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1 How to use this report

What is the purpose of this report?

The purpose of this report is to summarise the use of Outcome Harvesting (OH) as part of the final evaluation of CSEF III, conducted by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER). This document serves as a more extensive description of the methodology, process and findings, which are summarised in the main evaluation report, in particular in Section 4.3.

We used an OH approach as a means to explore the breadth of intended and unintended outcomes achieved by CSEF, working backwards to understand how the programme has contributed to these changes. We used OH to respond to three of our evaluation questions:

- **EQ2 Effectiveness**: To what extent did CSEF III achieve its objectives, as set out in the CSEF III results framework?
- **EQ6 Impact**: What are the intended and unintended changes, at global and regional levels, brought about by CSEF III and in what ways has the programme contributed to these changes?
- **EQ7 Impact**: What are the intended and unintended changes, at national and local levels, brought about by CSEF III and in what way has the programme contributed to these changes?

Who is this report meant for?

This document is meant for GCE and its partners as the evaluation client, as means to describe the findings from our OH in more detail, as well as the process undertaken to derive these. It is also meant to be accessible for the general public who would like to learn more about the changes that have resulted from the CSEF III programme and about OH as a method and its use in the CSEF III evaluation.

How is the report organised?

Section 2 provides a comprehensive discussion of the methodology and process undertaken for each of the steps of OH. Section 3 provides detailed OH findings of the online survey. Section 4 expands on mechanisms and significance of the nine outcomes that had the highest number of responses, drawing on responses from the online survey, as well as providing examples from case study countries. In Section 5, we provide conclusions of our findings from the OH process for the wider evaluation while Section 6 summarises the takeaways from the use of OH as part of the CSEF III evaluation.

What are the limitations of this report?

This report is mainly descriptive and it is meant to give a snapshot of the outcomes achieved by CSEF III as reported by coalitions. The description of CSEF III and wider background to the evaluation and its components can be found in the final evaluation report. This report supports our wider evaluation in providing additional information and insight into what the programme has achieved during its lifetime (2016 – 2019). When discussing the findings, we make informed connections between outcomes and the programme’s contribution based on our evaluation of the programme and the self-reported perceptions of coalitions, but we do not claim direct causal links.
2 Outcome Harvesting (OH) methodology

2.1 Rationale for using OH as part of the CSEF III Endline Evaluation

OH is an evaluation approach that has two purposes. Firstly, it is a participatory approach that values the input of both evaluation users and programme participants to validate and better understand the outcomes achieved by the programme. Secondly, it is an approach suited to evaluate complex programmes that involve multiple pathways to impact from different actors, such as CSEF III. It works backwards from the changes created by the programme to understand ‘how and why’ changes occurred.

For the evaluation of CSEF III, we used OH to achieve the following:

1. To better understand if and in what ways the intended outcomes and impacts of the programme (as defined in the programme’s theory of change (TOC) and results framework) were achieved;
2. To identify unintended or unexpected outcomes and impacts, whether positive or negative, to support programme learning; and
3. To build evidence of the presence or absence of intended or unintended outcomes and impacts, by providing a systematic way of triangulating and building cases for the evidence.

2.2 What is an outcome?

For the purposes of OH, the ‘outcomes’ identified do not necessarily correspond to the outcomes as specified in CSEF’s TOC and results framework. Instead, we use ‘outcome’ to refer to any of the changes that occur as a result of the actions of the programme. For instance, these can be the changes in knowledge, attitudes, behaviours, levels of dedication, relationships, activities, actions, policies, or practices.

Outcomes should be:

- **Observable**: evidence of associated changes in behaviour, relationships, actions, policies, or practices, which can be verified.
- **Contributory**: credible link between the change agent and the outcome (can be direct, indirect, partial, or even unintended).
- **Credible**: contributions are often not linear or straightforward, however, there must be a link of plausible cause and effect

Changes can also be non-actions, negative outcomes, or intended and unintended outcomes.

These changes should be initiated by what a ‘change agent’ did or is doing. Here, a ‘change agent’ is anyone participating in the CSEF programme and taking action and attempting to initiate change. In CSEF, change agents can be either individuals or organisations and can be working at national, regional, and global levels.

2.3 Overview of the OH process

Our implementation of the OH process has been designed in collaboration with evaluation users to ensure that their needs for and uses of the evaluation are at the forefront. Each step of the OH
process relied on iterative efforts of data collection and triangulation to ensure that our findings are rigorous and evidenced. This involved collecting data from multiple sources, assessing the strength of evidence, and engaging with multiple stakeholders throughout the process.

Our evaluation followed the six traditional steps used in OH: evaluation design, document analysis, outcome validation through stakeholder engagement, outcome substantiation through stakeholder engagement, analysis and interpretation of findings and final reporting (see Figure 1).

**Figure 1. OH process**

1. Evaluation Design
   Virtual inception meeting with GCE and inception report sign-off

2. Document analysis to identify initial outcomes
   Review and analysis of programme documentation

3. Engage with stakeholders to formulate and validate outcomes
   Two virtual workshops with representatives from national, regional and global levels

4. Engage with stakeholders to substantiate outcomes
   Online survey sent to all NECs and RSs plus case studies of a sample of six NECs

5. Analyse and interpret findings

6. Final report that supports the use of the findings

2.3.1 Evaluation design

The purpose of this step was to ensure that there is clarity and agreement on what questions the evaluation will answer and on what information is to be collected. For our evaluation, this first step was encompassed in the inception phase. We engaged closely with GCE to verify our understanding of the needs of the evaluation through a virtual kick-off meeting and inception report presentation. The ideas from these conversations, which were summarised in the Inception Report, allowed us to develop the tools and guides for data collection in the successive steps of the evaluation.

2.3.2 Document analysis

**Harvesting initial outcomes**

The purpose of this step was to identify potential outcomes (from programme reporting and other ‘learning’ documents produced by the programme) that have emerged across the programme, which are the result of the programme’s actions.

We consulted with GCE to collect available documents relevant to the evaluation. We then conducted an initial review in order to establish a sample of documents which ensured that outcomes at the national, regional global level were reflected in the harvest. This step was also useful for gathering information pertinent to the learning aims of the evaluation.
We established a sample of 27 NECs from which we harvested outcomes. Outcomes were harvested from both the progress reporting and proposals submitted by the NEC, which are logged as part of the online Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) platform. The sample size was based on the principle of saturation, whereby the amount of documents was deemed sufficient when new data was not adding new information\(^1\). We aimed to achieve 40% coverage of population of NECs, while also ensuring that the distribution was proportional across regions (see distribution in Table 1.). Within this distribution, NECs were selected at random for review.

### Table 1. Documentary review sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Documents reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National reporting</td>
<td>Programme reporting from 2016-2019 from 27 NECs; 51% from Africa, 30% from APAC, 11% from ME&amp;EE and 8% from LAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and regional reporting</td>
<td>39 programme documents, including CSEF progress reports and CSEF learning materials at the global and regional level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpreting the initial outcomes**

In our initial harvest, we identified a total of 204 outcomes from the review of over 50 documents. We mapped our outcomes to Coffman and Beer’s Advocacy Strategy Framework\(^2\) in order to identify typologies of outcomes achieved by the CSEF III programme and which were common across the portfolio. These are based on the type of change produced and the change targets. We identified three types of changes:

- **Awareness or knowledge**: refers to the development of abilities and includes general changes to knowledge and awareness levels as a result of exposure to information, training and research.
- **Will or attitudes**: refers to changes in motivation and cohesion. This includes changes to someone's opinions or belief, the intensity of those beliefs, the salience of those beliefs and changes to one's capacity levels for action.
- **Action**: refers to generating opportunities, including efforts to change policy. The goal here is to incite an action/reaction that otherwise would not have normally taken place.

We also identified three types of change targets, or actors who are the subject of the above types of change:

- **Coalitions**: this includes the NEC itself (including its individual staff members) as well as changes to the wider coalition membership and movement (e.g. training or raising awareness amongst coalition member groups, building coalition cohesion, increasing coalition diversity, etc.).
- **Public**: refers to changes targeted towards the wider community and public, including: specific education stakeholder groups (parents, teachers, unions, service providers, or

---

\(^1\) https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20204937/

students themselves), general citizens and service users, policy influencers such as media, community leaders, thought leaders, and other policy champions.

- **Decision-makers**: refers to those who make decisions that influence policy, both directly and indirectly. This may include elected officials, administrators, judges, civil servants, as well as donors or international institutions who may influence policy direction.

Our adapted advocacy framework is summarised in Table 2 (below).

**Table 2. Adapted advocacy framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of change</th>
<th>Action (3)</th>
<th>Will (2)</th>
<th>Knowledge (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coalition (1)</strong></td>
<td>Participation in working groups, international forums, consultations, drafting policy proposals, generating research</td>
<td>Change in attitudes/perceptions of coalition, including salience of particular education issues</td>
<td>Includes capacity building within coalition (secretariat and members), awareness raising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public (2)</strong></td>
<td>Participation in meetings, discussion, consultations, protests; increased community action in support of issues</td>
<td>Change in attitudes/perceptions, increased willingness of public groups to act in support of issue; changed importance of / salience of particular issues for the public</td>
<td>Training, capacity building of parents/teachers/ etc., mass media campaigns, general awareness and distribution of information to the wider public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision-makers (3)</strong></td>
<td>Active policy change, or efforts to change policy</td>
<td>Political will; demonstration of political commitment (public declarations, speeches etc.), participation in meetings</td>
<td>Providing research to decision makers, meetings to raise awareness of key issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (below) presents a summary of the distribution of our initial outcomes across our adapted Advocacy Framework. In our initial documentary review, 39% of the outcomes harvested targeted coalitions, 31% targeted the wider public and 29% targeted change in decision-makers. Half of the outcomes were focused on awareness or knowledge that a problem or a potential solution exists.
Building on the initial OH tool, we conducted an internal workshop to refine and consolidate the initial 204 harvested outcomes into 18 types of outcomes.

### 2.3.3 Validating outcome types through the OH workshops

The next step of the OH engaged programme stakeholders to review, validate, and refine our initial 18 outcome types and to identify additional relevant outcomes that might be missing. We engaged stakeholders from CSEF’s national, regional and global levels in two three-hour virtual workshops. The aim of these sessions was to discuss each outcome type in turn and explore:

- Whether the definition of the outcome is clear and an accurate description of CSEF experiences, and whether this outcome was intended or unintended
- Examples of the different mechanisms pursued by coalitions to achieve the outcome and whether they were successful or not and why
- The ways in which CSEF inputs have supported the outcome, and other external enablers and barriers
- The likelihood of sustainability of the outcome, if achieved
- Identify any additional outcomes not captured in the programme documentation.

We conducted the virtual workshops on 30 March 2020 and 1 April 2020, with a total of 27 participants representing national, regional and global levels: twelve NECs (with representation of all regions), four Regional Secretariats and GCE.

As a result of the OH workshops we validated 11 outcomes, merged four outcomes into two, refined two outcome statements. One outcome was invalidated, while two new outcomes emerged. This produced a final list of **17 outcome types** that we brought forward to the substantiation stage. The final list of outcomes is presented in Section 3 of this report.

---

3 Originally planned to be face to face workshops, were moved to a virtual setting upon the outbreak and spread of Covid-19 pandemic.
2.3.4 Outcome substantiation – online survey and case studies

In this step, we expanded (substantiated) our understanding of the 17 outcome types, by exploring the breadth with which they occurred across the CSEF programme through an online survey, and explored these outcomes in depth through the use of case studies. In line with this, we continued to engage with programme stakeholders in order to gather evidence to support the outcome descriptions, enhance the reliability of the outcomes, and to enrich our understanding of how the different outcomes relate to one another.

To understand the extent and breadth of these experiences, we conducted an online survey with a wider pool of CSEF participants. The aims of the online survey were to capture the views of each coalition (national and regional) on:

- Which outcomes emerged in their specific contexts, who did they target, when did the outcomes occur, what strategies were used, the extent of CSEF contribution, the type of evidence to support the outcomes, and the likelihood of sustainability after CSEF.
- Each coalition’s experience with the CSEF programme more broadly, in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The survey primarily consisted of multiple choice and Likert scale questions, with one open-ended question to expand on the significance of each outcome to the particular context of the coalition. We administered the survey in the five CSEF reporting languages (English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Portuguese), through the online platform SurveyMonkey. All CSEF national coalitions and Regional Secretariats were invited to participate. We received a high response rate, where all but four coalitions (in the Africa region) responded to the survey (Table 4).

**Table 4. Online survey response rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Invited to participate</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National coalitions</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME&amp;EE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the survey respondents, 67% of participants completed the survey in English, 19% in French, 8% in Spanish, 3% in Arabic and 3% in Portuguese.
The online survey results allowed us to triangulate and contextualise the qualitative findings to support the outcome statements and the process and learning areas of the evaluation. More detail on the online survey of OH findings is presented in Section 3 of this report, and Section 4.3 of the main report.

In addition, we used the online survey findings to inform our sampling for case studies. For our case studies, a ‘case’ is defined as a national coalition. We selected a sample of six cases in total; this is an increase from four as specified in the inception report, and afforded as the case studies we conducted were virtual and did not require travel. The cases were purposively selected based on the results of the online survey, which has allowed us to identify:

- Which outcomes are significant across the wider portfolio
- Which outcomes were particularly significant to which coalitions

We selected coalitions who represented some of the more significant outcomes that have been identified across the portfolio, as well as coalitions to represent a diversity of the significant outcomes. Finally, we balanced case selection to ensure that the cases represented:

- A diversity of regional representation
- A diversity of coalition maturity and depth of experience with CSEF
- A diversity of contexts (e.g. FCAS, non-FCAS)

Our final sample and sampling criteria for case studies is presented below (Table 5).

**Table 5. Case study sample and selection criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Coalition</th>
<th>Sampling criteria and justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>The Togolese National Coalition for Education for All (CNT / EPT)</td>
<td>Reported most of outcomes materialised FCAS, mature coalition, EOL eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>National Campaign for Education (NCE)</td>
<td>Reported most of outcomes materialised Non-FCAS, mature coalition, EOL eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somaliland</td>
<td>The Somaliland Network on Education for All (SOLNEFA)</td>
<td>Reported unintended outcomes FCAS, nascent coalition, EOL eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Albanian Coalition for Child Education (ACCE)</td>
<td>Reported unintended outcomes Non-FCAS, mature coalition, not eligible for EOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands⁴</td>
<td>Coalition for Education Solomon Islands (COESI)</td>
<td>Reported outcomes which were intended but did not happen Non-FCAS, mature coalition, EOL eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>The Forum for Education and Human Development of the Initiative for Nicaragua (FEDH IPN)</td>
<td>Reported outcomes which were intended but did not happen Non-FCAS, mature coalition, EOL eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Our original sample included Solomon Islands, however due to connectivity challenges it was not possible for the coalition to participate within the available time to complete the case study, therefore this case study is not included in the final sample.
The case studies aimed to consolidate evidence around the outcomes as well as to provide details and examples to illustrate their development and significance at both the national level and more broadly for the programme. The case study approach consisted of conducting a detailed desk-based review of available documentation for each selected coalition. This included a review of:

- **Coalition MEL data:**
  - Coalition profiles
  - Coalition proposals and background information (2018 and 2019 only)
  - Coalition reporting of ‘progress against policy targets’ (2016-2019)
  - Coalition Theory of Change (where available)
  - Excerpts from global annual report mentions of the coalitions

- **Coalition survey responses,** particularly against key outcomes selected

Through the review, we were able to get a better understanding of the individual coalition background, history and composition; the national education policy context of each coalition; and the activities and achievements of each coalition as reported by the coalition. This provided the initial information to collect a broad timeline of events and achievements during CSEF III, to paint a larger picture of what, how and why the coalition had or had not achieved an outcome, and its significance or importance to the coalition and within the national context.

As a final step in the case study process, we conducted remote interviews with the National Coordinators of the selected coalitions to validate and further explore the mapping of outcomes conducted during the desk review.

Each of the above steps informed the creation of the following outputs:

- **Coalition Change Maps:** These diagrams map the ways in which outcome changes occurred, including the contribution of CSEF and other external enablers, the strategies used by coalitions, the targets of the change, and the significance of the outcomes achieved.

- **Coalition Outcome Maps:** A chronology of events, achievements and outcomes over the life of CSEF to provide a visual story of the types of outcomes that occurred in the national context.

The final Change Maps and Outcomes Maps based on the case studies are presented in Appendix 1.

2.3.5 Analysis and interpretation

We analysed and interpreted the data collected throughout the OH process to provide findings against each of the evaluation questions and to generate important lessons and recommendations for GCE. The phased approach to data collection allowed us to iteratively analyse, and test our findings at the end of each phase, which in turn influenced the design and analysis activities of the subsequent phase. In addition, the inclusion of the OH workshop in the approach allowed for a

---

5 Note that these may not include all achievements, outcomes or events of the coalitions, but reflect those that most prominently featured in the desk review and validation interviews.
more participatory method, as the feedback from the research users was used to validate the findings from the OH.

2.4 Limitations of the OH methodology

The use of OH in an evaluations poses some limitations, in terms of:

- **Understanding attribution**: Given the complexity of civil society advocacy processes, we were unable to use methods allowing to make claims about attribution and causality.

- **Biases towards particular outcomes**: As a participatory methodology, OH relies on both programme documentation and programme stakeholders for the identification of outcomes. This may result in a potential bias of outcomes to be limited to those of which the programme stakeholders are aware and on which they have reported.

- **Scope of the evaluation and time frames**: The duration of the evaluation was roughly over nine months, which included the Inception Phase, data collection, analysis, and reporting. Within these time frames, we may have been unable to validate or report on some of the longer-term outcomes of the programme identified in the course of the outcome harvest.

The above-mentioned limitations of the OH methodology are briefly outlined here and elaborated in more detail in the main report (Section 3.3 of the main evaluation report).
3 Findings

3.1 Outcomes harvested

Using the OH process described in Section 2 of this report, and further described in Section 4.3 of the Final Evaluation Report, we surfaced a final total of 17 outcomes. The outcomes are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Outcomes harvested in the CSEF evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O#</th>
<th>Outcome Statement</th>
<th>Level of Change</th>
<th>Change target</th>
<th>Change type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The coalition and its members have strengthened their abilities to seek funding</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened its diversity and inclusiveness through increasing or maintaining its membership</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>Practice / action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cohesion and linkages between levels of the Movement (national, regional, global) are stronger</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>Attitudes / will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The research and evidence generated for policy advocacy is more inclusive and representative of the perspectives of communities and vulnerable groups</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cohesion across wider civil society is created through engagement with other advocacy groups or international NGOs</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Attitudes / will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Marginalised groups have increased legitimacy and capacities to participate in policy dialogue</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Citizens and key influencers are better informed to contribute to education policy dialogue</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civil society has developed capacities to monitor and support the rollout of education policies</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The coalition creates spaces to participate in policy dialogue through non-formal channels and facilitated engagements</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decision-makers</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Policy dialogue is more representative and participatory, through increased coalition engagement in government processes and working groups</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Decision-makers</td>
<td>Knowledge / awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Decision makers increasingly view coalitions as evidence-based and credible organisations</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Decision-makers</td>
<td>Attitudes / will</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We used three different ways to categorise and analyse our outcomes:

- By 'level of change', which examines outcomes at the national, regional or global levels.
- By 'change target', which categorises outcomes by the group targeted for change. This includes changes directed at CSEF-partner level (e.g. coalition – whether national, regional or global), various groups that constitute the ‘public’ (citizens and civil society groups external to the coalition) and education policy or practice decision makers or influencers.
- By 'type of change', which categorises outcomes according to changes to knowledge/awareness, attitudes/will or practice/action.

Five outcomes targeted knowledge/awareness and attitude changes at the coalition-level:

- Three outcomes targeted changes in knowledge/awareness at the national coalition-level, with regard to coalition capacities in technical areas such as advocacy or thematic capacities (O1), resource mobilisation (O2), and organisational areas such as coalition governance or management (O3).
- One outcome concerned the actions undertaken by NECs to strengthen membership diversity and inclusiveness (O4). This outcome corresponds with the CSEF Results Framework Outcome 1.1.
- One outcome targeted the attitudes and cohesion of coalitions more broadly (O5), whether across different countries (horizontal) or across different levels, such as regional and global (vertical).

Five outcomes targeted knowledge/awareness and attitude changes directed towards the public:

- Four further outcomes specifically targeted knowledge/awareness changes of citizens in a broad sense (O6, O9), specific marginalised groups within society (O8), or civil society groups who are not directly members of the coalition, such as advocacy groups working in other thematic areas or INGOs (O10). O6 roughly corresponds with Outcome 2.2, while O9 roughly corresponds with CSEF’s Outcome 2.1.
- One outcome targeted cohesion across the public, with a specific focus on cohesion across civil society groups (O7).

The final seven outcomes target decision-makers at the national-level (such as policy makers or implementers or those who may influence education policy, including international donors) and at the global or regional level (such as those who influence or set the global education agenda).
Within these, two outcomes target awareness changes in decision-making processes through the increased inclusion and participation of civil society, whether through formal channels (O12) or informal channels (O11). O12 corresponds with CSEF’s Outcome 1.2.

Two outcomes target changes in attitude of decision makers, including viewing civil society (and more specifically CSEF partners) as credible, evidence-based organisations (O13) and actively consulting civil society perspectives (O14).

Two outcomes target tangible changes in education policy and practice, including commitment and funding towards regional and global education goals such as SDG4 (O15) and changes to national education policy or policy implementation (O16).

The final outcome considers awareness changes to global and regional education discussions through the increased inclusion of more ‘grassroots’ perspectives, whether at the regional, national, or sub-national levels (O17). O17 relates to both Outcome 3.1 and 3.2 of CSEF.

### 3.2 Distribution of the outcomes across the portfolio

We examined the extent to which the 17 outcomes occurred throughout the CSEF portfolio through our online survey. We asked coalitions which outcomes apply to their coalition and context, and whether:

- the outcome happened
- the outcome was intended (e.g. was part of the coalition’s aims, or was a policy target in their CSEF reporting)

The prevalence of outcomes across the portfolio is presented in Figure 2 below and reported in more detail in Section 4.3.1 of the Final Evaluation Report.
Figure 2. Prevalence of outcomes in the portfolio

Based on these responses, we scored and mapped each outcome in a matrix of occurrence versus intention, to help us understand the patterns across the CSEF III portfolio (see Figure 3), where:

- the horizontal axis shows what outcomes have been more ‘successful’ or ‘challenging’ to achieve,
- the vertical axis shows which outcomes were a priority for coalitions (i.e. included in coalition’s objectives or policy goals).
Figure 3. Occurrence-intention matrix of CSEF III outcomes

Note: Outcomes in green were mostly reported as achieved and intended, outcomes in blue were mostly reported as achieved although not explicitly in the coalition's goals, outcomes in yellow were targeted but not always achieved, and outcomes in orange correspond to outcomes that were more challenging to achieve and 'less important' to coalitions (i.e. not targeted).

The most prevalent intended outcomes that coalitions reported to have achieved fall into two categories. The first focuses on the building of coalition capacities and strengths, including improving the technical skills of coalitions (O1 – 97% of coalitions reported that this outcome materialised), increasing the diversity and inclusiveness of coalitions (O4 – 91% of coalitions) and strengthening coalitions’ internal operations and processes (O3 – 84%). Coalitions also reported success in generating research inclusive of grassroots perspectives (O6 – 91%), supporting civil society capacities to monitor education policy (O10 – 88%), increasing civil society’s representation in policy dialogue (O12 – 83%) and in decision-makers modifying national education policy or policy implementation (O16 – 83%). These outcomes largely correspond to programme outputs (O1, O3) as well as planned Results Framework targets (O4, O6 and O12).

The most prevalent unintended outcomes include greater cohesion within CSEF levels (O5 – 13%) across civil society across all or any levels (O7 – 17%) and attitude changes of decision makers of coalitions as credible partners (O13 - 16%) or of the importance of civil society consultation in
policy making (O14 – 16%). Support for coalitions to seek funding (O2 – 22%) was also not an explicit goal of the programme although coalitions received support from the programme to, where possible, support coalitions’ financial sustainability.

The most prevalent unintended outcomes can be considered enabling outcomes to support other aims. Coalition financial sustainability was not a specific area in which the programme worked, although it was an area in which the GS and RS both supported coalitions where possible, recognising the importance of financial solvency for both the coalition’s current effectiveness and sustainability beyond CSEF. While participation in LEGs and in key sector policy and review processes was a specific programme outcome (Outcome 1.2), O13 and O14 can be considered as outcomes that are precursors of, or conditions to be met (e.g. assumptions) for Outcome 1.2. This suggests that a small but significant proportion of coalitions had to first ensure that policy makers viewed coalitions as credible and see the value in consulting with civil society, before coalitions are able to meaningfully participate in policy processes. As we argue in Section 4.2, this was not always possible.

This point is reinforced by looking at the outcomes in which the greatest number of coalitions faced challenges to achieve. This included O13 (in which 9% of coalitions reported they were unable to achieve) and O14 (also 9%). Furthermore, coalitions also faced challenges in achieving outcomes related to convincing decision makers to increase funding and commitment towards global goals (O15 – 28%), creating informal spaces or channels for policy dialogue (O11 – 11%) and supporting the capacity of marginalised groups to participate in policy dialogue (O8 – 9%). Unsurprisingly, when coalitions faced challenges in finding means to participate in policy dialogue, coalitions were also less successful in persuading policy makers to increase funding and commitment to global and regional education goals.

When considering how the materialised outcomes play out across the advocacy framework, the majority of the outcomes that materialised are concentrated at the coalition level, as well as across raising awareness and building knowledge. The results are reflected in Table 7, where the percentages represent the proportion of respondents that categorised the outcomes in each section as achieved/ materialised (regardless its intentionality) and does not account for instances where coalitions reported the outcome as non-applicable, as this meant the coalition was not working towards that outcome.

Table 7. Proportion of ‘materialised outcomes’ by type of outcome (Advocacy Framework)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of influence</th>
<th>Practice/Action (3)</th>
<th>72%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude/Will (2)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge/Awareness (1)</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition (1) Public (2) Decision-Makers (3)</td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The colour gradient reflects the higher (green) or lower (yellow) values in each cell.
Table 8. Differences in proportion of ‘materialised outcomes’ reported by regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Practice/Action (3)</th>
<th>Attitude/Will (2)</th>
<th>Knowledge/Awareness (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition (1) Public (2) Decision-Makers (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME&amp;EE</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition (1) Public (2) Decision-Makers (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The colour gradient reflects the higher (green) or lower (yellow) values in each cell.

When comparing the distribution of achieved outcomes in the advocacy framework across regions, coalitions from APAC reported lower overall levels of achieved outcomes targeting decision makers, while LAC coalitions reported the lowest percentage of achieved outcomes related to active policy change. ME&EE coalitions had the highest levels of self-reported outcome materialisation. However, the differences between regions were generally small, with the exception of outcomes targeting decision makers (see Table 8).

Maturity of the coalition appeared to make more of a difference on whether coalitions reported outcomes materialised (see Table 9 below). The higher percentages of materialised outcomes were reported by more mature coalitions (i.e. established between 2009 and 2015). Younger coalitions (i.e. established after 2015) reported lower percentages of outcomes targeting change in knowledge, will and action from decision makers. These findings highlight the long-term nature of advocacy work.6

---

6 For a wider discussion about how advocacy processes work see for example the ‘monitoring and evaluating advocacy’ report by Save the Children: https://www.open.edu/openlearncreate/pluginfile.php/128097/mod_resource/content/1/Monitoring%20and%20evaluating%20advocacy.pdf
### Table 9. Differences in proportion of ‘materialised outcomes’ reported by maturity of coalition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established before 2009</th>
<th>Established between 2009 and 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice/Action (3)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Will (2)</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Awareness (1)</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaliton (1)</td>
<td>Public (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Makers (3)</td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice/Action (3)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Will (2)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Awareness (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaliton (1)</td>
<td>Public (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Makers (3)</td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice/Action (3)</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Will (2)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Awareness (1)</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaliton (1)</td>
<td>Public (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Makers (3)</td>
<td>Actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The colour gradient reflects the higher (green) or lower (yellow) values in each cell.

### 3.3 Most significant outcomes identified by coalitions

We asked the survey participants to choose up to three outcomes (out of the list of 17) based on their significance to their context. As a result, we gathered detailed information on 185 outcomes\(^7\) regarding their: change target, year of occurrence, strategies used, contribution of CSEF, likelihood of sustainability and the type of evidence to support it.

The most prevalent outcome selected as significant by all survey respondents was ‘strengthened skills and capacity for advocacy work’ (O1), followed by strengthened diversity and inclusiveness (O4), more representative policy dialogue (O12), civil society developing capacities to monitor policies (O10), strengthened coalition’s operations and processes (O3) and research being more inclusive and representative of the perspectives of the community (O6).

Regarding the distribution of responses across regions, four outcomes were reported as significant by at least 10% of respondents within each region. Based on the frequency of responses, all regions coincided in selecting ‘strengthened skills for advocacy work’ (O1) as the most significant outcome: 27% of respondents in Africa, 21% in APAC, 31% in LAC and 22% in ME&EE. In Africa this was followed by more representative policy dialogue (O12); in APAC it was followed by more inclusive research (O6); in both LAC and ME&EE was followed by strengthened diversity and inclusiveness of the coalition (O4).

#### 3.3.1 When outcomes materialised

Unsurprisingly, of all the outcomes reported as having materialised, the greatest proportion of outcomes were reported to have materialised in 2019 (32%), with 29% in 2018, 20% in 2017, and

\(^7\) Each of the 63 online survey respondents chose three outcomes as significant from the list of seventeen. This allowed us to gather detailed information of the outcomes in 189 instances. From the 189 responses, we removed four that were reported twice by the same coalition. The analysis on this section is based on the information gathered on the 185 responses.
14% of outcomes in 2016. More than 50% of respondents who identified ‘civil society developed capacities to monitor and support the rollout of education policies’ (O10) as a significant outcome, reported it happening in the first half of CSEF III (2016-2017), (Figure 4). On the other hand, more than 80% of respondents reported policy change (O16) and better informed citizens who contribute to education policy dialogue (O9) as outcomes that materialised in the second half of the programme. A small number of respondents selected civil society developed capacities to monitor policy (O10), creation of non-formal spaces for policy dialogue (O11), and strengthened skills for advocacy work (O1) as significant outcomes that have not yet happened.

**Figure 4. Distribution of year of occurrence of significant outcomes**

### Year of occurrence of outcomes, as reported by coalitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Category</th>
<th>Percentage of reporting coalitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Early&quot; outcomes 2016-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CS capacity to monitor policy</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cohesion between levels of the movement</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal operations and processes</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diversity &amp; inclusiveness</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-formal policy dialogue spaces</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Evidence-based and credible coalitions</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Skills for advocacy</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to seek funding</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Decision-makers consult with CS</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Representative policy dialogue</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inclusive research</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CS informed contribution to policy</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Change in education policy</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.2 Strategies pursued

In order to better understand how coalitions achieved the outcomes, we asked the participants to choose all the strategies used to support the achievement of each reported outcome. Across the portfolio the most prevalent strategies reported by coalitions are consultation meetings with members, organising events to share information, conduct training on advocacy tactics as strategies, and participating in global and regional events (see Figure 5).

---

8 Additionally, 1% of outcomes were reported to have materialised in 2020, while 2% in total were reported to have not yet materialised.

9 Note: In this chart we are not including four outcomes that had less than five responses.
Respondents identified additional strategies to bring about change, such as:

- Participation in committees of regional intergovernmental events
- Creation of other type spaces to share experiences and knowledge between members and non-members CSOs (e.g. fieldworks, peer-to-peer accompaniment, publication of information on the network via e-mail newsletters, Website, social media and WhatsApp)
- Establishing and signing frameworks with International NGOs
- On-the-job training to coalition staff
- Identifying best practices in other civil society networks
- Spaces of dialogue and reflection between the RS and the NECs
- Membership in international networks.

3.3.3 The contribution of CSEF
Overall, coalitions recognised the importance of CSEF’s contribution to achieve all outcomes across the portfolio (see Figure 6). 100% of respondents who reported strengthened ability to seek funding (O2) and creation of non-formal policy dialogue spaces (O11) said that work towards these two outcomes would not have happened without CSEF support. Other outcomes which coalitions believed CSEF’s contribution to be key were key coalition capacity building outcomes such as technical skills (O1, 91%) and organisational capacities (O3, 85%) and decision makers viewing coalitions as evidence-based and credible (O13, 91%). From all the respondents that reported ‘research and evidence generated for policy advocacy is more inclusive and representative of the perspectives of communities and vulnerable groups’ (O6) as a significant outcome, less than a half (46%) said work towards it might have happened without CSEF support. Approximately a quarter of coalitions reported that outcomes such as building coalition diversity (O4, 25%), generating Movement cohesion (O5, 29%), encouraging decision makers to consult with civil society (O14, 27%) may have happened even without CSEF support.

**Figure 6. Extent of CSEF contribution to achieve outcomes**

How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?

- Work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support
- Work towards this outcome may still have happened without CSEF support
- Work towards this outcome would have happened without CSEF support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support</th>
<th>Work towards this outcome may still have happened without CSEF support</th>
<th>Work towards this outcome would have happened without CSEF support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-formal policy dialogue spaces</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to seek funding</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills for advocacy</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-based and credible coalitions</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in education policy</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS informed contribution to policies</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS capacity to monitor policy</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-makers consult with CS</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion between levels of the movement</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive research</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity &amp; inclusiveness</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative policy dialogue</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal operations and processes</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of responses

We asked participants to specify up to three inputs (as outlined in the CSEF programme Theory of Change) that they believed were key to achieve each significant outcome. The results are provided in Figure 7. Funding was selected a key input in 90% of outcomes, followed by capacity building

---

10 Note: In this chart we are not including four outcomes that had less than five responses
(64%), while operational guidelines and monitoring tools was reported as a key input to the fewest (23%) outcomes. For outcomes that would not have happened without CSEF support (O2, O11), funding played a key role in helping to realise the outcome, as did the facilitation of national-regional linkages.

**Figure 7. Key CSEF inputs to support outcomes**

For all of the above outcomes in Figure 7, funding was consistently reported as a key input by one third of responses (comprising from 27% to 39% of the proportion of responses). Technical accompaniment was a key input for building coalition operational capacities (O3), generating inclusive research (O6) and building the capacity of civil society to monitor policies (O10), yet coalitions reported it less relevant to supporting coalitions to build non-formal policy dialogue space (O11) and supporting decision makers to view coalitions as credible (O13) and value civil society consultation in policy dialogue (O14). Instead, for O11 and 14, capacity building was one of the most important inputs, in addition to its importance for improving coalition diversity (O4), Movement building (O5) and supporting decision makers to modify policy and implementation (O16). However, capacity building was less relevant to two outcomes for which technical accompaniment was key: O6 and O10, in addition to outcomes related to increasing civil society representation in policy dialogue (O12) and increasing the view of coalitions as credible (O13).

---

11 Note: In this chart we are not including four outcomes that had less than five responses.
While operational guidelines were generally regarded as the least important input, in relative terms they were considered to be important to outcomes that concerned public engagement activities such as building civil society capacity to monitor policy rollout (O10) and creating better informed citizens and key influencers (O9), as well as for increasing the representation of civil society in policy dialogue (O12). With regard to facilitating key national-regional linkages, this was most important to creating Movement cohesion (O5), but also for supporting coalitions’ ability to seek funding (O2) and building coalition credibility (O13) and improving the role of civil society consultation in policy processes (O14).

3.3.4 Outcome sustainability

We asked respondents whether they will continue working towards these outcomes after the end of the CSEF programme. In cases where the outcomes were already achieved, we asked whether they will be sustainable without CSEF support.

The more positive responses about sustainability of efforts after CSEF correspond to outcomes targeting changes in knowledge and will of decision makers (Figure 8). 93% of respondents thought that it was extremely or very likely that they would continue their efforts to achieve a more representative and participatory policy dialogue through increased coalition engagement in government processes and working groups (O12). 91% of respondents said it was extremely/very likely that efforts would continue towards building the credibility of the coalitions with decision-makers (O13) and civil society perspectives being considered in education policies through wider consultation processes (O14).
Furthermore, when asked about the sustainability of the outcomes after CSEF closure, the outcome that respondents reported with the highest probability of sustainability was the representative and participatory policy dialogue (O12, 87% extremely/very likely), followed by developed capacities of civil society to monitor policies (O10, 86%), and coalition’s strengthened skills for advocacy work (O1, 85%). On the other hand, the outcomes that were less likely to be sustained were change in education policy in response to advocacy (O16, 50% moderately/slightly likely) and cohesion between the national, regional and global levels of the movement (O5, 43%) (see Figure 9 below).

---

Note: In this chart we are not including four outcomes that had less than five responses
Figure 9. Likelihood of sustainability of the outcome after CSEF\textsuperscript{13}

If the outcome has occurred already, how likely will this outcome be sustained after the CSEF programme ends?

- Extremely/very likely
- Moderately/slightly likely
- NA, outcome has not happened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Extremely/very likely</th>
<th>Moderately/slightly likely</th>
<th>NA, outcome has not happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Representative policy dialogue</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. CS capacity to monitor policy</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Skills for advocacy</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Internal operations and processes</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Evidence-based and credible coalitions</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Decision-makers consult with CS</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diversity &amp; inclusiveness</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Non-formal policy dialogue spaces</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inclusive research</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability to seek funding</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. CS informed contribution to policies</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cohesion between levels of the movement</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Change in education policy</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} Note: In this chart we are not including four outcomes that had less than five responses
4 Outcome deep dives

In this section, we provide a deep dive into the nine most prevalent outcomes identified by coalitions, as identified in the online survey (see Table 10). A total of nine (out of the 17 selected outcomes) were selected on the basis that at least 15% of respondents (e.g. at least 10 respondents) selected these outcomes as significant to their context in the online survey, allowing us the opportunity to triangulate findings on how these outcomes worked in the context of CSEF.

Table 10. The outcomes selected by coalitions as significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #</th>
<th>Outcome statement</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes targeting the coalition level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened its diversity and inclusiveness through increasing or maintaining its membership</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes targeting the public level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The research and evidence generated for policy advocacy is more inclusive and representative of the perspectives of communities and vulnerable groups</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Citizens and key influencers are better informed to contribute to education policy dialogue</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civil society has developed capacities to monitor and support the rollout of education policies</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcomes targeting the decision-maker level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Policy dialogue is more representative and participatory, through increased coalition engagement in government processes and working groups</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Decision makers increasingly view coalitions as evidence-based and credible organisations</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Decision makers consult with and consider wider civil society perspectives in education policies and proposals</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We organise the outcomes in this section according to the change target (e.g. changes at the coalition, public and decision-maker levels). Within this, for each outcome we focus on four main questions:
• **What was the outcome?** We examine the outcome in terms of the main target of change, the year of occurrence and the type of evidence to support it.

• **How was the outcome achieved?** We look at whether the outcome was an intended target or goal for the coalition, what strategies were employed towards the outcome and the extent to which coalitions believe that CSEF has contributed to the outcome.

• **Why was the outcome significant?** We explore the significance of the outcome to the country and regional contexts and the extent to which coalitions believe that the outcome will be sustained beyond CSEF.

• **How did the outcome occur in context?** We provide further illustrations and examples of how these outcomes occurred in case study countries where available.

4.1 **Outcomes targeting the coalition level**

4.1.1  **Outcome 1: The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work**

**What was the outcome?**

This outcome was selected by 46 respondents (42 NECs and 4 RS) and refers to coalition members acquiring or developing the technical skills and knowledge required for their advocacy work, including:

- Their understanding of and experience in their local contexts
- Their understanding of SDG4
- Having a greater sense of ownership over advocacy techniques
- Increased skills in: budget tracking, communications, M&E
- Training in thematic areas such as: Right to education, threat of privatisation of education and protecting free public education, ECCD quality, school dropouts
- Having a stronger consultancy framework and pool of experts and resources to draw upon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialise?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition members and staff, 43%</td>
<td>2016: 13%</td>
<td>Coalition’s mass and social media appearances, 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government ministers, 15%</td>
<td>2017: 22%</td>
<td>Photographic evidence, 61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of policy groups (e.g. LEGs), 7%</td>
<td>2018: 26%</td>
<td>Policy recommendation/ Research report, 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Case study examples are not provided for Outcome 9 or Outcome 14 as none of the coalitions selected for case studies reported these outcomes as significant.
How was the outcome achieved?

The majority of respondents (98%) categorised this outcome as intended. 98% reported the outcome materialised.

What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?

- Conduct training on advocacy tactics, 91%
- Conduct training on key educational issues, 89%
- Organise or participate in events to share information, 80%
- Participate in regional and global education meetings, 80%

Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?

- Facilitating nat-reg links, 35%
- Guidelines and tools, 17%
- Capacity building, 74%
- Funding, 93%
- Technical support, 54%

How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?

- 91% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support

Other strategies identified include spaces created to share experiences and systematise learning across CSEF members and non-members organisations within the same region, and with other regions (through technical visits, technical and political accompaniment, workshops, publications, use of communication channels and social media), and budget allocation for member organisations to directly implement advocacy activities.

Why was the outcome significant?

76% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. 85% of respondents that said the outcome had already materialised thought that it was extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

This outcome was significant to coalitions in a variety of ways:

- By having a sustained group of members with proven competencies for advocacy, in turn encouraging other CSOs to join the coalition to benefit from this capacity building
- Providing differentiated skills to build the potential of members to advocate not only at the national but also at the district and province level; engaging with a variety of actors, from government officials to schools.
- Building the necessary skills to deliver good and robust research, which in turns endorse advocacy on national issues.
- Overcoming institutional challenges and political resistance to become a national benchmark in educational issues.
• Boosting networking with other education actors and reinforcing the image of the coalitions as champions for the right to education in the country
• Increasing the probability of achieving political change by improving relationships with government officials and strategizing the ways of engagement with the government (choosing more effective and efficient channels)
• Improving the coalition’s field of partnerships and position it strategically to occupy policy spaces. Consolidating the voice of members which is critical in shaping policy reforms.
• Increasing the notoriety and legitimacy of the coalition at the national level, which in turns attracts more CSOs to join
• Growing confidence, awareness, experience, commitment and advocacy by coalitions.
• Contributing to improving funding to education, increasing access to education for people with disabilities and keeping girls in schools.
• Building sense of ownership to the programme amongst member CSOs and providing a network to learn best practices from other coalitions

How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 1: Outcome 1 case study examples

All case study coalitions selected Outcome 1 as significant. The Somaliland Network on Education for All (SOLNEFA) in Somaliland joined CSEF in 2016 and was closely managed and supported by the Regional Secretariat to build and strengthen its capacity throughout CSEF III, which included close technical support and monitoring visits from ANCEFA. The coalition was able to progress with a number of activities to promote the importance of girls’ education through public awareness campaigns, engaging with the Local Education Group (LEG), inputting into budgeting and education strategy development discussions, and engaging in relevant policy dialogue. It is notable however, that while the coalition believed it had strengthened its skills for advocacy, the coalition selected Outcome 8: Marginalised groups have increased legitimacy and capacities to participate in policy dialogue, as a significant but unachieved outcome. This perhaps highlights how the coalition is still in the early phases of raising awareness of these issues, but the long term nature of advocacy means these activities have some way to go before the coalition can increase the wider participation of marginalised groups outside of coalition membership.

Meanwhile, the Albanian Coalition for Child Education (ACCE) relied less directly on the support of CSEF to strengthen its advocacy, and noted how it was able to build upon and consolidate the support and capacity it developed in the previous phase of CSEF. The coalition instead focused on building the capacity of the wider membership, for example building technical expertise in the analysis of laws and legislation, and held consultative meetings with traditionally excluded groups, such as Roma mothers and disabled children, to strengthen their voice in advocacy.

Coalitions in Togo and Nepal both stressed how building skills and capacity to strengthen advocacy was important in raising the profile of the coalition where CSOs may previously not have been trusted or fully engaged. In Nepal, this enabled the National Campaign for Education (NCE) to participate in LEG meetings and other education policy forums, and it has developed a good working relationship with federal and local government and parliamentarians. Since the LEG in Nepal is only operating at federal level, this working relationship has enabled the NEC to follow up
at local level, helping to empower local government and support sector coordination. NCE noted that its membership already had strong capacity in advocacy generally speaking, but that it needed specific support in advocacy for education which it has built through CSEF. It also noted that one of the key contributions of CSEF was not necessarily providing direct capacity building support (although support visits and guidelines were provided), but that it provided the funding which enabled it to run workshops and hire university-based consultants to provide training and support on how to conduct advocacy, engage with government, and monitor the implementation of the School Sector Development Plan (SSDP).

In Togo, for the Togolese National Coalition for Education for All (CNT / EPT), strengthening its ability to conduct research studies on relevant advocacy issues demonstrated to authorities that CNT-EPT has the capacity to deliver factually accurate reports on education system functioning. In Nicaragua, the Forum for Education and Human Development of the Initiative for Nicaragua (FEDH IPN) placed a similar emphasis on the importance of generating research and evidence skills and capacities for advocacy, which was essential for the coalition to adapt to increasing political repression which hinders CSO abilities to engage in formal advocacy spaces. Despite this hindering environment, the coalition was able to survive and keep its legal status, with support from CSEF to adapt to this contextual challenge. The coalition reframed its internal strategic planning and shifted the nature of its advocacy work towards generating evidence, and increasing its media presence. In the light of political persecution and regression of freedom of press in the last years, the coalition has turned to alternative communication channels like digital and social media (e.g. opening Twitter and Instagram accounts in 2017). Although it has been restricted from lobbying with parliamentarians, it has used media platforms to share its research findings and recommendations.

4.1.2 Outcome 3: The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes

What was the outcome?

This outcome was selected by 13 respondents (all of them NECs), and refers to the developing or strengthening the ability of coalitions to lead, adapt, manage, or technically implement their advocacy strategy. This includes:

- Coalition members acting on more articulated plans, structures, and partnerships
- Increased internal communications across members, such as with WhatsApp or telegram chat, to disseminate information or provide feedback from state/regional members, creating platforms (events) for sharing across thematic groups and regional groups
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities of board members
Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?

- Coalition member groups and staff, 46%
- Coalition secretariat and staff, 38%

When did the outcome materialise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?

- Meeting minutes, 92%
- Training materials, 62%
- Coalition’s mass and social media appearances, 46%
- Photographic evidence, 46%

Other types of evidence to support this outcome are: developed or revised policies and procedures, board minutes, revised operational manuals, annual financial audit reports, internal audit reports, and reviewed strategic plans.

How was the outcome achieved?

88% of respondents categorised this outcome as intended. 92% of respondents reported that the outcome was achieved regardless of intentionality.

What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?

- Build coalition’s org. capacity, 92%
- Consultation meetings with coalition members, 62%
- Conduct training on advocacy tactics, 46%
- Conduct training in other technical skills, 46%

Other strategies mentioned by coalitions are on-the-job training to coalition staff, and identification/advice of good practices in other civil society networks.

Why was the outcome significant?

69% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. Nevertheless, less than half of respondents who said the outcome had already materialised (42%) thought that it is extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

This outcome was significant for coalitions in different ways:
Involving members and capturing their experiences to develop the coalition's vision and strategy
Gaining credibility and recognition, and improving accountability of coalitions to donors and international organisations
Strengthening the governance of the coalition by giving members a better understanding of the roles and the strategic plan
Strengthening the members’ confidence in the capacity for action and influence of the coalition in matters of education.
Improving the effectiveness and quality of the coalition’s work, hence allowing for further expansion and development
Strengthening role of CSOs on monitoring education issues
Strengthening the oversight function of the Board of Directors.

How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 2: Outcome 3 case study examples
Two of the case study countries selected Outcome 3 as a significant outcome: Somaliland and Nicaragua.

The focus of capacity building for SOLNEFA in Somaliland was particularly notable due to its recent introduction into the CSEF programme (2016). As part of joining the programme, the coalition went through a process of establishing and growing its systems and strengthening its governance, with particularly important support from their Regional Fund Management Agency (RFMA) in financial capacity development. Support from CSEF helped it to obtain and build capacities in financial software, develop proposals for funding, create and strengthen internal policies. This support has enabled SOLNEFA to elect new board members, ratify and adapt new coalition policies and manuals, recruit and support new staff with improved management skills and develop a five year strategic plan for the coalition. The coalition believes this outcome has enabled them to seek funding from donors beyond CSEF.

For FEDH IPN in Nicaragua, the significance of this outcome focused more on its ability to change its strategic focus to account for increased political repression which has hindered its ability to conduct more traditional forms of advocacy. This included finding and utilising online platforms and meetings where in person options are no longer possible, using alternative forms of media to continue its presence where traditional government-controlled media no longer allows for this. While this new strategy lacks any lobbying component with parliamentarians, ministers and education officials, it allowed the coalition to survive when the 2018 political crisis hit. An unanticipated consequence of this has been that the coalition feels that it is more resilient to the recent impacts of Covid-19, as it has been continually building its capacities around digital communications.
4.1.3 Outcome 4: The coalition has strengthened its diversity and inclusiveness through increasing or maintaining its membership

What was the outcome?

This outcome was selected by 16 respondents (13 NECs and 3 RS), and refers to the representation of diverse actors in the coalition, such as youth groups, women's groups, regional or grassroots groups, and groups representing marginalised and minorities. It considers not only to the addition of new members to the coalition, but also the ability to maintain and actively engage the existing member base. Participation of members should be meaningful and effective to ensure that coalitions are more democratic. This outcome also covers increased geographic reach, not only presence but greater capacity of advocacy at the local level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialise?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other civil society groups, 31%</td>
<td>2016 13%</td>
<td>Meeting minutes, 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition member groups and staff, 25%</td>
<td>2017 31%</td>
<td>Photographic evidence, 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders, 6%</td>
<td>2018 19%</td>
<td>MoU or other legally binding document, 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International NGOs, 6%</td>
<td>2019 31%</td>
<td>Document stating partnerships with other stakeholders, 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coalitions also use membership registry forms and letters of invitation to CSOs as supporting evidence of this outcome.

How was the outcome achieved?

The majority of respondents (94%) categorised this outcome as intended. 97% of respondents reported that the outcome materialised regardless of intentionality.
What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?

- Conduct consultation meetings with coalition members, 81%
- Organise or participate in events to share information, 56%
- Develop & engage groups within the coalition, 56%
- Build coalition’s org. capacity, 42%

Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?

- Facilitating nat-reg links, 25%
- Guidelines and tools, 19%
- Capacity building, 75%
- Funding, 88%
- Technical support, 56%

How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?

- 69% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support

Why was the outcome significant?

75% of respondents indicated that it was extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. 81% of respondents who said the outcome had already materialised thought that it was extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

Coalitions reported in which ways this outcome was significant for their context:

- By having a large network of active and experienced CSOs, the movement gives more sense of ownership to all its current members to raise their voice and advocate strongly through the coalition. Provides a stronger unified advocacy voice.
- Pooling together a diverse set of skills and competencies to promote the regional agenda
- Increasing efficiency and effectiveness decision-making processes and programme implementation
- Having more female representation in the Board of Directors
- Increasing visibility of the coalition in the humanitarian and Human Rights sectors and with communities
- Helping the more excluded groups to express their views, demands and expectations to the government
- Increasing visibility of the coalition and strengthening its capacity for social mobilization.

How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 3: Outcome 4 case study examples

Of the case study countries selected, Albania selected Outcome 4 as a significant outcome.

ACCE focused on the empowerment of children and youth groups and set up child and youth advocacy groups in 2018 known as ‘youth parliaments’. The coalition goal for setting these parliaments was to give voice to the youth and engage them directly in policy discussions regarding the Right to Education. When legislation or strategies relating to the Right to Education are created...
nationally by government, the coalition gathers ‘youth parliaments’ in order to provide feedback to the Ministry of Education on behalf of children. In 2018, ACCE created six youth parliaments in six regions of Albania, which the government then replicated in its own initiative (although the extent of this was not verified).

In addition to youth groups, the coalition worked with communities who have been historically marginalised from education policy discussions and consultations, including Roma communities and parents of children with disabilities. Thanks to ACCE’s work, they now have increased abilities to identify cases of discrimination and know where to report them.

A prominent feature in the desk review and validation interview with ACCE was the importance of bringing together civil society in a cohesive network of diverse groups. The coalition argues that the main contribution of CSEF to achieving this outcome is “bringing together all organisations for a common goal that is education for all”. CSEF builds on the spirit of solidarity created by the GCE Movement and many member organisations would likely struggle both technically and administratively without a central support structure. CSEF funding had an important contribution to the geographical expansion of the coalition, rather than its diversity per se. According to ACCE, while wider CSO activity is generally strong in the capital, there are fewer organisations which are able to work outside the capital while maintaining the ability to coordinate effectively. CSEF funding enabled the coalition to expand their geographical reach, with sufficient funding to keep their members active.

4.2 Outcomes targeting the public level

4.2.1 Outcome 6: The research and evidence generated for policy advocacy is more inclusive and representative of the perspectives of communities and vulnerable groups

What was the outcome?

This outcome was selected by 13 respondents (all of them NECs) and refers to coalitions using and disseminating research that identifies education gaps and provides a better understanding of local contexts, while using findings to raise awareness of key issues and inform decision making. This includes identifying gaps in:

- Available data in key issues related to marginalised groups (e.g. on children with disabilities)
- Knowledge of key policy issues (such as global goals)
- Landscape of private actors in education and impact of fee-free education systems
- Knowledge of education practice at individual or systems levels (e.g. lack of systematic teacher training policy, on education provision and delivery, pedagogical knowledge, language of instruction)
- Funding areas and financial resources (raising the awareness of both public and government on this issue and motivating them to find solutions, leading to further research being conducted around inefficiency costs or used to lobby for more domestic budget and also to reach out to wider donors)
This outcome is also related to ensuring that educational research by academics is more community-based, depoliticising issues by giving them an evidence-base in communities’ perspectives, and building greater partnerships with academic institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialise?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Government ministries, 15%</td>
<td>2016: 8%</td>
<td>- Policy recommendation / Research report produced by the coalition, 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Members of policy groups (such as LEGs), 15%</td>
<td>2017: 15%</td>
<td>- Policy monitoring report, 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National government staff or administrators, 15%</td>
<td>2018: 38%</td>
<td>- Meeting minutes, 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019: 38%</td>
<td>- Research report produced by a third party, 38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other targeted actors mentioned by coalitions are marginalised, excluded and vulnerable sectors, such as people with disability, indigenous peoples, Muslims, disaster and conflict-affected communities, teachers, government officials at the national, provincial and district level.

**How was the outcome achieved?**

The majority of respondents (95%) categorised this outcome as intended. 94% of respondents reported that the outcome was achieved regardless of intentionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?</th>
<th>Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?</th>
<th>How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Organise or participate in events to share information, 62%</td>
<td>- Guidelines and tools, 8%</td>
<td>- 54% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data collection activities with communities, 62%</td>
<td>- Facilitating nat-reg links, 38%</td>
<td>- 46% consider it may still have happened without CSEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop and engage groups within the coalition, 54%</td>
<td>- Capacity building, 46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conduct policy or situational analysis, 54%</td>
<td>- Funding, 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical support, 62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why was the outcome significant?

77% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. Just over two thirds of respondents (69%) thought that it is extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

Coalitions reported several ways in which this outcome was significant for their context:

- Unravelling the complex relationship between ideas and innovations, their dissemination and their contextualisation within and between the different levels/actors of the education system, in order to identify and devise strategies to engage these multiple stakeholders in systematic and strategic change.
- Strengthening the capacity of coalition members on budget tracking and accountability
- Engaging more effectively with legislature for better parliamentary oversight and strong accountability mechanisms
- Generating evidence/data on education budget
- Engaging the multiple levels of the communities to have a stake in the education sector.
- Documenting violations against the right to education
- Building a good reputation for the coalition in the country
- Collecting data and understanding the implementation of policies in different areas of the country (grassroots level)
- Generating situational analysis of marginalised groups of the education sector, shedding light on the situation of the most vulnerable people, and in turn informing policy planning to make it more inclusive
- Giving the coalitions a strong and evidence-base position to engage more effectively with the government
- Generating a dynamic flow of information, investigations and memories of events between the state and civil society
- Increasing the voices of the marginalised groups, either by intermediation of the coalition or participating directly in policy spaces (such as LEGs).

How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 4: Outcome 6 case study examples

Of the case study countries selected, Nepal selected Outcome 6 as a significant outcome.

A particular goal of NCE was to use research and analysis to inform policy advocacy work focusing on both raising awareness of national policies as well as to advocate for progressive government plans. This is exemplified by the coalition’s research efforts in 2018 on the ‘Funding Gap in Education: In the context of Rights to Education in Nepal’, which explored the total financing gap for the provision of education rights as well as alternative forms of financing to meet the commitment for an education budget of 20% of the total national budget and 6% of GDP. The research established a financing gap of more than 125 billion Nepalese rupees; this tangible figure gave the coalition leverage in terms of its lobbying efforts to the government.

Alongside the research and advocacy work with government, the coalition engaged with its wider constituency and membership, to ensure that it was representing the views of the Nepali people. It
did so through the encouragement of public discussions, such as poster display programmes and rallies, to ensure that citizens were aware of the education funding gaps and their resulting impact on education and equality at their community level. NCE was able to use this research and public support as the basis to engage government stakeholders in a workshop. The coalition led a delegation of civil society to meet with the Minister of Finance on the issue of education sector budgets. The coalition was able to garner commitment from the Finance Minister towards needs-based education financing, as well as from the National Planning Commission and the Minister for Education, Science and Technology.

However, challenges remain in converting commitment into action at both the national and district levels. Ultimately, the coalition was unable to change the actions of the Minister of Finance to allocate further funding for the education sector, but as a result of the research conducted by NCE, there was a shift of attention towards the issue of budget inefficiency and the underutilisation of the allocated funds.

The coalition reports that it is now seen as a resource centre with credible research and evidence. This is evidenced by the increased demand from stakeholders for NCE research and increased online engagement, such as from the Chair of the National Natural Resource and Fiscal Commission and the National Planning Commission. This has enhanced its status in front of government bodies and stakeholders, and reinforced to the coalition the value and effectiveness of research and evidence as an advocacy tool.

4.2.2 Outcome 9: Citizens and key influencers are better informed to contribute to education policy dialogue

What was the outcome?

This outcome was selected by 11 respondents (all of them NECs). It works on two levels, using a feedback loop between coalitions and civil society. That is, coalitions increase the awareness and salience of key education issues through meetings, capacity building, training, media campaigns and engagement; and simultaneously coalitions are influenced on the importance of particular issues by the community through research consultation, informing or identifying current research gaps.

Issues raised included child safety and corporal punishment, role of private actors in education provision, language of instruction, SDG 4, Early Childhood Education ECE, inclusive education, violence against girls, minority rights to education, fee-free education, social protection, education financing, amongst others.

This outcome includes the roles of:

- Acting as civil society consultation, further surfacing issues to take forward, or generating greater salience on particular issues for the coalition.
- Creating champions of key education stakeholders or other community representatives to increase public awareness of particular issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialise?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalition member groups and staff, 18%</td>
<td>2016: 0%</td>
<td>Photographic evidence, 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and communities, 18%</td>
<td>2017: 18%</td>
<td>Meeting minutes, 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarians, 18%</td>
<td>2018: 36%</td>
<td>Coalition’s mass and social media appearances, 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders, 9%</td>
<td>2019: 45%</td>
<td>Visit/Fieldwork report, 55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coalitions mentioned other targeted actors such as Community Based Organisations (CBOs), other civil society networks, media, and students. Other type of evidence to support this outcome, as reported by coalitions, was excerpts from debates in the parliament.

**How was the outcome achieved?**

89% of respondents categorised this outcome as intended. 91% of respondents reported that the outcome was achieved regardless of its intentionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?</th>
<th>Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?</th>
<th>How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organise or participate in events to share information, 91%</td>
<td>Facilitating nat-reg links, 36%</td>
<td>82% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct training on key educational issues, 82%</td>
<td>Guidelines and tools, 45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting meetings with coalition members, 82%</td>
<td>Capacity building, 55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate or submit policy briefs or recommendations, 73%</td>
<td>Funding, 91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support, 45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why was the outcome significant?**

82% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. Less than two thirds of respondents (64%) thought that it is extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

This outcome was significant to coalitions in different ways:
• Helping previously unrepresented community groups to organise and consolidate their voice to be included in government consultations
• Creating spaces to present civil society concerns to the parliament through lobbying
• Generating interest of community leaders in education issues and policy activities
• Integrating teachers and students to take ownership and hold schools accountable
• Mobilising the community to strengthen citizen participation and accountability for SDG4
• Promoting accessible education by means of citizen engagement in policy planning
• Building alliances and capacities at all levels and providing a platform to share technical resources
• Sensitizing and motivating parliamentarians to defend the right to education in parliament
• Sensitizing journalists to publicize advocacy work in favour of inclusive education
• Making education stakeholders, such as teachers, aware of their own rights.

4.2.3 Outcome 10: Civil society has developed capacities to monitor and support the rollout of education policies

What was the outcome?
This outcome was selected by 14 respondents (all of them NECs), and refers to the work of coalitions to provide training and build or increase the capacity of parents, teachers, and communities, and more broadly to raise awareness on issues such as: SDG4, teacher working conditions, teacher effectiveness, monitoring school budgets, girls’ education and equity, national and local education policies, support for local education interventions (e.g. school feeding programmes), amongst others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialised?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalitions member groups and staff, 21%</td>
<td>2016: 7%, 2017: 50%, 2018: 21%, 2019: 14%</td>
<td>Policy monitoring reports, 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government staff and administrators, 21%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy recommendation or research report, 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders, 7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting minutes, 71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government representatives, 7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition’s media appearance, 64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was the outcome achieved?
95% of respondents categorised this outcome as intended. 92% of respondents reported that the outcome materialised regardless of intentionality.
What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?

- Monitor policy implementation, 86%
- Conduct training on advocacy tactics, 79%
- Conduct training on other technical skills, 71%
- Conduct training on educational issues, 71%

Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?

- Facilitating nat-reg links, 14%
- Guidelines and tools, 50%
- Capacity building, 50%
- Funding, 93%
- Technical support, 64%

How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?

- 79% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support

Why is it significant?

86% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. 86% of respondents who said the outcome had already materialised thought that it is extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

This outcome was significant for coalitions in different ways:

- Contributing to the promotion of education policies centred around the real needs of the community
- Actively involving the actual beneficiaries of education policies in the management of educational issues at all levels
- Increasing the visibility of the coalition and position it strategically to provide inputs for national and local policy
- Overcoming the negative perception of the government towards civil society and making civil society voice heard in the country
- Involving civil society in monitoring of policies and budgets, which ensures on one hand the transparency and efficiency of public spending on education and, on the other hand, equity in the orientation of resources.
- Making policy dialogue more participatory, and exerting more pressure and influence on decision makers
- Allowing coalitions to monitor the implementation of policies at the grassroots level
How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 5: Outcome 10 Case study examples

Of the case study countries selected, Nicaragua selected Outcome 10 as significant. The coalition has worked closely with research centres and academia, which have provided training and voluntary work in data analysis. These alliances have facilitated the collection and gathering of information at the local level, for both research and collective construction of the national education agenda. Furthermore, FEDH-IPN has worked directly with students and marginalised groups, not only to raise awareness about the Right to Education, but to gather their experiences as participants in research studies. Since the coalition is banned from entering schools, it has found creative ways to engage with student actors, such as surveying students in public spaces such as parks where students socialise after school.

Thanks to its affiliation with CSEF and its overall status and achievements, the FEDH-IPN was able to engage with aid/cooperation institutions. Although CSEF funding was a key contribution, the coalition found more value in the socio-political support given by CSEF, which generated a sense of being part of a larger movement and a feeling of regional support. The coalition mentioned that one of the enabling factors that led to these outcomes has been the challenging environment to operate, which has pushed it to ‘reinvent’ its approach to advocacy.

4.3 Outcomes targeting the decision-maker level

4.3.1 Outcome 12: Policy dialogue is more representative and participatory, through increased coalition engagement in government processes and working groups

What was the outcome?

This outcome was selected by 15 respondents (all of them NECs), and refers to increased coalition engagement and participation in formal government education policy processes, including:

- Participation in LEGs, coordinating committees, task forces, and other working groups
- Participation in consultation meetings and invitations to provide input/consultations on Joint Consultative Council in Education (JCCE), National Council on Education (NCE), Joint Education Sector Review committees/meetings, amongst others.
- Other formal acknowledgement of the role that the NECs play in policy making/accountability (i.e. signing MOUs).
Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?

- Government ministries, 33%
- Members of policy groups (such as LEGs), 27%
- National government staff or administrators, 13%

When did the outcome materialise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?

- Meeting minutes, 67%
- Government-issued policy document, 53%
- Photographic evidence, 53%
- Policy monitoring reports, 53%

Coalitions also use government invitation letters and consultation emails as evidence to support this outcome.

**How was the outcome achieved?**

The majority of respondents (91%) categorised this outcome as intended. 92% of respondents reported that the outcome materialised regardless of intentionality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in policy planning, 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise or participate in events to share information, 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop partnership with other stakeholders, 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminate or submit policy briefs or recommendations, 53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating net-reg links, 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines and tools, 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building, 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding, 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support, 47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why was the outcome significant?

93% of respondents indicated that it was extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. 87% of respondents who said the outcome had already materialised thought that it was extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

This outcome was significant for coalitions in different ways:

- Contributing to refining or re-directing the national strategy for education
• Although still challenging, the coalitions are actively trying to bring more equity in policy planning, so that the needs of communities are met in the education system.
• Setting good examples of effective involvement in policy spaces to other CSOs, encouraging them to increase participation
• Widening fundraising opportunities and partnerships with International NGOs
• Holding the government accountable in regards of policy formulation and implementation
• Overcoming institutional or political resistance to civil society involvement. The Regional Secretariats have played a key role in supporting coalitions to establish active policy dialogue with the government

How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 6: Outcome 12 case study examples

Of the case study countries selected, Albania selected Outcome 12 as significant.

Some of ACCE successes related to this outcome include putting the need to protect children from violence in the education sector on the agenda for Ministry of Education, with activities including the drafting of a 3-year national action plan for protecting children from violence in the education system which was in the hands of the Ministry of Education for approval in 2019. ACCE integrated with other CSOs, INGOs and NGOs, and the Ministry of Education in working groups to support the drafting of this plan. In 2019, ACCE, together with its youth parliaments, was able to convince the president to withdraw his support of the Youth Law which was in opposition with global human rights provisions, in part by advocating to ensure the law was properly aligned with the European Union’s Acquis Communautaire for youth rights.

ACCE became part of European Union Accession Chapters in Albania, including the education working group in the Ministry of Education which oversees the educational aspects in the Chapters’ mandates and in the EU’s Acquis Communautaire. Since 2014, ACCE has been part of the working group of the Ministry of Education drafting the Albanian education sector strategy. In 2019, the country started drafting the new strategy, which included some of the coalition recommendations.

One intended, but unachieved outcome for the coalition was ensuring the commitment of the government to global education goals. This is partly due to the lack of functioning LEG in the country, which exists on paper but is inoperative despite efforts made by the coalition to re-active it. Additionally, the government has prepared a national report for the SDG agenda which does not include SDG 4. The coalition suggests this is due to education financing in the country being below the stipulated share of the national GDP. In August 2020, ACCE had an online meeting with the government to discuss the education budget for 2021 as part of their participation in the working group thereof.
4.3.2 Outcome 13: Decision makers increasingly view coalitions as evidence-based and credible organisations

What was the outcome?
This outcome was selected by 11 respondents (all of them NECs), and refers to changes in attitudes of decision-makers towards CSOs. Particularly regarding decision-makers viewing coalitions as credible - and in some cases, seek out research from them- as result of coalitions having increased their research capacities through:

- Strengthened engagement with academia and partnerships with academic institutions
- The successful raising awareness and salience of particular issues, such as education budgets, teacher practice, etc.
- Presenting themselves as a social movement with a strong political position towards each piece that the government produces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialise?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government ministers, 45%</td>
<td>2016 27%</td>
<td>• Meeting minutes, 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of policy groups (such as LEGs), 18%</td>
<td>2017 9%</td>
<td>• Policy recommendation / Research report, 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government staff and administrators, 18%</td>
<td>2018 45%</td>
<td>• Coalition’s mass and social media appearances, 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2019 18%</td>
<td>• Documents stating partnerships with other stakeholders, 64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was the outcome achieved?
83% of respondents categorised this outcome as intended. 89% of respondents reported that the outcome was achieved regardless of it being on the coalition’s targets or not.
What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?

- Develop partnerships with other stakeholders, 91%
- Conduct policy or situational analysis, 82%
- Participate in policy planning, 82%
- Monitor policy implementation, 73%

Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?

- Facilitating national-regional links, 45%
- Guidelines and tools, 18%
- Capacity building, 73%
- Funding, 100%
- Technical support, 27%

How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?

- 91% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support

Why was the outcome significant?

91% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. 82% of respondents who said the outcome had already materialised thought that it is extremely/very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme.

This outcome was significant to coalitions in different ways:

- Achieving recognition of the coalition’s work by members of the government, international organisations and society in general.
- Allowing to improve the inclusion of vulnerable groups in the education system
- Empowering the coalition’s members in the area of advocacy, which in turns facilitates a positive change in education policies
- Bringing the voice of civil society to the Ministry’s decision-making spaces
- Increasing involvement of the coalition in policy processes at the national and local level, by becoming a key point of consultation for educational authorities
- Improving the coalition’s image not only with decision-makers in the country, but also with donors, international NGOs, philanthropists, and businesses.
- Integrating several actors in the discussion and debate on the development, implementation and monitoring of educational policies, and demonstrating the added value of the participation of the coalition in those spaces.
- Increasing the participation of the coalition in ad hoc committees to resolve educational problems related to education in emergencies, for example mediation during school crises or guaranteeing provision of education during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- Improving the coordination of civil society to achieve more effective interventions, for example by increasing the availability of deep data and documented approaches that underpin their advocacy activities.
- Increasing the government’s trust in the coalition, which in turns motivate coalition members to continue contributing to the education sector through research and advocacy
How did the outcome occur in context?

Box 7: Outcome 13 case study examples

Of the case study countries selected, Togo selected Outcome 13 as significant. CNT-EPT’s increased ability to generate relevant studies on various themes around education financing and inclusivity, bolstered by the additional visibility and credibility afforded to it by being part of the CSEF programme has enabled it to establish close relationships with the legislative, in particular the parliamentary education committee. CSEF was considered by the coalition to be an important contributing factor to the progress within this outcome, particularly through its ability to demonstrate to relevant stakeholders that the coalition can make a contribution and add value to education policy debates, despite the context which is reported to be generally suspicious of CSOs and advocacy groups.

There are several examples of CNT-EPT being invited and consulted by decision makers. Its work with the members of parliament includes developing parliamentarians’ knowledge of relevant educational issues, engagement with advocacy, sharing research results, and showing “the reality on the ground”. The coalition supports members of parliament by providing studies, evidence and questions that parliamentarians can use to question and challenge ministers. Members of parliament help to facilitate the coalition’s dialogue with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance. CNT-EPT participates actively in processes related to the education sector reviews. In this capacity, it asks member organisations within the country for ideas and input, so these can be incorporated in the review processes.

While institutionally, the coalition is very much part of the landscape and is regularly invited and consulted in policy dialogue, its relationships with main stakeholders, including the legislative education commission and the Ministry of Education, have not been formalised. There is a reluctance to formalise such relations with CSOs, for both legal reasons and due to a lack of willingness to formalise relations with wider CSOs. Therefore, the coalition maintains a “tacit partnership”, which the coalition believes works well in this context, although it may present a longer term sustainability risk.

In addition to national level decision makers viewing the coalition as credible and evidenced based, there are examples of global decision makers trusting research findings. For instance, a report by CNT-EPT was used by UNESCO IIEP-Pôle de Dakar during Togo’s 2018 education sector review to demonstrate a gap in evidence between CNT-EPT’s findings and government’s statements on an issue related to the logistics of the distribution of GPE-funded textbooks and their subsequent use. The study was carried out during CSEF II, while the report was presented to ministers and the parliament during CSEF III.
4.3.3 Outcome 14: Decision makers consult with and consider wider civil society perspectives in education policies and proposals

What was the outcome?

This outcome was selected by 11 respondents (10 NECs and one RS), and refers to coalitions capturing civil society perceptions and recommendations and include them in policy discussions. Actions include:

- Coalitions carry out consultative meetings with members to capture their feedback on specific education issues
- Coalitions present suggestions, proposals, recommendations, position papers, etc. to government officials and legislation spaces
- Coalitions’ input is included in education sector planning committees

The change target of this outcome is policy-makers’ willingness to consider the perspectives of civil society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was the main actor targeted to achieve the outcome?</th>
<th>When did the outcome materialise?</th>
<th>If the outcome materialised, what kinds of evidence do you have to support this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National government staff and administrators, 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Photographic evidence, 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of policy groups (such as LEGs), 18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy recommendation / Research report produced by the coalition, 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarians, 18%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government-issued media statement, 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How was the outcome achieved?

83% of respondents categorised this outcome as intended. 89% of respondents reported that the outcome was achieved regardless of being included or not on their coalition's targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What type of strategies were undertaken to support this outcome?</th>
<th>Which inputs from the CSEF programme were key to supporting this outcome?</th>
<th>How important was the contribution of the CSEF programme to this outcome?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consultation meetings with coalition members, 82%</td>
<td>Facilitating linkages, 55%</td>
<td>• 73% of respondents consider that work towards this outcome would not have happened without CSEF support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop partnerships with other stakeholders, 82%</td>
<td>Guidelines and tools, 9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participate in policy planning, 82%</td>
<td>Capacity building, 73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct policy or situational analysis, 73%</td>
<td>Funding, 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical support, 18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why was the outcome significant?

91% of respondents indicated that it is extremely/very likely that their efforts towards this outcome would continue after the end of CSEF. 82% thought that it is very likely that it would be sustained beyond the programme (in cases where it has occurred).

Coalitions reported several ways in which this outcome is significant for their context:

- Collecting input from different stakeholders to draft concept notes and policy recommendations that effectively feed into national education processes
- Improving the ways of engagement of civil society in policy dialogue, which contribute to better quality of policy processes and documents
- Building and enabling environment to ensure that the right to education of all children is protected and upheld, especially for most marginalised. This includes advocacy work towards changes in legislation, education policies and programming, and education financing; particularly in countries without a policy framework supportive of inclusive education.
- Strengthening the legitimacy and institutionality of the coalition, therefore opening communication channels between civil society and government authorities, especially for groups that had not been previously involved in decision-making.
- Generating a ‘toolbox’ for effective engagement of civil society and policy makers.
5 Conclusion

The use of outcome harvesting allowed the evaluation to surface a total of 17 outcome types, which targeted awareness and attitudinal changes across coalitions, awareness and attitudinal changes of the wider public, and awareness, attitudes, and actions of key education policy decision makers.

As part of the CSEF III endline evaluation, we used the OH evaluation approach to examine the impact of the programme, in terms of intended and unintended changes, at global, regional and national levels. This corresponds to key evaluation questions 6 and 7 in the evaluation framework.

After harvesting outcomes, validating the outcomes with key stakeholders, and refining the outcomes, we harvested a total of 17 types of outcomes across the breadth of the CSEF programme at the global, regional and national levels. These outcomes can be organised by:

- The **change target**, which categorises outcomes by the group targeted for change. This includes changes directed at CSEF-partner level (e.g. coalition – whether national, regional or global), various groups that constitute the ‘public’ (citizens and civil society groups external to the coalition) and education policy or practice decision makers or influencers.

- The **type of change**, which categorises outcomes according to changes to knowledge/awareness, attitudes/will or practice/action.

Five outcomes targeted knowledge/awareness and attitude changes within individual coalitions and their membership, as well as the GCE Movement more broadly. Five outcomes targeted knowledge/awareness and attitude changes of the general public, which included marginalised groups within society, specific key education stakeholder groups such as parents, communities, teachers and students and civil society advocates more broadly. Finally, seven outcomes were oriented towards decision makers at all levels of change, whether policy makers at the national level, key influencers of policy making or implementing processes, representatives of donor groups and those involved in the setting of international goals.

**Coalitions reported the most success in achieving outcomes related to building capacities and intended programme-level outcomes**

The harvested outcomes also cut across the six programme objectives: O4 corresponds with Outcome 1.1, O12 corresponds with Outcome 1.2, O9 roughly corresponds with 2.1, O6 aligns with Outcome 2.2 and O17 encompasses both Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2. Of the remaining 12 outcomes, three encompass changes at the output level and focused on building capacities of coalitions and their members on technical advocacy work, on resource mobilisation and on organisational governance and management processes (O1, O2 and O3).

The most prevalent outcomes, in terms of coalitions having reported their materialisation, are outcomes that relate to coalition building, such as capacity building of technical skills (O1) and strengthening internal operations and processes (O3), while other prevalent outcomes unsurprisingly align with intended programme outcomes, such as strengthening the diversity and inclusivity of coalitions (O4), generating research inclusive of grassroots perspectives (O6) and increasing civil society representation in policy dialogue (O12). A large proportion of coalitions also
reported having supported civil society capacities to monitor policy (O10) and decision-makers to modify national education policy or policy implementation (O16), demonstrating the programme’s effectiveness in translating advocacy efforts into policy actions.

Coalitions were also able to achieve outcomes related to building cohesion across civil society and the wider GCE movement as well as in satisfying pre-conditions for national-level policy engagement; however, the outcomes in which coalitions reported the least success in achieving include supporting marginalised groups to engage in policy dialogue and garnering policy commitments towards global goals

The unintended outcomes achieved by the programme, or those not explicitly targeted by the programme, fall under two categories: the first concerns cohesion built both across the GCE Movement (O5) and across civil society at the national level (O7). The second category of unintended outcomes encompasses outcomes that could be considered as the pre-conditions to which coalitions have worked to secure in order to support the achievement of increasing their engagement in policy dialogues (O12 and Outcome 1.2). These concern changing the attitude of policy makers with regard to: viewing coalitions as credible, evidence-based organisations (O13) and valuing diversity and inclusion, through the representation of civil society perspectives, in policy processes (O14). These outcomes both support the achievement of O12. A final unintended, but often also unsuccessful, outcome concerned building coalitions’ capacities to seek funding (O2).

With regard to the outcomes that coalitions reported the least success in achieving, these concerned: circumstances where coalitions were unable to engage with policy processes, coalitions instead sought ways of working through non-formal processes to engage policy makers (O11); translating advocacy efforts into policy commitments towards global goals (O15); and the building of capacities of marginalised groups to participate in policy dialogue (O8).

Different outcomes had greater significance in different regions, but generally, outcomes related to creating key changes in policy and policy spaces required more time to materialise

Coalitions were also asked about the outcomes most significant to their coalition. Once again, capacity building on technical skills (O1) remained the most popular; in Africa, increasing the representativeness of policy dialogue (O12) was noted to be the most significant, while in APAC it was generating inclusive research (O6) and in both ME&EE and LAC, it was strengthening coalition diversity (O4). Although more definitive conclusions cannot be made as to why there is regional differences in the regard of outcome significance, this suggests that there are important contextual factors which dictate the relevance of particular outcomes to a coalition, which may also be aligned with regional factors.

Unsurprisingly, through the course of the CSEF programme, more outcomes materialised each year. Coalitions most quickly achieved the outcome of building civil society capacity to monitor and support the rollout of education policies (O10) and building internal coalition operational capacity. However, outcomes such as generating awareness across citizens and key influencers (O9), convincing decision-makers to modify education policy or policy implementation (O16), and key programme outcomes such as generating inclusive research (O6) and increasing the
representativeness of policy dialogue (O12) were slower to materialise. This reinforces the concept that the outcomes in policy advocacy work takes considerable time and effort to realise.

**While funding was a key input for to all outcomes, building coalition capacities and credibility relied on technical accompaniment and capacity building support while engaging with the public utilised operational guidelines and tools**

Coalitions were asked about their perceptions of the contribution of CSEF to the achievement of outcomes. Their responses provide some insight into the key value add provided by the programme. Two outcomes which coalitions believe would not have happened without CSEF are on the ability to seek funding (O2) and on the creation of non-formal spaces for policy dialogue (O11). These two outcomes point to two areas which are outside the remit of normal funding, yet in this case, supported by CSEF’s provision of core funding. O2 was further supported by the facilitation of national-regional linkages; O2 was the outcome to which national-regional linkages contributed to the most.

Overall, funding was a key input to all of the outcomes. Key inputs provided by regional secretariats and the global secretariat in terms of capacity building and technical accompaniment were particularly important for not only the capacity and coalition-building outcomes (O3, O4) but also for building non-formal dialogue spaces (O11), building the credibility and reputation of coalitions and civil society perspectives in the eyes of decision makers (O13, O14). As with funding, these two inputs played a large role in almost all of the outcomes.

Outcomes such as generating inclusive research (O6) and generating cohesion across the Movement were generally less reliant on the support of CSEF, although both were supported by CSEF funding. In these cases, these are two outcomes where coalitions have likely been working towards these before and outside of CSEF and therefore are less dependent on CSEF support.

**Coalitions appeared the most confident in sustaining efforts and changes to ensuring civil society representation in policy dialogue, as well as in changing the attitudes of decision makers on the contribution of civil society; however, coalitions were less confident in sustaining efforts such as Movement building and sustaining work in non-formal policy spaces and on the lasting impact of policy changes**

Coalitions are most confident in both continuing their efforts towards and the sustainability of the impact of increasing the representation of civil society in education policy processes (O12) and in increasing the capacity of civil society to monitor policies (O10). Coalitions also appear confident in sustaining their efforts towards to pre-conditions of O12 through their work changing the attitudes of decision makers with regards to viewing coalitions as credible and evidence-based (O13) and the value of civil society participation in policy processes (O14). This is an important affirmation of sustainability of CSEF’s Theory of Change in terms of building an accountability feedback loop between civil society and policy makers.

While coalitions believe that outcomes related to capacity building of coalitions (O1, O3) will be sustained, they indicated that efforts to continue to build capacities are mostly likely, but not guaranteed. The outcomes at greatest risk in terms of the sustainability of both efforts and impacts following the programme closure include efforts to build cohesion across the GCE Movement (O5),
to build non-formal policy dialogue spaces (O11), and in modifications to education policy or policy implementation (O16). Furthermore, outcomes such as the ability to seek funding (O2) and generating awareness across citizens and key influencers to contribute to education policy dialogue also remain threatened with the close of the programme. Given the reliance on CSEF for O2 and O11, it seems intuitive that these outcomes would also be under threat after CSEF.

**Coalitions were able to build capacities in technical advocacy skills and strengthen coalition management and governance, which in turn supported coalitions to take action to strengthen the diversity and inclusion of coalition membership**

With the support of CSEF, a large majority (73%) of CSEF coalitions realised O1 in terms of building key technical advocacy skills and knowledge. For newer coalitions such as SOLNEFA, this was focused on building the capacity of internal staff, whereas for more mature coalitions such as ACCE, NCE, and CNT/EPT who have been engaged in CSEF prior to CSEF III, this involved building capacities of its wider membership or building capacities in new areas. Similarly, strengthening internal organisational capacities was particularly important for new coalitions such as SOLNEFA and for older organisations such as FEDH IPN in Nicaragua, who are having to find new ways of operating given the increasingly repressed political climate. Both of these efforts support coalitions to diversity membership by engaging marginalised groups, such as youth groups in the case of ACCE. As with the case of ACCE, increasing coalition diversity served the purpose of both increasing coalition membership by engaging marginalised groups, but also to further build the credibility of the coalition in the eyes of policy makers.

**Coalitions used evidence and research to generate awareness of citizens and key influencers, which in turn, supported the building of civil society capacities to also play a role in participating in holding policy makers accountable**

The generation of rigorous research has always been a cornerstone of coalitions’ evidenced-based policy advocacy efforts. These efforts were continued through CSEF financial support, as well as through CSEF’s approach of generating not just rigorous research, but promoting a form of more inclusive research. As with the case of NCE, the production of research that not only connected the views of citizens but also provided tangible evidence allowed the coalition to spark and maintain the interest of policy makers. While this help garnered commitment of policy makers, research was also crucial to both engage with and be engaged by the wider public. The further building of civil society capacities to also participate in accountability efforts (such as monitoring the rollout of education policies) provided coalitions with another means to put pressure on governments. This was particularly important in the case of FEDH IPN in lieu of direct engagement with government.

**Coalitions were able to bolster their engagement in policy dialogue by changing the attitudes of policy makers towards civil society coalitions as evidence-based, credible organisations and on the importance of civil society consultation, thus supporting a more representative and participatory policy dialogue and process**

One of the key and targeted outcomes of the CSEF programme was to build a more representative and participatory education policy dialogue and process. 24% of coalitions reported this outcome as being one of the most significant to its coalition; Coalitions have utilised different mechanisms to engage in policy dialogue processes, such as through various forms of membership in working
groups or committees. The effectiveness of this engagement is also dependent on governments taking the coalitions and civil society seriously, as membership in government committees or working groups does not guarantee any effect on policy making overall, as demonstrated by the case of ACCE. Stronger engagement can be generated if governments increasingly see coalitions as credible, evidence-based organisations, such as the case of CNT-EPT and NCE.

6 Takeaways from the OH process

The current CSEF III Endline Evaluation proved OH to be a relevant and useful evaluation tool for large-scale, complex evaluations. Previous literature has identified that OH is particularly suitable for use in complex programmes and when the focus of the evaluation is on outcomes rather than activities\(^\text{15}\). This certainly fit the nature of CSEF III evaluation.

As any tool, OH also has some shortcoming and Section 2.8 already described the methodological limitations of using OH. The additional challenges that emerged in the current process, were largely to do with the amount of the resources invested in the current evaluation given the scale of the programme. OH proved to be a rather time- and resource-intensive method in the context of CSEF III Endline Evaluation, this was largely due to the scale of the CSEFIII programme, the number of participating coalitions and the amount of information produced. This was particularly salient in step 2 of the OH process, which covered the document review and conceptualisation of draft outcome descriptors.

Despite the shortcomings, the evaluation benefitted from the choice of OH as a method in several important ways. Some of the most significant strengths of OH, which were confirmed in the current CSEF III Endline evaluation included:

- Analysis of intended and unintended outcomes: Traditional methods often fail to consider the outcomes that emerge through a programme because their starting point is a predetermined set of outcomes they want to substantiate; whereas OH ‘works backwards’ and collects evidence for what has changed this allowed a consideration of a wider scope of coalitions’ outcomes.
- Participatory approach: OH uses a common-sense approach to generate outcomes which helps to engage the research users, the OH workshop used in this evaluation proved to be a very helpful way to not only verify and validate the outcomes harvested through OH but also to engage the research users in the evaluation process.
- Multi-method approach focused on specific evidence: OH is compatible with various data collection methods such as document review interviews and surveys, this was very helpful in the process of adapting to the changing context of the current survey, particularly with the emergence of the Covid-19 pandemic. OH approach to generating verifiable outcomes and focus on answering actionable questions with specific, concrete evidence was also evident in this evaluation.

As a result, the current work found OH to be a very useful evaluation tool for a complex, multi-actor education-focused programme, such as CSEF III.
Appendix 1: Case Study Coalition Change Maps and Outcome Maps

This section provides visual illustrations of the diversity of ways in which case study coalitions targeted and achieved selected outcomes, based on the desk reviews and validation interviews. For each coalition, we provide a:

- **Coalition Change Map**: outlining the ways in which outcome changes occurred, including the contribution of CSEF and other external enablers, the strategies used by coalitions, the targets of the change, and the significance of the outcomes achieved.

- **Coalition Outcome Map**: which presents a high level chronology of events, achievements and outcomes over the life of CSEF to provide a visual story of the types of outcomes that occurred in the national context.

It should be noted that these diagrams have been prepared using the best judgement of the research team, which where possible was validated with the coalition. It is not a complete representation of all coalition achievements, activities, strategies, challenges or enablers, but aims to provide a snap shot view of some of the notable steps towards achieving outcomes.
### Case study coalition ‘Change Maps’

#### Coalition Change Map: Togo

**CSEF Contributions**
- Successfully enhanced legitimacy of CNT/EPT with stakeholders, offsetting existing suspicions of CSOs and organisations which engage in advocacy in the country
- Brought together members of parliament and CNT/EPT in a “tact partnership,” enabling the coalition to develop parliamentarian’s capacities and advocate for a legislative education commission
- Consolidated CNT/EPT’s credibility in the eyes of donors
- Provided financial and technical support for capacity building and the opportunity for the coalition to test its advocacy abilities
- Promoted knowledge exchange by enabling the coalition to participate in global meetings

**Enabling Factors**
- Strong support for SDG4 and positive achievements measured in the country
- Creation of the legislative education commission allowing for improved policy dialogue with the Executive
- Non-confrontational relationship with the Executive
- Good reputation of coalition among the population, domestic decision-makers and foreign stakeholders

**Change Targets**
- Members of Parliament
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Finance

#### Change Strategy

**Outcome 1: The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work**
- Partnering with NGOs to offer them support in advocacy activities
- Carrying out evidence-based studies, utilizing data as a basis for advocacy activities

**Outcome 2: The coalition and its members have strengthened their abilities to seek funding**
- Presenting CNT-EPT’s results in CSEF (2009-2018) to donors with a view to secure funding after CSEF
- Increasing time spent looking for funding opportunities
- Reorientation to the implementation of development projects

**Outcome 13: Decision makers increasingly view coalitions as evidence-based and credible organisations**
- Participating in policy forums and committees, including the Togolese education sector review
- Developing parliamentarians’ knowledge on educational issues through capacity building activities and sharing research results
- Providing members of parliament with evidence and question to use in interrogations with ministers

#### Significance of Outcomes Achieved
- CNT/EPT has become part of the national educational landscape and is regularly invited and consulted by education stakeholders
- The coalition has strong credibility and vast networks which help it engage with other organisations
- CNT/EPT is able to adjust to future donor requirements for advocacy activities as well as, increasingly, undertake development projects
## Coalition Change Map: Nepal

### CSEF Contributions
- Funded capacity building activities strengthened NCE’s voice and rendered it more credible
- CSEF funding enabled the coalition to commission research and produce evidence-based reports which support NCE’s advocacy and, in particular, its active participation in policy dialogues with government officials
- Promoted best practices exchange enabling the coalition to learn from other countries when participating in global and regional meetings

### Enabling Factors
- Strong pre-existing capabilities in civil society engagement and advocacy in other (non-education) sectors
- Recent federalisation of the country provided coalition with the opportunity to assist education authorities and CSOs to operate on a decentralized, federal basis
- Strong pre-existing relationships with a broad range of stakeholders including government officials at all levels, members of parliament, academics, journalists and, in particular, local governments

### Change Targets
- Incumbent political stakeholders
- Political parties (including during elections)
- Public officials and institutional and especially local levels
- GPE Local Education Group

### Change Strategy

**Outcome 1:** The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work
- Improving capabilities specifically for advocacy in education
- Working with political parties to align their activities with SDG4 and the needs of the Nepalese education context

**Outcome 5:** Cohesion and linkages between levels of the Movement (national, regional, global) are stronger
- Developing groups within the coalition through engaging them in coalition activities
- Promoting global and regional cohesion among coalitions by participating in international forums
- Adapting to Nepal’s new three-tiered federal system by expanding the coalition’s presence to all districts

**Outcome 6:** The research and evidence generated for policy advocacy is more inclusive and representative of the perspectives of communities and vulnerable groups
- Undertaking studies on improving public funding for education through a better managed tax system, and utilising this data for evidence-based advocacy with officials
- Advocating for and monitoring disaster resilient education to tackle the post-earthquake and conflict-related educational fallout as well as to restore effective education for students
- Supporting local level administrations and contributing to conversation at the grassroots level in many districts
- Increasing participation of marginalised communities and representation in the coalition policy platform

### Significance of Outcomes Achieved
- GDP spending on education rose from 9% to 11.6% during CSEF III following years of decrease
- Coalition maintains strong relationships with 350 member CSOs spread through urban and rural regions representing a wide variety of population groups and associated advocacy issues
- Strong advocacy capabilities, strengthening of decentralisation of education and attention to education in emergencies (including Covid-19) sustained by the coalition beyond CSEF III
## Coalition Change Map: Albania

### CSEF Contributions

- Brought together a cohesive network of CSOs committed to causes related to children and youth
- Expanded the geographic reach and coordination of coalition members outside of the capital, which was primarily enabled through CSEF funding, with also enabled ACCE to act as a central support unit for coalition member organisations in strategic and administrative matters
- Built member expertise in advocacy, legislation analysis, relationship building, proposal writing, and theory of change development
- Long term and cumulative support from CSEF II was built upon and consolidated by the coalition throughout CSEF III

### Enabling Factors

- European Union legal frames of reference (Acquis Communautaire) mandates the Ministry of Education call on CSOs to participate in decision-making and policy processes
- Privileged position in national educational debates as the only child and youth education CSO recognised by the MoE
- Strong historical relationships with previous MoE administrations

### Change Targets

- Ministry of Education
- Other ministries (Finance, Health and Social Protection)
- Members of parliament
- Children and youth networks

### Change Strategy

**Outcome 1:** The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work

- Empowering children and youth to participate in advocacy through diverse means, including ‘youth parliaments’
- Voicing concerns and drafting a 3-year national action plan to address violence against children in the education system
- Strengthening school accountability systems, benefiting parents, students and communities.
- Consulting with Roma children and children with disabilities, as well as their parents, to tackle issues related to discrimination in schools

**Outcome 4:** The coalition has strengthened its diversity and inclusiveness through increasing or maintaining its membership

- Liaising extensively with children and youth networks across Albania
- Including organisations out of the capital-city, in various provinces, in the coalitions’ network
- Conducting activities collaboratively with the national teachers’ union

**Outcome 12:** Policy dialogue is more representative and participatory, through increased coalition engagement in government processes and working groups

- Entering several working groups in the Ministry of Education and participating in hearing sessions and consultation meetings in parliament and the Executive
- Submitting recommendations to government and Legislative committees
- Despite ACCE’s efforts, however, the LEG remains inactive in Albania since 2009

### Significance of Outcomes Achieved

- Working with its youth parliaments, ACCE succeeded in helping withdraw the controversial Youth Law in 2019
- Succeeded in putting the protection of children from violence in the education of the agenda of the Ministry of Education
- Became part of the European Union Accession Chapters in Albania working in education
- Coalition will concentrate its future activities on lobbying the government to catalyse structural change in education
### Coalition Change Map: Somaliland

#### CSEF Contributions
- CSEF funding, direct technical support, and financial capacity building built foundational capacities in financial management, governance, operational policies and processes, staff capacities, strategic and operational programming, and business development.
- ANOFEA assisted the coalition staff in LEG meetings, meetings with the Ministry of Education, other government bodies, and UNICEF.
- Enabled SOLNEFA to participate in CSOs consultation meetings with the GPE board, to better understand GPE processes.

#### Enabling Factors
- Pre-existing fruitful relationships with Somaliland’s government.
- Favourable environment and attitudes towards SOLNEFA, with minimal challenges/opposing forces.

#### Change Targets
- Somaliland general public, particularly attitudes towards girls’ right to education.
- Ministry of Education.
- Parliament.

#### Change Strategy

**Outcome 1:** The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work.
- Generating mass public awareness on the importance of girls’ education.
- Generating evidence on the enrolment and completion rates of female students in the country.

**Outcome 3:** The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes.
- Securing formal recognition by the Ministry of Education to sit as a full member on all government-led fora.
- Expanding to other country regions by having district-level representatives in the biggest country districts.
- Developing a 5-year strategic plan which will guide the coalition into the future.

**Outcome 8:** Marginalised groups have increased legitimacy and capacities to participate in policy dialogue.
- Engaging with the LEG, the Ministry of Education and members of parliament to promote the right to education of girls and marginalised groups, especially internally displaced persons.
- Participating in the development of the 2017–2021 Education Sector Strategy Plan focusing, in particular, on policies promoting girls’ education.
- Helping the Education Act 2019 to gain approval by the Legislative and the Executive.
- While the coalition has made steps towards the achievement of the outcome, they report this to have been ‘unachieved’.

#### Significance of Outcomes Achieved
- National budget allocation to gender-focused education increased.
- The status of girls’ education in the country improved, with female enrolment in education said to have improved.
- The coalition is more solidly established and has greater capacity and potential to operate and influence Somaliland’s educational landscape.
# Coalition Change Map: Nicaragua

## CSEF Contributions
- Funding, technical support, training and political backing enabled the coalition to survive and adapt in a hostile political context.
- Financial support and capacity building on research facilitated FEDH-IPN's adapted advocacy strategy which was based on research and evidence generation.
- Increased FEDH-IPN legitimacy and credibility build through solidarity with CLADE.

## Enabling Factors
- The repressive environment in which FEDH-IPN operates pushed them to skillfully reinvent their advocacy approach.
- The externally driven refocusing of education advocacy issues in terms of the Education 2030 Agenda and SDG 4 was promptly seized by CSOs and the coalition in favour of their activities.
- FEDH-IPN’s legal status has not been withdrawn, unlike other human rights organisations.

## Change Targets
- Wider civil society
- Organisations working with marginalised groups

## Change Strategy

### Outcome 1: The coalition and its members have strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy work
- Increasing skills and delivery of academic advocacy work based on research and evidence generation.
- Increasing media presence, particularly through alternative media channels such as social media, where traditional government-led media channels are inaccessible.

### Outcome 3: The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes
- Forging national, regional and international alliances with diverse segments of the Nicaraguan society to improve its adaptability and reach (e.g. LGBTIQ organisations, rural populations, indigenous peoples, youth).
- Listing with donors and agencies for project implementation.
- Setting up virtual meeting strategy with stakeholders prohibited from entering the country.

### Outcome 10: Civil society has developed capacities to monitor and support the rollout of education policies
- Areas of activity encompass very diverse aspects of Nicaragua's educational landscape (intercultural education, inclusive education, rural education, multigrade and single-teacher schools, education and political violence, Education 2030 Agenda, etc.)
- Partnered with Nicaraguan universities and research centres to receive training in research and evidence generation and carry out collaborative studies.

## Significance of Outcomes Achieved
- Survived direct governmental repression as a result of the range of CSEF support mechanisms which allowed them to adapt and reinvent their advocacy work and operational strategy.
- The coalition remains a reputed reference for education, a source of credible research and evidence, and a constructive alternative to governmental narratives of education.
- Educationally disadvantaged segments of the Nicaraguan society have in FEDH-IPN a privileged actor for advocacy.
- FEDH-IPN did not become isolated as it could maintain regional articulation and education policy dialogue, particularly via CLADE.
Case study coalition ‘Outcome Maps’

Coalition Outcome Map – Togo

Annex K: Outcome Harvesting Report
Coalition Outcome Map – Nepal

(1) The Nepalese School Sector Development Plan acknowledged the role of CSOs and included SDG perspectives on educational issues

(2) Pressure placed on the government to improve public education financing and monitor private school providers

(3) Disaster school resilience becomes part of the Nepalese School Sector Development Plan

(4) Recommendations on improved selection criteria of the governmental scholarship programme incorporated by government

(5) Television and other public discussions support public education financing through fair taxation and against education privatisation

(6) NEC collaboration solicited by Ministry of Education at provincial and local levels to help coordinate actions in the new federal context

(7) NEC suggestions on school-level improvements in education quality, equity, governance and teacher preparation incorporated into Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development regulations

(8) Advocated for earthquake-hit schools to be brought into mainstream school system under the responsibility of the Ministry of Education

(9) Provisions for free education, school meals, health checks, uniforms and stationary incorporated in the country’s new bill for free compulsory education following lobbying from civil society

(10) Political parties included education in their political agendas

(11) Coalition research publications valued and utilised by journalists, academics, young professionals and the government

(12) Enhanced engagement of CSOs with local, provincial and federal governments after country federalisation

(13) Member recommendations incorporated into the National Education Policy 2019, Local Education Acts as well as programmes of various municipalities

(14) Solicited by national authorities to provide research evidence on alternative sources of public education funding

(16) Coalition-advocated provisions for girls’ education, disadvantaged provinces and literacy adopted by government

(17) Increased interest from teacher groups, journalists, community organisations and CSOs for partnering with NCE

2016

2017

2018

2019

Outcome # | Outcome Statement | Line Color/Type | Relationship Between Outcomes | Line Color/Type
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1 | The coalition has strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy | Chronological Link | --- | ---
5 | Cohesion and linkages between levels of the Movement are stronger | Contributory link | --- | ---
6 | Research and evidence generated for policy advocacy is more inclusive | --- | --- | ---

Annex K: Outcome Harvesting Report
Coalition Outcome Map – Albania

2016
(1) Led consultation about education budget, submitted recommendations, and participated in parliamentary sessions.
(2) Formed partnerships with Local Education Authorities
(3) Led hearing session with parliament on pre-university system education challenges
(4) Submitted recommendations for the law on child protection and the law on social care services to the parliament
(5) ACCE recommendations on the implementation of SDG4 included in the national education policy

2017
(6) Implemented a school-community-based tool to enable citizens to monitor and evaluate the services provided by Local Education Authorities
(7) Created a child protection working group, which reviewed the legal framework and mechanisms to report and prevent violence in schools
(8) Conducted locally based advocacy campaigns on RTE with parents and children, focusing on Roma and disabled children

2018
(9) Invited by MoE to participate in education budget debates where coalition lobbied for an increase to the budget
(10) Participated in national meetings about monitoring system of SDG4 agenda
(11) Set up 'youth parliaments' and developed capacities of child and youth advocacy groups through a training academy
(12) Child and youth advocacy groups held national consultations to review and submit recommendations about the draft of the national Law on Youth
(13) Evidence and policy recommendations presented to the parliament on protecting children from violence and bullying

2019
(14) Presented to MoE the findings of a desk research on psycho-social situation in schools
(15) Provided accredited teacher training to 60 teachers increasing capacities and knowledge about the rights of disabled children
(16) Drafted report on pre-university education policy in Albania presented to MoE and media
(17) Active dissemination and awareness campaigns in media conducted including participation of youth groups in media debates
(18) The president removed the support to the Law on Youth, responding to coalition's concerns about lack of check and balances

Annex K: Outcome Harvesting Report
Coalition Outcome Map – Somaliland

1. Generated mass public awareness on the importance of girls’ education
2. Engaged with local education groups (LEGs), Ministry of Education and members of parliament in order to promote girls’ education
3. Contributed to the Education Sector Strategy Plan (2017 - 2021) and national education policies in favour of girls’ education
4. Four public outreach and mobilisation meetings conducted in Awal, Sahil, and Maroodi Jeex
5. Five consultative meetings held with parliament and LEGs
6. Helped to approve an Education Act by the Legislative and the Executive, which is ready for implementation
7. Partner organizations increased participation in government-led forums, including gender-focused forums, during consultation meetings at grassroots level
8. Ministry of Education’s budget allocation to gender-focused education increased
9. Held a general assembly and elected new board members; coalition’s policy and manual documents were ratified and adopted
10. Coalition recruited new staff and supported improved internal management
11. Improved support and commitment of national legislative members to promote education policies for girls, as evidenced by the establishment of the Parliament Caucus for Girls’ Education
12. Coalition selected to participate in CSO2 consultation meeting and GPE board meeting
13. Letter secured from the Ministry of Education certifying the coalition as a full member of all government-led forums
14. 5-year strategic plan for the coalition developed
15. District level chambers of representatives built in the country’s largest districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #1</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #3</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome #8</td>
<td>Marginalised groups have increased capacities to participate in policy dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coalition Outcome Map – Nicaragua

(1) Created a national network of “Living Community Cultures” to articulate CSOs in the country

(2) Produced and disseminated documentation on SDG4 and RTE to generate debate in the regions

(3) Conducted and presented the results of the study ‘Perceptions on the quality of Nicaraguan education’

(4) Campaigned for school retention in rural areas (keep kids out of work in farms)

(5) Collectively constructed regional strategy to mobilise funds

(6) Created partnerships with independent media that use alternative and virtual platforms

(7) Used social media to position SDG4 in the public arena

(8) Appealed to the government for a collectively designed education plan

(9) Led the ‘Enrol me now’ campaign in support of an enrolment initiative by the MoE, which led to an increase in enrolment in the period

(10) Diversification of the coalition’s network (e.g. including youth and LGBTI communities)

(11) Raised concerns about political repression to international platforms (e.g. UN rapporteur for the RTE)

(12) Produced qualitative research exploring the reality experienced by LGBTI youth groups in schools

(13) Published study about youth participation and social transformation, in the light of the socio-political crisis in the country

(14) Recommendations submitted to the government about education financing and facilitating access to data

(15) Held workshops with university students, opening spaces for underrepresented groups

(16) Used social networks and new tools to generate attractive content (e.g. Tableau)

(17) Disseminated the Alternative Civil Society Report on Education

(18) Published studies about multigrade teaching in rural schools, and the state of initial education in rural formal preschools

2016

2017

2018

2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #</th>
<th>Outcome Statement</th>
<th>Line Color/Type</th>
<th>Relationship Between Outcomes</th>
<th>Line Color/Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened skills and capacities for advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronological link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The coalition has strengthened internal operations and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributory link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civil society has developed capacities to support the rollout of education policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for excellence in education