

Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative

Final Synthesis Report Volume 4

Appendix V: Note on Approach and Methods

July 2010



Acknowledgements

The mid-term evaluation of the Fast Track Initiative has been carried out by a consortium of Cambridge Education, Mokoro Ltd. and Oxford Policy Management contracted by the World Bank on behalf of the FTI partnership.

The evaluation team has been led by Stephen Lister. The core team members were; Manos Antoninis, Felicity Binns, Roy Carr-Hill, Mailan Chiche, Catherine Dom, Keith Hinchliffe, Fred Merttens, Georgina Rawle, Abby Riddell, Anthea Sims Williams, Muriel Visser-Valfrey, and Eric Woods. The country reports and desk studies were carried out by members of the core team in conjunction with: Hassan Abdulmalik, Sulleiman Adediran, Zuber Ahmed, Emily Allardyce, Terry Allsop, Ramlatu Attah, Masooda Bano, Ann Bartholomew, Serge Bayala, Clare O'Brien, Elisabet Jané Camacho, Tim Cammack, Elsa Duret, Stephen Jones, Ian MacAuslan, Felicia Omibon, Eldah Onsomu, Ray Purcell, Nick Santcross, Tuomas Takala, George Taylor, Khieu Vicheanon and Daniel Wilde. Additional support to the evaluation team was provided by: Stephanie Allan, Valentina Barca, Rebecca Bird, Philip Lister, Frieda McAlear, Luca Pellerano, Daniel Ross, Sarah Scott and Shakil Sidat.

Programme management support has been provided by: George Hartless, Carlos Orte, Robert Smith and Diana Webster.

The internal quality assurance panel comprised Nils Boesen, Christopher Colclough, Steve Packer and Juliet Pierce. Juliet Pierce also facilitated the team's workshops and meetings.

The evaluation team received guidance and comments throughout the evaluation from the Evaluation Oversight Committee which was coordinated by Joe DeStefano.

The evaluation team is very grateful to the Global Learning Portal, <http://www.glp.net>, which hosted the evaluation team's internal website and provided technical support and to the Education Policy and Data Center, <http://epdc.org/>, which provided data for the country case studies.

All the evaluation's final outputs can be downloaded from <http://www.camb-ed.com/fasttrackinitiative/>.

The evaluation team is very grateful to the FTI Secretariat, to all interviewees and to others who helped the team to locate documents and data and generally to understand the FTI.

COMPONENTS OF THE SYNTHESIS REPORT

VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT

Executive Summary
Main Report

VOLUME 2: ANNEXES¹ AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annex A Timeline
Annex B Governance and Evolution of the FTI
Annex C The Indicative Framework and UPC
Annex D Summaries of Country Studies
Annex F Monitoring and Evaluation of the FTI
Annex G The FTI and Capacity Development
Annex H The FTI and Fragile States
Annex J Interviewee Analysis
Annex K Financing Gaps
Full Bibliography

VOLUME 3: APPENDICES I-IV

Appendix I Statistical Appendix
Appendix II Trends in Financing of Basic Education
Appendix III The Catalytic Fund
Appendix IV The Education Program Development Fund

VOLUME 4: APPENDIX V

Appendix V Note on Approach and Methods

VOLUME 5: APPENDICES VI-VIII

Appendix VI M&E Framework and Impact Analysis
Appendix VII Reforming the Catalytic Fund
Appendix VIII Addressing the High Level Questions

¹ What was originally Annex E was later redesignated as Appendix VIII. Similarly Appendix VII was formerly designated Annex I. To minimise confusion, remaining annexes have kept their original letters.

EOC Disclaimer

The following disclaimer has been inserted at the request of the Evaluation Oversight Committee:

*The Evaluation Oversight Committee has not endorsed this Appendix but has agreed to allow its inclusion among the Evaluation Report Appendices in the interests of transparency. A **Note on Approach and Methods** was commissioned by the Evaluation Oversight Committee as an opportunity to provide critical reflection on the methods used by the evaluation team, and to demonstrate the ways in which contribution analysis and the innovative use of analytical workstreams had provided robust evidence to substantiate the findings of a complex and important evaluation. The EOC believes that Appendix V fails to provide methodological reflection of the type requested, and instead focuses on a number of contested and unresolved issues of process (some of which could have been instructive for future evaluations, had they been presented in an appropriately balanced fashion). We remain of the view that Appendix V does not provide a contribution to methodological debate, and we regret that this opportunity was not taken by the Evaluation Team.*

The EOC's views on this Appendix are not shared by the evaluation team, or by the quality assurance panel which advised the team and reviewed its outputs. The QA panel's comments on this appendix are available on the evaluation team's FTI website. www.camb-ed.com/fasttrackinitiative or on request from the study coordinator (e-mail asimswilliams@mokoro.co.uk).

Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
EOC Disclaimer	v
Acronyms and Abbreviations	vii
1. Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Background	1
Outputs	2
Approach	4
2. Methodology and Evaluation Instruments	5
Development of the Methodology	5
Evaluation Criteria	5
Overall Approach	6
Evaluation Instruments and Information Sources	7
The Country Studies	8
3. The Evaluation Process	12
Introduction	12
Evaluation approach to process	12
Oversight and Quality Assurance	13
4. Reflections	14
Limitations on the Evaluation	14
Independence of the Evaluation	14
Lessons Learned	17
Annex 1 Summary Timeline for the Evaluation	19
Annex 2 Terms of Reference for the Evaluation	21
Annex 3 Evaluation Oversight Committee Terms of Reference	33
Annex 4 Extended Logical Framework for the Evaluation of the FTI	36
Annex 5 Common Structure for Country Reports	61
Annex 6 Analytical Matrix for Country Studies	63
References	71

Boxes

Box 1	Evaluation Standards for the Review of Methodology and Process	1
Box 2	The DAC Evaluation Criteria	5
Box 3	Alternative Meanings of "Impact"	6
Box 4	DAC Guidelines on Quality Assurance	17

Tables

Table 1	FTI endorsements and evaluation case study countries	10
Table 2	List of Key Workshops and Meetings	13

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABE	Adult and Basic Education
ADEA	Association for the Development of Education in Africa
CD	Capacity Development
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DP	Development Partner
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EOC	Evaluation Oversight Committee
EPDF	Education Program Development Fund
ESP	Education Sector Plan
ET	Evaluation Team
FF	Financing Framework
FTI	Fast Track Initiative
GMR	Global Monitoring Report
GRPP	Global and Regional Partnership Programs
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
IDA	International Development Association (World Bank)
IEG	Independent Evaluation Group
IIEP	International Institute for Educational Planning
INGOs	International Non Governmental Organisations
JAR	Joint Annual Review
JICA	Japan International Corporation Agenda
LDG	Local Donor Group
LEG	Local Education Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
PER	Public Expenditure Review
PFM	Public Finance Management
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RFP	Request for Proposals
SWAp	Sector-Wide Approach
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
UIS	UNESCO Institute for Statistics
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
UPC	Universal Primary Completion
USD	United States Dollar
WB	World Bank

Appendix V: Note on Approach and Methods

1. Introduction

Purpose

1.1 This Appendix documents and comments on the methodology and process employed in the mid-term evaluation of the Fast Track Initiative. In doing so it responds to the DAC evaluation guidelines (OECD DAC 2006) and to the guidelines in the *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs* (IEG 2007), see Box 1 below.

Box 1 Evaluation Standards for the Review of Methodology and Process

FROM THE DAC EVALUATION GUIDELINES (OECD DAC 2006)

4. Evaluation methodology

4.1 Explanation of the methodology used

The evaluation report describes and explains the evaluation method and process and discusses validity and reliability. It acknowledges any constraints encountered and their impact on the evaluation, including their impact on the independence of the evaluation. It details the methods and techniques used for data and information collection and processing. The choices are justified and limitations and shortcomings are explained.

6. Independence

6.1 Independence of evaluators vis-à-vis stakeholders

The evaluation report indicates the degree of independence of the evaluators from the policy, operations and management function of the commissioning agent, implementers and beneficiaries. Possible conflicts of interest are addressed openly and honestly.

FROM THE GRPP SOURCEBOOK (IEG 2007)

17.6 The evaluation report should provide a clear and complete description [inter alia] of the following:

- The evaluation process and the TOR (in a preface or annex)
- The evaluation methodology applied, including any limitations to the methodology
- The data collection instruments (usually in the annexes).

Background

1.2 In November 2005 the FTI Steering Committee (SC) decided to commission a mid-term evaluation of the FTI. It set up an Evaluation Task Team (which later became the Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC)) to prepare and manage this process. The EOC drew up Terms of Reference, both for itself and for the evaluation, which were approved by the SC. The World Bank was the contracting agent for the evaluation, acting on behalf of the EOC. The evaluation was funded by contributions from a number of donors. Consultants were selected through competitive tendering, and the evaluation has been undertaken by a consortium of Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM (a full team list appears in the Acknowledgements). Work commenced in September 2008, although the contract was not signed until early November.

1.3 A summary timeline for the evaluation to date is at Annex 1. The full TOR are at Annex 2. The TOR for the EOC are at Annex 3.

Outputs

1.4 The first phase of the approach defined by the TOR involved the elaboration of the evaluation methodology and the preparation of a Preliminary Report drawing on information available at global level. Country case studies were the centrepiece of the second phase, leading to the preparation of the present draft full report. The formal and informal outputs of the evaluation have been as follows.

Formal Outputs of the Evaluation

Evaluation Framework	
Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009a	Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative <i>The Evaluation Framework: Evaluation Team Guidelines on Process and Methodology</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM, January 2009..
Preliminary Report	
Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009b	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Preliminary Report</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. draft, 4 April 2009.
Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009c	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Preliminary Report</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM, 25 May 2009.
Full Country Case Studies	
Chiche et al 2010	<i>Burkina Faso Country Case Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and, OPM. Mailan Chiche, Elsa Duret, Clare O'Brien, and Serge Bayala, February 2010.
Purcell et al 2010	<i>Cambodia Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ray Purcell, Abby Riddell, George Taylor and Khieu Vicheanon, February 2010.
Allsop et al 2010	<i>Ghana Country Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Terry Allsop, Ramlatu Attah, Tim Cammack and Eric Woods, February 2010
Thomson et al 2010	<i>Kenya Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Anne Thomson; Eric Woods, Clare O'Brien and Eldah. Onsomu, February 2010.
Bartholomew et al 2010	<i>Mozambique Country Case Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, Tuomas Takala, and Zuber Ahmed, 2010.
Visser-Valfrey et al 2010	<i>Nicaragua Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, Eli. Jané, Daniel Wilde, and Marina. Escobar, February 2010..
Santcross et al 2010	<i>Nigeria Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Nick Santcross; Keith Hinchliffe, Anthea Sims Williams; Sullieman Adediran and Felicia Onibon. February 2010.
Lister et al 2010	<i>Pakistan Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Stephen Lister, Masooda Bano, Roy Carr-Hill and Ian MacAuslan. February 2010.

Duret et al 2010	<i>Yemen Country Case Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Hassan Abdulmalik, Elsa Duret and Stephen Jones, February 2010.
Country Desk Studies	
Dom 2010	<i>Ethiopia Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, February 2010.
Rawle 2010	<i>Malawi Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Georgina Rawle, February 2010.
Chiche 2010a	<i>Mali Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Mailan Chiche, February 2010.
O'Brien 2010	<i>Moldova Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Clare O'Brien, February 2010.
Chiche 2010b	<i>Rwanda Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Mailan Chiche, February 2010.
Purcell 2010	<i>Uganda Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM, Ray Purcell, February 2010.
Bartholomew 2010a	<i>Vietnam Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, February 2010.
Bartholomew 2010b	<i>Zambia Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, February 2010.

Informal Outputs²

Working Papers	
Carr-Hill 2009	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 3, Issues in Data and Monitoring and Evaluation.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Roy Carr-Hill, 28th June 2009.
Dom 2009a	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 6 , FTI and Fragile States and Fragile Partnerships.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, 9 January 2009.
Dom 2009b	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 6, FTI and Fragile States and Fragile Partnerships – Literature Review.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, 9 January 2009.
Rawle 2009	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 2: Finance and Public Financial Management,</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM: Georgina Rawle, 28 June 2009.
Riddell 2009	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 4: Preliminary Paper on Capacity Development.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro, OPM. Abby Riddell, 26 February 2009.
Visser-Valfrey 2009	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 5b: Governance.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro, OPM. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, 24 March 2009,

² Informal outputs were background and interim papers that were not milestone deliverables under the contract.

White 2009	<i>Working Paper 3b: Impact Evaluation Scoping Study, Prepared for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Education For All Fast Track Initiative</i> , International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie). Howard White, draft, 11 March 2009.
Woods 2009	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 1: Preliminary Paper on Education Policy and Planning</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro, OPM. Eric Woods, 29 March 2009.
Country Visit Notes	
Chiche et al 2009	<i>Etude de cas Burkina Faso: Note de visite pays FTI Mid-Term Evaluation</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Mailan Chiche, Elsa Duret, Clare O'Brien and Serge Bayala, 20 May 2009.
Purcell et al 2009	<i>Cambodia Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ray Purcell, Abby Riddell, George Taylor, Khieu Vicheanon. 8 February 2009
Allsop et al 2009	<i>Ghana Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Terry Allsop, Ramlatu Attah, Tim Cammack, Eric Woods 28 May 2009
Thomson et al 2009	<i>Kenya Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Anne Thomson, Eric Woods, Clare O'Brien and Eldah Onsomu 17 February 2009.
Bartholomew et al 2009	<i>Mozambique Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, Tuomas Takala and Zuber Ahmed 12 June 2009.
Visser-Valfrey et al 2009	<i>Nicaragua Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, Elisabet Jané, Dan Wilde, Marina Escobar 17 June 2009
Santcross et al 2009	<i>Nigeria Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Nick Santcross; Keith Hinchliffe, Anthea Sims Williams; Sulliemman Adediran and Felicia Onibon. 07 June 2009
Lister et al 2009	<i>Pakistan Case Study: Country Visit Note, Mid-Term Evaluation of the Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Stephen Lister, Masooda Bano, Roy Carr-Hill, 18 July 2009.
Duret et al 2009	<i>Yemen Case Study: Country Visit Note, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative</i> . Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Elsa Duret, Stephen Jones and Hassan Abdulmalik, 29 June 2009.

Approach

1.5 Section 2 explains the overall methodology for the evaluation and the main instruments used. Section 3 reviews the evaluation process. Section 4 provides reflections on key aspects. This note is, of course, written from the perspective of the evaluation team. In its scope and the issues addressed, it takes particular account of the guidelines of the *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards* (IEG 2007).

2. Methodology and Evaluation Instruments

Development of the Methodology

2.1 The TOR acknowledged the inherent difficulties for the evaluation, given that the FTI has been evolving, it does not easily lend itself to counterfactual analysis and in any case has been running only for a relatively short period. The evaluation team was required to spell out a detailed methodology, including a programme logic which would articulate the underlying hypotheses about FTI performance that the evaluation would systematically test. The full agreed methodology is set out in the *Evaluation Framework* (Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009a). The main elements of this methodology, plus some subsequent elaborations are noted in the present Appendix.

Evaluation Criteria

2.2 The standard DAC evaluation criteria (Box 2 below) were used. However, when considering potential future impact analysis, potential confusions between alternative definitions of impact were noted (see Box 3 below). The evaluation team has used the DAC definition unless otherwise specified.

Box 2 The DAC Evaluation Criteria

The five DAC evaluation criteria are:

- *Effectiveness*: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
- *Efficiency*: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.
- *Relevance*: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.
- *Impact*: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.
- *Sustainability*: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time.

Source: OECD DAC 2002

2.3 The TOR (¶13) noted that:

The Initiative has not been established long enough to allow for an evaluation of impact, but a comprehensive design for FTI monitoring and evaluation, including an evaluation of impact and relevant baseline data, should be one of this evaluation's outputs.

This aspect of the TOR is addressed in Appendix VI, in Volume 5 of this report. Despite the TOR's legitimate caution about the possibility of determining impact at this point, there was considerable stakeholder interest in establishing an "FTI effect" on endorsed countries (e.g. by drawing comparisons between endorsed and non-endorsed country performance). Such casual comparisons feature strongly in FTI publications, but too easily confuse coincidence with causality and ignore the bias in selection of countries for endorsement. The Technical Note attached to the main volume of this report discusses what can and what cannot legitimately be inferred from comparisons between endorsed and non-endorsed countries.

Box 3 Alternative Meanings of "Impact"

Much confusion has arisen from the two meanings of impact in the evaluation literature.

The tradition in evaluation has been that 'impact' refers to the final level of the causal chain (or logical framework), with impact differing from outcomes as the former refers to long-term effects. For example, the DAC definition of impact is 'positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended'. Any evaluation which refers to impact (or often outcome) indicators is thus, by definition, an impact evaluation. Hence, for example, outcome monitoring can fall under the heading of impact evaluation. In addition, there are established fields of impact assessment, including participatory impact assessment, which rely largely or solely on qualitative approaches which also fall under the impact evaluation label.

But this definition is not shared by many working on impact evaluation, for example in the World Bank. Impact is defined as the difference in the indicator of interest (Y) with the intervention (Y_1) and without the intervention (Y_0). That is, $\text{impact} = Y_1 - Y_0$ (e.g. Ravallion 2005). An impact evaluation is a study which tackles the issue of attribution by identifying the counterfactual value of Y (Y_0) in a rigorous manner.

These are completely different definitions of impact, so the different definitions result in different types of study being labelled as impact evaluations. Since this is a purely semantic matter, neither side is right or wrong. The definitions are just different. No debate about methodology will be of any use unless we first agree which definition is being used.

It may therefore limit confusion to talk instead in terms of "factual" vs. "counterfactual" approaches.

In practice, discussions often conflate the two definitions, or move from one to the other without any clear distinction. The ToR for the FTI evaluation do this. At times the word impact refers to higher-level outcomes, for example, 'development of a manageable set of indicators for tracking progress towards sustainable impact, and baseline data from case study countries on those indicators'. But at others it refers to counterfactual analysis: 'how has the FTI impacted government support for other EFA objectives?' When talking about the latter, the ToR are clear that counterfactual analysis is not restricted to educational outcomes, but also to indicators lower down the causal chain; for example, 'some criteria for impact evaluation might be changes in the human resource bases in FTI countries, and, at the global level, the long-term impact of FTI on donor effectiveness as defined throughout these terms of reference, including the impact of FTI as a global partnership designed to exemplify the new aid architecture'.

Source: White 2009

2.4 As with *impact*, the TOR noted that the criterion of *sustainability* could not be fully applied in a formative evaluations (TOR ¶17):

... even though it is too early to assess the sustainability of FTI beyond its implicit closing time (at EFA culmination in 2015), issues of sustainability at the country level should be addressed in this evaluation, for example, in examining the sustainability and predictability of domestic funding for primary or basic education and the effects of capacity building efforts on long term institutional capacity.

Overall Approach

Contribution Analysis

2.5 The methodology is based on *contribution analysis*. This recognises that the FTI's activities are (often deliberately) interwoven with a wider set of activities oriented towards the same objectives. It therefore seeks first to establish the broader set of activities and effects that took place, and then use quantitative and qualitative evidence to assess the FTI contribution to them. The emphasis is first on the factual (what did happen?) and then on the careful use of available evidence to make judgements about the counterfactual (what would have happened in the absence of the FTI's inputs?).

2.6 This approach reflects the fact that the evaluation's task is not simply to discover *what has happened in FTI-endorsed countries*, but to assess *what difference the FTI has made to those countries*. It requires the evaluation team to bring together and balance different kinds of evidence. All of the evaluation's reports have tried to distinguish clearly between the factual findings of the evaluation, the conclusions drawn from those findings, and any recommendations, so that the basis for the conclusions is clear. Contribution analysis provides the organising principle that links the different study components and evaluation tools.

Analytical Workstreams

2.7 From its outset, the FTI has focused on the four "gaps" concerning education policy and planning, finance, data and capacity, and on aid effectiveness. The evaluation used these as an organising framework for the team. The programme logic for the evaluation was organised along these dimensions, and within the core evaluation team, a workstream leader was assigned to each topic. Complementary analytical work within the core team focused on fragile states, and on governance issues. This approach was reflected in the structure of the country studies and the synthesis report. Section 3 discusses how the evaluation process was used to ensure interaction between workstreams as findings were synthesised.

Evaluation Instruments and Information Sources

Extended Logical Framework for the Evaluation

2.8 The extended logical framework for the evaluation was the core of the *Evaluation Framework* document. It is reproduced as 0.

2.9 The Cambridge consortium's proposal had included a first version of the FTI "programme logic" to be investigated. This took the form of an overall "results chain" together with disaggregated results chains at country and global level for five anticipated streams of effects (on policy and planning, finance, data, capacity and aid effectiveness). The first Team Workshop (TW1) spent considerable effort on further analysis and elaboration of the programme logic, and this was subsequently further developed by the core team. It was decided to consolidate the separate results chains into a single matrix that would provide a common point of reference and also highlight the links and interactions between the different streams of hypothesised effects. The result was presented in two forms: a concise single-page summary (reproduced as Exhibit 3 in the main volume of this report), and the full version annexed to this Appendix.

2.10 The purpose of the Logical Framework was to provide both a theoretical and a practical guide to the work of the evaluation. At a theoretical level it proposed a set of hypotheses to be tested. At a practical level, it listed relevant detailed evaluation questions, together with main sources of evidence needed to answer them. It thus provided a focus for each workstream's enquiry. It also underpinned the analytical matrix for the country studies that was later developed (see ¶2.24 below and Annex 6).

Mapping of High Level Questions on to workstreams and products

2.11 The TOR included a set of High Level Questions (HLQs) and subquestions (see ¶19 of the TOR at Annex 2). These were an important checklist throughout the evaluation. In the January 2009 *Evaluation Framework* and subsequently, the evaluation team systematically kept track of which workstreams and which evaluation products (e.g. Preliminary Report, country studies, final report) were expected to address each question, and noted the evidence base that would be required for each. Appendix VIII, in Volume 5 of this report, is the culmination of this series.

Interviews

2.12 Interviews (face to face and by telephone) were a key source of information, both at global level and for the country studies. Interviews were systematically written up, so as to provide a searchable archive of (confidential) interview notes accessible to all team members. This archive was repeatedly interrogated on various thematic topics as the synthesis report was prepared. Annex J, in Volume 2, of this report provides a full analysis of interviewees.

2.13 Evaluation team members also observed the FTI meetings held in Paris (September 2008), Oslo (December 2008), Copenhagen (April 2009) and Rome (November 2009). Evaluation team members also visited Washington DC for interviews and meetings with the FTI Secretariat, the World Bank and others.

Bibliography

2.14 An extended bibliography is included in Volume 2 of this report. It does not include the more country-specific documentation which can be found in the bibliographies of each of the country case study reports. The evaluation team was provided with the full electronic files of the FTI Secretariat for each of the case study countries.

Data Sources and Limitations

2.15 Data sources used and their limitations are carefully described in each thematic Annex/Appendix of this report. See in particular the discussion of data limitations in Appendix I, Part B, and the discussion of data issues in Appendix II (Education Financing), Annex C (the Indicative Framework) and Annex K (Financing Gaps). See also the *Technical Note: Inferences from the Performance of Endorsed Countries*, which concludes Volume 1 of this report.

Concurrent Studies

2.16 A number of concurrent studies were especially important in supplementing the evaluation team's own work:

- The Hewlett Foundation had commissioned a study into external financing for basic education which aims to answer the question of why, despite the rhetoric of strong political support to basic education, the sector has not been able to attract more donor funds (Steer & Wathne 2009). This is summarised in Exhibit 12 of the main report.
- A study on *Sector Budget Support in practice* (Mokoro and ODI 2009) was a parallel activity for a number of the evaluation team members, and its country studies overlapped with the FTI evaluation set. (See the main volume Exhibit 13 for a summary of its findings).
- The EFA Global Monitoring Report team were also very helpful in sharing their latest data sets.

The Country Studies

Role

2.17 The country case studies were seen as crucial to the evaluation, since only through a detailed case-study approach could country-level relationships be understood, as a basis for assessing FTI contributions. In view of their importance, it was agreed to supplement the nine full country case studies with eight desk studies.

Selection of country cases

2.18 The set of case studies eventually agreed with the EOC was as follows:

Full case studies	Desk Studies
Kenya (pilot)	Ethiopia
Cambodia (pilot)	Malawi
Mozambique	Mali
Ghana	Moldova
Yemen	Rwanda
Burkina Faso	Uganda
Nicaragua	Vietnam
Pakistan	Zambia
Nigeria	

2.19 The rationale for their selection was explained in Annex H of the *Evaluation Framework* (Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009a). The aim was to achieve a balance in terms of the duration of countries' involvement with the FTI, their size, geographical and educational characteristics, and so forth. Table 1 below (reproduced from the main volume of this report) shows the endorsement status of the case study countries, and they are compared across other dimensions in the main volume's Exhibit 9.

2.20 The main point of controversy was whether unendorsed countries should be included in the sample. The evaluation team took the view that the FTI should seek to learn from the experiences of eligible countries which had not joined FTI as well as those that had. The case study approach to non-endorsed countries was explained as follows in the *Evaluation Framework*:

- It is necessary not only to review what the FTI has done (e.g. in its endorsed countries) but also to examine what FTI hasn't (yet) accomplished and why. Hence it is expected that two non-endorsed countries will be included among the case studies.
- The contribution analysis methodology is well-suited to asking **why not?** questions about FTI's role, and the structure of country reports on endorsed and non-endorsed countries will be similar. In the non-endorsed countries there will be the same concern to establish the context (the then and now of basic education performance and the contributions aid has made). Beyond that there will be careful documentation of how the country has featured in FTI aspirations and actual FTI contacts; assessment of any FTI inputs (EPDF, influence on donor architecture etc), consideration of plans and prospects for future FTI roles and inputs; and considerations of the relevance of FTI (in its various formulations) to country needs. All this will be used to inform forward looking judgements about whether and how FTI could be relevant in future.

2.21 In the event, the full country case studies included two large un-endorsed countries (Nigeria and Pakistan), and the desk countries included several which had not been endorsed, or where endorsement was very recent (Uganda, Malawi, Zambia). These studies provided important insights into:

- the early activities of the FTI and its approach to the "analytical fast track countries";
- the reasons why certain countries (and/or their donor partners) did not pursue endorsement at early stages in the FTI's history but have sought Catalytic Fund support more recently;

- the difficulty of applying to large and federal countries the FTI design as crystallised in the FTI Framework (FTI 2004);
- the heterogeneity of the so-called "analytical fast-track countries", and hence the need for the FTI to develop customised approaches if it is to engage more directly with them in future.

2.22 Particularly in view of the FTI's continuing interest in expanding the number and range of countries it supports, it would have been extremely unfortunate to limit the evaluation's case studies to endorsed countries only.

Table 1 FTI endorsements and evaluation case study countries

Countries with endorsed plans by year of endorsement (as of December 2007)			Countries expecting endorsement ³		Other FTI eligible countries
			In 2008	In 2009	
2002	Burkina Faso Guinea Guyana Honduras	Mauritania Nicaragua Niger	Bhutan Burundi Chad Malawi	Angola Bangladesh Comoros Congo, Dem Rep of Congo, Rep of Eritrea Guinea-Bissau Lao PDR	Afghanistan Cote d'Ivoire India Indonesia Kiribati Myanmar Nepal Nigeria (other states)
2003	The Gambia Mozambique	Vietnam Yemen	Papua New Guinea	Nigeria (3-4 states) Solomon Islands Tanzania Togo Tonga	Pakistan Somalia Sri Lanka Sudan Zimbabwe
2004	Ghana	Ethiopia	Uganda Vanuatu		
2005	Kenya Lesotho Madagascar	Moldova Tajikistan Timor-Leste	<i>of which, countries who achieved endorsement in 2008^x</i> Central African Republic Haiti Zambia		
2006	Albania Cambodia Cameroon Djibouti Kyrgyz Republic	Mali Mongolia Rwanda Senegal		<i>countries which achieved endorsement in 2009^y</i> Lao PDR Nepal	
2007	Benin Georgia Liberia	Sierra Leone Sao Tome & Principe			

Key: full case study indicated **thus**; desk study indicated **thus**.

^x Table updated with information from CF Status Report, April 2009.

^y Table updated with information from FTI website, October/November 2009.

Case study approach

2.23 The approach to the case studies was set out in Chapter 4 of the *Evaluation Framework*. This involved a staged process. Prior to the country visit, extensive documentary research was undertaken and basic data (general and FTI-specific) were assembled. An internal issues paper was prepared by the country study team leader and reviewed by the evaluation's workstream leaders. This issues paper set out the country team's view of key issues for the country concerned, and related this to the proposed in-country work programme. At the conclusion of the country visit, a Country Visit Note was shared with key in-country stakeholders (and the EOC); its purpose was to share preliminary

³ Lists of countries "expecting endorsement" in a particular year have always proved optimistic.

observations and provide an early opportunity for feedback. Subsequently, draft reports (once accepted by the EOC) were also shared with in-country stakeholders for comment and feedback.

Role of the Pilot Studies

2.24 The Cambodia and Kenya studies were conducted as pilots. Their fieldwork took place in January/February 2009, whereas the other studies' country visits were in May and June 2009. The role of the pilots was extremely important. It enabled the practicalities of the general approach to be tested and the pilot studies yielded direct lessons for the subsequent studies. Two practical pieces of guidance for the later studies emerged:

- (a) Through trial and error, a standard structure for the country reports was developed. This is apparent in the country reports themselves, and is summarised in Annex 5. This simultaneously reflected the contribution analysis approach (starting with the broader picture, then focusing on FTI inputs and influences), and the workstream-wise analysis of the programme logic.
- (b) The treatment of the programme logic was more systematically developed for the country studies in the Analytical Summary Matrix shown in Annex 6. This was retro-fitted to the pilot studies, but was an important checklist and organising framework for the subsequent cases.

2.25 Other lessons from the pilots were summarised as follows in the Preliminary Report (Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009c):

<i>Experience</i>	<i>Response</i>
It is important to engage fully with the government; this means communicating with the government directly, not just via a coordinating donor.	In conducting the remaining studies, all communications will fully involve the government.
The EF set out a sequence of desk research, issues paper, country visit, Country Visit Note, full report. The sequence is robust and each stage is valuable. It is especially important to do as much as possible in advance of the country visit.	Continue this approach. The pilots provide useful lessons for each stage, e.g. what data to collect in advance, the need to prioritise interviews within the limited in-country time, and standard templates for the Country Visit Note and final Country Report.
The Evaluation Framework programme logic provides a useful way of organising enquiries. Teams can divide work along workstream lines, but there is a lot of potential ground to cover, and therefore a need to identify the key issues early on and concentrate on them.	The remaining country studies will have the advantage of the pilots' experience. They will also have a stronger platform of Working Papers and the Preliminary Report to draw on. The pilots have been used to develop a standard report template; this attempts to echo the structure of the Evaluation Framework, while remaining accessible to readers.
It is important for cross-cutting issues to be considered in all workstreams, but there is a danger of findings being scattered or overlooked.	A chapter on cross-cutting issues, to be included in all reports, will ensure that they receive adequate attention.
It is important to summarise findings accessibly and in a way that relates to the key questions being explored through the Evaluation Framework.	A standard summary matrix has been developed. This will be used for the desk-studies as well, so as to facilitate comparisons across all the countries reviewed.

Additional Desk Studies

2.26 The resources available for each desk study were much more limited than for the full country cases. However, to the extent feasible, the same methodology was followed – e.g. making use of the analytical summary matrix and following the same basic report structure. The authors in each case were already familiar with the country concerned. As a result, the desk studies were a substantial addition to the case study evidence on which the evaluation could draw.

3. The Evaluation Process

Introduction

3.1 The general process of the evaluation was specified in the TOR (see Annex 2, ¶24–27), which described two broad stages.

- Stage 1 was to be focused on gathering global level data addressing questions of FTI effectiveness and efficiency, relying principally on desk study to paint an initial picture of FTI outputs and outcomes (on resource mobilization, on improved policy and planning, and improved alignment, harmonization, ownership, on basic EFA indicators etc). It would also gather stakeholder perceptions of FTI effectiveness and efficiency, including its governance arrangements. Stage 1 would also review and assess the current monitoring and evaluation arrangements within FTI. As implemented, Stage 1 also included two pilot country studies.
- Stage 2 was to be focused on gathering additional data to flesh out global perspectives on effectiveness and efficiency and address remaining questions of relevance. It would include the remaining country case studies, and would feed into a full report which would present overall findings, lessons learned, and recommendations. Stage 2 would also include the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impact of FTI.

3.2 The TOR and the *Evaluation Framework* emphasised the importance of consulting with the full range of FTI stakeholders, both in the preparation of draft reports and then in seeking comments and feedback between the draft and final versions of reports.

Evaluation approach to process

3.3 Two challenges for the evaluation team were to synthesise findings across the different workstreams and country studies, and to facilitate stakeholder discussion and feedback.

Coordination and synthesis across the evaluation team

3.4 The internal organisation of the evaluation team along the main workstreams identified in the Evaluation Framework has already been mentioned. Means of ensuring interaction across workstreams included a series of evaluation team workshops (see the Timeline at Annex 1, and Table 2 below). These were crucial in aligning approaches and sharing insights across the team. There was interlocking membership between the core team and the teams conducting country studies, and country study issues papers and draft country studies were systematically shared and reviewed across the team. The draft report was built up from the components that now appear as Annexes and Appendices, and these too were the subject of reciprocal review and comment (see also the discussion of quality assurance below). A restricted website⁴ enabled documents and interview notes to be made available to all team members.

⁴ The evaluation is indebted to the Global Learning Portal, <http://www.glp.net>, which hosted this website.

Table 2 List of Key Workshops and Meetings

25-26 Nov 2008	Evaluation Team Workshop 1, Cambridge – design and discussion of evaluation framework (with EOC participation)
12-13 Feb 2009	Evaluation Team Workshop 2, Cambridge – Review of working papers and pilot country case studies, induction of country case study teams
30 Jun-1 Jul 2009	EOC Workshop, Cambridge – discussion of material emerging from the evaluation and direction going forward (with EOC participation).
20-21 July 2009	Evaluation Team Workshop 3, Oxford – review of country studies, desk studies, preliminary report and working papers; discussion of Synthesis Report.
11-12 Sept 2009	Meeting with EOC, Oxford – review of zero draft Synthesis Report and discussion and planning for the final phase of the evaluation.

Stakeholder feedback

3.5 Securing stakeholder feedback proved more difficult. Thematic papers and country visit notes were circulated and posted on the external website, but responses were limited. Similarly draft country studies (once approved for circulation by the EOC) were circulated to country stakeholders the team had met with and posted on the study website. In most cases the response was limited. The Preliminary Report was envisaged as a stimulus to debate within the partnership. In practice, most of the comments received focused on the "tone" of the report rather than its substance (see the discussion in Section 4 below). Eventually, the time allowed for public feedback on the draft Synthesis Report (from early December 2009 to early January 2010) was minimal. In the end the only systematic and detailed comments on the formal outputs of the evaluation were those provided by the EOC itself; again, this issue is taken up in Section 4 below.

Oversight and Quality Assurance

3.6 The evaluation's working methods included systematic quality assurance from an expert QA panel. The role of QA panel members was to review and comment on draft and final outputs from an independent perspective; they were not members of the evaluation team as such, and were not responsible for the team's conclusions. However, they were also drawn upon for ad hoc advice, and participated in team workshops, including some working sessions with the EOC.

3.7 From the outset, the evaluation team sought to work closely with the EOC while safeguarding the independence of the evaluation team's conclusions. To this end, the evaluation team invited EOC comment, on an informal basis, on various early drafts of its outputs. This was described in the Evaluation Framework as follows:

The evaluation team respects the EOC's role in quality assurance, and recognises the expertise and experience possessed by EOC members. Without compromising the independence of the evaluation, the team will give EOC members (and other informed stakeholders) the opportunity to comment on drafts prior to the formal submission of deliverables.

3.8 The EOC participated in the first Evaluation Team Workshop (when the Evaluation Framework was being developed). In addition to this, two special two-day sessions with the EOC were held. The relationship between the EOC and the evaluation team is further considered in Section 4 below.

4. Reflections

Limitations on the Evaluation

4.1 A number of limitations on the evaluation were anticipated in the TOR. These included the short duration of the FTI's activities, especially in the more recently endorsed countries, and hence the acknowledgement that analysis of impact would not be feasible, and that only limited comment on sustainability would be possible. The FTI's changing design (see Chapter 2 of the main volume), and the contested interpretations by different partners of the FTI's objectives and role were also noted, and have been specifically addressed in the evaluation's reports.⁵

4.2 Some additional difficulties were unanticipated. The TOR implicitly assumed that the Indicative Framework would have been used systematically in endorsed countries' plans and in subsequent monitoring, both by the countries themselves and by the FTI Secretariat, and that this would provide a basis for systematic assessment of these countries' performance against IF benchmarks. As noted in Annex C (in Volume 2 of this report), these assumptions were not borne out. Partly because of this, and because of the other conceptual and data limitations described in the Preliminary Report, there was little that could be learned about FTI effects from statistical comparisons between endorsed and un-endorsed countries, or between early-endorsed and later-endorsed countries. This gave added importance to the country case studies and, as noted in ¶2.17 above, the original set of full country studies was supplemented with eight desk studies.

Independence of the Evaluation

Evaluation Standards

4.3 The DAC quality standards for evaluations (OECD DAC 2002) stipulate:

6.1 Independence of evaluators vis-à-vis stakeholders

The evaluation report indicates the degree of independence of the evaluators from the policy, operations and management function of the commissioning agent, implementers and beneficiaries. Possible conflicts of interest are addressed openly and honestly.

4.4 The GRPP *Sourcebook* (IEG 2007) provides more detailed guidance:

DESCRIPTION OF DEGREE OF INDEPENDENCE IN EVALUATION REPORTS

3.17 The evaluation report should indicate the degree of the independence of the evaluators from the policy, operations, and management functions of the commissioners, implementers, and beneficiary groups. It should also indicate the level of transparency and impartiality observed in the commissioning, contracting, definition of scope of work, and selection of evaluators. Conflicts of interest and the ways in which they were dealt with should be addressed openly and honestly. It would also be good practice for the evaluation team, whether internal or external, to report on pressures or obstructions encountered during the evaluation process that could have affected — or did affect — their independence or objectivity. [a footnote observes: *If it were to become common practice that evaluators report on such pressures encountered during the course of their work to their own community of peers (such as a professional network of evaluators), the program and its constituents would be less inclined to exert such pressures.*]

⁵ Chapter 4 of the Preliminary Report (Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009c) dealt extensively with this. See also Chapter 2 of the main volume of the present report, and the more extensive discussion in Annex B (in governance issues) in Volume 2. Differing interpretations of the FTI's role are also a recurring theme in the country case studies: differences among donors were an important dynamic in many of the cases, while country partners tended to be more narrowly focused than the donors on the anticipated financial benefits of the Catalytic Fund.

- 4.5 The glossary in the GRPP *Sourcebook* (op cit.) includes the following definition:
Independent evaluation: An evaluation that is carried out by entities and persons free from the control of those involved in policy making, management, or implementation of program activities. This entails organizational and behavioural independence, protection from interference, and avoidance of conflicts of interest.

Independent Oversight

- 4.6 The Evaluation Oversight Committee was established in recognition of the need to insulate the evaluation from the undue influence of those being evaluated. Under the heading of "Organizational Independence" the *Sourcebook* notes that:

The evaluation function has to be located independently from the other management functions so that it is free from undue influence and so that unbiased and transparent reporting is assured." Accordingly, the members of an evaluation unit or team should not have been directly responsible for setting the policy, design, or overall management of the program, nor expect to be in the near future. Members of an evaluation unit or team evaluating a GRPP should report to a unit separate from program management. This would normally be the commissioner of the evaluation, usually the governing body. (op cit. ¶3.3).

- 4.7 However, the "normal" assumption that the governing body (in FTI's case the Steering Committee, now the Board) could safeguard the independence of the evaluation did not apply, because the Steering Committee was itself a subject of evaluation. One of the concerns noted from the SC's discussion of the evaluation in May 2007 was:

The management of the evaluation needs to be done well and should not be done by the Steering Committee since they will also be evaluated. (from Annex 1 to the Minutes of the Steering Committee meeting held on Tuesday May 22, 2007 and Friday, May 25 2007 (FTI 2007)).

- 4.8 The *Sourcebook* similarly notes that: *Having a governing body commission or manage an evaluation that includes an assessment of governance (that is, the performance of the governing body itself) poses a potential conflict of interest.* (op cit, footnote 12).

- 4.9 In principle, an EOC could serve to insulate the evaluation satisfactorily. However, the EOC's Terms of Reference (at Annex 3) provided that its members could reflect "institutional representational perspectives". The EOC membership included members who had themselves been deeply involved in the activities being evaluated, and/or who were simultaneously serving on the SC. The EOC terms of reference allowed them simultaneously to serve on the EOC and to comment on the evaluation reports from the perspective of the organisations that employed them. It was not reasonable to assume that the conduct of EOC business would be unaffected by these conflicts of interest. Future evaluations should be meticulous in ensuring the full independence of the EOC from the governing body.

Discussion and Feedback on Draft Reports

- 4.10 The TOR embodied an admirable commitment to an open and consultative evaluation. The SC agreed to a transparent evaluation process, aimed at engaging all FTI partners in reflection on the partnership's progress and prospects. However, the sequence of reports required from the evaluators, and the role of the Preliminary Report in this sequence, were clearly not understood by the majority of FTI aid agencies. Few of the aid agencies were comfortable in dealing openly with evaluation findings that were less than fulsome. Although the limited and interim nature of the Preliminary Report was spelt out in the TOR, this was not well understood. The evaluation team faced accusations of bias and negativity which were never substantiated, but which became accepted as fact among

agencies which never thoroughly read or commented on the PR itself. There was substantial pressure on the evaluation team to bias its reporting in a more positive direction.⁶

4.11 The evaluation team has endeavoured to assess all evidence impartially, and does not believe that the pressures it faced, although very regrettable, have materially affected its findings or conclusions.

4.12 The FTI needs to consider, when it commissions future evaluations, whether it is really prepared to accept the discomforts of a transparent and consultative evaluation process. If it is, then it needs to do a better job of preparing its stakeholders to engage positively. The aid agencies involved in the FTI – their evaluation departments in particular – should also reflect on this experience and consider whether their staff are properly briefed and prepared for appropriate engagement in such a process.⁷

Collaboration with the EOC and wider consultations

4.13 This evaluation also offers lessons about the relationship between the evaluation team and the oversight committee. The evaluation faced considerable time pressures from the outset, and these were exacerbated by bureaucratic delays in issuing the initial contract. The new FTI Board was naturally concerned to receive the evaluation's findings as early as possible, and the reaction to the Preliminary Report (§4.10 above) generated additional pressures on both the evaluation team and the EOC. This eventually put the relationship between the evaluation team and the EOC under considerable strain. The evaluation team and the EOC agreed that it would not be possible to complete and circulate all the elements of the Synthesis Report ahead of the Board meeting scheduled for November 2009. The EOC, itself under heavy pressure from the Board, pressed the evaluation team to prepare an "Executive Summary" for clearance by the EOC in advance of the draft of the main report. The evaluation team consistently held that such a top-level summary could not be prepared or assessed independently of the evidence on which it was founded, and first provided the EOC with drafts of the key annexes and appendixes that now form part of this report. Eventually the EOC circulated drafts of the evaluation report that had been provided to it in strict confidence. This ruptured the relationship of trust between the evaluation team and the EOC, and cannot be regarded as an acceptable precedent.

4.14 The consortium was contracted to conduct an independent evaluation, with the task defined in terms of a number of distinct deliverables. The EOC had the task of satisfying itself (against the internationally accepted evaluation standards of the DAC and the GRPP Sourcebook) that those deliverables were of adequate evaluation quality. The evaluation team was not obliged to share intermediate drafts and other products with the EOC, but voluntarily chose to do so, in the belief that this degree of transparency would be to the advantage of both parties, and would speed up the process of review and acceptance of deliverables, so as to make the findings available to the SC/Board as rapidly as possible.

4.15 An unintended effect of the time spent in detailed interaction with the EOC was to squeeze out other avenues of feedback. Proposals for discussion forums involving a wider set of stakeholders and knowledgeable experts were never taken up. It was agreed in principle that special efforts needed to be made to ensure that partner countries could be fully involved in the review of the draft report, but in the end there was no consultative event in which the wider group of partner countries had a meaningful engagement, and wider

⁶ The tendentious summary circulated after the evaluation team's meeting with aid agency stakeholders in Paris on 19 May 2009 is an example of this.

⁷ DFID has already undertaken some relevant reflections: see *The Quality of DFID's Evaluation Reports and Assurance Systems, A Report for IACDI Based on the Quality Review Undertaken by Consultants Burt Perrin and Richard Manning*, Roger C. Riddell, November 2009.

stakeholders were given an extremely short period of time in which to comment on the full draft report. In the end the EOC's detailed comments were the only ones received.

Lessons Learned

4.16 Future evaluations should anticipate these dilemmas and deal with them (a) by taking more care to ensure the independence, autonomy and adequate resourcing of the evaluation oversight body; (b) by distinguishing more clearly between the functions of quality control and of stakeholder feedback; (c) by making explicit and timetabled provision for consultation forums with wider stakeholders from the outset; and (d) as noted in ¶4.12 above, making sure that the governing body and key stakeholders fully understand the implications of an open and independent evaluation process, and are prepared to cope with the discomforts that this may involve.

4.17 As described above, the relationship between the evaluation team and the EOC broke down under the pressure of a very demanding timetable. It is unlikely that future evaluations will avoid timetable pressures, although careful examination of previous evaluations' experiences might prevent the setting of overoptimistic timetables in the first place. (For example, the time it would take for the EOC to review drafts was seriously underestimated, as was the overall time commitment required from EOC members.) However, the role conflicts that undermined the management of the evaluation clearly could and should be avoided in future. There are several elements to this:

- the TOR for an evaluation oversight body should clearly specify its role as a buffer between the governing body and the evaluation team and insulate it from the kinds of pressure experienced by the EOC after the Preliminary Report was circulated;
- members of an evaluation oversight body should not simultaneously serve on the governing body, nor as representatives of stakeholders in the evaluation;
- the evaluation oversight body should not include members who have a strong vested interest by virtue of their own past involvement in the subject of the evaluation;
- there should be a clear demarcation between the roles of quality control and of stakeholder consultation.

Box 4 DAC Guidelines on Quality Assurance

8. Quality assurance

8.1 Incorporation of stakeholders' comments

Stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. The evaluation report reflects these comments and acknowledges any substantive disagreements. In disputes about facts that can be verified, the evaluators should investigate and change the draft where necessary. In the case of opinion or interpretation, stakeholders' comments should be reproduced verbatim, such as in an annex, to the extent that this does not conflict with the rights and welfare of participants.

8.2 Quality control

Quality control is exercised throughout the evaluation process. Depending on the evaluation's scope and complexity, quality control is carried out either internally or through an external body, peer review, or reference group. Quality controls adhere to the principle of independence of the evaluator.

Source: OECD DAC 2006

4.18 On the last point, the DAC guidelines on quality assurance draw an important distinction between the quality control function and the incorporation of stakeholder comments – see Box 4 above. The role of quality control is to ensure the methodological

rigour of the evaluation drafts. As part of this, the body overseeing the evaluation should be satisfied that the evaluation team's internal quality assurance procedures are credible, but it should not seek to duplicate the role of the internal QA. The oversight body should ensure that stakeholders have well-defined opportunities to comment on drafts, and that the feedback from stakeholders is appropriately taken into account in the revision of drafts, but it is not appropriate for the oversight body itself to assume the role of providing stakeholder feedback.

Annex 1 Summary Timeline for the Evaluation

Element	Timing	Comment
1. Evaluation Task Team set up	November 2005	The FTI Steering Committee established a task team to prepare and support a mid-term evaluation of the FTI.
2. Evaluation Oversight Committee mandated	September 2007	The FTI Steering Committee officially handed over the role of overseeing the mid-term evaluation to the Evaluation Oversight Committee.
3. EOC TOR and evaluation Issues Paper	April 2008	EOC finalises draft EOC TOR and Issues Paper for Tokyo meeting.
4. Finalisation of TOR	June/July 2008	(Final version of evaluation TOR is dated 8 July 2008).
5. Competitive tendering	3 June 2008	Tender process begins with WB call for Expressions of Interest (deadline 18 June).
6. Technical Proposal submission and bid acceptance	August 2008	Technical proposal submitted, includes basic methodology and work plan which were subsequently elaborated in Evaluation Framework document. Late August notification to consortium of preferred bidder status.
7. Negotiations with EOC	September 2008	Evaluation Team members attend Paris meetings (16–19 September), for participant observation at the FTI meetings, plus negotiations with EOC. Results of the discussions and negotiations with EOC are incorporated in the full Project Description subsequently incorporated in the contract issued by the WB.
8. Contract signature	3 November	At negotiations, contract signature was anticipated to be no later than end-September, but, after bureaucratic delays, the eventual contract is dated 3 November, hence need to reschedule evaluation deadlines.
9. Interviews and research	continuing	Interviews, documentary and data research, globally and for country studies
10. Team Workshop 1 (Evaluation Framework)	25-26 November 2008	Held in Cambridge, UK, with active participation of EOC members (seven of whom attended for one or both days). Focused on further refinement of evaluation methodology, identification of countries for case study, and initial review of issues.
11. FTI Meetings, Oslo	11-14 December 2008	Evaluation Team observes meetings, interviews participants. The EOC and the Evaluation Team Leader gave an update on progress and the Evaluation Framework. (Original intention was to present the Preliminary Report at this point but slippage in contracting made this impossible).
12. Visit to Washington	11-15 January 2009	Evaluation team meetings and interviews in Washington DC.
13. Final Evaluation Framework	January 2009	Evaluation Framework becomes the detailed guide for implementation of the evaluation.
14. Pilot study field work	19 January – 6 February	Field work for pilot studies in Kenya and Cambodia.

Element	Timing	Comment
15. Thematic Working Papers	January –June 2009	See reference list of informal outputs. Working papers intended to assemble preliminary information and discuss key themes, as background for country studies, inputs to Preliminary Report and main report, and as stimulus for feedback.
16. Team Workshop 2 (Preliminary Report Stage)	12-13 February	Evaluation Team Workshop 2, Cambridge – Review of working papers and themes and pilot country case studies, induction of country case study teams.
17. Preliminary Report (PR)	draft, 4 April 2009 final, 25 May 2009	Draft PR presented and discussed at Steering Committee and Partnership Meetings in Copenhagen, 21-23 April.
18. Discussion of PR with donors	19 May 2009	Meeting in Paris, at request of donors, to discuss PR with the evaluation team.
19. Country study field work	May-June 2009	Field work for remaining country studies.
20. Desk studies	June-July 2009	Preparation of country desk studies.
21. Workshop with EOC	30 June – 1 July 2009	Workshop with EOC (Cambridge) – discussion of material emerging from the evaluation and agreed procedures for remaining stages, with aim of providing key findings for Rome meetings of FTI Board.
22. Team Workshop 3 (Synthesis Report Stage)	20–21 July 2009	Evaluation Team Workshop 3, Oxford – review of country studies, desk studies, preliminary report and working papers discussion of Synthesis Report.
23. Meeting with EOC	11–12 September 2009	Meeting with EOC, Oxford – review of zero draft Synthesis Report and discussion and planning for the final phase of the evaluation.
24. Draft Full Report	October/November 2009	Phased submission of draft full report to EOC.
25. FTI Meetings, Italy	3 November 2009	Evaluation team presents main findings, conclusions and recommendations to FTI Board.

Annex 2 Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

External Evaluation of the Education for All – Fast Track Initiative

Final Terms of Reference dated 8 July 2008

BACKGROUND

1. The Fast Track Initiative Partnership has established an Evaluation Oversight Committee to commission an evaluation of the Initiative's work at the approximate midpoint between the inception of the FTI and the target date for achieving the EFA goals the Initiative was designed to support. The EOC is therefore seeking a qualified firm or group of firms to conduct a formative mid-term evaluation of the FTI's relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, provide recommendations designed to improve the initiative going forward, and create a monitoring and evaluation framework for continued assessment of its processes, outcomes and impacts.

FTI Objective, Goals and Assumptions

2. The Education for All – Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) is an evolving partnership of developing and donor countries and agencies having the main objective of “accelerating progress towards the core EFA goal of universal primary school completion (UPC), for boys and girls alike, by 2015.”⁸ It was established in 2002 by 22 bilateral donors, development Banks and international agencies, prompted by the 2000 Dakar World Forum on Education, which yielded both the current EFA goals and a commitment to increased financial support for basic education.⁹ Also, as an outgrowth of the 2002 Monterrey Consensus, FTI was designed as a compact, linking increased financial support and country improvements in “policy performance and accountability for results.”¹⁰

3. According to its *Framework* document (2004), the FTI's major contributions to accelerated UPC is through the following, which also captures some of the assumptions behind the goals:

- **Sound sector policies in education:** The FTI assumed that one of the best ways to accelerate UPC and contribute to EFA progress at the country level was through the strengthening of sector policies and use of benchmarking;
- **More efficient aid for primary education:** the FTI assumed that countries could focus more attention and resources on service delivery if aid partners coordinated better among themselves and adopted more efficient, harmonized approaches to support along lines that were eventually codified in the Paris Declaration (2005);¹¹
- **Sustained increases in aid for primary education:** the FTI's call for more sustainable support assumed that longer-term and predictable aid to education would allow countries to plan better and take the needed bold steps forward;
- **Adequate and sustainable domestic financing for education:** most increases in financing would still come from domestic sources and these needed to be substantial and sustainable to allow for breakthroughs in service delivery; the FTI looked for

⁸ FTI 2004, p. 3.

⁹ The Dakar Forum communiqué stated that “No countries seriously committed to Education for All will be thwarted in their achievement of this goal by lack of resources.”

¹⁰ FTI 2004, p. 4. The FTI is considered to be the first global initiative to operationalizes the Monterrey Consensus and has become an example for other sectors.

¹¹ OECD DAC 2005, *Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability*. High Level Forum, February 28-March 2.

evidence of increased and sustainable funding for education in a country's poverty reduction strategy, medium-term expenditure framework, or other country statements, as appropriate;

- **Increased accountability for sector results:** the FTI acknowledged the boost to effectiveness provided by an open and transparent reporting of progress and key sector outcomes against a set of appropriate indicators.

Through such contributions to country progress on EFA goals, the FTI aspired to help countries close four gaps: *financial, policy, capacity and data*.¹²

Guiding Principles

4. The 2004 *Framework* set forth the following as guiding principles of the Fast Track Initiative:

- **Country-ownership:** the FTI is a country-driven process, with the primary locus of activity and decision-making at the country level;
- **Benchmarking:** the FTI encourages the use of indicative benchmarks (the FTI Indicative Framework), locally adapted, to stimulate and enlighten debate over policies, to facilitate reporting of progress on both policies and performance, and to enhance mutual learning among countries on what works to improve primary education outcomes;
- **Support linked to performance:** The FTI is intended to provide more sustained, predictable and flexible support to countries that have demonstrated commitment to the goal of UPC, adopted policies in full consideration of a locally adapted FTI Indicative Framework, and have a need for, and the capacity to use effectively, incremental external resources;
- **Lower transaction costs:** The FTI encourages donor actions to provide resources to developing countries in a manner which minimizes transaction costs for recipient countries (and for the agencies themselves);
- **Transparency:** The FTI encourages the open sharing of information on the policies and practices of participating and donors alike.

The FTI Mechanisms and Processes

5. During the early phase of the FTI, low-income countries having Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and strong Education Sector Plans were invited to submit proposals for FTI support, with their proposals being reviewed and endorsed at the global level. As FTI evolved it opened the partnership to all low-income countries (as determined by IDA eligibility) and based the endorsement process on a review of country programs and priorities articulated in an existing education sector plan. Also, instead of being undertaken at the global level, the process is now managed at the country level by Local Education Groups – involving government, civil society and the development agencies having educational support programs in the country. To establish a common process for endorsing national education sector a common framework and assessment guidelines were adopted in 2005.

6. FTI endorsement has also involved review of a country's commitments on a common set of indicators as set out in the FTI "Indicative Framework." This comprised a set of policy and financing parameters considered "indicative" of good progress towards UPE.¹³ Benchmarks on these indicators have been provided, based on average figures from a set of

¹² See www.education-fast-track.org, "About FTI."

¹³ Based on research reported in Bruns et al 2003. For a display of the Indicative Framework and related benchmark values see FTI 2004.

“on-track” countries for universal primary school completion,¹⁴ but potential FTI partner countries have been encouraged to set their own target levels according to local preferences and constraints and to use these to encourage dialogue among country-level stakeholders. Ultimately, accountability in FTI is based on an annual review of progress on Indicative Framework commitments as well as other nationally developed indicators agreed to during the endorsement process.

7. In 2003 and 2004 two new financial instruments (or Trust Funds) were established within the FTI: the Catalytic Fund (CF), and the Education and Program Development Fund (EPDF). The Catalytic Fund was set up to provide grant financing over a 2 to 3 year period to “endorsed” countries with a limited number of donors. The CF is managed by the World Bank but country executed. As of February 2008, funders had pledged USD1.3 billion to the CF. The Fund had disbursed USD218 million to 18 countries as of December 2007. With the recent change in the CF to allow longer term financing (up to 3 year periods through 2015) and access by all endorsed countries having substantial financing gaps even after domestic funding mobilization, it is anticipated that the fund will need to grow substantially in coming years.

8. The Education and Program Development Fund (EPDF) was established in 2004 to provide eligible countries access to grant financing for capacity building (e.g., analytic work for planning and budgeting or training) and to support cross-country learning experiences. In particular, the Fund aims to increase the number of low-income countries with sound education sector programs, to strengthen country capacity to develop policies through a broad-based consultative process, to improve and share knowledge of what works, to strengthen donor partnerships and harmonization at the country level, and to strengthen partnerships with regional networks and institutions. The EPDF had disbursed USD15 million (of USD24.2 million committed) to over 60 countries as of December 2007. As in the case of the CF, it is managed by the World Bank.

FTI Governance and Management

9. The FTI has a two-tiered governance and decision making structure, consisting of global and country-level entities. At the global level the ultimate authority is the full FTI Partnership, which includes FTI countries, donor agencies and NGOs, lead by co-chairs (bilateral agencies) one from a G-8 country and the other a non-G-8 donor, which serve for one year on a rotating basis. The Full Partnership meets biannually (prior to 2006 annually) to deliberate progress and set strategic policies and directions. The chief executing body of the FTI is its Steering Committee; it implements Partnership policies and makes operational decisions. It originally had eight members: six development agencies plus one each from a developing country and civil society, but as of 2006 two more seats have been added for developing countries and two for civil society organizations. A small FTI Secretariat, hosted and legally managed by the World Bank (see staffing chart in Annex B), provides management and technical support to the Partnership, promotes communication at all levels, and provides support to the Steering Committee and to the FTI trust funds (CF and EPDF). Between September 2004 and March 2008 the Secretariat disbursed around USD3.5 million for its services, or about USD1 million per year (see Annex C). At the country level FTI operates through a Local Education Group, consisting of government officials, civil society groups and local donor agency representatives. The donor agencies join to form a Local Donor Group, chaired by a “coordinating agency.” The Local Donor Group serves as a primary link with the country on FTI operational issues, makes endorsement and funding decisions, mobilizes funding needed for endorsed sector plans, and promotes aid effectiveness.

¹⁴ See Bruns et al., above.

Evolution of the FTI

10. As a global partnership established to operationalize the Monterrey Consensus in the education sector and accelerate action on EFA, the FTI had no precedents; thus, it has been both exploratory and experimental. Consequently, the partnership has evolved considerably over its almost six years of existence. For example, originally partner countries were selected by invitation on the basis of the strength of their poverty reduction and sector plans and a record of good governance. Eventually the Initiative evolved, first to include all low-income countries having poverty reduction and sector plans and finally, even more inclusively, to include fragile states for which different requirements and approaches are still being worked out. There also has been an evolution in the endorsement process: at first countries were invited to submit FTI proposals which were reviewed globally; more recently they have simply been required to submit their current (or updated) sector plan for review with the review being at the country (not global) level. The Catalytic Fund as well has evolved from a bridging fund for a few countries to a source of funding for almost all FTI endorsed partners. Over the years the FTI has formed various task forces to examine and recommend changes in its processes or mechanisms, and as a result some of the ways the FTI conducts business have changed and continue to change through a variety of processes and backed by varying amounts of analytical work and consultations.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

11. This evaluation is being commissioned by the FTI Partnership through its Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has appointed an Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC) to manage and assure the independence of this evaluation. The evaluation is being conducted at the mid point between FTI's founding in 2002 and the culmination date of the Education for All goals (2015), and thus will be mostly formative in nature.

12. The main purpose of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness of FTI to date in accelerating progress towards achievement of EFA goals in participating countries, with particular attention to country movement towards universal primary completion (UPC). The evaluation will also assess FTI's contributions to improving aid effectiveness at both the country and global levels. The evaluation will assess the Initiative's added value, identify lessons learned from its strengths and weaknesses, and formulate recommendations for improved partnership programming and effectiveness. Given the fact that the FTI is a global program in the "established" stage (see OECD DAC 2002),¹⁵ the evaluation will focus on the issues considered appropriate for this status: resource mobilization, strategy, inputs, activities, and outputs, as well as a reanalysis of program design, governance and management structures, and recommendations for improvements as the Initiative moves forward. Some EFA *outcomes* will also be a focus since this is the main realm where FTI is expected to add value, but only in countries that have been in the partnership long enough to show results.

13. The scope of the evaluation should cover the entire period of FTI's existence, from its founding in 2002 through September 2008, and assess the evolution of its goals and processes over that period with the objective of identifying lessons-learned to guide recommendations for the future direction of the Initiative. Given the fact that FTI processes and programs are at both the international (global) and national level, the scope will include both international and country program and progress. Some data will be compiled or collected on all 35 FTI endorsed countries (see Annex E for a list of countries) mostly from existing archives held by FTI, the countries and development agencies. More in-depth data will be collected on case study countries only. The Initiative has not been established long enough to allow for an evaluation of impact, but a comprehensive design for FTI monitoring

¹⁵ World Bank, Independent Evaluation Group (2007), *Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards*.

and evaluation, including an evaluation of impact and relevant baseline data, should be one of this evaluation's outputs.

14. The estimated budget provided is an indication only, and consultants are free to propose their own estimates.

OBJECTIVE OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

15. The objective of this evaluation will be to assess the current relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the Fast Track Initiative. More specifically, it will assess:

- The relevance of FTI objectives and goals to country educational and development needs (relevance);
- FTI's contribution (value added) to country progress in accelerating action on EFA, in particular towards UPC, and related processes (effectiveness);
- FTI's contribution (value added) to improved resource mobilization and aid effectiveness (efficiency);

Additionally, the evaluation will develop a comprehensive framework for monitoring and evaluation of the FTI, building on the evaluation framework created for this evaluation, which will help frame future monitoring and evaluation efforts, including the assessment of FTI impact. The comprehensive framework should indicate baseline data needed for the evaluation of FTI impact, much of which will be collected during this evaluation.

AUDIENCES FOR THE EVALUATION

16. The main audiences for the evaluation will be the full FTI partnership (partner country actors at the national and sub-national levels, and representatives from participating development agencies and civil society organizations), the FTI Steering Committee (which commissioned the study), and the FTI Secretariat.

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK AND QUALITY STANDARDS

17. This evaluation will be expected to apply three of the five DAC evaluation criteria for evaluating development assistance, *relevance*, *effectiveness*, and *efficiency*. Because it is primarily a formative evaluation it will not be expected to fully apply the other two, *impact* and *sustainability*. However, as mentioned above, it will be expected to provide guidance for the assessment of the impact of the FTI at a later stage and to gather baseline data for such an assessment at both the global and country levels (e.g. in case study countries). Also, even though it is too early to assess the sustainability of FTI beyond its implicit closing time (at EFA culmination in 2015), issues of sustainability at the country level should be addressed in this evaluation, for example, in examining the sustainability and predictability of domestic funding for primary or basic education and the effects of capacity building efforts on long term institutional capacity.

18. As an evaluation of a global or regional partnership program (GRPP) this evaluation should also be oriented by the GRPP evaluation *Sourcebook* (see footnote 6). This *Sourcebook* sets quality standards for global program evaluations, including, for example, the need for an examination and critique of the global programs existing monitoring and evaluation framework, the legitimacy of the organization's governance structure, conflict of interest issues, and the appropriate kinds of issues to address given the development stage of the global program. The proposals for this evaluation should show evidence of a clear understanding of *Sourcebook* recommendations, and in particular should demonstrate how consultants intend to comply with the *Sourcebook's* quality and ethical standards.

QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED

19. In the following, each evaluation objective will be followed by a set of "high level

questions” and further elaborated by a tentative set of detailed questions, drawing from the Evaluation Oversight Committee’s “Issues Paper,” which synthesizes inputs and suggestions from a wide-range of FTI stakeholders and evaluation experts.¹⁶

Objective 1: Assess the Relevance of FTI Objectives and Goals to Country Educational and Development Needs

High Level Questions 1: Is what FTI aims to accomplish consistent with current needs and priorities of FTI client countries? What can be done to ensure the relevance of FTI going forward?

Related questions:

- a. How is FTI perceived and understood by various stakeholders and to what extent have varying interpretations of what FTI is and what it can accomplish influenced its effectiveness in any way?
- b. To what extent is FTI’s focus on primary school completion relevant to the current needs of partner countries (and potential partner countries) and how has this emphasis been treated within the broader context of country EFA programming?
- c. Are FTI’s intended contributions appropriate, given the partnership’s objectives? Can they be expected to make a difference?
- d. How has the evolution of the FTI contributed to maintaining its ongoing relevance as a global partnership supporting EFA?

Objective 2: Assess FTI’s Contribution to Country Progress in Accelerating Action on EFA and Related Processes

High Level Questions 2: To what extent is the FTI accomplishing what it was designed to do, namely, accelerating progress on EFA? Are FTI mechanisms and processes contributing effectively to this? How can FTI mechanisms and processes be improved to maximize their contributions going forward?

Related questions:

- a. To what extent has FTI and its mechanisms/processes (e.g. Indicative Framework and the endorsement process) helped countries strengthen education policies, sector plans, and educational data/statistics?
- b. Are FTI mechanisms and processes evolving appropriately to address the needs of different client countries (e.g. fragile states)?
- c. Has policy making and planning become more open, transparent, and participatory in participating countries?
- d. To what extent has FTI contributed to improved institutional capacity in partner countries (including those preparing for partnership); has the capacity building provided been sufficiently comprehensive to make a sustainable difference.
- e. To what extent and how has FTI contributed to accelerated progress towards universal primary school completion by 2015;
- f. How have FTI programs contributed to intermediate outcomes such as improvements in the grade 1 intake and gross enrolment ratios?
- g. Has FTI itself supported other EFA objectives in partner countries and, if so, to what effect?

¹⁶ Early formulations of evaluation questions were compiled by the Evaluation Oversight Committee in the form of an “Issues Paper,” which was shared with stakeholders in Tokyo (FTI 2008) and Maputo, Mozambique (ADEA 2008) as a means of stimulating and gathering feedback and new inputs. The feedback is reflected in the revised Issues Paper which is in the TOR Annex.

- h. How has the FTI impacted government support for other EFA objectives?

Objective 3: Assess FTI's Contribution to Improved Resource Mobilization and Aid Effectiveness

High Level Questions 3: Has the FTI helped mobilize domestic and international resources in support of EFA and helped donor agencies to adopt more efficient development assistance strategies based on Paris Declaration ideals? How can FTI best help mobilize resources and improve aid effectiveness going forward?

Related questions:

- a. To what extent are FTI partners improving the alignment of their development assistance to country-owned plans?
- b. Has FTI helped them to improve interagency cooperation and harmonization?
- c. Has FTI contributed to the reduction in transaction costs, both for partner countries and partner agencies?
- d. To what extent have partner countries and agencies been using innovative and flexible means of financial support and to what extent do those means of support demonstrably improve aid effectiveness?
- e. Has FTI been influential in mobilizing increased funding levels and non-financial resources for education among partner countries and agencies?
- f. To what extent has FTI assisted countries in closing their financing gaps for their EFA acceleration efforts? Has this been in the context of sustainable fiscal policy?
- g. Has FTI succeeded in mobilizing additional resources in support of EFA? To what extent have any increases come from domestic financing? From international assistance? In countries where domestic financing in support of EFA has increased what are the prospects for sustaining those levels of funding?
- h. Has FTI's own governance and management made a difference in how efficiently the Initiative works in furthering EFA goals? Namely, can the FTI governance bodies be considered legitimate? Are FTI decision-making processes open, transparent, inclusive and well founded? Does the Initiative have an adequate monitoring and evaluation framework, and is it creating regular, useful inputs to decision making? Are FTI processes (endorsement, processing of catalytic funds requests, triggering the flow of funds) consistent across countries, timely and efficient (for example, how much time does it take between FTI endorsement and the flow of FTI-triggered funding at the country level)?

METHODOLOGY

General considerations

20. Details on evaluation methodology will be developed by the bidders in their proposals (with final details being agreed to during negotiations). It should take cognizance of the data routinely collected from all FTI endorsed countries on EFA indicators (see Annex D), any previous evaluations and studies, and progress reports at the global and country level. Key actors should be identified at the international level (e.g, FTI Steering Committee and Secretariat members and key headquarters officials of partner agencies and CSOs) and the country level (government, CSO and agency decision makers), and a procedure established for selecting, as a balanced set of key informants, comparable groups of actors from each agency, organization and country. Proposals should include the firm's initial understanding of the program theory¹⁷ underpinning FTI (including differences among stakeholders) and a

¹⁷ By "program theory" this TOR means the major assumptions and guiding principles behind FTI programs and processes, including the pathways along which FTI support has been expected to contribute to desired outputs and outcomes. This does not necessarily mean laying out a logical

description of how the firm will refine its view of the program theory in the first weeks of the evaluation. This view should be reflected in a framework (conceptual and operational) for this formative evaluation. Subsequently, the consultant should create a more comprehensive monitoring and evaluation framework, covering both this mid-term evaluation and proposed future M&E efforts, including the evaluation of FTI impact.

20 [sic]. Proposals should also include the appropriate treatment of gender and other equity considerations, both in terms of assessing the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of FTI, as well as in the data collection and analytical approaches of proposed cross country and case study methodologies. They should also explain how the firm expects to measure FTI's unique contribution or value added (see objectives 2 and 3), given the fact that FTI has not been organized with an experimental design and does not lend itself easily to counterfactual assessment (see "Limitations").

21. Case studies are expected to be used in this evaluation as a means of developing greater insight into country-level processes, accomplishments, and problems, all in the context of each country, thus making a contribution to the lessons-learned part of the evaluation. Proposals must indicate that a priority will be placed on consulting equally all the key actors – government, civil society, and local funding agencies. Unlike desk studies the case studies can reach down to sub-national levels for informants and site visits to validate desk review findings and examine more details at the service delivery level. Case studies will be particularly useful in examining: a) questions about FTI relevance from various points of view; b) detailed questions about effectiveness, such as policy adjustments and the inclusiveness of the process; effects of capacity building, EFA outcomes at the school and community levels, etc), and c) detailed questions about efficiency (such as the functioning of the local donors group; any real evidence of donor agency changes in aid effectiveness; resource mobilization, and the sustainability of systems).

22. Proposals should create and explain a sampling design for case studies representing a wide range of countries and optimizing possibilities for contrast and comparison. Proposals should also specify the kinds of informants that should be sampled in each case and the sampling methods. Proposals should include between 8 and 16 strong case studies. Bidders will be expected to create their own country selection framework, with the provision that they should consider parameters such as:

- Country geographical region (e.g., Africa/Non-Africa)
- Time of entry into FTI (e.g., early v. late)
- FTI endorsed v. countries invited into FTI but not endorsed
- Countries on-track as well as off-track for achieving UPC by 2015
- Size of country
- Etc.

23. Prospective consultants should indicate which countries they would include on their case study list, what procedure they used in selecting the countries, how they would select informants and site visit locations within countries, and how their selections would allow the evaluation to address the evaluation questions set forth in these terms of reference.

24. After reviewing the existing FTI approach to monitoring and evaluation and developing a refined view of program theory (see paragraph 19), the consultant will propose

framework for FTI, but at least there should be an elaboration of the assumed results chain, from FTI-inspired inputs, to processes, to outputs, outcomes and impacts. It should be noted that different stakeholders have held different assumptions about FTI and its program theory, and these have changed overtime. This will need to be acknowledged and dealt with by the bidders.

a framework for this mid-term evaluation, and, ultimately, a comprehensive M&E framework for FTI. The comprehensive framework should include a proposed design for the evaluation of FTI impact, including the baseline data that will need to be collected, plus estimates of cost and level of effort to conduct it. Some criteria for impact evaluation might be changes in the human resource bases in FTI countries, and, at the global level, the long-term impact of FTI on donor effectiveness as defined throughout these terms of reference, including the impact of FTI as a global partnership designed to exemplify the new aid architecture.

Stages of the study

Stage 1: September to December 2008. Focused on gathering global level data addressing questions of FTI effectiveness and efficiency, relying principally on desk study to paint initial picture of FTI outputs and outcomes (on resource mobilization, on improved policy and planning, and improved alignment, harmonization, ownership, on basic EFA indicators etc). It will also gather stakeholder perceptions of FTI effectiveness and efficiency, including its governance arrangements. One option during Stage 1 would be the piloting of the case study methodology in one country. Stage 1 will also review and assess the current monitoring and evaluation arrangements within FTI.

25. Within the first 30 days of Stage 1, the consultant will submit to the Evaluation Oversight Committee for review its evaluation framework for this mid-term evaluation, incorporating its refined view of FTI program theory, and an indication of how it will go about creating a comprehensive M&E framework for FTI.

26. The main product of Stage 1 will be a preliminary report which will be used as part of the formative process of engaging the FTI Partnership in discussing global findings on FTI effectiveness and efficiency. It should provide evidence from existing reports, documents and studies of how the FTI has or has not contributed to the trajectory of indicators in FTI countries during the past decade, and include a first review of different stakeholder perceptions of the FTI. It should enable a comparison of trends on key indicators in FTI endorsed countries before and after endorsement, as well as in comparison to those endorsed at different times, or to countries not participating in the FTI. The report should present the findings of an initial review of the governance and management arrangements and the existing FTI monitoring and evaluation framework and approach. The preliminary report should also indicate how the consultant expects to continue to gather data during Stage 2 of the evaluation, including restating or revising the list of case studies that will be conducted and methodologies for systematic stakeholder sampling. If the case study methodology will have been piloted in Stage 1, then the preliminary report should be structured to include lessons learned from that pilot and specific statement of how the consultant will use the lessons from the pilot to improve the conduct of the additional cases to be undertaken in Stage 2.

27. Stage 2 – December 2008 through September 2009. Focused on gathering additional data to flesh out global perspectives on effectiveness and efficiency (with country examples and carefully constructed lessons learned) and addressing remaining questions of relevance. Insights from completed case studies will be compiled and analyzed and used together with Stage 1 preliminary findings for the full report, presenting overall findings, lessons learned, and recommendations which can be used by the partnership to change course as needed and improve relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Stage 2 should also include the development of a framework for monitoring and evaluating the impact of FTI, including development of a manageable set of indicators for tracking progress towards sustainable impact and baseline data from case study countries on those indicators. Stakeholders should be consulted for input regarding their perspectives on the long-term impact of their education investments supported through FTI and likely indicators of progress

towards that impact. Stage 2 products include a progress report due in March and scheduled to coincide with the technical meetings of FTI, as well as the draft full report due in July and final full report due in September. Stage 2 will also produce up to 4 thematic briefing papers (e.g., one covering a proposed monitoring and evaluation framework, including impact study indicators and baseline data), and a condensed version (synopsis) of the full report.

DELIVERABLES

28. The consultant will be expected to deliver reports and briefings as specified below:

- Attendance at FTI meetings in Paris in September 2008
- Within 30 days of signing the contract, a report establishing the evaluation framework (based on a refined FTI program theory) that will guide this formative evaluation.
- A Preliminary Report, including an executive summary, in English and French to be submitted no later than the end of November 2008.
- Attendance at a December '08 FTI meeting to present/discuss the preliminary report and gather stakeholder input/feedback on it.
- Stage 2 progress report to be submitted no later than March '09
- Attendance at Spring '09 FTI meeting to present/discuss the progress report
- Individual case studies, including executive summaries of each
- Draft Full Report, including a comprehensive M&E framework no later than July '09.
- Attendance at Fall '09 FTI meeting to present/discuss draft Full Report and gather stakeholder input/feedback on the report
- Final Full Report, including an executive summary in English and French
- Attendance at November '09 High Level Meeting to present/discuss the Full Report
- Up to four short thematic briefing papers targeting policy makers. The themes for these papers to be discussed with the EOC and FTI Partnership (at draft full report stage)
- Commitment to participate in/lead 3 dissemination events based on the final report and/or thematic briefing papers

29. The consultant will also be required to provide the FTI Partnership the raw data on which the reports/products are based, with the additional stipulation that it cannot independently use the data to generate its own reports and publications.

LIMITATIONS

30. It is acknowledged that there are certain limitations which will constrain the power and generalizability of this evaluation effort. First, time constraints and overall project design/ history have limited the possibility of employing an experimental or quasi experimental design, meaning it is not possible to rule out certain biases in the findings. In addition, the evaluation is faced with difficult questions of attribution: are positive changes towards EFA goals a result of FTI support or would they have happened anyway? Another problem is endemic to quickly evolving initiatives: a study may painstakingly ascertain the contribution of a certain intervention only to find the intervention is evolving. Thus, it is sometimes difficult to know what to evaluate: original design features or what the intervention has been transformed into.

31. Proposals should include a further elaboration of the limitations inherent in executing these terms of reference and, more importantly, indicate what specific measures the consultant will take to overcome or mitigate the identified limitations.

CONSULTANT PROFILE AND QUALIFICATIONS

32. An evaluation group or team (Consultant), selected through competitive proposal submission, will carry out the evaluation. Given the wide range of themes and the compressed time schedule for the evaluation, it is anticipated (but not required) that the Consultant will consist of a consortium of institutions. Also, given the fact that there will be data collection and case studies in developing countries, it would be desirable that all or many of the Consultant's institutions have experience in conducting evaluations/ studies in such countries, and include one or more developing country institutions. The Consultant should include personnel with advanced professional background (at the doctoral level for senior researchers and master's degree level for research assistants) and extensive experience in: 1) education issues in developing countries, particularly at the basic education or EFA level; 2) the study and/or evaluation of basic education initiatives and reforms in such countries; 3) assessment of education outcomes (e.g., primary school access, completion and learning gains) at the national and sub-national level; 4) conducting financial analysis of domestic and international spending on basic education (changes in commitments and modalities, predictability, disbursement, etc.); 5) evaluation of institutional development and change at the national and global levels; 6) the management and conduct of case studies in diverse developing country settings (need for staff fluency in at least French and English); and 7) the use of alternative evaluation methodologies, quantitative and qualitative, and the capacity to synthesize various strands into a concise report including actionable recommendations for the future. The team leader should have extensive experience managing complex multi-country evaluations of development assistance.

33. The organization of the evaluation will be the responsibility of the Consultant and should be specified and explained clearly in the proposal. Program objectives, high level questions and related evaluation questions are to be based on the points made in these Terms of Reference (including the "Issues Paper" in Annex A), but the Consultant is given some latitude in refining, prioritizing and combining evaluation questions, and deciding how to collect and analyze data and present the results. The candidate consultant's proposals will be the technical basis for selection. Before a formal contract is issued a negotiation will take place between the candidate consultant and the EOC in which specific design features, work plans, timelines, and deliverables will be agreed upon.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

34. The evaluation is being commissioned by the FTI partnership, through its Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has appointed an Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC) which operates independently with the express purposes of a) defining the terms of reference for the evaluation, b) managing the tendering process and selection of an evaluation consultant, c) managing the implementation of the terms of reference, and d) assuring the overall quality and theoretical and methodological rigor and integrity. The consultant will therefore report to the EOC. All reports, products and deliverables will be submitted to the EOC for technical review and feedback. The EOC will determine the acceptability of all deliverables. The consultant will communicate with the EOC regarding their ongoing work and will report any deviations from the expected timely execution of the terms of reference or from the negotiated and agreed upon work plan.

35. The EOC is working through the FTI Secretariat and the World Bank's procurement department to contract for this evaluation. World Bank staff in the FTI Secretariat will oversee the execution of the contract to ensure compliance with World Bank procurement and contract procedures and regulations.

QUALITY ASSURANCE AND SUPPORT

36. As an external evaluation, it is important that the consultant be able to pursue its

work plan and make its conclusions without interference. However, there is a need for quality assurance, and this will be exercised both by the Evaluation Oversight Committee and by the consultant itself. The roles of the EOC with regard to quality assurance will include: a) selecting the consultant based on an objective and unbiased review process, b) making sure, during contract negotiations with the consultant, that the proposed evaluation design and work plan are consistent with the TOR, realistic, and consistent with professional standards for the evaluation of global partnerships (see section on Evaluation Framework and Quality Standards), c) reviewing progress as indicated in the second quarter progress report; d) reviewing the preliminary and full reports, assuring that they are methodologically sound and rigorous, that conclusions are clear and supported by evidence, and that recommendations follow from the conclusions; and e) assuring that gender issues are adequately addressed by the evaluation and that females are represented on the evaluation team. Concerning quality assurance measures to be taken by the consultant, these should be described in the proposals submitted by the candidate firms, including the treatment of gender issues. Where the EOC quality assurance measures reveal that quality standards are not met, it can request that the consultant make changes and revisions. Deliverables will only be submitted to the FTI Steering Committee after they are certified by the EOC to have met the above mentioned quality standards.

37. The final report should be of publishable quality and will be published by the FTI Partnership.

PROPOSAL SPECIFICATIONS

38. Proposals must be submitted in English both electronically and in hard copy (10 copies). The narrative portion of the technical proposal must not exceed 35 pages, single spaced, 12 point font, with margins of 1 inch. Annexes can comprise up to another 35 pages.

Annex 3 Evaluation Oversight Committee Terms of Reference

1. Purpose of the FTI Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC)

The Evaluation Oversight Committee has been established at the request of the Education for All - Fast Track Initiative (EFA-FTI) Steering Committee to oversee and manage an external evaluation of the FTI to cover the period 2002 to 2008. The evaluation will be undertaken from mid 2008 to mid 2009.

The EOC will:

- Ensure that the evaluation is of maximum value to all FTI stakeholders (donors, partner country representatives, NGOs and academics), beneficiaries and the international community in general;
- Assure the overall quality of the evaluation, including its theoretical and methodological integrity, the appropriateness of the evidence selected, the accuracy of its interpretations, and the usefulness of its recommendations for FTI stakeholders and beneficiaries;
- Ensure the independence of the evaluation. The EOC will act with autonomy, but provide a quarterly report to the FTI Steering Committee and will make information available to the full FTI Partnership at the biannual FTI Steering Committee meetings;
- Provide both expert advice and comment, and, where applicable, institutional/representational perspectives.

In undertaking this, the Evaluation Oversight Committee (EOC) will:

- (i) Articulate, in a preliminary way, the scope and objectives of the external evaluation and the key questions it will address, ensuring as a first consideration that the evaluation reflects the information needs of the FTI's key stakeholders and beneficiaries for both accountability and lesson-learning and best-practice purposes;
- (ii) Produce an "issues paper" laying out preliminary evaluation objectives and questions for use in stimulating and eliciting inputs from stakeholders and beneficiaries, assuring full consideration of their interests and concerns in the evaluation's terms of reference;
- (iii) Create Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation, based on the issues paper and inputs from stakeholders and beneficiaries;
- (iv) Assure that the funds raised for the conduct of the evaluation are adequate to assure high quality implementation of the desired TOR before commissioning the work, and advise the FTI Steering Committee of the need for additional funds if those initially raised are not adequate;
- (v) Draft the bidding documents ("request for proposals" or RFP) to be used in the selection of a contractor to undertake the evaluation based on the TOR;
- (vi) Select the evaluation contractor based on a rigorous and objective vetting of the proposals submitted in response to the RFP;
- (vii) Oversee the contractors overall implementation of the evaluation, in terms of its timeliness, adherence to the TOR and its quality standards, and management of and accounting for the use of funds;
- (viii) Comment on the drafts of the evaluation report, particularly in terms of its rigor, relevance, appropriateness of data interpretation, and success or failure to substantiate judgements;
- (ix) Through the quality assurance measures in points vi-viii above, ensure that the evaluation has credibility across the full range of stakeholders and beneficiaries;
- (x) Make recommendations to the FTI Steering Committee on the dissemination and use of the evaluation report.

2. Evaluation management

The evaluation will be undertaken by a contractor selected and overseen by the EOC. The day-to-day management of the contractor will be assumed by a member of the EOC nominated as the Secretary. The Secretary's tasks will include circulating papers for appraisal and comment, organizing and chairing EOC meetings, recording and distributing meeting minutes, keeping the web portal up-to-date, liaising with the evaluation contractor, overseeing and approving invoices submitted by the contractor (for onward transmission to the World Bank contracts office), and arranging – in liaison with the full EOC – for sign-off the final products submitted by the evaluation contractor. On short-term, logistical decisions the Secretary will seek advice from a “core group” of 4-5 volunteer EOC members.

No substantive decision will be taken by the Secretary, core group, or any other sub-group that may be constituted in the future without advice and consent of the full EOC. When EOC decisions cannot be made by consensus, they will be arrived at by a majority vote.

3. Contracting of firm to implement the evaluation

The firm selected by the EOC to implement the evaluation will enter into a contract with the appropriate office within the World Bank. This office will create and hold the legal documents for the execution of the evaluation and will provide payments to the contractor, as they are due. The EOC will review contractor progress, products, and requests for payments and indicate to the WB contracts office whether payments are authorized.

The independence of this external evaluation is central to its credibility. The EOC will provide critical inputs to the evaluation contractor, but it is essential that its independence be respected. As mentioned in Section 2, the EOC can, however, challenge drafts and findings on the grounds of inadequate rigour, relevance, interpretation of findings, and/or failure to substantiate judgements

4. EOC Meetings

Meetings will be kept to a minimum, in number and duration. It is expected that at least two will be face-to-face. Much of the business of the EOC will be conducted by e-mail. A web portal will provide information updates.

5. Timeline

The duration of the EOC's mandate runs until the completion of the evaluation and the submission of the final report to the FTI Steering Committee. A preliminary timeline for the work of the EOC includes the following benchmarks and indicative dates:

Mar 08	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalize the EOC TOR• Draft an “Issues Paper” as basis for gathering stakeholder input
Apr	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use the “Issues Paper” to structure a web-based stakeholder survey
Apr 21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Present the EOC TOR to and discuss the Issues Paper with the FTI Steering Committee
May 4-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Attend the ADEA Biennial Meeting and gather Stakeholder Input from ADEA countries
May	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalize the evaluation TOR based on all stakeholder input
Jun-Aug	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prepare and manage the tendering process through the appropriate office within the World Bank
Aug	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Award the evaluation contract

Sept	• Evaluation implementation begins
Dec 08	• Initial report from evaluation consultants on progress of evaluation
Jan 09	• EOC review of first report and feedback to consultants
April 09	• Second report from evaluation consultants on progress of the evaluation
May 09	• EOC review of second report and feedback to consultants
July 09	• Draft final report submitted
Aug 09	• EOC review of draft final report
Sept 09	• Final report completed

Annex 4 Extended Logical Framework for the Evaluation of the FTI

Explanation of the matrix

1. This Annex is the detailed version of the Logical Framework for the evaluation.
2. The matrix follows a standard structure, in that it proceeds through successive levels from inputs to impact. Note, however, that there are feedback loops between levels. FTI is a continuing programme and successive phases of activities are influenced by previous ones. Thus successive levels of the framework are a logical sequence, but the chronological sequence may involve successive rounds of inputs etc, and the design of the programme may change over time.
3. The overall time period that is relevant to the evaluation includes the formative years of FTI, through its formal establishment and (as nearly as possible) up to the present. For particular countries, the dates of first FTI inputs will vary, and it will be necessary to record carefully what form they took, as FTI modalities have themselves been evolving. "Level Zero" is included to ensure that evaluators gather full information on the context and situation prior to FTI inputs. This is particularly important in addressing the set of High Level questions concerning the relevance of FTI, and of its focus on UPC, in the context of different stakeholders' perspectives and different countries' engagement with it.¹⁸
4. FTI represents only part of the overall efforts towards EFA and UPC. The evaluation is using contribution analysis as an organising framework for its enquiry. This requires FTI to be carefully set within the context of these overall efforts; their combined effect is assessed as a prelude to assessing the particular contributions of FTI to the overall effects. The five streams of hypothesised effects are separately tracked through Levels 1–3 (inputs → immediate effects → intermediate outcomes), though interactions between the streams are also sought (there are overlaps between questions, and the external factors/assumptions column highlights some of the interactions between streams). Under "assumptions" it is important to check whether different stakeholders and different countries operate with the same understanding of FTI objectives and functions. If it is found that they do not, the consequences for efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability should be explored for all relevant workstreams and evaluation levels.
5. At Level 4 (Outcomes) the emphasis is on understanding overall effects on the quantity, quality, access and sustainability of primary education, then the extent to which these effects can be explained by direct and indirect FTI inputs. Hypotheses and questions at Level 4 are interlinked with hypotheses and questions at earlier levels. The enquiry at Level 4 will establish what the outcomes ("results on the ground") have been; questions at earlier levels will seek to establish whether and how FTI inputs may have contributed to those results on the ground.
6. The mid-term evaluation of FTI will not attempt to assess the effects of FTI at Level 5 (Impact). However, an impact evaluation scoping study will assess the prospects, and make proposals, for monitoring and evaluating FTI impacts over the long term.¹⁹
7. The FTI's Indicative Framework proposed benchmark values for a number of key performance indicators. Country-level evaluators should pay special attention to the role

¹⁸ Relevance of FTI is also a concern at subsequent levels of the framework. The same applies to the existence, and possible influence, of differing perspectives on the FTI's objectives and role.

¹⁹ This took place (see White 2009) and the evaluation's recommendations are set out in Appendix VI.

and relevance of the Indicative Framework and gather available information on trends in the indicators it proposed.

8. The letters G and C are used in the matrix below to indicate whether the detailed questions in the second column apply mainly to the global or to the country level of enquiry.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
Level ZERO – PRE-FTI (Establishes the context and starting point prior to FTI)			
0.1. EDUCATION POLICY AND PLANNING OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: Education sector policy and planning at global and country levels was lacking; development partners were not supporting country processes effectively or efficiently			
a. International development agendas and country development frameworks giving insufficient priority to education and also to primary sub-sector. b. Education sector policy in need of strengthening globally and at country level c. Stakeholder involvement in education sector patchy d. Education planning not taking account of key cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV, equity, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-FTI, what was state of progress towards EFA goals (G and C) • Pre-FTI, what fora existed for global policy and planning? How effective were they? To what extent did they support country level processes? (G) • How did donor agendas influence global policy and planning? What was the balance of donor support: between education and other sectors? between sub-sectors within education (Global – aggregate and individual donors) • How did key actors conceptualise “a credible plan” post Dakar? (G and C) • What main changes had happened in the education sector in the years prior to FTI? (G and C) • What influence did the HIPC agenda and PRSPs have on education strategy? Was the PRSP process complementary to EFA planning? Was UPC a priority? Which stakeholders had most influence on the setting of strategic priorities? (G and C) • Did an education sector plan exist before FTI? (If so what was the process for drafting it, agreeing it, implementing it, monitoring and evaluating it; for taking account of failures and weakness and addressing them? Did it encompass the full sector or were some sub-sector elements omitted? Was it well established before FTI became a factor? C) • How consultative was the process of macro-economic planning and policies been? (C) • How consultative was the process of education policy making and planning? (C) • Did education plans take account of key cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV, equity, disability? (G and C) 	<p>Documents (global): Background documents on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Global education strategy, from Jomtien onwards. - Millennium aid commitments - PRSP approaches - donor and CSO strategies (general and education) - evaluations of basic education - origins and intentions of FTI <p>Documents (country): National strategies and plans, including PRSP Education policy and programme documents Donor group records, SWAp documents etc Donor documentation with analysis on policy and implementation (for country and for education sector)</p> <p>Interviews: Global actors in setting strategy for early days of FTI. Country actors and observers for the period (ministries of planning, finance and education, civil society, donor partners, etc)</p>	<p>External factors which are important to understanding different contexts over time and across countries include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Political and governance factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Election cycles ○ National elites ○ Stability/fragility ○ Corruption ○ Institutional capacity and reforms ➤ Economic factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ global trends ○ national economic performance ➤ Aid environment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ aid and foreign policy agenda of donors ○ global commitments on aid effectiveness ○ aid dependency ○ aid modalities ➤ Other factors e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ HIV and AIDS ○ Disasters ➤ Cross-currents from other sectors and sub-sectors <p><i>NB. These factors are relevant, in different degrees, across all the workstreams.</i></p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
0.2. EDUCATION FINANCE			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Domestic and external financing constraints were impeding progress towards UPC			
<p>a. Overall funding to education fell short of needs, including needs for basic education (globally and at country level)</p> <p>b. External funding for education insufficient and unpredictable;</p> <p>c. Education not getting sufficient domestic funding priority and/or insufficient priority for primary education</p> <p>d. No well-costed, and prioritised education sector plan (ESP) in place, and/or financial planning and management (costing, budgeting and monitoring) in the education sector was weak</p> <p>e. Funding levels not adjusted to deal with major challenges to UPC such as the impact of HIV and AIDS, conflict, gender inequality, and reaching disadvantaged groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What had been the level of funding to the education sector, and basic education, over time from domestic and external resources? (G and C) • How were decisions on funding to the education sector made prior to FTI? (G and C) • How were stakeholders collaborating in decisions around funding and was this based on a review of achievements/progress in the sector? (G and C) • How predictable was funding for basic education? (G and C) • Did a costed ESP exist? To what extent was it used to guide domestic and external resource allocation to education? (C) • How integrated were key elements of the budget process in the education sector—strategic planning, budget preparation, monitoring and reporting? (C) • What information was available on funding patterns and how accessible was this information (G and C)? • How comprehensive were the education budget and expenditure reports? What role did the MoE play in compiling information on domestic and external funding (C)? What role was played by expenditure and financial monitoring reports in prospective education planning? (C) • Which external partners were providing the bulk of the resources and through what modalities? (G and C)? • What funding was on-budget and off-budget? (C) • To what extent were specific financial provisions made to deal with major challenges affecting the education sector such as HIV and AIDS, conflict, gender and equity, disability (C and G)? 	<p>Documents (global): International data on aid flows and public spending patterns Global education financial datasets (UIS, DAC)</p> <p>Documents (country): MTEFs Education sector plans Education sector multi-year financial frameworks Education sector budgets Expenditure monitoring reports End-of-year financial reports Donor financial reports and strategy documents Education sector review documents Studies on education finance and planning (e.g. PERs, global reports on aid-flows) Reports on financial implications of cross cutting issues (gender, HIV, etc.)</p> <p>Interviews (country): MoE finance and planning staff Ministry of Finance Ministry of Planning National AIDS Authority Key external stakeholders e.g. donor partners, civil society Relevant TA personnel</p>	<p>➤ Assumption that finance is a binding constraint implies that other constraints (e.g. implementation capacity) can be overcome.</p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
0.3. DATA AND M&E OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: Monitoring and evaluation of education sector progress is not prioritized, was weak and fragmented and inadequately linked to overall global and national development plans			
a. Global progress on education goals insufficiently monitored b. Agreed upon indicators of progress that allow for country comparisons and time trends not in place c. Monitoring and evaluation of progress in the education sector in need of strengthening d. Decision-making not sufficiently informed by evidence e. Data not adequately capturing progress on key cross cutting issues (HIV, gender, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the situation regarding education data and M&E prior to FTI activities? (G and C) In particular... How frequently were the World Education Reports and other UNESCO international statistics referred to, and used in, policy discussions? (G) How had data collection and analysis in education evolved over time? (G and C) How was data shared? And to what extent and at what moments was there joint discussion around data? Which fora existed for discussion of education analysis? How functional were these? Who was involved and at what levels? (G and C) What was the capacity for data collection and analysis like prior to FTI?(C) Which key indicators have been used over time to monitor progress? Were any targets set? Did these data capture progress on cross-cutting issues (HIV, gender, equity, disability etc.)? (G and C) Were there any incentives/procedures for stakeholders to pay attention to data in their decision making? If so which ones and to what extent did they work? (G and C) What resources were expended over time on data collection and analysis? (C) Was there an EMIS in place? (C) Was data informing decision making systematically? In what ways? (C) 	<p>Documents: Household surveys Education statistics reports over time EFA GMRS UIS Reports</p> <p>Interviews: GLOBALLY Education Analysts in 1990s in UNESCO / WB Consultants promoting EMIS systems IIEP staff Donors, including former education specialists in multilateral and bilateral agencies</p> <p>IN CASE STUDY COUNTRIES MoE Planning staff at central and decentralized levels Ministry of Planning Ministry of Finance National Bureau of Statistics Consultants providing support on EMIS Donors, including former education specialists in multilateral and bilateral agencies</p>	➤ Assumption that obstacles to evidence-based decision-making are technical rather than political or cultural.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
0.4. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: Poor capacity was hampering the development and implementation of education plans and programmes and affecting progress on achieving UPC			
<p>a. Weak capacity affects various levels (e.g. planning, budgeting, financial management, education service delivery, M&E.</p> <p>b. Capacity development not receiving sufficient attention in planning and budgeting globally and nationally</p> <p>c. Monitoring of outcomes and impact of capacity development needing improvement</p> <p>d. Capacity development efforts fragmented and insufficiently linked to key sector priorities; not addressing cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV&AIDS and equity issues; not integrated with institutional and organisational development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the main capacity constraints on the sector? Which areas of the sector were most affected? (sub-sectors, activities, institutional levels, geographical regions) (G and C) How did the DPs approach capacity development (including the capacity of DPs themselves)? (G and C) How well was capacity development linked to planning and priority activities in the sector? (C) What major capacity development efforts were in place prior to FTI for planning staff as well as for teachers and other important areas of the plan? (C and G) Who was responsible for these? How were priorities determined? How were modalities decided? How effective were these efforts? (C) How was the outcome and impact of the capacity development being tracked in general? (C) Was there prior to FTI a capacity building plan for the sector? If so, did it address cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV/AIDS, disability, equity issues? (C) 	<p>Reports:</p> <p>Analysis of capacity bottlenecks from general sector and country reports.</p> <p>Institutional and governance reports.</p> <p>Reports of capacity assessments in the civil service and the education sector</p> <p>Donor reports</p> <p>Capacity development plans</p> <p>Sector plans</p> <p>WB IEG Report on CD</p> <p>JICA TC Report</p> <p>Interviews:</p> <p>Relevant MoE staff</p> <p>Ministry of Planning</p> <p>Ministry of Finance</p> <p>Key donor task managers over time</p> <p>Key responsible consultants/TA over time</p> <p>Training institutions (private and public)</p> <p>Universities</p>	<p>Special influences of external factors on capacity include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> salaries public service structure and reform governance and economic management <p>Also relevant over time are changing international approaches to the analysis of capacity, and changing concepts of good practice in TA and capacity development.</p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
0.5. AID EFFECTIVENESS			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: Aid to basic education was fragmented, fell short of needs and was insufficiently targeted to global and national priorities			
<p>a. Aid provided in a fragmented manner and guided mostly by individual donor priorities</p> <p>b. Planning taking place at the level of individual stakeholders rather than collectively</p> <p>c. Aid distribution between countries is sub-optimal (donor orphans and financing gaps)</p> <p>d. Aid distribution between education sub-sectors is also sub-optimal</p> <p>f. External funding modalities for education are inefficient (weakness in alignment and harmonisation)</p> <p>e. Mechanisms for discussion around aid effectiveness poor and insufficiently consultative</p> <p>f. Insufficient attention to cross-cutting issues that affect the education sector</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What had been the history of aid to the education sector over time? What key bottlenecks existed in coordination, harmonisation and alignment prior to FTI? (G and C) • Which donors have been involved? Which donors have been most influential and in what way? (G and C) • What levels of funding were being provided? What have been the trends in terms of modalities and priority areas of support? (G and C) • How have key stakeholders coordinated and reviewed progress? Have any external assessments of aid effectiveness to the sector (or more broadly been conducted? What main changes had taken place in this respect over time? Were there in-country donor agreements? (C) • What role has the MoE or/and other ministries taken over time in coordinating aid to the education sector? How effective has this been? (C) • What was the situation like with respect to external aid to the sector when FTI came in? (C) • What sector wide programs and approaches were in place or in preparation (SWAps)? (C) • What motivated country stakeholders to go for FTI? Were there different motivations for different stakeholder groups? Did any tensions arise as a result? Were all main stakeholder groups able to participate? (C) • What was the purpose of FTI understood to be? Did this change over time (e.g. for different cohorts of endorsed countries)? (G and C) 	<p>Reports: Background literature on aid effectiveness and new aid modalities. Reports of annual sector reviews Individual donor reports Multi-donor aid reviews Selective comparison of FTI with other GRPPs.</p> <p>Interviews: MoE senior staff (especially from planning) and former relevant staff Ministries of finance/planning Key education stakeholders over time (globally and nationally) Civil society Teacher unions</p>	<p>➤ Need to appreciate that the international aid effectiveness debate continued to evolve during the genesis and implementation of the FTI. Important to take account of changing perceptions and pressures over time.</p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
Level ONE – ACTIVITIES / INPUTS (Relates to activities and inputs which were provided in support of basic education, globally and at country level)			
1.1. EDUCATION POLICY AND PLANNING OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: FTI processes and activities supported the strengthening of policy and planning for EFA and UPC at global and country levels.			
a. Policy experiences across countries periodically shared and used to inform decision making by FTI partners b. Existing policy framework for the education sector reviewed by all stakeholders with guidance from MoE and designated lead donor in order to achieve UPE c. Education sector policy and implementation plan costed d. Studies and consultations conducted to strengthen weak areas of policy and planning e. [Participation] Country PRSP reviewed in a participatory manner, examining in particular priority for education within the overall development framework f. [CCI] Policy framework addresses cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV&AIDS and equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What FTI activities were undertaken in relation to education policy and planning? In what ways were education policy and planning modified as a result? (G and C) What specific contributions were made by EPDF in support of education policy development and planning? (C) What was the process for preparing for endorsement? (C) What changes took place to the plan before it was presented to FTI? Was it improved as a result of this process? In what ways? Was the development of the indicative plan in keeping with what the country would have done itself, possibly in a different manner? (C) Who initiated the review process of the education sector as part of the FTI engagement? What was the quality of the process? (C) Was there a lead donor? How was the donor selected? To what extent was this influenced by the political economy in the donor group? (C) What was the decision making process in the donor group? (C) Who were the key stakeholders involved? How was their participation sought? Did their participation change over time? (C) What were the main policy contestations? Were additional studies conducted to develop particular policy areas? By whom and with what consultation? (C) How effective were the reviews? (C) What role did the indicative framework of FTI play in shaping country policy? (C) To what extent, if any, did global discussions around education policies translate into country level action? (C) What specific efforts were made to ensure that cross-cutting issues were adequately addressed in policy and planning? How successful were these efforts? (G and C) 	Reports: Education policy documents Education review reports Reports and documents of the FTI Secretariat for specific countries Hazel Bines World Vision report Education's Missing Millions (2007) EDPF concept notes. EDPF proposals, activity reports Interviews: MoE directors of planning Senior MoE staff in charge of policy FTI Secretariat and Steering Committee members Consultants supporting the MoE and FTI WB Regional Managers Field visits: To educational settings to assess implementation of policies.; stakeholder perceptions of FTI-related activities Schools, colleges, Policy institutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Government and key stakeholders committed to promoting EFA ➤ (For most FTI countries) PRSP process in place and constitutes a reference for planning ➤ Education sector plan available as a starting point for more detailed planning ➤ Commitment by key partners to a participatory approach for fine-tuning the education plan. ➤ Funding and capacity in place to conduct additional studies as a basis for an improved sector plan ➤ At least one donor willing and sufficiently resourced (manpower) to take on the role of lead donor for the FTI process <p><i>Test the assumption that different actors share the same understanding of FTI objectives, mechanisms and obligations.</i></p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
1.2. EDUCATION FINANCE OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – The FTI process put in place a complete set of activities aimed at identifying financial requirements and mobilising domestic and external funding to support EFA and UPC globally and at country level.			
a. Support to education sector strategic planning: costing and modelling studies conducted b. Comprehensive financial framework (FF) developed consistent with ESP; financial gap quantified c. Medium-term budget prepared consistent with ESP financial framework d. Financial management and monitoring arrangements reviewed; instruments and processes developed e. External funds mobilised at global level to support the CF/EPDF f. Country applications submitted for the CF and EPDF as appropriate g. Information and lessons shared between countries on FTI processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What FTI financial inputs were provided, and what FTI activities were undertaken to encourage the financing of basic education? (G and C) Did the FTI strategy for addressing financing gaps change significantly over time? Have donor expectations of financing considerations been consistent over the FTI process period? (G and C) How were the global and country level FTI processes and criteria developed? G(G) What measures were taken to mobilise funds at global level for the CF and EPDF? G(G) How and by whom was the education sector financial framework put together? Had such exercises been conducted pre- FTI? (C) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the MoE consult/work with other ministries, notably MoF, in producing the FF? Was a medium-term budget for education prepared based on the ESP FF? (C) What was the consultative process on proposed financial allocations? Which stakeholders participated? (C) Were relevant cross-cutting issues taken into account? (C) How did the FTI indicative framework influence the development of the FF? Did its primary education focus affect financial planning for other subsectors? C(C) Was all external donor support to education included in the FF? C(C) What instruments and processes to strengthen financial management and monitoring of the education sector were developed? G(G and C) Did external partners share information and lessons on funding modalities for education? G(G and C) What did the process of: (i) seeking endorsement of the ESP; (ii) applying to the CF; (iii) applying to the EPDF, involve? C(C) What activities or processes were put in place to promote information sharing and lessons learning between countries on FTI processes? (G) To what extent did FTI-supported activities add to or enhance pre-existing sector processes? (G and C) 	<p><u>Documents:</u></p> FTI secretariat records e.g. minutes, supporting documents Country level FTI documents e.g. Initial info. from FTI to LEG; Govt letter to LDG; fiduciary assessment; mapping of current and future aid; EPDF application; ESP appraisal report; CF program proposal LEG & LDG minutes ESP & financial framework Education sector medium-term and annual budgets, expenditure reports, financial monitoring reports Donor budgets and reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Financial resources and technical capacity available for conducting additional studies ➤ Donors make available data on activities, financial commitment and modalities of support ➤ EPDF and CF resources provided in a timely manner to fund and support selected activities ➤ Commitment and participation by other government departments (especially finance and planning) ➤ Bottlenecks in financial systems identified in a timely manner and addressed ➤ Coherent resource planning takes place at sector level, or is adequately articulated with national planning, budgeting and aid management. <p><i>Test the assumption that different actors share the same understanding of FTI objectives, mechanisms and obligations.</i></p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
1.3. DATA AND M&E OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI recognized the importance of data systems for decision making and supported activities which aimed at ensuring strong data collection, reporting and feed back to decision making			
a. Indicators agreed for monitoring progress towards UPC and other EFA goals b. Strength and weaknesses of data management assessed and appropriate mechanisms put in place for continuous quality improvement. c. Capacity built for designing, maintaining and updating data systems d. Indicators of quality of data systems agreed upon between stakeholders, monitored regularly and used in decision making on priorities for improving data management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What data-related activities did FTI directly undertake or indirectly support? (G and C) Which indicators were selected to monitor progress in quality of data systems? How was this carried out, according to whose design and under what management? Were any benchmarks/targets defined? Were cross-cutting issues included? (G and C) What reporting mechanisms around data were put in place? (G) What capacity building has taken place to strengthen data systems? (G and C) What priority activities were rolled out under FTI to address constraints on data collection and analysis? (G and C) Was EPDF used for strengthening data systems, and if so what activities were conducted? What funds were made available under EPDF and were these commensurate to the problem? Were there any issues in accessing EPDF funding and support? Was EPDF funding used at all to strengthen capacity on data collection and processing around cross-cutting issues? (G and C) What is status of EMIS in FTI and other countries? (G and C) Do pre-endorsement documents include an analysis of gaps in data and progress in filling them? (G and C) Do JARs - or equivalent – include an analysis of the progress in improving data systems and gaps and (i) how do these compare between FTI and non-FTI countries and (ii) how have these changed in FTI and non-FTI countries over this decade? (G and C) Which indicators were selected to monitor progress? How were these determined? Were cross-cutting issues included? (C) 	GLOBALLY Documents GMR FTI Indicative Framework and progress reports Interviews FTI Secretariat Consultants promoting EMIS systems GMR staff UIS staff IIEP staff CASE STUDY COUNTRIES Documents: Government and MoE progress reports and annual reviews Donor documentation EPDF progress reports Interviews: Senior MoE and other planning staff Relevant TA personnel Field work: Field visits to local education offices	➤ Bottlenecks in data management identified and a process designed to address these ➤ Stakeholders committed to ensuring that data systems get sufficient funding and are prioritized ➤ Staff in place in key positions for data management at MoE and decentralized levels ➤ EPDF funding provided in a timely manner for capacity building needs in data management ➤ Technical support available ➤ Mechanisms for periodic review of data established and used ➤ Cultural and political obstacles to evidence based decision making overcome

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
1.4. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI promoted a harmonized approach to capacity development and supported capacity development in areas which constitute a priority for achieving UPC			
a. Stakeholders jointly identify capacity gaps and agree on plans to address these b. Capacity development plans are periodically updated to reflect changing needs and to ensure mutual accountability c. Capacity development is conducted in accordance with needs of all stakeholders, in line with their respective roles and cognizant of institutional and organisational constraints. d. Proposals submitted to the EPDF for specific capacity development priorities e. Monitoring and evaluation of capacity development activities carried out and reports on results/impact produced, disseminated and acted upon. f. Cross-cutting issues integrated across capacity development plans and activities and progress and included in reporting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What activities related to capacity development did FTI directly undertake or indirectly support? (G and C) What was the process by which capacity development needs were identified (under whose initiative, who managed it, and to what extent is capacity assessed more broadly in the public sector and not just the education sector)? (C) Have the FTI Capacity Development Guidelines been used, to what effect, with whose involvement? (C) Is there a capacity development plan? How was it developed? Is it used? (C) To what extent is there a shared perception of capacity development by the MoE, the donor community and other country stakeholders? (C) How often is the capacity assessment updated,? Do the updates show changes in the plan and activities? (C) How have regional advisory groups for EPDF influenced the CD assessment, its planning, implementation processes? (G and C) To what extent have country stakeholders contributed towards identifying approaches to developing capacity and rolling these out? (C) What levels and types of funding were made available for capacity development? From what sources? (G and C) Was effective support provided to build capacity in financial management? (C) What proposals were submitted for funding by the EPDF? What financing and support was received? How effective was this? How was effectiveness assessed? (G and C) To what extent have relevant cross-cutting issues been included in capacity development efforts? How important is capacity development in these areas to stakeholders? Has any funding been made available specifically for these priorities? (G and C) How are the outcomes and impact of capacity development efforts being monitored? By whom? To what extent does monitoring inform future priority setting? In what ways? (G and C) 	<p>Documentation: EPDF reports FTI regional reports Needs assessment documentation Capacity development plans Sector development plan Aide memoires Hazel Bines World Vision report Education's Missing Millions 2007</p> <p>Interviews: Key stakeholders, including donors and lead donor Task managers Universities and other training institutions Private training providers WB regional education managers TA/hired consultants for capacity development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Country stakeholders have a shared vision of capacity development and are committed to ensuring that it gets priority attention ➤ Capacity gaps clearly identified and a process for addressing these developed ➤ EPDF funding provided in a timely manner and in line with the identified needs ➤ Trained staff stay on the job (i.e. incentives in place to keep them there) ➤ System able to cope with loss of manpower through HIV and AIDS ➤ Systems in place for periodically reviewing capacity gaps and for revising plans for capacity development

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
1.5. AID EFFECTIVENESS OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI resulted in a review of current practice to promote better coordination, harmonisation and alignment among stakeholders in education at global and country levels.			

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
<p>a. Coordination mechanisms reviewed and strengthened</p> <p>b. Mechanisms put in place for ensuring that the FTI endorsement process is an integral part of the country process for education review and approval</p> <p>c. Specific efforts made to include additional stakeholders to ensure adequate representation of key groups</p> <p>d. Stakeholders regularly provided with updated information on aid flows and aid effectiveness</p> <p>e. Monitoring country progress and identifying constraints to further progress (e.g. poor accountability, concerns about financial management, etc.)</p> <p>f. Specific actions identified to address constraints to aid effectiveness e.g. capacity, strengthening of public financial management, etc.</p> <p>g. Aid harmonisation and alignment efforts take account of key cross-cutting issues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What activities did FTI directly undertake or indirectly support to promote greater aid effectiveness? (G and C) • What were the governance arrangements for FTI, and how did they change over time? (G and C) • How have global efforts at coordination impacted at country level? (G and C) • What changes in coordination among stakeholders have taken place in the education sector? To what extent can these changes be attributed to FTI? (C) • How and to what extent were key bottlenecks in coordination, harmonisation and alignment addressed through FTI? (C) • Did stakeholders adopt more harmonised and aligned approaches? How did this come about? (G and C) • To what extent were changes in aid management for the education sector linked to overall changes in aid management? (G and C) • How is aid effectiveness monitored? How is information on aid effectiveness shared, and how does this inform further decision making? (G and C) <p>How is adherence to the Paris principles monitored as part of FTI? (G and C)</p>	<p>Documentation:</p> <p>Document on aid management and coordination, including multi-sector forums and programmes (e.g. PRSCs)</p> <p>Annual education reviews</p> <p>Overall aid effectiveness studies</p> <p>MOF, MoE and donor group statistics on donor support to the sector</p> <p>Comparison with other GRPPs</p> <p>Interviews:</p> <p>MoE and other ministry staff responsible for coordinating external support to the sector</p> <p>Key donors and other stakeholders over time</p> <p>Ministries of Planning and Finance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Donors committed to improved coordination, harmonization and alignment ➤ MoE takes leadership of efforts to promote coordination in the education sector ➤ MoE willing to demand accountability by all stakeholders ➤ Approaches adapted to country systems of decentralisation. ➤ Donor incentives to reform their ways of doing business. <p><i>Test the assumption that different actors share the same understanding of FTI objectives, mechanisms and obligations.</i></p>

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
Level TWO – IMMEDIATE EFFECTS (Relates to the effects of the activities/inputs on processes in the education sector)			
2.1. EDUCATION POLICY AND PLANNING OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Adoption of education policies and plans which reflect strategic priorities for achieving UPC and draw support from all key stakeholders			
<p>a. Improved understanding of priority strategies and actions needed globally and at country levels to reach EFA and UPC goals is reflected in operational plans</p> <p>b. National plans, including PRSP, reflect greater priority for (basic) education sector</p> <p>c. Increased commitment to EFA and UPC reflected in donor policies</p> <p>d. Involvement of a wider group of stakeholders in meaningful policy dialogue around basic education</p> <p>e. Specific strategies and priorities identified and adopted for key cross cutting issues in the sector (gender, HIV&AIDS, equity)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What changes have occurred in donor policies to commit them to a stronger emphasis on support to EFA? (G and C) What increases are discernable in the prioritisation of UPC –related policies and plans? C(C) Has there been an increase in media/civil discussion of education and in the media generally? To what extent was open public debate fostered by FTI? (C) How coherent are the PRSP, the national development plan, and the education sector plan? Has this changed over time? (C) What was produced as a result of the planning process under FTI? What did the policy framework entail? Did a pre-existing policy framework exist and if so was it altered in response to FTI? (C) Did the education plan presented to FTI have any parliamentary oversight at all? Or oversight by other ministries? C(C) What emphasis has been given to the full extent of EFA, i.e. including early childhood, Adult and Basic (ABE) and non-formal, as opposed to over-emphasis on formal primary schooling at the expense of the other elements? (G and C) What policies for key cross-cutting issues have been put in place and how strongly are they reflected in plans (Annual Work Plans and other?) (C and G) What are the mechanisms for key stakeholders to make their contributions in formulation of policies, plans and in periodic (annual) reviews, especially with respect to EFA? C(C) What has been the role of the EPDF in generating and supporting a deepening commitment to EFA? (regional and country) To what extent is stakeholder engagement ongoing? C(C) To what extent have the changes at this level resulted from the FTI activities and inputs identified at Level 1? (C and G) 	<p>Documentation</p> <p>FTI reports Media reports Reports of WB Annual Meetings Global Monitoring Reports Reports of Annual Sector Reviews and Joint Review Missions Thematic Studies and reports EPDF annual and activity reports In-country Civil Society reports</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>FTI Secretariat CS Stakeholders Education International and in-country teacher unions WB Regional directors- Members of FTI Steering Committee, etc MoE directors of planning Senior MoE staff in charge of policy Ministries of Finance and Planning Consultants supporting the MoE and FTI NGOs and INGOs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Donor agendas and commitments reflect (and are adjusted to) priority for basic/primary education ➤ Gov and MoE committed to inclusive and participatory approach to education planning ➤ Wider stakeholder participation strengthens sector policy and performance.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
2.2. EDUCATION FINANCE			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Education sector budget process is more transparent, comprehensive, integrated and efficient			
<p>a. Education budget cycle processes strengthened; clear links between financial monitoring and reporting, strategic planning, and budget preparation</p> <p>b. Strong financial management systems in place to facilitate comprehensive monitoring of education sector funding</p> <p>c. Improved coordination and information sharing between key government departments and external partners on education funding</p> <p>d. Greater clarity among external partners on resource requirements; planned funding increasingly linked to improved performance in the sector</p> <p>e. Decisions by external partners to adopt more aligned financing modalities.</p> <p>f. Agreement on harmonised modalities for external funding and mechanisms for enhancing efficiency and reducing transaction costs</p> <p>g. Agreement on a harmonised and aligned modality for CF</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the education sector budget comprehensive and consistent with the ESP FF? C(C) What financial monitoring and review processes for education are in place at national and sub-national levels? How comprehensive are they? Who is involved? What is the information used for? C(C) Are financial monitoring reports used in: (i) overall education sector review processes; (ii) education planning and budget preparation processes? C(C) Are effective processes in place for sharing information on education funding between key government departments and external partners? C(C) Are there any systems in place for tracking public expenditure to school and student level? C(C) What financial monitoring processes for education are in place at global level (including CF/EPDF monitoring)? What is the information used for? G(G) How did external partners decide on the amount of funding to commit to the education sector? Are decisions linked to information from a performance monitoring process? (G and C) Did external partners decide to adopt more harmonised and aligned modalities? Why did they take these decisions? (G and C) What modality was agreed for grants from the CF? Was this modality harmonised with others used by external partners in the sector? How aligned was this modality? (C) Can MoF clarify distinct aid flows into education? Are these as expected? (C) What changes have there been in the proportion of the education budget allocated to EFA in its widest sense: specifically to primary? (G and C) To what extent have the changes at this level resulted from the FTI activities and inputs identified at Level 11? (G and C) 	<p>Documentation: ESP, FF & monitoring & implementation framework Education budgets and preparation documentation Expenditure monitoring reports End-of-year financial reports Donor financial reports and strategy documents Studies on education finance and planning (e.g. PERs) Education sector review documents LDG minutes FTI CF/EPDF financial reports Global education financial datasets (UIS, DAC)</p> <p>Interviews: MoE finance and planning staff Ministry of Finance Relevant parliamentary committees LDG Key non-government stakeholders e.g. civil society, others involved in the LEG FTI secretariat staff who work on the CF/EPDF; CF fund managers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Government staffing in place at critical levels of the system ➤ External partners able/willing to provide data on financial commitments

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
2.3. DATA AND M&E OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Data collection on education progress improved, shared with stakeholders and capacity built to inform decision making around policies and plans for achieving UPC			
a. Improved frequency and quality of reporting on progress towards EFA and UPC b. Improved understanding of areas of progress and of gaps that need to be addressed to achieve EFA, including on cross-cutting issues affecting the sector c. Improved capacity for data use and management at various levels of education systems reflected in quality reporting, and flow of information. d. Key intermediate indicators and targets for measuring progress on EFA and UPE agreed upon among stakeholders, including indicators and targets on key cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has data collection and analysis in education evolved over time? (G and C) Can countries report any changes in data collection and management decision-making on the basis of data at national and district levels? (C) Is there any evidence of use of data for management at sub-national levels? (G and C) Has there been a qualitative improvement in data collection and dissemination? If yes, in what way? (G and C) If implemented, are indicators of quality of data systems monitored regularly? (G and C) Is data more widely available and more regularly distributed? (G and C) What evidence is there for increased capacity of data analysis at various levels of system (G and C) What is coverage of non-formal education, private sector data, etc. Did FTI contribute, directly or indirectly, towards filling perceived data gaps? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the FTI Secretariat indicate any improvements in education data in FTI countries? (G) Can education planners identify any improvements in education data and if so, how far do they attribute this to FTI or other sources of support? (C) To what extent have the changes at this level resulted from the FTI activities and inputs identified at Level 1? (G and C) 	<p>Documents</p> <p>Review of EMIS systems based on published articles (G and C)</p> <p>Review of a sample of JARs from FTI and non-FTI countries (G and C)</p> <p>Search for published or grey literature on sub-national analyses and classification by contributing authors (G and C)</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Directors of Planning (C)</p> <p>Main Providers(s) of Non-State Education (C)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Staff and systems in place for data collection at all levels of the education system ➤ Mechanisms for sharing of information fully operational and linked to decision making structures internally (within the sector) and externally (MoF, donors, etc.) ➤ Staff in charge of management and decision making (at all levels of the system) has sufficient capacity and incentives to use data as a basis for decision making ➤ External partners decision making processes data driven ➤ Accountability mechanisms in place which are data driven ➤ Cultural and political obstacles to evidence based decision making overcome.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
2.4. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Support to the education sector oriented towards developing capacity in agreed-upon priority areas of the education sector plan – and increasingly harmonised.			
a. Key stakeholders aware of main capacity gaps and committed to providing increasingly harmonised, necessary financial and technical support in context of institutional and organisational constraints b. Capacity development needs adequately costed and integrated in the Education Sector Plan c. Increase in resources devoted to capacity development in context of EFA and UPC d. Funding and human resourcing shifts at level of different stakeholders (MoE, donors, etc.) reflect capacity gaps and needs globally and at country level e. Increasing attention to capacity development of external stakeholders such as NGOs and donors f. Capacity development includes attention to cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV&AIDS and equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the key stakeholders come together to harmonise and align capacity development according to a commonly understood approach to needs identification and choice of funding, CD modalities and management? (C and G) Is CD integrated in the education sector plan? Is it costed? (C) Have additional funds been committed to CD as a result? (C and G) Has a capacity building plan been produced in the context of EFA and UPC? What is the quality of this plan and of the strategies? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have contextual issues been taken into account in drafting the CD plan? Does the plan address institutional development and organizational environment issues? (C) What is the ownership of the plan, who manages it and who monitors it? Has there been wider participation of other stakeholders in defining the approach to and development of CD plan? (C) Has the 'niche' for EPDF activities been identified – against other CD funding? To what extent does the EPDF mechanism influence whether CD needs and resource requirements are embedded in the sector plan or not? (G and C) Have donor representatives/ lead/ task team leader with appropriate qualifications and experience been appointed to deal with ongoing developments? (C) Have appointments and post descriptions of those undertaking CD management within the MOE been made? (C) Has such an approach paid sufficient attention to cross-cutting issues such as gender, HIV&AIDS and equity – and included a concern for disability (G and C) <p>To what extent have the changes at this level resulted from the FTI activities and inputs identified at Level 1? (G and C)</p>	<p>Documents</p> <p>EPDF and other donor capacity development evaluations 'Project' documents on capacity development and reviews</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Key stakeholders, including donors and lead donor Task managers Universities and other training institutions Private training providers WB regional education managers TA/hired consultants for capacity development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Donor agendas prioritize capacity development of partner countries and sectors ➤ Donor funding sufficiently flexible to allow for adjustments based on specific capacity needs ➤ Stakeholders periodically held accountable for progress on capacity development ➤ EPDF funding made available in accordance with priority needs and in a timely manner ➤ Government staffing and human resource development plans in place and in line with key priorities of the education sector plan ➤ Government civil service mechanisms address factors which impact negatively on staff retention

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
2.5. AID EFFECTIVENESS			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Partners modify their way of operating globally and at country levels to ensure better coordination, harmonisation and alignment			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Greater clarity on mutual commitments and time frames among partners b. Increased aid flows globally and at country levels linked to education performance c. Aid commitments that are longer-term and more predictable d. Improved reporting of stakeholders' financial and technical contributions to the sector e. Increased use of aid modalities that are more harmonised and aligned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What instructions have headquarters of donor agencies, bilateral and multilateral, issued to their country teams to apply Paris Declaration harmonisation and alignment, etc. Which of their procedures, e.g. commitment to conduct bilateral reviews and evaluations, have they changed? (G)How have country and DP behaviour changed at country level in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mechanisms for dialogue, alignment and harmonisation use of country systems? • aid modalities and approaches (budget support, SWAps etc) • Agreed performance indicators and systems for joint review? (C)How have approaches to aid effectiveness in the education sector (especially basic education) evolved in comparison to other sectors? (C) • How effective has been the coordination between the education sector and national systems for planning, budgeting and aid management? (C) • How effective has been the coordination between central and local levels? (C and G) • To what extent have the changes at this level resulted from the FTI activities and inputs identified at Level 1? (C and G) • To what extent have the governance arrangements for FTI (a)met relevant criteria of legitimacy, representativeness, efficiency, effectiveness, etc; (b) affected FTI's influence, positively or negatively? (C and G) 	<p>Documents</p> <p>Literature related to Rome and Paris Declarations; monitoring of the implementation of the Paris Declaration</p> <p>Studies on use of country systems</p> <p>Literature on SWAps and budget support (with special reference to education sector)</p> <p>Donors' general and country reports and studies</p> <p>Comparison with other GRPPs</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Participants in global and country level aid management and coordination, from all relevant phases of FTI evolution and implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Country and leadership on donor coordination strong ➤ Donor HQ, regional and country levels interact and collaborate effectively to address bottlenecks to aid effectiveness ➤ Donors held accountable for progress on coordination, harmonisation and alignment at country and global levels ➤ Mechanisms for reviewing progress globally and at country level in place and effective in making decisions.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
Level THREE: INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES (Changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)			
3.1. EDUCATION POLICY AND PLANNING OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: Implementation of improved sector policies and plans, with support from all key stakeholders			
a. Implementation of national plans, including PRSP, that reflect greater priority for education sector b. Implementation of comprehensive education sector policies and plans designed to achieve UPC c. Implemented plans include clear measures to address issues such as HIV&AIDS, gender inequity, geographical disparities d. All key stakeholders engaged with and support national policies and plans for UPC. e. Mechanisms established for policy monitoring and review, including indicators on cross-cutting issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What overall difference has FTI made to national strategies as reflected in, e.g. PRSPs? (G and C) To what extent have strengthened sector policies and plans been implemented? What have been the limits and constraints on implementation? (C) How has the prioritisation of EFA and UPC affected the balance within the education sector and across sectors? (G and C) Is the education sector plan operational? Are policy commitments being implemented? Are budgetary commitments being funded? (C) To what extent are the activities of all stakeholders (including donor partners) aligned with the government plan? (C) Is there increased public understanding of education policy? (C) What is the legal framework within which FTI works? Are the legal and education policies aligned or contradictory? C(C) Is there parliamentary oversight at all? Or oversight by other ministries? (C)) To what extent can changes at this level be attributed to FTI inputs and activities? (G and C) 	<p>Documentation: GMRs etc Education policy and planning documents over time MOUs between donor groups and governments FTI status reports, and research Global Monitoring Reports Academic literature (CREATE, especially) Reports of EPDF Events and activities</p> <p>Interviews: Relevant parliamentary committees Ministers and Senior MoE officials over time Donor representatives Other stakeholders Media representatives FTI SC members</p> <p>Inventory: Compile an inventory of policy and planning document which show change over time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ PRSP process operational ➤ Strong MoE participation in the PRSP process ➤ Strong horizontal planning mechanisms with other key government ministries ➤ Strong, independent media ➤ Fora for public participation in education at all levels in place ➤ Systems for government accountability to Parliament in place and functional ➤ Donor agendas reflect priority for basic/primary education ➤ Donor agencies able to flexibly respond to changing priorities, including in terms of budget allocations ➤ Strong FTI governance mechanisms.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
3.2. EDUCATION FINANCE			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS: Domestic and external funding allocations to the education sector increased and better aligned with policy priorities			
<p>a. Costed ESP reflecting priorities, including cross-cutting issues, and sources of funding – available and endorsed by all stakeholders</p> <p>b. Domestic and external funding allocations for education increased at country and global levels</p> <p>c. Domestic and external funding allocations shifted to reflect priorities in ESP</p> <p>d. External funding modalities increasingly harmonised and aligned</p> <p>e. Funds allocated and disbursed efficiently by the CF/EPDF, if the country has met the relevant criteria</p> <p>f. CF/EPDF grants allocated as per needs identified at country level</p> <p>g. Annual financial monitoring reports available and of good quality</p>	<p><i>better policy alignment..</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there an ESP with a credible FF available? What specific financial provisions are included to deal with major challenges affecting the education sector such as HIV and AIDS, conflict, gender inequality and reaching disadvantaged groups? (C) What parts of government finalised and approved the ESP? Did the Ministry of Finance approve the FF? Which donor partners endorsed the ESP and FF? (C) <p><i>increased and more appropriate funding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is a comprehensive annual financial report available for the education sector? Has the quality of financial reporting improved? (C and G) Have domestic and external funding allocations for education increased? Have allocations increased beyond what would have been expected from past trends? What role has the CF played in any increase? (C and G) Have patterns of domestic and external funding allocations changed? Are shifts consistent with ESP priorities? (C and G) Are increasing amounts of external funding being allocated on-budget? (C and G) Has the duration of external funding commitments to education increased? (C and G) To what extent have donor partners been using common arrangements and flexible means of financial support? (C and G) What was the process for application and approval of the CF like? Were there any significant delays? Why? C(C) Are FTI processes (endorsement, processing of CF requests, triggering the flow of funds) consistent across countries? (C) Has the FTI CF and EPDF been distributed according to its criteria? How equitably has it been distributed? (G) To what extent can changes at this level be attributed to FTI inputs and activities? (G and C) 	<p>Documentation:</p> <p>ESP, FF & monitoring & implementation framework</p> <p>Education budgets</p> <p>End-of-year financial reports</p> <p>Donor financial reports</p> <p>Studies on education finance and planning (e.g. PERs)</p> <p>Education sector review documents</p> <p>FTI CF/EPDF financial reports</p> <p>Global education financial datasets (UIS, DAC)</p> <p>Studies on use of country systems</p> <p>Interviews:</p> <p>MoE</p> <p>Ministry of Finance</p> <p>Ministry of Planning</p> <p>LDG/LEG</p> <p>Key non-government stakeholders e.g. civil society, others involved in the LEG</p> <p>FTI secretariat</p> <p>CF/EPDF fund managers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Government adopts targets for education spending and is held accountable on progress ➤ MoE shows leadership and commitment in working with other government ministries ➤ Donors held accountable for progress on harmonisation and alignment ➤ Donors adopt multi-year commitments ➤ Development budgets of donor governments adjusted to reflect priority for basic education ➤ Economic growth ➤ CF made available in accordance with identified needs and in timely manner ➤ Country and sector level financial management, reporting and accountability strengthened

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
3.3. DATA AND M&E OVERALL HYPOTHESIS - Reports of education sector progress against agreed upon indicators inform decision making and funding allocations to the sector			
a. Improved understanding of areas of progress and of gaps that need to be addressed to achieve EFA, including on cross-cutting issues affecting the sector b. Key intermediate indicators and targets for measuring progress on EFA and UPE agreed upon among stakeholders, including indicators and targets on key cross-cutting issues c. Improved frequency and quality of reporting on progress towards EFA and UPC d. Improved capacity for data use and management at various levels of education systems reflected in quality reporting, and flow of information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has there been a qualitative improvement in data collection and dissemination? If yes, in what way? (G and C) If implemented, are indicators of quality of data systems monitored regularly? (G and C) Is data more widely available and more regularly distributed? (G and C) Is there any evidence of use of data for management at sub-national levels? (G and C) What evidence is there for increased capacity of data analysis at various levels of system (G and C) What is coverage of non-formal education, private sector data, etc? (G and C) To what extent can changes at this level be attributed to FTI inputs and activities? (G and C) 	<p>Documents</p> <p>Review of EMIS systems based on published articles (G and C)</p> <p>Review of a sample of JARs from FTI and non-FTI countries (G and C)</p> <p>Search for published or grey literature on sub-national analyses and classification by contributing authors (G and C)</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Directors of Planning (C)</p> <p>Main Providers(s) of Non-State Education (C)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ External institutions/ stakeholders (e.g. private institutions) effectively involved in sectoral coordination efforts and willing to share data ➤ Management systems in the sector link data generation and analysis to decision making at key levels of the system ➤ Human resources in place, trained, and motivated at all levels of the education system ➤ Fora for consultation and decision making among external stakeholders in place and functional ➤ FTI Governance arrangements favour accountability and decision making ➤ Political and cultural obstacles to evidence based decision making are overcome.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
3.4. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OVERALL HYPOTHESIS - Key capacity gaps in the sector addressed ensuring good quality policy, planning, budgeting, implementation and reporting in priority areas of the education plan			
a. Implementation of capacity and institutional development plan outlining priorities for each sub-sector and for different levels of the education plan b. Capacity development plan linked to UPC is implemented and monitored c. Mechanisms in place to assess effectiveness of capacity development efforts in terms of quantitative and qualitative gains for the system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What evidence is there that capacity in the sector overall has improved? And in what areas? (C) Is a CD plan being implemented? How and by whom is implementation being monitored? (C) Who decides what activities/modalities and levels of CD will be carried out? Have any evaluations of CD activities been carried out which demonstrate their effectiveness? (C) Are funding agency CD activities better aligned with country CD plans? (C) Have there been improvements in terms of capacity development approaches over time? (G and C) Has the EPDF helped address key capacity gaps? What use has been made of EPDF compared to FTI core funding for capacity building? (C and G) What changes are evident pre- and post- FTI/EPDF in terms of priority setting, resource allocation and monitoring of CD in the sector? (C) Has it resulted in funding agencies better aligning their activities with the CD plan over time? (C) What changes have there been among the donor community in terms of professional capacity as well as staffing? (G and C) Has policy around CD evolved? In what ways? Is this reflected in assessment and evaluation? (G and C) Are CD plans being periodically assessed and updated? (C) Is there better accountability on the impact of CD? (C and G) <p>To what extent can changes at this level be attributed to FTI inputs and activities? (C and G)</p>	<p>Documentation: EPDF and other donor capacity development evaluations ‘Project’ documents on capacity development and reviews</p> <p>Interviews: Key stakeholders, including donors and lead donor Task managers Universities and other training institutions Private training providers WB regional education managers TA/hired consultants for capacity development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Donor agendas prioritize capacity development of partner countries and sectors ➤ Donor funding sufficiently flexible to allow for adjustments based on specific capacity needs ➤ Stakeholders periodically held accountable for progress on capacity development ➤ EPDF funding made available in accordance with priority needs and in a timely manner ➤ Government staffing and human resource development plans in place and in line with key priorities of the education sector plan ➤ Government civil service mechanisms address factors which impact negatively on staff retention

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
3.5. AID EFFECTIVENESS			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – Improved predictability of aid flows to the sector and greater accountability of external stakeholders on their commitments to promoting UPC			
<p>a. Qualitative improvement in dialogue around education at country and global levels and greater awareness of constraints which need to be addressed</p> <p>b. External funding modalities increasingly harmonised and aligned</p> <p>c. Growing amount of money allocated and channelled through common funding mechanisms; reduction in parallel programmes</p> <p>d. Greater predictability of funding with increasing volumes of funds released</p> <p>e. Improved accountability of funding to education and of progress towards aid effectiveness in the sector</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there greater predictability of funding with increasing volumes of funds released in accordance with agreed schedules and as part of annual and multi-annual arrangements? (C and G) • Is there a growing amount of funding allocated and channelled through common funding mechanisms? (C and G) • Is there increased use of country systems for aid delivery? (C and G) • Are there indicators of improved accountability of funding to education and of progress towards aid effectiveness in the sector? (C and G) • Is there more effective dialogue among stakeholders in the sector, with respect to EFA and UPC targets and generally? (C and G) • To what extent can changes at this level be attributed to FTI inputs and activities? (C and G) • To what extent have the governance arrangements for FTI (a) met relevant criteria of legitimacy, representativeness, efficiency, effectiveness, etc; (b) affected FTI's influence, positively or negatively? (C and G) 	<p>Documents</p> <p>Literature related to Rome and Paris Declarations; monitoring of the implementation of the Paris Declaration</p> <p>Studies on use of country systems</p> <p>Literature on SWAp and budget support (with special reference to education sector)</p> <p>Donors' general and country reports and studies</p> <p>Comparison with other GRPPs</p> <p>Interviews</p> <p>Participants in global and country level aid management and coordination, from all relevant phases of FTI evolution and implementation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Country and leadership on donor coordination strong ➤ Donor HQ, regional and country levels interact and collaborate effectively to address bottlenecks to aid effectiveness ➤ Donors held accountable for progress on coordination, harmonisation and alignment at country and global levels ➤ Mechanisms for reviewing progress globally and at country level in place and effective in making decisions.

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
Level FOUR: OUTCOMES (Effects on quantity, access, quality and sustainability of basic education)			
4.A. EFFECTS ON THE QUANTITY OF BASIC EDUCATION PROVIDED OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI has helped to expand the provision of basic education.		Note: from here on streams of effects at previous levels are expected to converge. But different workstreams are still looking at characteristically different evidence; it should be fairly evident which workstream will be the principal source of evidence for each question.	
a. The provision of basic education services has increased. b. FTI has contributed to this increase in provision.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trends in numbers and proportion of children enrolled in and completing primary education. (G and C) Expenditure on basic education, in total and as percentage of all education expenditure and of all public expenditure. (G and C) Other indicators of inputs and service provision (teachers, teacher training, text books and learning materials, physical facilities) (C and G) Contribution of external aid to the financing of public expenditure. (G and C) Direct contributions of FTI to expenditure on UPC. (G and C) Indirect influences of FTI on patterns on domestic and external expenditure on basic education (G and C) 	Same documentary and interview sources of evidence as at previous levels. Particular role for interviews in helping to assess extent to which FT has contributed to results.	
4.B. EFFECTS ON ACCESS TO BASIC EDUCATION OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI has helped to expand access to basic education.			
a. There is greater access to basic education. b. FTI has helped to ensure greater access to basic education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall enrolment rates at country level. (C) Enrolment and completion rates by gender, geographical, social and ethnic groups within the country. (C) Global patterns of enrolment and completion. (G) Direct contributions of FTI in expanding access to primary education. (G and C) Indirect influences of FTI on policies and strategies that have expanded basic education (G and C) 	Same documentary and interview sources of evidence as at previous levels. Particular role for interviews in helping to assess extent to which FTII has contributed to results.	➤ Demand as well as supply for basic education

Main Evaluation Hypotheses	Information Required (detailed questions)	Sources of evidence	External factors/ Assumptions
4.C. EFFECTS ON THE QUALITY OF BASIC EDUCATION			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI has helped to maintain and improve the quality of basic education			
a. Basic education is of sufficient quality to provide lasting benefits to those completing the primary cycle. b. FTI has had a positive influence on the quality of basic education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on proxies of education quality (pupil/teacher ratios, teacher qualifications, completion rates etc (UPC) (G and C) Data on trends in learning outcomes. (G and C) Trends in continuation to higher levels of education. (G and C) Direct contributions of FTI in maintaining and improving the quality of basic education. (G and C) Indirect influences of FTI on policies and strategies that have maintained and improved the quality of basic education. (G and C) 	<i>Same documentary and interview sources of evidence as at previous levels.</i> <i>Particular role for interviews in helping to assess extent to which FTII has contributed to results.</i>	➤
4.D. EFFECTS ON THE SUSTAINABILITY OF BASIC EDUCATION			
OVERALL HYPOTHESIS – FTI has helped to secure improvements in provision, access and quality of basic education which are sustainable .			
a. Improvements in provision, access and quality of basic education are sustainable. b. FTI has helped to ensure the sustainability of these improvements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aggregate and unit costs of basic education (G and C) Balance between education sub-sectors, and between education and other sectors (G and C) Prospects for domestic financing of basic education (future trajectory of costs vs. domestic revenues)? (taking account of costs of provision for "hard to reach" children) (C and G) Is there adequate capacity to sustain and improve primary education provision? (C) Are there adequate data and systems to monitor education performance and adapt policy and expenditures in light of experience? (C) Are there effective mechanisms to maintain relevance, adequacy and effectiveness of aid to the sector? (C and G) Direct contributions of FTI towards ensuring the sustainability of progress towards UPC. (C and G) Indirect influences of FTI on policies and strategies that have ensured the sustainability of progress towards UPC. (G and C) 	<i>Same documentary and interview sources of evidence as at previous levels.</i> <i>Particular role for interviews in helping to assess extent to which FTII has contributed to results.</i>	➤ population growth ➤ economic growth ➤ sustained demand for primary education (in terms of pupils claiming places, in terms of political support for the prioritisation of UPC) ➤ aid commitments up to and beyond 2015
Level FIVE – IMPACT (The long term benefits derived from more children completing primary education)			
NOTE: The mid-term evaluation of FTI will not attempt to assess the effects of FTI at this level. However, a scoping study will assess the prospects, and make proposals, for monitoring and evaluating FTI impacts over the long term.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> enhanced learning, life skills and opportunities for individuals stronger local and national institutions personal and social benefits in education and other sectors (including health) economic growth due to increased human capital 			

Annex 5 Common Structure for Country Reports

Section/Chapter	To cover...	Related annexes/ comments
Executive Summary	highlights	5 page max./ mostly conclusions
PART A: APPROACH		
1. Introduction	Evaluation purpose, role of case studies, methodology, process for this country, outline of report	Standard text for this chapter and methodology annex provided to the country teams
PART B: EFA IN [COUNTRY]		
2. Country Background	Brief country information; national development strategy; aid relationships	
3. Basic Education in [Country]	Education system National education strategy Progress towards EFA Aid for basic education	This chapter to mention FTI where it is a significant part of the story, but not go into FTI details. Use FTI benchmarks (among other data) in charting sector progress.
PART C: THE FTI IN [COUNTRY]		
4. Overview of the FTI in [Country]	Careful chronological account of interactions between [country] and the FTI, including any CF and EPDF inputs and disbursements. Perspectives of different stakeholders on what FTI was, and what it was supposed to do. Basic design of the FTI intervention(s) and summary of activities and inputs so far.	[refer again to timeline annex – a timeline was produced for each country study team as part of their background information pack.]
5. FTI and Education Policy Planning	Each workstream chapter to cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• context• FTI inputs and activities• Relevance• Effectiveness• Efficiency]• Sustainability	In each case it is important to link the discussion to the hypotheses in the Evaluation Framework, and to assess the FTI contribution (+/-) to the EFA and aid effectiveness trends discussed in Part B.
6. FTI and Education Financing		
7. FTI and Data Gaps		
8. FTI and Capacity Development		
9. FTI and Aid Effectiveness		

Section/Chapter	To cover...	Related annexes/ comments
10. Cross-cutting Issues	Which CCIs are important in this country? how (and how well) have they been addressed by FTI?	Possible CCIs include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender • HIV/AIDS • Exclusion and equity (social, geographical) • Fragility
PART D: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
11. Conclusions	Overall conclusions on the main evaluation questions.	
12. Recommendations / reflections	Recommendations (country-specific) if appropriate, plus wider reflections of relevance to the Synthesis Report and the FTI generally	Be frugal with recommendations. May include recommendations for issues to be further investigated in other country studies and as part of main evaluation work.
References/Bibliography	Full references for documents (and websites etc) cited in the text, plus other key sources used.	
ANNEXES (illustrative)		
Annex A:	Methodology	Annexes in the sequence of their appearance in the main text.
Annex B:	Timeline	
Annex C:	People Met	
Annex D:	Basic Education Indicators	
Annex E:	Aid Data	
Annex F:	Education budgets and expenditure	
[final annex]	Analytical Summary Matrix	

Annex 6 Analytical Matrix for Country Studies

SUMMARY – COUNTRY X		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero? What was happening in country before FTI?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did a costed sector plan exist? Was it credible? Was it being implemented? What level of financing was available for the sector? What modalities were being used for financing by donors? What progress had been made on harmonisation and alignment in the sector? What were the key capacity issues? Was data available? Was the implementation of sector activities and achievements being adequately monitored? What were the key cross-cutting issues of relevance to the context? Were these being adequately addressed? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What main changes in policy, planning, financing, implementation, M&E and aid effectiveness took place in the sector over the evaluation period? What key inputs did FTI provide to this context? What main non-FTI inputs were provided? 		
Relevance - <i>Were the objectives of FTI support relevant? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy expenditure and service delivery)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to improving education sector policies, planning, data, budgeting, level of finance, delivery, monitoring and evaluation and aid effectiveness?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How economically was FTI support translated into results?</i>
<p>Were the objectives of FTI support overall relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country?</p> <p>Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has education policy improved and become more strategic? Are key stakeholders participating in the sector? Has funding to the sector increased? Is the funding gap for UPC/EFA closing? Has capacity for delivering education improved? Is key data available and are process and outcomes being better monitored and evaluated? Are cross-cutting issues being adequately addressed? Is aid being provided more effectively and is it better aligned? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to improvements in sector policies, planning, data, budgeting, level of finance, delivery M&E and aid effectiveness?
Outcomes: <i>What has been the effect on quantity, quality, access and sustainability of primary education?</i>		
<p>What effect has FTI had on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of primary education and movement towards the UPC target Positive effects on access and equity and in addressing key cross-cutting issues Positive effects on learning outcomes Sustainability of primary education provision and its quality 		
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place in policy and planning, finance, capacity, M&E and aid effectiveness interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How durable are the improvements? <p>Risks include:</p>		

STREAM 1: Policy and Planning		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero with respect to policy and planning? What was happening in country before FTI?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did a costed education sector plan exist? How comprehensive was the education sector plan? To what extent did it guide priority setting? What were the key sector policies? What strategies were in place for ensuring EFA and achieving UPC? How were HIV/AIDS, gender, equity and exclusion being addressed in the sector plan, in particular at primary level? How integrated and inclusive were educational planning processes? Did they include all major stakeholder groups, including at decentralized levels? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<p>FTI specific inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities to support the preparation/strengthening of education sector policy Activities aimed at supporting strategies for achieving UPC Activities to strengthen the planning process in the education sector. <p>Non FTI inputs into country-level education policy and planning in the period since FTI came in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education sector planning activities (Joint annual reviews, joint studies, development of sector or sub-sector policy proposals) Political and policy decisions related to EFA and UPC 		
Relevance - <i>Were the objectives of FTI support to policy and planning relevant? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to developing quality education plans encompassing UPC targets? To what extent did FTI contribute to implementation of sector policies?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How economically was FTI support to country level policy and planning translated into results?</i>
<p>Were the objectives of support to policy and planning in the sector relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country?</p> <p>Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has education policy improved and become more strategic? Do activities in the sector reflect the policy priorities? Are key education stakeholders actively participating in policy setting and planning processes? Are cross cutting issues such as gender, HIV/AIDS, equity and exclusion being adequately addressed in policy documents and as part of the planning process? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to improvements in terms of strengthening the scope, quality and inclusiveness of planning processes? How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs) in terms of support to policy relate to improvements which were observed in policy definition and prioritization in the sector?
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place in policy and planning interventions likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How durable are the improvements in the education planning process? Has leadership in the education sector on policy and planning issues improved and is this likely to continue? Are the changes in planning processes which took place well integrated in the sector's planning processes? And into overall national planning? <p>Risks include:</p>		

STREAM 2: Finance		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero with respect to education finance? What was happening in country before FTI?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was external and domestic finance adequate to meet UPC/EFA targets? Did a costed education sector plan exist? To what extent was it used to guide domestic and external resource allocation to education? How integrated were the key elements of the budget process: strategic planning, budget preparation, implementation, monitoring and reporting? How comprehensive was the budget? Are budget allocations similar to actual expenditure? What was the quality of public finance management (PFM)? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<p>FTI specific inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities to support financial planning e.g. costing the sector plan, assessing funding gaps [technical assistance, tools etc.] Activities to mobilize domestic and external funds e.g. consultations with various govt and donor stakeholders during the endorsement process and just afterwards, application to the CF <p>Non FTI inputs into country-level financial planning and resource mobilization in the education sector in the period since FTI came in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing budget cycle activities e.g. annual budget and MTEF preparation, Activities to strengthen PFM Education sector planning activities e.g. costing exercises, joint annual reviews (in relation to finance) 		
Relevance - <i>Were the objectives of FTI support to education finance relevant? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to a stronger education budget process? To what extent did FTI contribute to the increase in total funds for primary education?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How economically was FTI support to country level finance for education translated into results?</i>
<p>Were the objectives of FTI support for education finance aligned with the country's overall development strategy and education sector strategy (if one was in place before FTI)?</p> <p>Were the FTI supported finance activities appropriate (likely to meet the objectives) given the context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the education budget process more comprehensive, transparent and efficient? Has there been an increase in: (i) total funds for primary education; (ii) funds from domestic sources for primary education; (iii) funds from external sources for primary education? Is the funding gap for achieving UPC/EFA closing? Are funds for primary education better aligned with policy priorities? Are they getting to beneficiaries? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs etc) in terms of support to financial planning relate to the improvements observed in the education budget process? How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs etc) in terms of support to resource mobilisation relate to the additional resources raised for primary education? How efficient are disbursement procedures for primary education? Do resources for primary education reach beneficiaries quickly with minimal transaction costs? Has FTI contributed to any improvements in this area? How predictable is domestic and external finance for primary education in the short and medium term? Has FTI contributed to any improvements in this area?
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place in the education budget process and the level of finance for primary education likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How durable are the improvements in the education budget process? Given the macroeconomic outlook for the country, does the increase in domestic finance for primary education look affordable going forward? Does the increase in external finance for primary education look likely going forward? [based on interviews with donors, prospects for further support from the CF] <p>Risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		

STREAM 3: Data and Monitoring & Evaluation		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero with respect to data and M&E? What was happening in country before FTI? Was quality and use of data relevant to the context and to the monitoring needs of the education strategies?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was comprehensive data on the education sector being collected? Was data accessible to all key stakeholders? Did this include data on key cross-cutting issues? Were monitoring and evaluation processes for the education sector and its key sub-sectors in place? How were data and monitoring & evaluation processes linked to key moments in educational planning? Were data and the key outcomes of monitoring and evaluation processes being used for decision making at centralized and decentralized levels? Which, if any, of the indicators from the FTI Indicative Framework (IF) were being monitored? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<p>FTI specific inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities to strengthen the scope and processes of data (e.g. setting up/strengthening EMIS) Activities to strengthen monitoring & evaluation processes (e.g. Joint Annual Reviews, commissioning of key studies) Activities to improve linkages between the data and monitoring & evaluation processes and the planning processes in the sector Activities to ensure data and monitoring & evaluation processes included key cross-cutting issues (HIV/AIDS, gender, equity and exclusion) Activities to ensure inclusion of the IF indicators in the endorsed plan and in mechanisms for subsequent monitoring of its implementation <p>Non FTI inputs into country-level education data and monitoring and evaluation in period since FTI came in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other key activities and decisions which strengthened the sector's capacity to generate good quality data and to regularly monitor & evaluate processes and outcomes in the period since FTI came in (including inputs from other sectors e.g. Ministry of Planning) 		
Relevance - <i>Were the objectives of FTI support relevant to data and M&E needs? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to improved collection of data and better information services? To what extent is there better use of data to inform policy and funding?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How economically was support to country data and M&E translated into results?</i>
<p>Were the objectives of support to data and monitoring in the sector relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country?</p> <p>Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is more reliable and better quality data being generated? Does this include data on cross-cutting issues? Is data more accessible to all the stakeholders in the sector? Is data being better used to inform policy making, planning processes and funding decisions? Is there evidence that decision making at decentralized and central levels is being consistently informed by data and monitoring & evaluation processes? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs) in terms of support to data collection relate to improvements which were observed in the generation, use and dissemination of data? How efficiently were government systems used for data collection and management? Was their better harmonization of donor requirements for performance indicators, with corresponding efficiency gains? How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transactions costs) in terms of strengthening monitoring & evaluation processes relate to stronger decision making and planning processes?
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place data and M&E management likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well are the improvements in data collection and monitoring & evaluation integrated in the regular decision and planning processes of the sector? How durable are the improvements in data collection, processing and dissemination and in the monitoring & evaluation processes? <p>Risks include:</p>		

STREAM 4: Capacity		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero with respect to capacity? To what extent was the capacity adequate for EFA and UPC targets?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What capacity was in place for delivery of (basic) education prior to FTI? What were the key capacity concerns, in particular with respect to achieving UPC? What strategies were in place for addressing the capacity constraints? Was there a capacity development (CD) plan? Did this include capacity to address cross-cutting issues? Did the CD strategies cover capacity with respect to key cross-cutting issues (HIV/AIDS, gender, equity and exclusion)? How well were the strategies for addressing capacity concerns being implemented and funded? How was capacity in the sector being monitored? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<p>FTI specific inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities to plan for, support and monitor capacity development (e.g. CD plan, training, workshops) Activities related to better understanding and addressing contextual constraints to capacity (e.g. human resource assessments, involving other sector ministries in discussions on capacity issues) EPDF inputs or capacity development component within a programme supported by the CF? <p>Non-FTI specific inputs to capacity assessment and capacity building in the period since FTI came in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other capacity building strategies were put in place and what specific activities (non-FTI) took place during the period 		
Relevance - <i>Were the objectives of FTI support to policy and planning relevant? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to implementation of measures to strengthen capacity? To what extent was quality capacity created to implement policy and services?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How economically was FTI support to country level capacity building translated into results?</i>
Were the objectives of support to capacity development in the sector relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country? Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context? (Did design include use of government systems? If not, why not?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does a clear strategy and approach exist for strengthening the planning and implementation capacity in the sector? Does this include capacity on key cross-cutting issues? Is capacity development being prioritized and funded? Is the approach to capacity strengthening in the sector more harmonized? Is there a technical assistance strategy and plan for the sector? Is it being followed by key partners? Is capacity development being monitored? Is key capacity in place for the management and delivery of basic education? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs) in terms of support to capacity strengthening relate to improvements which were observed in the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) understanding of key capacity issues B) strategies for addressing the key constraints identified
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place in capacity likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How durable are the achievements in addressing key capacity issues? <p>Risks include:</p>		

STREAM 5: Aid Effectiveness		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero with respect to aid effectiveness? What was happening in the sector before FTI? To what extent was aid for education efficiently & effectively provided?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How efficiently and effective was aid delivery to the education sector before FTI? What mechanisms and modalities were being used for aid delivery by donors? What mechanisms were in place for improving aid effectiveness in terms of sector dialogue, funding mechanisms, predictability, accountability? How committed and involved were key stakeholders to ensuring aid effectiveness? How were processes to improve aid effectiveness in the education sector linked to other processes on-going in the country? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<p>FTI specific inputs to improving aid effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonization of mechanisms for dialogue regarding FTI with overall sector dialogue Harmonization of financing mechanism (i.e. What modality did FTI use for the provision of aid through the catalytic fund? What was the time-scale and predictability of funding, and did the financing include recurrent costs? Predictability and accountability Use of government planning, financial, disbursement, reporting, and monitoring & evaluation systems <p>Non-FTI specific inputs to improving of aid effectiveness during the period since FTI came in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities promoted by other stakeholders to harmonize and align with government systems, including changes in modalities for aid delivery and in predictability of funding during the FTI period Activities promoted by other stakeholder to improve accountability 		
Relevance - <i>Was FTI support to aid effectiveness relevant? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector policy, expenditure and service delivery)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to more international aid, and to aid that is better, coordinated and more coherent with domestic efforts in the sector?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How efficiently was aid delivered?</i>
<p>Was aid management and delivery designed in ways that are consistent with the Paris and Accra principles concerning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonisation among donors? Alignment with country priorities? Alignment with government systems? Focus on results? Mutual accountability? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are harmonized mechanisms in place for sector dialogue? Are harmonized mechanisms in place for funding to sector priorities? Is there greater predictability of funding to the sector? Has the volume of (present and future) aid been increased appropriately? Is there greater accountability by donors? Has the quality of overall aid to the sector improved? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs) in terms of support to aid effectiveness relate to improvements which were observed in sector dialogue, in predictability of funding, and accountability?
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place with respect to aid effectiveness likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How likely is it that the achievements in aid effectiveness will be sustained over time? (including the likelihood of appropriate medium to long term predictable aid to the education sector) 		
Key risks are:		

STREAM 6: Cross-Cutting Issues (HIV/AIDS, gender, equity and exclusion)		
Context: <i>What was the situation at level zero with respect to cross-cutting issues? What was happening in country before FTI?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were HIV/AIDS, gender, equity and exclusion issues adequately mainstreamed in the education sector plan? How important were each of these cross cutting issues in context of EFA and UPC and given the context and challenges at the time? Did clear strategies exist for addressing the key cross-cutting issues? Was funding and technical capacity available for implementation of these strategies? Was progress with respect to these cross-cutting issues being monitored? How strong was MoE leadership on cross-cutting issues? Were stakeholders being involved in planning for, implementing and addressing the key cross-cutting issues? 		
Inputs: <i>What did FTI do? What problems did it identify and how did it address them? What non-FTI inputs and processes took place over the same period?</i>		
<p>FTI specific inputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activities aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the key cross cutting issues (studies, training, technical support, technical discussions, reviews, etc.) Activities aimed at ensuring cross-cutting issues are integrated in sector planning, implementation and monitoring processes <p>Non FTI inputs aimed at ensuring that relevant cross-cutting issues are understood and mainstreamed into policy, implementation and monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Studies Political and policy decisions related to cross-cutting issues Capacity building in the sector 		
Relevance - <i>Were the objectives of FTI support to cross cutting issues relevant? Was the design appropriate?</i>	Immediate effects and intermediate outcomes: <i>What were the effects and intermediate outcomes on the sector in terms of effectiveness, and efficiency? (Immediate effects refer to processes, intermediate outcomes refer to changes in sector planning and implementation with respect to cross-cutting issues)</i>	
	Effectiveness – <i>To what extent did FTI contribute to improved strategies to address cross cutting issues? To what extent did FTI contribute to implementation of these strategies?</i>	Efficiency - <i>How economically was FTI support to cross cutting issues translated into results?</i>
<p>Were the objectives of support to cross-cutting issues relevant to the priorities of the sector and of the country?</p> <p>Was the manner in which the support was provided appropriate to the needs and the context?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are relevant cross-cutting issues better mainstreamed in the education sector plan and in the planning process? Have clear strategies been put in place for addressing the gaps with respect to the relevant cross-cutting issues? Is more reliable and better quality data being generated on progress with respect to cross-cutting issues? Has capacity with respect to cross-cutting issues improved and does this reflect the priorities of the sector? What was FTI's contribution to each of the above? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transactions costs) relate to improvements in terms of strengthening the focus on cross-cutting issues in sector planning, implementation and monitoring processes? How does the volume of FTI inputs (time, transaction costs) relate to improvements in terms of improved capacity in the sector to address cross-cutting issues?
Sustainability: <i>Are the changes that took place in the manner in which cross-cutting issues are addressed likely to survive? How resilient are the benefits to risks?</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How durable are the improvements that have been made in the planning, implementation and monitoring for key cross-cutting issues? Has leadership in the education sector on cross-cutting issues improved and is this likely to continue? Is the capacity that was created likely to be sustained? <p>Risks include:</p>		

References

- ADEA 2008 *Beyond Primary Education: Challenges and Approaches to Expanding Learning Opportunities in Africa*. Biennale on Education in Africa, Maputo, Mozambique. L'Association pour le developpement de l'education en Afrique (ADEA), May 2008.
- Allsop et al 2009 *Ghana Case Study: Country Visit Note*. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Terry Allsop, Ramlatu Attah, Tim Cammack, Eric Woods 28 May 2009
- Allsop et al 2010 *Ghana Country Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Terry Allsop, Ramlatu Attah, Tim Cammack and Eric Woods, February 2010
- Bartholomew et al 2009 *Mozambique Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, Tuomas Takala and Zuber Ahmed 12 June 2009.
- Bartholomew 2010a *Vietnam Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, February 2010.
- Bartholomew 2010b *Zambia Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, February 2010.
- Bartholomew et al 2010 *Mozambique Country Case Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, Tuomas Takala, and Zuber Ahmed, 2010.
- Bruns et al 2003 *Achieving Universal Primary Education for All by 2015: A Chance for Every Child*. Washington: World Bank. Barbara Bruns, Alain Mingat, and Ramahatra Rakotomalala, 2003.
- Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009a *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: The Evaluation Framework- Evaluation Team Guidelines on Process and Methodology*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM, January 2009.
- Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009b *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Preliminary Report*. draft, 4 April 2009. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM.
- Cambridge Education, Mokoro & OPM 2009c *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Preliminary Report*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM, 25 May 2009.
- Carr-Hill 2009 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 3, Issues in Data and Monitoring and Evaluation*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Roy Carr-Hill, 28th June 2009.
- Chiche 2010a *Mali Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Mailan Chiche, February 2010.
- Chiche 2010b *Rwanda Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Mailan Chiche, February 2010.
- Chiche et al 2009 *Etude de cas Burkina Faso: Note de visite pays FTI Mid-Term Evaluation*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Mailan Chiche, Elsa Duret, Clare O'Brien and Serge Bayala, 20 May 2009.
- Chiche et al 2010 *Burkina Faso Country Case Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and, OPM. Mailan Chiche, Elsa Duret, Clare O'Brien, and Serge Bayala, February 2010.

Dom 2009a	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 6 FTI and Fragile States and Fragile Partnerships.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, 9 January 2009.
Dom 2009b	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 6 FTI and Fragile States and Fragile Partnerships Literature Review.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, 9 January 2009.
Dom 2010	<i>Ethiopia Country Desk Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, February 2010.
Duret et al 2009	<i>Yemen Case Study: Country Visit Note, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Elsa Duret, Stephen Jones and Hassan Abdulmalik, 29 June 2009.
Duret et al 2010	<i>Yemen Country Case Study, Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Hassan Abdulmalik, Elsa Duret and Stephen Jones, February 2010.
FTI 2004	<i>Accelerating progress towards quality universal primary education: Framework.</i> FTI, 2004.
FTI 2007	<i>Steering Committee Meeting Minutes.</i> FTI, May 2007.
FTI 2008	<i>FTI Catalytic Fund Committee Minutes.</i> FTI, April 2008.
IEG 2007	<i>Sourcebook for Evaluating Global and Regional Partnership Programs: Indicative Principles and Standards.</i> Washington: World Bank. Independent Evaluation Group, 2007.
Lister et al 2009	<i>Pakistan Case Study: Country Visit Note, Mid-Term Evaluation of the Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Stephen Lister, Masooda Bano, Roy Carr-Hill, 18 July 2009.
Lister et al 2010	<i>Pakistan Country Case Study.</i> Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Stephen Lister, Masooda Bano, Roy Carr-Hill and Ian MacAuslan. February 2010.
Mokoro and ODI 2009	<i>Sector Budget Support in Practice: Synthesis Report.</i> Mokoro and ODI, Tim Williamson and Catherine Dom, Final Draft, 28 November 2009.
O'Brien 2010	<i>Moldova Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Clare O'Brien, February 2010.
OECD DAC 2002	<i>Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management [in English, French and Spanish].</i> Paris: OECD DAC (DAC Working Party on Aid Evaluation), 2002.
OECD DAC 2005	<i>Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.</i> High Level Forum, Paris February 28th to March 2nd 2005. OECD, 2005.
OECD DAC 2006	<i>DAC Evaluation Quality Standards,</i> Paris, OECD DAC, March 2006.
Purcell et al 2009	<i>Cambodia Case Study: Country Visit Note.</i> Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ray Purcell, Abby Riddell, George Taylor, Khieu Vicheanon. 8 February 2009
Purcell 2010	<i>Uganda Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM, Ray Purcell, February 2010.
Purcell et al 2010	<i>Cambodia Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ray Purcell, Abby Riddell, George Taylor and Khieu Vicheanon, February 2010.
Ravallion 2005	<i>Evaluating Anti-Poverty Programs.</i> Development Research Group, World Bank. Martin Ravallion, 2005.
Rawle 2009	<i>Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 2: Finance and Public Financial Management,</i> Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM: Georgina Rawle, 28 June 2009.

- Rawle 2010 *Malawi Country Desk Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Georgina Rawle, February 2010.
- Riddell 2009 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 4: Preliminary Paper on Capacity Development.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro, OPM. Abby Riddell, 26 February 2009.
- Santcross et al 2009 *Nigeria Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Nick Santcross; Keith Hinchliffe, Anthea Sims Williams; Sulliemman Adediran and Felicia Onibon. 07 June 2009
- Santcross et al 2010 *Nigeria Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Nick Santcross; Keith Hinchliffe, Anthea Sims Williams; Sulliemman Adediran and Felicia Onibon. February 2010.
- Steer & Wathne 2009 *Achieving Universal Basic Education – Constraints and Opportunities in Donor Financing.* ODI. Lisebet Steer and Cecile Wathne, 2009.
- Thomson et al 2009 *Kenya Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Anne Thomson, Eric Woods, Clare O'Brien and Eldah Onsomu 17 February 2009.
- Thomson et al 2010 *Kenya Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Anne Thomson; Eric Woods, Clare O'Brien and Eldah. Onsomu, February 2010.
- Visser-Valfrey 2009 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 5b: Governance.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro, OPM. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, 24 March 2009,
- Visser-Valfrey et al 2009 *Nicaragua Case Study: Country Visit Note. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, Elisabet Jané, Dan Wilde, Marina Escobar 17 June 2009
- Visser-Valfrey et al 2010 *Nicaragua Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Muriel Visser-Valfrey, Eli. Jané, Daniel Wilde, and Marina. Escobar, February 2010..
- White 2009 *Working Paper 3b: Impact Evaluation Scoping Study, Prepared for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Education For All Fast Track Initiative,* International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie). Howard White, draft, 11 March 2009.
- Woods 2009 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Working Paper 1: Preliminary Paper on Education Policy and Planning.* Cambridge Education, Mokoro, OPM. Eric Woods, 29 March 2009.