) formed alliances with the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Kenya Institute of Education (KIE) and parents of autism children and Nairobi City Council. This alliance has provided care and support to autistic children at City Primary School in Nairobi. Through the efforts of AOSK, MOE has acknowledged that autism is a condition that needs government support in schools. AOSK has been recognized as a resource centre for management and assessment of autistic children.

BTL formed an alliance with KIE to produce learning materials to enhance access to education by marginalized ethnic groups in Tharaka and Mt. Elgon districts under this alliance. KIE has undertaken the task of publishing Mother Tongue Education (MTE) books and the BTL is now recognized by KIE and the Ministry of Education as a key partner in MTE and are consulted in decision making.

Currently GCN is in partnership with the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) and MOE in developing guidelines for implementing the gender policy in education. A draft copy has already been formulated. They have also developed international and national linkages through workshops in different regions which include Kenya, Uganda and Dakar. Through these linkages and the success in sanitary towel campaign, GCN has influenced other countries including Zambia, Uganda and Ethiopia to initiate such campaigns in their countries.

## **b. Influencing government policy and practice**

A good measure of success as a result of strengthening CSOs was influence on government policy. Several partners engaged the government to influence policy at national and local levels. The achievements and outcomes resulting from these initiatives were:

GCN in collaboration with other CSOs, succeeded in having the Ministry of Education to formulate the gender policy in education. This was finalized and published in 2007.

Through partnership with the MoE, GCN has produced materials that highlight its intervention in addressing some of the factors that hinder girl child retention and performance in schools such as lack of girl-friendly latrines. In one of their projects in Kajiado district, GCN has worked with communities to build girl friendly latrines in schools. This initiative has influenced MoE and other stakeholders to replicate the project in other areas. The practice of establishing gender friendly sanitary facilities is emerging as a best practice in promoting gender parity in education.

GCN was at the forefront in lobbying the government to allocate budget provision to support provision of sanitary towels to girls in schools. This effort succeeded in the 2007/2008 financial year when the government allocated Ksh 165,000 (about 2300 US dollars) towards the provision of sanitary towels to girls in schools.

Dupoto managed to influence the government to allocate a budget for boarding schools in ASAL areas to enable children to learn in a stable environment when parents move due to the nomadic practices of pastoral communities.

CADEC established parliamentary support groups as a tool for institutionalizing the debts for children campaign through enactment of relevant statutes. This happened in the context of the 9<sup>th</sup> parliament. The 10<sup>th</sup> parliament was elected towards the end of 2007. It is unclear how the campaign will shape up with the change in parliamentary context. Furthermore, CEFK stopped funding CADEC in 2005 due to financial accountability reasons.

EYC alongside other actors made efforts to advocate for inclusion of ECD in FPE, recognition and increase in budget allocation to adult education and recognition of NFE. Varied levels of success were realized through these efforts. The inclusion of ECD in FPE is under consideration by the government. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the government made a minimal increase in budget allocation to adult education. There was positive progress in recognition of NFE in that children from NFE centers have been officially allowed to link up with the formal education system. In addition, the children, community and teachers became more aware of the government education policies and plans and their responsibility towards holding the government accountable.

EYC conducted several and diverse forums and activities to campaign for free, relevant and compulsory basic education and also advocate for the review of the cost and financing of basic education. Other campaign activities were geared towards tracking education budgets and expenditure, dissemination of EFA plans; Review of the Education Act; Development of the education policy and monitoring implementation of policy and plans; and review of the Dakar declarations. EYC's major campaign activity was the annual global campaign week that was held every year. The campaign week was packaged into several activities that

targeted different stakeholders; government, CSOs, community and school children. The activities were held in Nairobi and all EYC regions.

EYC was involved in the review process for laws related to education. Upon the launch of the Task force on review of education law (known as Kamunge Task force), EYC convened a stakeholders meeting which deliberated on the gaps in the existing laws. A report was produced and presented to the Kamunge Task force. EYC also participated in an open forum for education held in Nairobi to discuss gaps in education laws and to suggest on way forward.

### **c. CSOs Support and capacity building**

CEFK undertook much work to build and support existing coalitions and networks. These were provided with financial, capacity building and advisory support. The CSOs accessed money to implement CEFK project activities which in turn raised the profile of the organizations at national, regional and in some cases international levels. The support leveraged new funding for the CSOs for example; GCN attracted funding for programmes as a result of the findings of the research that had been funded by CEFK. The financial support also enabled the CSOs to implement programme activities at their chapters and district levels that would not otherwise have been undertaken. The effect of this was to activate regions, chapters and districts.

The CSOs staff and board members also attended several capacity building training workshops that were organized by CEF. The trainings were on: governance for NGO Boards, financial management, advocacy and lobbying and gender. Sharing and learning forums were also held. The outcomes of these interventions can be summed up by the following comment made by a partner representative during the 2005 CEFK mid term review:

*'It is encouraging to note that, the organizations brought on board had minimal experience in lobbying and advocacy for EFA. We, the partners, are unanimous that CEF was a necessary intervention that has strengthened our capacities and made us more focused, committed and even well perceived by communities and MoE.'*

CEFK provided management and technical advice through field visits, email and telephone contacts to the partners. As reported in the mid term review report, the partners were happy by the fact that the CEFK Coordinator was very supportive and followed their activities through out the project life. The 'voice' of some of the partners can be demonstrated through a statement sampled from many others that conveyed similar message:

*"CEFK is different and unique from other donors. The Coordinator and the Accountant have walked with us; they are interested in the processes on the ground and not results alone. All the time we get advice and we share our constraints with them. Our capacities have been built in many way. The Coordinator has confidence in us".*

#### **d. Research and documentation of critical issues in education**

Through CEFK support, partners carried out research, produced reports and disseminated findings to influence policy and practice on education issues. They also produced and published several documents for use in the appropriate areas of practice. The major initiatives were:

1. EYC initiated and commissioned a study on “monitoring the FPE and establishing unit cost of primary education in Kenya in 2004”. The study was completed and disseminated.
2. GCN conducted a national research on the status of gender equity and equality in primary education in Kenya. The report was disseminated in a national stakeholders’ forum and in different regions. The research findings informed the gender in education policy, were the basis for the sanitary towel campaign and have influenced many interventions on gender practices in schools, for example, the construction of gender friendly sanitary facilities in schools.
3. LIFA in collaboration with Kenya’s Masinde Muliro University conducted research on the status of NFE in the advent of FPE in Kakamega District. The findings of this research were used to influence NFE policy and practice. LIFA has for instance, in collaboration with ACCESS( an IT private company in Kenya )facilitated, supported and established community owned model NFE centers in Kakamega district that are likely to be widely adopted as best practice in NFE.
4. WERK conducted research on orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs) in relation to FPE in Embakasi and Ruiru, in Nairobi and Thika Districts respectively. They used the research findings to create awareness on the need to support the education of OVCs in Laikipia and Garissa.

#### **e. Raising Awareness**

Significant achievements cited by most partners include increased awareness as a result of publicity campaigns. National and local level sensitization forums, the use of media, distribution of information, education and communication materials, meetings and training workshops were all evidence of increased capacity and efficacy of CSOs. These activities targeted many different groups including government, communities, teachers, parents, children, and in few cases the private sector. The partners used innovative, participatory methods of raising awareness that were successful. Examples of these include EYC’s global action week forums and regional stakeholders’ conferences and GCN’s research dissemination forums.

#### **f. Gender enhancement by the CEFK project**

One of the findings of the mid-term evaluation was that gender issues had not been addressed by the project. At the second phase of the project, gender was factored in when CEFK supported a gender mentor who worked with four organizations; GCN, KNAP, EYC and LIFA. The following are the achievements that were reported under the gender initiative:

GCN trained girls, parents and teachers and the community on the needs of boys and girls with a focus on sexual maturation, promoted access to sanitary towels for girls and contributed to a conducive learning environment for them in schools. GCN was trained on how to report on gender demonstrating the impact the project has had on both girls and boys.

EYC, KNAP and LIFA were also trained on gender reporting so as to be able to report the impact of the project on both boys and girls.

### ***3.2.2 Summary of partners' key achievements in objective one***

The major achievements undertaken by each of the partners that were involved in implementing objective one are summarized hereunder:

#### **i. GCN**

CEF Kenya supported GCN to carry out a research on girls' access to education. From the research, several programmes were developed as follows:

- a. Improving learning environment for both girls and boys in schools. Latrines and girls changing rooms have been constructed in 25 schools. This initiative has influenced the MOE and other stakeholders to design and implement programs aimed at creating gender friendly sanitary facilities in primary schools.
- b. Lobbying policy makers on budgetary allocation for sanitary towels for girls in schools. GCN has influenced the government on gender issues in education which have now been included in the education policy. Their working together with the government has led to gender inclusiveness in the education policy. Girls in schools have also been mentored on sexual maturation, rights of a child, life based skills and negotiation skill among other issues.
- c. The participation of GCN activities includes their chapter members, children, parents, local organizations and churches with the help of the network members. As a result of these activities significant impact was felt in areas where GCN has worked and also nationally as follows:
  - Shs.165 million has been allocated by the government for the provision of sanitary towels in schools.
  - More girls are retained in schools and performance improved.
  - The trainings received were an eye opener to the communities and to stakeholders on gender issues as many confessed to have been ignorant.
  - Education policy was revised to include GCN's four thematic areas which are:-
    - Gender responsive management of the sexual maturation process
    - Gender based violence and sexual harassment
    - Appropriate curriculum and pedagogy
    - Dissemination of the Gender policy with a focus on the four thematic areas to GCN's four chapter members in Western, Mt. Kenya, Coast and Nairobi.
  - GCN has demystified the use of sanitary towels. Areas such as Kajiado and North Eastern had negative attitude towards sanitary towels that they were not even stocked in shops.

- GCN lobbied the government along with FAWE and FIDA to remove tax on sanitary towels (zero-ratings).

## **ii. Elimu Yetu Coalition (EYC)**

EYC was formed as a national coalition comprising of 110 civil society organizations. The membership is comprised of; professional groups, CSOs, education research institutions and other practitioners in education sector. CEFK has been instrumental in funding the coalition's advocacy work. Among other activities, EYC developed a 5 year strategic plan which addressed key issues like structure of its governance, AGM, supervisory role among others. EYC has demystified the government budget process and educated people on the process.

Under CEFK, EYC campaigned for the review of cost and financing of basic education; participated in the development, review and implementation of the National Education Policy, Education Act and EFA plans; and engaged in tracking budgets and monitoring expenditure patterns in the education sector. The coalition also supported policy oriented studies and documentation.

The other activities/achievements by EYC under CEFK support were:

- a. Expanded membership from 90 to 110 organisations
- b. Conducted 2 national studies, one launched, implemented and outcomes disseminated in 2004.
- c. Represented in MoE committees and forums e.g. the Committee for the Implementation of FPE and Education Sector law Review Task force, and at the National Education Conference.
- d. Have launched chapters of EYC in 6 Provinces.
- e. Trained 500 facilitators and conducted budget tracking in, Central, Rift Valley, Nyanza, Western and Coast Provinces.
- f. Together with Daraja Kenya launched adult education thematic network, Kenya Chapter of Pamoja Africa to advocate for issues related to adult education.
- g. EYC was part of the process in developing a national EFA plan and supported publication, launch and dissemination of the same.
- h. Translated budget tracking tools into Swahili, published and disseminated them.
- i. Organized annual global week action on education to campaign and raise awareness on EFA goals related issues.

## **iii. DUPOTO e MAA**

With CEF support, Dupoto e Maa, a Maasai membership NGO, advocated for the formulation of a pastoralist friendly, all inclusive education policy. This was to ensure that government budgets and plans guarantee access to basic education for all pastoralists' children of school going age.

The type of budget work supported by CEFK was budget making, own budget tracking and tracking the government funds. Dupoto carried out several activities to realize these goals as outlined below:-

- Training of school management committee on budget tracking in 17 schools.

- Dupoto staff have also been trained on budget tracking
- Formation of sectional education action groups (three in number). Each section monitored education in a location.

The education action groups participated in monitoring education budgets in public schools. They visited schools, held meetings and education days to publicize education and attended education related meetings called by schools. As a result of these activities, there are several outcomes reported where Dupoto worked. For instance:-

- a. Community members were aware of funds available in local schools and were able to do budget tracking on their own.
- b. Community members were able to write funding requests and put together budgets. For example Ologian-karani primary school raised money from a CBO for beds and mattresses. Kisharu primary school and Mashuru primary school respectively raised funds from CDF, CDTF and LATF.
- c. The action groups were taking initiatives to follow up funds they deem to be for the community e.g. the chairman of the District Women Lobby group after training on budget tracking visited Kajiado County Council offices to get information on beneficiaries of the school bursary funds.

### **3.3 Objective two: Supporting local communities to monitor Spending on Education both at national and local levels.**

#### **3.3.1 CEFK support to CSOs and the major activities**

This objective was allocated 18 per cent of the total CEFK budget. As reported in the mid-term review, CEFK addressed this priority by supporting partners to carry out budget tracking activities in eight provinces and 15 districts. The partners who implemented activities to pursue the objective were; EYC, KNAP, Dupoto, NCKK, EKWVC and KAACR. Some of the major activities that the partners carried out were:

- a. Training School management committees (SMCs) on budget tracking.
- b. Training budget tracking facilitators and district monitors.
- c. Formation of community education action groups by Dupoto and KAACR. The role of the action groups was to create awareness and monitor education in their designated areas.
- d. Sensitization of parents to support their children's education and to take interest in school budgets.
- e. Education Forums with parents and community leaders to discuss and to be sensitized on the role of government, communities and parents in free primary education.
- f. Lobbying and advocacy at national and decentralized level to sensitize education stakeholders on government expenditure in education in general and in investment in education by EYC, NCKK and Dupoto.
- g. Publishing, reprinting and dissemination of budget tracking tools and translation of the same into Kiswahili.
- h. Actual tracking of school budgets in 8 provinces and 15 districts; whistle blowing to bring to the open cases of mismanagement of school funds.

- i. Capacity building of member organizations and other CSOs on budget analysis, tracking and expenditure monitoring.
- j. Sensitizing children, parents and teachers on child participation and children rights by KAARC.

### **3.3.2 Achievements and outcomes**

#### ***a. Community involvement in budget tracking at local level***

Most partners recorded success in the achievement of this objective. Parents and the community in general have become more aware of school budget allocation by the government and are now actively involved in decision making and budget tracking. Partners such as EYC, Dupoto, KNAP and NCKK have managed to infiltrate local communities and education officials and have built consensus on the role of parents and communities in supporting the development of education in their areas. The trained community action groups and district monitors, monitored education budget allocations and expenditure in schools. In Kakamega district, for example, there were abuses of CDF as it was not easily accessed by schools. There was also misuse of funds in a few schools that the community and the district monitors identified and reported. KNAP wrote letters of protest to the government about the CDF case and the cases of misuse of school funds was raised with MoE officials.

#### ***b. Budget tracking at national level***

EYC organized national education budget hearings and discussions, which brought together stakeholders including community to contribute input into budget submissions for consideration by the government. The budget hearing sessions also made a critical analysis of the annual budget allocation to education. The outputs of these sessions were used to influence education budget allocation based on national priorities from people's perspective and an increase in the national budget to education.

#### ***c. Improved accountability and usage of school funds***

The involvement of parents, community and the district monitors in budget tracking was reported to have resulted in improved usage of school funds in a number of schools. Communities were reported to have demanded accountability for education funds delivered to schools. There was increased information flow and transparency reported between the head teachers, SMCs and local communities; and a growing commitment to education development at the community and district levels. An example is Kajiado district where community members were enlightened on the importance of education and budget tracking and have developed a positive attitude towards education. For example, they made contributions in cash, materials and labour to support schools in Ologian Karani and Mashuru primary schools that were visited during this evaluation.

#### ***d. Children participation in decision making in schools***

Children participation in management of schools was reported as an achievement that contributed to improved usage of school funds. Many schools were reported to have involved children in decision making through children representation in SMCs. For instance, Kitale Academy was cited as one of the schools where children gave their views on the sanitary towels discussion and other issues affecting them. Children in some schools in Kwale district were also cited as examples of children participation in decision making.

The other benefit cited as a result of involving children in decision making in schools was that cases of indiscipline and strikes had drastically reduced in some schools. An example cited was Vihiga district that used to be notorious on school strikes but these had reduced as a result of children participation and guidelines given on children's' rights.

***e. Gender incorporated in budget tracking and gender equity in schools***

Dissemination of the gender policy in education through workshops and gender monitoring mechanisms have been put in place to explain to the people what gender policy really means. GCN, KNAP and EYC made efforts to promote gender as an important component in education budget allocation, budget monitoring and reporting. The interventions undertaken by the CEFK gender mentor enhanced the competence of the partners and therefore contributed to these efforts.

In Kajado and Kuria districts, Dupoto and KAACR reported that there was increased enrolment and improved gender equity in schools where general enrolment previously stood at 4:1 for boys and girls respectively. Notable improvements were in some primary schools that recorded an almost equal enrolment of boys and girls especially in lower classes.

**3.3.3 Summary of partners' key achievements in objective two**

The major achievements undertaken by each of the partners that were involved in implementing objective two are summarized hereunder:

**iv. KNAP**

The main focus of KNAP was the widespread issue of weak accountability that was a common practice in schools. Also whether the parent and the community understood the issue of government money received and how it was spent in schools (Budget tracking).

KNAP's main strategy was to use evidence based advocacy. This was through use of contacts at the grass roots to highlight the issue of mismanagement of public funds in public schools i.e. FPE funds and CDF in relation to education. Their intention was to create a network that could feed national advocacy campaign with evidence.

CEFK supported KNAP to recruit 15 District monitors from different regions. The role of the monitors was to gather evidence of misuse of public funds in schools and whistle blowing when such evidence was available. The evidence was also to support a national campaign, especially through the media, against misuse of public funds in schools.

Some of their activities were not funded due to a dispute between KNAP and CEFK over some funds. The disputed amount was Ksh 343,125 (about 4900 US dollars) that CEFK declined to refund to KNAP. The dispute was in a court of law at the time of this evaluation and therefore the details cannot be discussed in this report. Doing so would be tantamount to contempt of the court of law as per the laws of Kenya.

KNAP held several seminars under CEFK support. For instance in 2006 there was a seminar in Gender mainstreaming held in Nairobi for 3 days. In 2007, a workshop on the girl-child in Nairobi for 3 days was held, and in the same year, a follow-up seminar was held in Eldoret on the girl-child.

KNAP's main concern was the welfare of children in relation to access and retention to schools. The coalition appreciated the alarming magnitude of problems that children faced. A visit to Shinyalu primary school in western Kenya indicated that most children dropped out of school due to child labor, early marriages/pregnancies, high degree of parental illiteracy, parents' alcoholism, HIV and Aids among others. Examples of some of the activities that KNAP carried out through CEFK funding included the following:-

- a. In Shinyalu District, one of the schools we visited during this evaluation had come up with an innovative initiative of raising funds for uniform and writing materials for orphans. KNAP supported beekeeping as an income generating activity (IGA). The income from the beehives was used to support the education for 20 orphans. The IGA generated Ksh. 600 (about 9 US dollars) per month per child.
- b. Educated stakeholders of over 200 schools through meetings on gender and education policy.
- c. With girl-child hygiene in mind, KNAP has mobilized organizations like Sun-towels to provide girls with sanitary towels in some schools in Kakamega. A local church (St. Elizabeth) through the effort from KNAP has also sensitized local medical centre through advocacy work to provide free medical care for the needy children in a local school in Shinyalu.

The District monitors were involved in monitoring school budgets and providing evidence for the national media campaign.

## **V. NCKK**

National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCKK) was registered as a religious organization in 1984. NCKK is an umbrella organization of protestant churches in Kenya, with a membership of twenty five (25) denominations, eleven (11) associates and six (6) fraternal associates. NCKK was supported to train school committees in six rural districts of Kenya per year and as a result form district budget tracking networks. NCKK sensitized communities on their roles in free primary education program, and organized quarterly forums to identify advocacy issues in education financing to facilitate its national advocacy activities. NCKK achieved the following outputs:

- Sensitized communities on their role in education and budget tracking.
- Trained budget tracking facilitators in the six districts who in turn trained school management committees.
- Participated in budget tracking training by EYC.

### **3.4 Objective three: Supporting innovative approaches for educating the most marginalized children.**

#### **3.4.1 CEFK support and the major activities**

The children that were targeted under this objective were; girls, OVCs, children with disabilities, autistic children and children from marginalized ethnic communities (for example, in Tharaka and Mt Elgon districts). The goal of the interventions that were carried out in this priority was allocated 17 per cent of the total CEFK budget.

This evaluation found that CEFK successfully supported several innovative interventions that fell under this priority. The interventions were carried out by seven CSO partners; KAACR, LIFA, GCN, Dupoto, Autism Society of Kenya, WERK, BTL and Elimu Kwa wana vijiji coalition. The partners worked in collaboration with local stakeholders in education.

KAACR used child rights and community support approach to address cultural practices that have caused exclusion of girls in education in Maberera division of Kuria district. Such practices as female genital mutilation (FGM) and early marriages were rampant in Maberera division and were a major hindrance to girls' education. KAACR worked in all the 25 primary schools to establish a children's movement that coalesced around child rights clubs in the schools. It mobilized community support groups to campaign against FGM and early marriages and to advance learning opportunities for all in the division. The child rights clubs and the children movement provided effective avenues that enabled children to participate in child rights education campaign and decision making in schools. The children also used the skills and knowledge acquired to advocate against FGM and early marriages in their local communities through songs, plays and poems that were performed in public forums, e.g. the day of the African child. The community support groups promoted education for all and supported Parent-Teachers Associations (PTAs) and School Management Committees (SMCs) to efficiently manage schools' resources and support EFA goals.

LIFA promoted use of multi-grade approach in Non-Formal Education (NFE) to enhance access to education by marginalized children including the over-aged. LIFA advocated for increased recognition and support of NFE in Kakamega district and beyond. The aim of their efforts was to diversify basic education opportunities and choices for out of school and marginalized children in the district. LIFA sensitized and mobilized communities to support NFE centers. The communities contributed their resources, land, building materials and labour for the construction of NFE centers. The community also managed the centers through centre committees that comprised of community members.

GCN used their research findings to spearhead campaign to promote and support girl child education. The focus of the campaign was to create awareness and address some of the issues identified through the research. These included sexual maturation process and its effect on girls' education and gender based violence. One of the major factor in girls sexual maturation process that hindered girls' access to education and retention in school was lack of sanitary towels and gender insensitive sanitary facilities in primary schools. GCN led a campaign dubbed "sanitary towel campaign" that enhanced awareness on the same and its effect on girls' education. The campaign also mobilized resources from donors and the

private sector to support provision of sanitary towels to girls in schools (GCN distributed 385,000 sanitary towels)

WERK was supported to conduct a research and advocacy campaign that aimed at ensuring full participation of orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs) in FPE. This happened in Embakasi and Ruiru divisions in Nairobi and Thika Districts respectively and central division of Garissa District. The focus of the research was the status of OVCs in the 2 divisions.

The research findings were disseminated through advocacy campaigns to sensitize communities on the education of OVCs. This was done in Ruiru, Embakasi, Garissa, Tharaka and Annuli. The advocacy campaign and dissemination were done through stakeholders' forums, media and public awareness forums. The participants in these campaigns were primary school pupils, parents, teachers, SMCs, social workers, children's officer and Ministry of Education officials at the district levels.

Elimu kwa Wana Vijiji Coalition conducted a baseline survey on the status of education in informal settlements and used the findings to input into the ongoing formulation of a national non-formal education policy. It also built the capacity of its members on lobbying and advocacy and policy analysis. The coalition also mobilized communities in the informal settlements and sensitized them on the implications of free primary education to NFE in informal settlements.

#### **3.4.2 Achievements and outcomes**

CEF partners have cited tremendous achievements throughout the five year period and are positive that the activities carried out with support from CEF will leave a legacy for later generations. For instance, Autism Society of Kenya counts themselves lucky to benefit from funding from CEF. Like most other reports from CEF partners, Autism Society of Kenya has been able to 'convince' the MOE to recognize autistic children who have now been identified and placed appropriately in units for autistic children that are different from those for the mentally handicapped. A special curriculum is being developed for these children by KIE. The advocacy work by the Autism Society of Kenya has created a link between the MOE and the Ministry of Health (MOH) in an effort to care for these children.

This goes a long way in achieving one of the CEFK goals which is to support innovative ways for civil society to ensure that all the children including those with disabilities are able to access quality education. Through the funding of CEF, Autism Society of Kenya for example, has managed to work with professionals and they are now able to 'push' for funding from the government through the MOE. They have also been able to work with doctors to educate people that autism is not madness and autistic children should be put in special units where they receive special education. Autism Society of Kenya has been able to establish units for children with autism in 24 districts.

The activities of EKWVC would have gone a long way in achieving CEF's objective 3. This, however, did not happen significantly since the organization focused on pockets of poverty in rural, urban, and slum areas where access to education for all children has always been a problem. CEF's support to EKWVC was purely advocacy. However, funding was stopped in 2005 due to mismanagement.

KAACR and GCN have gone a long way in making sure that girls not only have access to education but they are also retained in schools. This was achieved through the improvement of learning environments and addressing FGM and other cultural practices that affect girls' education. As reported through research findings by GCN, many girls were missing schools for many days because of menstruation and other maturation related challenges such as FGM and early marriages.

Non formal education has been recognized and so far 63 children have been accepted in secondary schools in Kakamega district. The non-formal education has helped in ensuring children's access and retention in school. There has been increased enrolment, access and retention of children in NFE centers in Kakamega district and better performance. For instance, it was reported that since the inception of CEFK activities, over 1,500 children who were not schooling have accessed schools in Kakamega district. Children from poor and disadvantaged families are able to benefit. For instance, Kenya's Masinde Muliro University has developed a programme to train teachers on disadvantaged children in non-formal education.

Community groups have been established and their capacity built to make sure that parents are involved in their children's rehabilitation and change of attitude towards schooling. This community empowerment through skills and knowledge building was key to the sustainability of CEFK initiatives. Examples include the community support groups in Maberera, Kuria district, Social Action Groups in Kajiado and NFE center committees in Kakamega district.

There has been change in the attitude of teachers and parents in the use of mother-tongue in lower primary schools and the practice has been embraced in some schools as gathered from Tharaka and Sabao where the project was implemented by BTL.

### **3.4.3 Summary of partners' key achievements in objective three**

#### **V. Autism Society of Kenya (ASOK)**

It is important to note that for the first time in the history of Kenya and through the activities of Autism Society of Kenya, a program with a focus on children with autism and pervasive developmental disorders has been recognized. Previously, these children have been turned away from schools and locked away in their parents' homes. Some of the activities carried out by Autism Society of Kenya with support of CEF funding are:

- Through advocacy work, there has been mass public awareness on autism in Kenya. Autism Society of Kenya, besides holding workshops, held awareness walks in 2005 and 2006. One of the workshops held was to establish the status of autism in Kenya which led to an action plan with a focus on curriculum development for children with autism.
- Lobbying line ministries to recognize the needs of autistic children which has led to recognition of autistic children as a separate condition from mentally handicapped children. Some of the innovative approaches that Autism Society of Kenya has used are; use dietary intervention, sensory integration, behavior modification, activities of daily living and other individualized education programmes to manage autism thus ensure access and retention of these children in schools.

AOSK has involved parents of autistic children in support groups. Siblings of autistic children are involved through support groups, while line ministries and The City Council Nairobi are also involved in addressing the plight of autistic children.

## **VI. Literacy for All (LIFA)**

This is a community based organization working in Kakamega District in Western province. The organization targets children who have dropped out of school, orphans and youths who never went to school, the disadvantaged and neglected children. They have organized adult classes in their bid to ensure education and literacy for all.

LIFA initially started the programme at a local church but through CEF funding, the organization has managed to mobilize and sensitize the community on the plight of these children and the need for literacy for all. Other activities that LIFA has carried out include:-

- Helping the community to put up structures for these centers. Through advocacy work, they have been able to convince the community to cost share whereby the community provided land, stones and labour and LIFA through CEF funding did the rest of the construction.
- LIFA has also encouraged children from these centers willing to join formal schools by providing them with desks, uniform and other writing materials.
- Training of trainers (TOTs) has been done as well as training thirty seven teachers on capacity building in the years 2003 and 2004.
- LIFA has come up with a teacher's manual for non formal programmes.
- Through advocacy work, the government has been brought on board and now appreciates non formal education. Teachers in the formal mainstream were also sensitized to appreciate NFE. Pupils from NFE are now admitted to secondary schools with no problem.
- Research has helped in re-educating the community on alternative forms of education thus increasing access to primary education.
- LIFA uses multi-grade approach to enhance access and retention of marginalized children with a focus on th

## **VII. Bible Translation and Literacy (BTL)**

BTL used CEF resources to lobby and advocate for the use of mother tongue in enhancing education performance and retention of boys and girls in the lower classes in primary school. BTL also launched a comparative study in Sabaot (Mt Elgon) and Tharaka districts. Some of the achievements gathered in this evaluation were:-

- BTL has built linkages with institutions of higher learning that offers linguistics studies in its promotion of use of mother tongue in education.
- KIE has now supported and taken over the task of writing books in Kitharaka and Sabaot.
- Training key persons for mother tongue advocacy has been done.
- Lobbying to inform education forums on the importance of mother tongue communication in education has been done.
- Training of education inspectors for supervision and inspection of the use of mother tongue in schools has been achieved.

## **3.5 Interagency collaboration and management**

### ***3.5.1 CEFK Management Structure***

According to the CEFK mid term evaluation report, in the first 3 years, the management and implementation of CEFK was undertaken in a participatory manner that entailed collaboration among AAK, Oxfam GB and Save the children UK. According to the CEF global agreement, Action Aid Kenya (AAK), Save the Children UK and Oxfam GB were charged with the responsibility of managing CEFK project. A seven (7) person's management committee was formed at the beginning of the program, comprising of two representatives (the Country Director and the Education Manager/Officer) from each organizations' country office and the CEFK Coordinator. In Kenya CEFK was located within Action Aid Kenya offices, who provided the coordination office with space and other logistical support. This tripartite arrangement was not a Kenya's initiative but a global one in the sense that almost all CEF programs were managed under this arrangement. There was also the CEF Coordinator, who was in-charge of day-to-day management and running of the fund. The Accountant, a full time employee of AAK, was seconded to the Fund. The management was responsible for key decisions, policy statements, and giving direction and support to the Fund.

### ***3.5.2 Successes and challenges***

The assessment of the management arrangement for the first 3 years indicated that this had been effective in managing the fund. This was due to the historical focus, reputation and acceptance of the three international organizations in Kenya. There was 'cross fertilization' of strengths (education focus, professionalism, technical support, efficiency, advocacy and lobbying skills, etc.) of the three organizations' in overseeing the Fund, as revealed in the words of a country director of one of the organization;

*"The values, strengths and reputation of the three organizations are similar. It is thus easy for them to work together and manage the Fund in tripartite arrangements. We are key players in lobbying and advocacy and capacity building internationally. The three organizations believe in efficiency and effectiveness. These values have been so far transferred in the management of the Fund in Kenya. Besides, we are regarded highly in Kenya because of what we do. This has made CEF partners and the Ministry of Education (MoE) in Kenya to respect what we do." (Member of Management Team, 2005 – CEFK Mid term review report).*

One of the challenges arose from the fact that the three organizations were independent and each has its own programmes. Their respective CEOs and Education Programme Officers had full time responsibilities in their organizations. They had dead lines to meet and pressure of work. This meant that, managing CEF was an additional workload, which was not in their mainstream responsibilities! Thus, regular meetings and close supervision of CEFK was a challenge. Getting the representatives of the three organizations to share a common forum was a challenge. Thus, in some cases decisions were made by e-mails or telephone. The fact that the Country Directors (CDs) and Education Officers of the three organizations were also the managers of CEFK at times posed a challenge to CEFK due to their multiple roles that undermined quality time and support the officers were able to give to the Fund.

Another challenge arose from the constant changes of the representatives of the three organizations at the CEFK management committee. This undermined the effectiveness of management meetings and decisions. Besides, the Coordinator had to work with new officers whenever there was change of leadership or education staff in the three organizations. This slowed the process to some extent because the Coordinator had to spend time briefing new officers who were brought on board.

The arrangement that CEFK was located within Action Aid Kenya offices at times created some logistical challenges to the efficient management and operation of the fund. Generally, the Fund through the Coordinator had to operate under the rules and regulations set by AAK and this sometimes caused delays and tension. Two examples were sighted by both the management and partners in the CEFK mid term review report:

- “Since most Action AID Kenya senior staff consider CEFK to be under Education section and do not understand its uniqueness in terms of focus and operations, there are cases where even after the CEF management has approved some tasks, the Action Aid Kenya Management disapproves such activities. There are cases where contracts have been cancelled and studies/assignments delayed”.
- “Facilitation of mobility / travel is also problematic for CEFK. This was because the Coordinator has no assigned vehicle and has thus to line-up and compete with other mainstream Action Aid Kenya programmes. If there is no available vehicle or there is another pressing AAK job to be done, CEF work has to be delayed or postponed”.

However, it was indicated that being located within AAK offices had its own advantages including the fact that CEFK worked within an already established structure and also rode on the good reputation of AAK.

During the last two years of the project, only AAK was left of the three organizations that managed CEFK. Save the children UK and Oxfam had pulled out. The reasons cited by those who were interviewed during this evaluation indicated that Save the children UK relocated their operations from Kenya and Oxfam GB ceased its focus on education as a priority due to a shift in their strategy. None of the former staff of the two organizations who were involved in CEFK were available for interview during this evaluation process. The information and opinion cited in this report were obtained from the CEFK Coordinator, partners and the midterm review report.

Despite the challenges as far as management of CEFK was concerned, the mid term review indicated that the tripartite arrangement had opened a window of collaboration and working together in enhancing the development of education in Kenya and in other sub-Saharan countries. This was in terms of visioning together, sharing resources and operationalizing ‘grand’ management. The fact that “the three organizations were international when they were managing national partners through CEFK gave national issues credibility and attention they deserved. This ‘was motivating to CEFK Partners and beneficiaries’, (Partner Representative, 2005 – mid term review report).

### ***3.5.2 Analysis of cost and budget utilization by CEFK partners***

CEFK received UK Pounds 600,000 from CEF global office, Comic Relief and Citibank provided additional UK Pounds 19,000 and 4,000 respectively. These funds were used to finance programme activities, project monitoring, personnel, and administrative costs. About 90% of the total amount received was used for programme activities. About 10% of the total funds were used for project monitoring, personnel and administrative costs. The programme funds were disbursed and utilized by the CEFK partners.

Table 1 below shows utilization of budgets by partners during the period 2003-2008. So far 99% of the approved funds have been utilized compared to 67% utilization recorded during the mid term review. This shows that the capacity of the partners to utilize funds and implement programme activities increased as the project progressed. It is also an indication that planned activities were undertaken as expected. However, it should be noted that there is unutilized amount of Ksh343, 125 (about 4900 US dollars) under KNAP. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the money was in dispute and a court case was yet to be determined at the time of writing this report.

***Table 1: Utilization of Budgets by Partners 2003-2008***

<b>Partner</b>	<b>Approved Kshs</b>	<b>Utilized Kshs</b>	<b>Utilized as % of Approved</b>
Girl Child Network (GCN)	11,872,600	12,519,604	100%
Cancel Debts for the Child Campaign (CADEC)	4,364,000	4,364,000	100%
Kenya Alliance for Advancement of Children Rights (KAACR)	6,066,705,	6,066,705,	100%
Elimu Kwa Wanavijiji Coalition (EKWVC)	3,649,062	3,649,062	100%
Dupoto e Maa	3,271,350	3,271,350	100%
Literacy for All (LIFA)	5,356,672	5,356,672	100%
Elimu Yetu Coalition (EYC)	23,367,902	24,166,045	100%
Women Educational Researchers of Kenya (WERK)	4,677,230	4,677,230	100%
National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCK)	4,142,160	4,142,160	100%
Bible Translation Literacy (BTL)	4,971,000	4,971,000	100%
Autism society of Kenya	3,464,000	3,464,000	100%
KNAP	7,408,062	7,064,937	95%
KSMH	2,125,258	2,125,258	100%
<b>Total Kshs.</b>	<b>84,736,271</b>	<b>84,393,146</b>	<b>99%</b>

The budget utilization at 99% was an excellent result. This shows that the budgeted CEFK funds were fully utilized except for the small amount under dispute with KNAP. It further shows that the CSOs absorption capacity grew as a result of CEFK support. The issue of CSOs absorption of funds was raised as a caution and an issue to watch in the mid term review report.

The analysis of the figures in Table 1 indicates that there was efficiency as far as disbursement and utilization of funds are concerned. This explains the partners' happiness

about how disbursement was done except for occasional delays in disbursement of funds. It was indicated that CEFK disbursed funds in an organized manner so long as a partner accounted for the funds disbursed. The quarterly disbursement was also approved by the partners. A few cases of inadequate accountability of funds by some partners were experienced and reported. CEFK management took action to terminate funding for these partners. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, some district monitors reported that they were not paid the full stipend budgeted for by their organization.

Generally, the evaluation team was satisfied by the utilization of resources that were approved, except for a few cases where some partners were not fully accountable. Based on the results that we have analyzed above, the CEF resources were generally utilized properly.

#### **4.0 CEFK Issues and challenges**

Though CEFK has achieved a lot, there were issues noted by the evaluators and challenges that were faced by CEFK partners in pursuing their goals. These are discussed in this section:

Some recommendations in the CEFK mid-term review were not pursued. Examples include the need to strategically rally the masses (communities) to be active and useful members of a national movement for change and the need for campaigns and lobbying activities initiated under CEFK to be taken over by communities and key stakeholders. The second example is the need to hire more qualified staff to assist the CEF coordinator to manage and supervise CEF activities. The third is the expansion of the CEF management committee to incorporate for example, a representative of the private sector. The fourth one is the need for CEF to forge strategic partnerships with the private sector.

The evaluators noted that some of the district monitors did not perform their work beyond visiting 2-3 schools. In one case the monitor carried out activities only in the school where he/she was teaching during the two or so years. The second example was a monitor who visited 3 schools in two years. In the third case, the monitor had visited a few schools but did not submit a report to his/her organization because the organization had failed to pay him/her the monthly stipend.

Some district monitors reported that they were not paid the total amount of money allocated for their transport. An example was one monitor who was paid as little as Ksh 6,000 (about 85 US dollars) and not the Ksh 90,000 (about 1270 US dollars) that was allocated for each monitor in the agreement signed with CEFK. Another monitor said he/she was paid Ksh 15,000 (about 210 US dollars) for the whole period. This made it difficult for the monitors to operate since the money was supposed to cater for their transport while carrying out monitoring activities. It also raises the question of accountability among some of the partners.

Another example is that of GCN chapters where members were working only in their institutions and have not reached other institutions or communities around them. Reason given for this was limited resources.

Although some of the CEFK activities carried out by partners are potentially sustainable e.g. budget tracking by community action groups in Kajiado and the trained school management committees (SMCs) in different schools and campaign against FGM by children rights clubs in Mabera, some of the activities, in our view, were unsustainable. These are activities where the communities were not actively involved in the planning and implementation and therefore a sense of ownership was not inculcated. Examples of activities that did not show indications of continuity include the training forums for stakeholders that focused on budget monitoring at district level without any follow up and were not linked to any specific community. The activities of the district monitors may not be sustainable without donor(s) to provide support for logistics. The “one off” education awareness forums conducted by some partners in different regions did not establish mechanism for follow up and were not linked to any organized structures for continuity. Examples were the one day education awareness forums done in Nanyuki and Garissa. The findings of the study done on the education status of OVCs in Ruiru and Embakasi were not linked to any organized structures for implementation and continuity.

The regional structures of the CSO coalitions and networks were reported to be weak in terms of cohesiveness among members, resources, facilities and programmes. They have not formed and evolved strongly and depend on the national secretariats for direction, support and resources, for example, the GCN chapters. The national secretariats on the other hand, were strong with facilities, resources and controlled programmes. The major decisions, in most cases, were made by the national secretariats except the election of officials which was done at the annual general meetings. The CEFK interventions did not shift the status quo. Majority of the interventions carried out by the regional structures under CEFK were not followed up due to lack of resources. The regional structures raised concern over the amount of resources that reached them. They recommended that in future the majority of funds should go to regional and grass root structures directly since that was “where the point of pain was”.

Other challenges that were cited by the partners were:

- Partners expressed concern over the delay of funds. In some cases, funds were delayed for up to three months. These delays in funding had been a major hindrance in the effectiveness of activities planned.
- The government’s response to some of the initiatives was / is very slow and laborious. For instance the enactment and printing of the gender policy in education took a long time and demanded a lot of pushing by partners.
- Some partners cited resistance as a major challenge. For instance, gender equality in education project (GEP) came in at the middle of the project and therefore faced a lot of resistance from partners who saw this as interference with their activities.
- The gender mentor felt that she wasn’t really an ‘insider’ in CEFK and therefore was not able to help in some issues that arose in partner organizations after mentoring them. Distances were also cited as a challenge especially for the CEFK coordinator and the gender mentor. The programme activities of the partners were spread out in different regions and the distances involved limited the follow by the CEFK Coordinator and the Gender mentor.

- Cultural issues are still a barrier to girls' participation in school especially among the Maasai's in Kajiado and Kuria communities. Female genital mutilation and early marriages were still rampant in these communities.

#### **4.1 Lessons learnt and recommendations**

The key lessons that also form the recommendations for future programmes, which were identified with regard to the implementation of CEFK project include:

Through a fund such as CEF, guiding, regulating and monitoring the use of funds is much easier. It also allows participating CSOs to adopt a broader perspective and different angles of approach when solving problems.

Increased community awareness, skills and capacity is more likely to lead to change in policy. This in turn will lead to changes in practice that will benefit poor and excluded children's access to education.

In order to achieve the sharing of best practices within coalitions, alliances and networks, there needs to be an increase in the capacity of CSOs to engage in policy formulation, implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation. This in turn suggests the potential benefit of all CEF supported groups periodically sharing experiences and information in areas of work.

Careful planning, realistic scope and effective monitoring of programmes are essential to ensure learning, accountability and result measurement.

There is a great deal to learn from those programmes that have made steps towards securing their longer-term sustainability. This seems to be related to effective community/stakeholder involvement, forging strong links with donors, other NGOs and the private sector.

In many cases capacity building, both for individual organizations and networks is essential to achieve effectiveness in delivering intended results. It appears that a few organizations with capacity are more likely to deliver more results, whereas a broad network of organizations without capacity may be less effective in operation and less likely to develop.

Other Key lessons cited by the partners include:

1. Networks/coalitions can play a key role in national level work, demystifying national government budgets, sharing learning and advocacy around budgets. In this respect, local initiatives and national ones need to be linked.
2. The need to allocate more resources (funds) for monitoring and evaluation of CEF activities, outcomes and impacts at the regional and grass root level is important.
3. Most of the partners learnt that for the success of any activity, the government is a vital organ to work with.
4. Community sensitization, mobilization and community participation (such as dialogue with opinion and religious leaders) is necessary at the on-set of the implementation of the project activities as their support is important in the achievement of the project goals.
5. Mentoring develops relationships and would therefore be more effective in carrying out activities like gender work than consultancy approach.

6. Lobbying and advocacy for positive change is a tricky and sensitive engagement that needs forging partnerships, innovativeness and patience.

Some of the best practices to be left as a legacy from the CEFK project include:

- Children participation in school management committees has had a tremendous impact in the reduction of indiscipline cases and can contribute to better accountability and performance.
- Identification, assessment and placement of children with autism and other forms of disabilities is important. Their plight has been incorporated in the proposed education act.
- Establishment of girl-friendly sanitation / sanitary facilities in schools is important for conducive school environment for girls.
- Collaboration of the government and civil society in providing education for all is important.
- The community driven NFE centers in Kakamega are an effective model to facilitate access to education for marginalized children left out in the FPE.

## **5.0 CONCLUSION**

Overall, CEFK has made significant contribution to FPE in terms of improving policy and practice, better allocation and utilization of government education funds and in supporting access and retention of marginalized children in schools. Its priorities and objectives are relevant in the national and wider EFA context. Besides, there are practices happening in the communities and schools, for example budget tracking, change of negative cultural practices and creation of conducive learning environment for girls in schools that will continue to impact positively to children access to quality education, especially the disadvantaged and vulnerable ones.

Although the CEFK project has come to an end, the initiatives that were undertaken needed further support for fuller fruition of the benefits accruing from the project. This is more so for initiatives that were funded for shorter periods of two to three years, for example, those by NCKK, KAACR, EKWVC, and KSMH.

The project was largely successful in achieving its objectives. Some of the initiatives have the potential to continue beyond the CEFK funding particularly those that actively involved the community and other stakeholders in the implementation. There were initiatives undertaken that are not sustainable without further donor support and close follow up. Examples include the ‘one off’ awareness activities that were not linked to any community structures or institutions to ensure their continuity.

The budget utilization by partners at 99% by the end of the project compared to 67% during the mid term review confirms that partners capacity to implement activities increased as the project progressed. It further confirms that the project was efficient in utilization of resources and implementation of activities.

Generally, the evaluation team was satisfied by the utilization of resources that were approved, except for a few cases where some partners were not fully accountable. Based on the results that we have analyzed above, the CEF resources were generally utilized properly.

The project experienced a few accountability and management challenges. This include the KNAP dispute that is already in a court of law and two other partners that were dropped due to accountability issues. The inter agency collaboration in the management of the CEFK project worked for the first three years but declined there after and was non existent towards the end of the project.

**APPENDIX 1: CEF COUNTRY SUMMARY TEMPLATE**

**Country: Kenya**

	Key Successes	Key Evidence	Key Factors/ Reasons for Successes
<p>Area 1</p> <p>Civil Society Participation in Education Planning</p>	<p>Participation at formulation of government policies and plans.</p> <p>Lobbying the government to allocate budget for sanitary towels for girls in schools.</p> <p>Budget allocation by government to boarding schools in ASAL areas (pastoralists / nomadic communities)</p>	<p>GCN formulated gender policy with government.</p> <p>GCN succeeded in 2007/08 in having government allocate 165,000 (about 2300 US dollars) for sanitary towels in schools.</p> <p>Dupoto e Maa in Kajiado succeeded in having government allocate budget to boarding schools in the ASAL areas.</p>	<p>Capacity building training support provided by CEF to partners (financial, governance, gender, etc).</p> <p>Activation of districts, regions and chapters to support the secretariats.</p> <p>On-site technical advise by CEF coordinator to partners through visits, emails and phone calls.</p>
<p>Area 2</p> <p>Monitoring of Education Budgets by Civil Society at National and Local Levels (budget analysis, tracking</p>	<p>Regional and grassroots structures created to monitor budgets.</p> <p>Sensitization of</p>	<p>For example, community education action groups formed by Dupoto in Kajiado.</p>	<p>Capacity building of partners on budget tracking and providing them with required tools for the work.</p>

<p>&amp; advocacy)</p>	<p>leaders and parents to take interest in school budgets and take action.</p> <p>Publishing of budget tracking tools.</p> <p>Actual tracking of budgets in 8 provinces</p>	<p>For example, KNAP has sensitized parents and leaders who in turn have taken action on misuse of school funds in Kakamega district.</p> <p>Training and providing partners with tracking tools, eg. EYC, Dupoto, and KNAP.</p> <p>EYC, Dupoto and KNAP have participated in budget tracking contributing to the coverage of the 8 provinces.</p>	
<p>Area 3</p> <p>Development and Dissemination of Innovative Practice to enable Access to Quality Education for Marginalised Children especially Girls</p>	<p>Research carried out and findings used to spearhead campaigns to promote and support girl child in education.</p>	<p>For example, research by GCN, WERK and EKWVC</p>	<p>Wider dissemination of findings of the research to government, parents, pupils, teachers, SMCs and MOE officials.</p>

	Less Successful/ Problematic	Key Evidence	Key Factors/ Reasons for Difficulties
Area 1  Civil Society Participation in Education Planning	Some weak CSOs coalitions and networks at regions and grassroots	For example, some GCN chapters which are not cohesive, that is, members work as individuals and not together as a chapter.  Also fewer resources reaching the chapters	The regional structures have not formed fully and depend on national secretariat for direction.  Failure by project to allocate some resources directly to regional structures.
Area 2  Monitoring of Education Budgets by Civil Society at National and Local Levels (budget analysis, tracking & advocacy)	Though government agreed to allocate budget to adult education in 2007/2008, the amount was minimal.  Some advocacy networks are inactive  In some instances, there are weak follow up mechanisms for trained district forums for stakeholders  Limited scope of budget tracking.	For example, EYC efforts to have government allocate budget to adult education.  For example, KANNET in Kakamega district was found inactive.  For example, there are weak follow up mechanisms for budget tracking support groups in Kajiado.  Some district monitors did not perform their work beyond visiting 2 to	Minimal budget allocation blamed on slow government response to commit itself to issues presented before it.  Inactivity of networks blamed on lack of resources.  Weak follow up mechanisms an oversight by the partners.  Monitors blame their inability to reach more schools and communities to

		3 schools, others failed to submit reports to their organizations on instances when they were not paid.	lack of resources.
Area 3  Development and Dissemination of Innovative Practice to enable Access to Quality Education for Marginalised Children especially Girls	Weak networks and coalitions through which to disseminate information.  Cultural issues a barrier.	For example, KANNET in Kakamega is a weak network.  FGM and early marriages are some of the cultural barriers, for example, in Kajiado and Kuria districts.	KANNET's weakness blamed on lack of resources.  Cultural issues blamed for resistance to change as proposed in the reports, eg gender research report.

## APPENDIX 2

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs) FOR THE COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION FUND (CEF) KENYA END OF PROJECT EVALUATION**

#### **Background**

The Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF) which is a project based at Action Aid Kenya offices plans to conduct an end of term review or evaluation to assess the impact it has had on Education for All (EFA) campaigns since its inception in 2002. The CEF was established through the collaborative efforts of Oxfam GB, Save the Children UK and Action Aid and was designed to be managed through an inter agency structure of the three organizations with Action Aid acting as the lead agency and host to the fund in Kenya. A strategic plan covering the period 2002-2005 was developed for guiding management and implementation of the project on its inception. The plan was developed following consultations with key civil society and government actors in the education sector as well as through review of recent developments in EFA in Kenya.

The global focus of the CEF was to strengthen civil society input into the EFA process-raise EFA profile, especially through advocacy and campaigning work in education across civil society in 16 countries of the poorest commonwealth countries. Kenya was chosen among the 16 countries that were to implement the project. The project was to focus on partnership and capacity building program working with local partners active in advocacy and policy influencing in basic education. Over time it has worked with 13 different organizations spread across the country.

#### **The Goal & Objectives of the CEF Project**

The CEF project goal has been to enhance the opportunity for all children to access and complete quality primary education and close the gender gap in basic education. It has covered three broad objectives as follows;

- Strengthening civil society participation in the design and implementation of national and local education plans and frameworks. This was to happen principally through support for broad based national alliances and coalitions. Particular priority was to have been given to supporting initiatives that can accelerate progress towards gender equity in education
- Enabling local communities to monitor spending on education, both at the national and local levels
- Supporting innovative ways for civil society to ensure that all the children including those with disabilities and from nomadic communities are able to access quality education. This was to happen within the framework of national education plans, in a way that links to the national coalition's members.

#### **Specific Task**

After about five (5) years of project implementation, there is need to evaluate the CEF objectives as reflected in the project strategy (2002-2005) and reviewed in the mid-term review (2005) to assess performance/results against these frameworks. The evaluation is expected to generate a quality report that will inform the donor (DfID), Action Aid Kenya, Oxfam GB Kenya and Save the Children (UK) Kenyan programme as to what extent the

goal has been achieved or otherwise. The process is intended to be as objective as possible and therefore the need to contract an external evaluator to carry out the review. These TORs are therefore intended to share the insight of the task at hand and subsequently guide the development of review tools for the entire process. The process will also be a contribution towards the global evaluation report of the CEF project to be presented to DfID in UK by the London office.

### **Purpose of the End of Project Evaluation**

- To ACCOUNT, LEARN and SHARE Learning from achievements and failures – in order to meet statutory requirements of donors, share our experiences and learning leading to sustaining the ‘good practises’ and leaving a legacy.
- To share with others our aims, achievements as well as our challenges.
- To allow internal and external stakeholders to explore our work and help us to assess impact, achievements and learning. (This might help increase synergy across CEF’s work.)
- To increase our accountability to our internal peers and external partners.

### **Scope of Work**

- Review all CEF and partners generated documents, analyze and compile findings
- Review the CEF strategy and the midterm review
- Develop tools such as focus group discussion (FGD) guides, short questionnaires, interview guides and case study formats
- Conduct a mapping exercise of potential interviewees
- Examining the financial costs involved during the project implementation
- Lead field visits and review sessions of CEF partners
- Analyze and Document unexpected outcomes (both positive and negative)and
- Make recommendations from lessons learnt

### **Possible stages in the process**

The evaluation process should enable the project to work with stakeholder groups to:

- Reflect on the work from the beginning to the end of the project
- Learn from the 5 year’s experience
- Analyse and articulate how project objectives have been met or otherwise and how the learning will improve future work.

However, as well as practical issues, there are the harder questions to answer:

- What is it that makes this process different from the other reviews, assessments and “participatory processes” that we’ve undertaken?
- What do we want to achieve through the process?
- What can CEF offer in terms of devolving decision making or handing over power?
- How will we handle our own defensiveness and any tendency to “close down” rather than “open up” the possibility for honest dialogue with our stakeholders?
- How will we ensure that it is worth people’s while to be involved in this process?

The answers to such questions will guide the planning process while the matrix table below will assist in the design of review tools.

### ***Methods of Data Collection***

The entire process should be very participatory and involving to ensure quality findings. The research must ensure that both qualitative and quantitative data/information is collected and analyzed. The consultant may use the following mechanisms:

- Workshop(s) with key informants, partners, especially those working closely with vulnerable communities and learners including children.
- Literature review of partners reports and any other project material
- Use of questionnaires, interviews, and field visits
- Peer review amongst the CEF partners to evaluate the project impact.
- Internal examination of relevant documentation and statistics.

### **Expected Outputs**

- A detailed, comprehensive and analytical CEF review report containing several sections such as;
  - a) Analysis of the review of CEF and partners documents, strategies used in the process
  - b) Outcomes both positive and negative
  - c) Analysis of cost vs. work done
  - d) Recommendations/way forward
  - e) Lessons learnt
  - f) CEF beyond 2007 and fund sustainability
  - g) Appendices of sources of information, data collected and research tools used

A reader friendly short and succinct summary ten page report (based on the detailed report)

### APPENDIX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

NAME	ORGANIZATION
1. Ndinda Okello (Kuria West)	QASO
2. Odero Julias (Ikerege Zone)	Education Officer
3. Judith Akoth FM2 (Student)	St. Mary's Maberu Secondary School
4. Astride Vihenda FM3 (Student)	„
5. Helen Nyagata FM1 (Student)	„
6. Sophia Mugori FM1 (Student)	„
7. Linda Pire FM1 (Student)	„
8. Mary Musira FM3 (Student)	„
9. John Okemere	Maberu Primary School
10. Maren Akeyo	Role Model Maberu Primary School
11. William Migwi	CEF Co-ordinator
12. Dr. Nikkei Kaman	CIF Gender mentor
13. Manchaca Salem	KNAP – Coast (Kwale)
14. Joseph Otieno	Deputy DCO – Kuria West District
15. John Langat	DCO
16. Doreen Oluoch	Project Assistant – KAACR
17. Simon Tinega	DEO's Office – Kuria
18. David Ligale	Head teacher Shanjero Primary School
19. Godfrey Tamba Mate	Site Co-ordinator - Elufafa Community Centre
20. Enock Mambile	Programme Director – ACCESS
21. Joseph	LIFA
22. Matias Khalumi	KNAP/EYC
23. Wellington Lumosi	Shinyalu (KNAP)
24. Mercy Musomi	GCN
25. Florence	GCN
26. Chapman Kisiero	National Co-ordinator EYC
27. Onesmus Kamwara	Project Leader (Tharaka)
28. John Nguu	Resource person/Incharge of advocacy - Tharaka
29. Violet	WERK
30. Fredrick Munyalo	KNAP – Nakuru
31. Owalla	EYC – Kwale
32. Ms Musomi	GCN
33. Eddah Migwi	Kenya Society of Mentally Hand
34. Tim Ekesa	KAACR
35. John Muriu	H/M Ol Maroroi Primary School
36. Cyrus Murage	BTL – Nairobi
37. Isaack Shurke	Duputo
38. Stephen Mulianka	Duputo
39. Sabina Wangui	GCN Nyeri Chapter
40. Joseph Kingori	GCN Nyeri Chapter
41. Anne Wamboi	„

- 42. Elizabeth Juma ”
- 43. John Nganga ”
- 44. Anthony Nganga ”
- 45. Lydia Theuri ”
- 46. Magdalene Kirema H/M Marimanti Primary School
- 47. Felisty Nyambura Autism Society of Kenya
- 48. Monica Mburu ”
- 49. Anastasia Murugi ”

## APPENDIX 4: QUESTIONNAIRE

### CIF END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

#### Interview Guide (1)

#### Strengthening civil society participation

##### A. Background

1. Name of partner organization  
.....
2. Location  
.....
3. Person interviewed  
.....
4. What are the major activities of your organization? (For new partners)
5. When did you start your partnership with CIF?
6. What support have you received from CIF?
7. What activities have you carried out within the CIF support?
8. How have the poor people or their representatives been involved in these activities?
9. Have there been efforts to build long term grassroots involvement in the process towards realizing education for all.
10. How have you addressed education issues that are specific in girls, boys, and women in these activities?
11. What achievements have you realized in these efforts (Question 12)
12. For coalitions and networks
  - a. How broad based is your coalition / network?
    - i. Is membership regional / national / international?
    - ii. How has CIF impacted on these linkages
    - iii. Do you offer space for members to come together?
    - iv. How are decisions made within the coalition / Network?
    - v. Who has the most and least active role in the coalition / Network and why?
    - vi. Where has the main funding for the coalition / Network and its campaign activities come from?
    - vii. If primarily funded by CIF how these activities will continue?
13. Give examples of how your partnership with CIF has resulted in changes in
  - i. Practices
  - ii. Effectiveness
  - iii. The capacity of your organization to engage in policy work.
14. Has the CIF support led to increased representation and engagement of your organization with government in education policy forums, debates and PRS processes?
  - i. How has this been achieved?
  - ii. What is the relevance and level of this engagement?
  - iii. What are the lessons learnt?
15. To what extent has the advocacy work strengthened your organization to hold those in positions of power accountable in the long run?
  - i. How has this been achieved?
16. To what extent has CEF's support enabled linkages and alliance with other organizations working on education issues?

- i. How has this been done?
  - ii. What have been the lessons and outcomes?
17. What difficulties have you encountered in trying to achieve objectives in this partnership?
- i. What have been the expected outcomes?
  - ii. What would you do differently?
18. Comment on GOK capacity to address constraints to achieving Education for all that lie outside education system, after CIF support.

## CIF END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

### Interview Guide (II)

#### Supporting local communities to monitor spending on education both at national and local levels

##### A. Background

1. Name of partner organization  
.....
2. Location  
.....
3. Person interviewed  
.....
4. What are the major activities of your organization? (For new partners)
5. When did you start your partnership with CIF?
6. What support have you received from CIF?
7. What type of budget work has CIF supported in your partnership?
8. Is there published information on education budget and expenditure at the local or other level?
  - a. Have there been changes in the accessibility of education budgets since the start of the CIF programme?
  - b. If so, what have been factors leading to this change?
9. What type of training in budget analysis has been undertaken?
10. Who takes part in education monitoring work?
  - a. What is the nature of their participation?
11. What are the examples of your support for local level monitoring on influencing government decisions on education for plans at local or national level?
12. Are there examples of your support for Local / National level monitoring of education budget that is disaggregated along gender lines?
13. Has this objective been achieved? Explain. E.g.
  - Influencing government decisions on education.
  - Impact on the delivery of education at local level.
14. What difficulties have you encountered in trying to achieve this objective?
  - i. What have you learnt?
  - ii. What have been the unexpected outcomes?
  - iii. What would you do differently?

## CIF END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

### Interview Guide (III)

**Supporting development of innovative approaches to educating the most marginalized children (especially girls and the most vulnerable) in a way that influences a wider policy and practice**

#### **A. Background**

1. Name of partner organization  
.....
2. Location.....  
.....
3. Person interviewed  
.....
4. What are the major activities of your organization? (For new partners)
5. When did you start your partnership with CIF?
6. What support have you received from CIF?
7. What have been the main activities in documenting and researching approaches to educating marginalized and excluded children? Any innovative approaches used?
8. Has this work led to:-
  - i. Changes in government policies / practices in relation to factors that have caused exclusion for different groups / communities? (Give examples)
  - ii. Supported movements / groups of excluded children / their parents and carers to take up education as a right?
  - iii. Improved access to primary school enrolment / completion rates for these excluded groups of children?
9. Would you say this objective has been achieved?
10. What difficulties have you encountered in trying to achieve this objective?
  - i. What have you learnt?
  - ii. What are the unexpected outcomes?
  - iii. What would you do differently?

## CIF END OF PROJECT EVALUATION

### Interview Guide (IV)

#### Inter Agency collaboration and internal functioning of CIF

1. How did the collaboration work in the CIF Kenya programme?
  - Comment on the cost effectiveness and reports of the implementation process.
  - How were the working relationships?
    - i. What was the level of representation of each agency in the CIF management committee?
    - ii. What was the gender balance in the management committee?
    - iii. How often did the management committee meet?
    - iv. How were decisions made in the management committee?
2. How was the CIF management committee transparent with regards to:-
  - i. Budget allocation and reporting.
  - ii. Key decision making processes.
  - iii. Providing key information and learning.
3. Were M & E systems developed? If so, how did monitoring and evaluation system:-
  - i. Encourage participation of key stakeholders in all stages of programme design and implementation.
  - ii. Involve different stakeholders in monitoring?
  - iii. Examine both intended and unintended impacts.
  - iv. Encourage learning and reflection.
4. What were the mechanisms and processes used to devolve decision making authority within the CIF country programme?
  - a. What was achieved in this area between
    - i. AAIK / Oxfam / SCF
    - ii. Coalitions and partners.
    - iii. Local CBO's.
    - iv. Others.
5. What difficulties did you encounter in working in collaboration?
  - i. What were the lessons learnt?
  - ii. What were the unexpected outcomes?
  - iii. What would you do differently?
6. Any impact arising from policy recommendations from the documentations that were implemented?

## APPENDIX 5: EVALUATION WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANIZATION</b>
1. Dr Nikkei Kaman	CIF Gender Mentor
2. William M Migwi	CIF Coordinator
3. John Mwendwa	Facilitator (Iceberg Consultants)
4. Jane Munene	Facilitator (Iceberg Africa Consultants)
5. Alice Kiboi	Facilitator (Iceberg Africa Consultants)
6. Joseph Mutamba	Literacy for All (LIFA)
7. Mathias Khalumi	EYC Western Chapter
8. Onesmus Mmasi	EYC Western Chapter
9. Chapman Kisiero	EYC National Coordinator
10. Felicity N Ngungu	Autism Society of Kenya
11. Stephen Murianka	Dupoto e Maa
12. Dorothy Nyambu	COPDEC
13. Andrew Agisi	KNAP Nyanza
14. Moses Wabomba	Bungoma
15. Wellington Lumosi	KNAP Kakamega
16. Martine W Chesoli	KNAP Trans Nzoia (Kitale)
17. Sam Odhiambo	EYC Coast Chapter
18. Florence Annan	Girl Child Network (GCN)
19. Violet Gatwiri	WERK
20. Mercy Musomi	GCN
21. Ken Ambetsa	Kenya Alliance for Children's Rights (KAAC)

