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Executive Summary

Better Governance for Education (BG4E) is a 4 year project (July 2016 – June 2020) funded by the Australian Government’s ‘Australian NGO Cooperation Program’ (ANCP) with a total budget of 1.7 million Australian dollars. It is a pilot project that aims to develop and test a model that shows that better governance (and therefore better decision-making, resource allocation, project implementation oversight, monitoring & evaluation) results in improved service delivery. BG4E is based on CARE International’s Governance Framework, which states that if marginalised citizens are empowered, if power-holders are effective, accountable and responsive, and if spaces for negotiation are created, expanded, effective and inclusive, then sustainable and equitable development can be achieved, particularly for marginalised women and girls. The project worked intensively in four school communities, within the Obura Wanenera District, and at sub-national level in 3 districts (Obura Wonenara, Okapa and Lufa) within Eastern Highlands Province.

This evaluation consisted of a desk review, interviews with relevant Department of Education representatives at National, Provincial, District and school level, and field visits to the four project communities where interviews, focus group discussions and observations were undertaken. In total, the evaluation team spoke to 191 people (53% women). A detailed matrix (see figure 3), specifically developed for this evaluation, was used to judge the success of the project against expected changes within each domain of CARE’s Governance framework (see figure 1).

The evaluation focused on answering four key evaluation questions:

1) IMPACT - Has improved gender inclusive governance led to better service delivery in education?

Community Level:
Of the four communities the project worked with intensively, one demonstrated improved inclusive governance leading to better service delivery – characterized by improvements in each of the domains of the inclusive governance framework (Citizens empowered, Power holders effective, Spaces for negotiation, Effectiveness of education service delivery). Key differences between this community and the other three communities was a pre-existing, high level of community cohesion, and a full complement of teachers allocated to the school with high attendance rates. A common factor among the other three communities was poor effectiveness of power holders, characterized by understaffed schools, high absenteeism of the TIC/Head Teacher, and poor accountability mechanisms within the education system.

Sub-national level:
The project’s focus at sub-national level has been on establishing District Education Implementation Committees (DEICs). In 2018, the project succeeded in establishing DEICs in three districts - Obura Wonenara, Okapa and Lufa. These DEICs are recognised by the National Department of Education, and members of the committees understand their roles and responsibilities. While this is a promising start, implementation has stalled for all three DEICs due to lack of funding and other support from the District, Provincial and National Department of Education.
2) MODEL - Has this project produced a proven or promising approach?

The BG4E ‘model’ is a package of four community trainings (outlined in Table 3), in addition to teacher training in the Standards-Based Curriculum (SBC), phonics and numeracy. This evaluation has found that this model is not sufficient in achieving its goal (of improved gender-inclusive governance leading to improved service delivery), however, some promising approaches and important lessons for future programming have emerged.

3) RELEVANCE - How relevant is the project to the policy context?

This project is highly relevant, both to the stated government policies and the realities of the context. The consensus between representatives from National Department of Education (NDoE) and the Provincial Department of Education (PDoE) interviewed was that this project closely aligns with relevant policies, and contributes to filling a gap in government capacity. They explained that the government does not have the budget or resources to fully implement some policies – such as establishing District Education Implementation Committees (DEICs) to monitor school expenditure, rolling out the current curriculum (SBC), providing regular teacher training and support (especially to remote schools) and supporting gender equality. The BG4E project not only aligned with major policies, but also supported government systems, staff and practices through using Department of Education training guidelines and trainers to conduct Board of Management and DEIC training, and providing training for teachers that has been officially sanctioned (Jolly Phonics and SBC). The project’s commitment to supporting government systems and policies has led to CARE being seen as a partner by the Department of Education.

4) SUSTAINABILITY - Are the outcomes and impacts likely to be sustained after the end of the project?

This evaluation found that while some changes brought about by the project may be sustained beyond the life of the project, others will need additional support from CARE or the Department of Education to continue.

Of the four communities that were the focus of the project’s governance strengthening work, one was assessed as achieving improved gender inclusive governance. While this community has requested ongoing involvement from CARE, some key community members the evaluation team spoke with felt that they will continue supporting education regardless.

While the three DEICs (Obura Wonenara, Okapa and Lufa) have been registered and recognized by the National Department of Education, and the members have been trained, they are not yet fully functional. Of the four DEIC members interviewed (from Obura Wonenara and Okapa District DEICs) during this evaluation, all said that the DEICs would be unlikely to continue beyond the end of the project. Reasons given were a lack of support from the District, in terms of oversight and allocation of funding to allow the committee to undertake its work, and a lack of understanding of the role and responsibilities of the DEIC – from school level to national level. The BG4E team plan to share the experience of DEICs - that number 3 of the 4 total number of registered DEICs across the 89 districts of PNG - with other districts, with the Province and the national level DoE, which may trigger support from the DoE to establish, train and resource DEICs across the county.
Introduction

Context

Gender equality & women’s voice in education

Women in PNG face severe disadvantages, as social and cultural gender norms compound the general challenges of living in remote areas and limit women’s engagement in government and community-level decision-making. Women are constrained politically, economically, and socially, and tend to have higher workloads than men, particularly in agricultural activities and caring for their families.¹ Women are underrepresented in both formal and informal governance structures at the sub-national levels of government and in villages and communities in PNG. Further to this, women and girls are underrepresented within formal and informal education structures within Provincial and District Departments of Education. While the PNG National Department of Education has gender equity policies, Provincial and District Education Advisors and National Department of Education Standards Officers struggle to link with schools and communities to fulfil their gender responsibilities. Most schools therefore do not achieve gender parity in student attendance, student leaders, principals or head teachers or on School Boards of Management or Parents and Citizen Committees.

Education access & quality

The education system in Papua New Guinea is under severe stress, especially in rural and remote areas. Recent studies² of elementary students across 10 Provinces (including Eastern Highlands Province) have shown student performance is well below national standards in literacy and numeracy. Elementary school infrastructure is poor - with limited access to electricity, fresh water and adequate toilets - and most do not have a school library or other basic learning resources. While the majority of elementary school teachers have completed a Certificate in Teaching, most have not completed high school or received regular in-service training. Both teacher and student absenteeism is high. Most schools do not have an adequate School Learning Improvement Plan (SLIP), an important tool for school management. Monitoring and inspection visits to Elementary schools by officials is uncommon. Primary school student results³ paint a similar picture of education quality.

In Obura Wonenara District, Eastern Highlands Province, access to formal and non-formal educational opportunities is severely limited and literacy rates are extremely low, particularly for girls. While boys may be permitted to make the often difficult, multi-day walk to reach a classroom in serviced area, cultural norms and serious safety and security issues prevent girls from accessing these same opportunities. In addition to this, although there are numerous school-age children in the district, there are serious shortages of schools and teachers. Local teachers (including school leavers that volunteer as teachers) number only a few, and most are not adequately qualified, nor can they access in-service professional development opportunities to further their knowledge and skills. Those responsible for

³ The Pacific Islands Literacy and Numeracy Assessment (PILNA) 2015.
providing teacher support and establishing schools often do not have the budget to support these aspects in remote locations.

While the Government of PNG has numerous policies in place to improve access to and quality of education and a clear structure of roles and responsibilities for planning and delivering educational services (see table below), implementing policies remains a challenge.

The Tuition Fee Free (TFF) is a Government of Papua New Guinea policy initiated in 2011 and first implemented in 2012 country-wide. It aims to enable free access to education for all Papua New Guinean children, in elementary, primary and secondary schools, by providing 100% subsidies for students’ tuition fees. Monitoring and managing of the TFF funding at the district level has been a mammoth task for the inspectors and the district education officials. They have faced problems in monitoring, acquittals and reporting the usage of the funds over the years since its inception. A major finding by the National Department of Education (NDoE) is mismanagement of TFF around the country and therefore the National Executive Council (NEC) Decision No. 77/2016 gave authorization for the establishment of District Education Implementation Committees (DEIC). These committees are tasked with monitoring schools’ functions as per its TFF disbursement and to perform other functions for the NDoE, such as collecting raw data at the district level. Before this project, only one DEIC (out of 89 total districts in PNG) had been established – the pilot DEIC in National Capital District.

Table 1: Education governance: Roles & responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>30% administration component of TFF is paid to schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Board of Management, made up of community representatives (including women), head teacher/Teacher in Charge, Ward Councilor and other key stakeholders in education, has responsibilities laid out in the Education Act⁴, including supporting community engagement in the school, ensuring accountable and transparent use of funds, and advising on school management issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Level</td>
<td>40% infrastructure component of TFF is held at the district treasury to be overseen by the District Education Implementation Committee (DEIC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The composition of the DEIC is made up of the District Education Administrator (Chairman), District Education Officer, District Treasurer, Standard Officer, Church and women representatives and Provincial TFF Coordinator that oversees the committee but is not an official member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Education Officer updates school census information and ensures that schools are in place and operating through visits and communication with school management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Provincial Level | 30% teaching and learning component of TFF is managed by the Provincial Education office.  
The Provincial Division of Education (PDoE) creates new positions, appoints new elementary, primary and secondary teachers, scopes for new school locations, reopens schools, and provides professional development to teachers. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Level</td>
<td>The National Department of Education (NDoE) registers schools, ensures professional development, and develops and distributes school curricula throughout the country. The NDoE is also responsible for the development of non-formal education and literacy programs, curricula, and literacy trainers through the National Literacy Awareness Secretariat, which oversees the implementation of literacy programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overview of the Better Governance for Education (BG4E) Project**

BG4E is a 4 year project (July 2016 – June 2020) funded by the Australian Government’s ‘Australian NGO Cooperation Program’ (ANCP) with a total budget of 1.7 million Australian dollars. It is a pilot project that aims to develop and test a model that shows that better governance (and therefore better decision-making, resource allocation, project implementation oversight, monitoring & evaluation) results in improved service delivery. Specifically, the project aims to improve education outcomes by strengthening sub-national inclusive governance (at the school, district and provincial level), by providing direct support to schools (materials, infrastructure & teacher training) and by mobilizing communities to support education outcomes (especially for girls). The project contends that increasing gender equality is essential and intrinsic to improving good governance. This project has built on a partnership with the Eastern Highlands Division of Education that began in 2011 under CARE’s Integrated Community Development Program (ICDP).
BG4E is based on the CARE International Governance Framework (see above) which states that if marginalised citizens are empowered, if power-holders are effective, accountable and responsive, and if spaces for negotiation are created, expanded, effective and inclusive, then sustainable and equitable development can be achieved, particularly for marginalised women and girls. This means working with governance on both the “demand” and “supply” side. For BG4E, this means working with children, parents, and communities to increase confidence, skills and awareness of the right to education. It also includes working with School Boards of Management (BOM) and Head Teachers/Teachers in Charge (TIC), District & Provincial education authorities, in particular DEICs, to be aware of their roles and responsibilities and working to broker effective communication, links and negotiations between these stakeholders (see diagram below).
The project focused on four school communities in Obura Wonenara District, Eastern Highlands Province: 1) Ande Elementary School Community; 2) Boiko Elementary School Community; 3) Sindeni Elementary School Community; and, 4) Gun-Yani Primary School Community (which includes Ande, Boiko and Sindeni Elementary schools within its feeder school zone). Each of these ‘school communities’ includes several villages. The project also worked at the District Level, to establish District Education Implementation Committees (DEICs) in three Districts: Obura Wonenara District; Lufa District; and Okapa District. In addition, the project provided teacher training (SBC, phonics and numeracy) to a range of teachers from schools across Obura Wonenara District.

Table 2: Project outcomes & activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stated end of project outcome</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome 1: Improved school & sub-national education governance (School, District, Province)** | **School level:**  
  - SLIP planning sessions for school/community members where SLIPs are reviewed for alignment with Local Level Government (LLG) education plans so schools can gain funding for next year.  
  **District level** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2: Direct support to schools (materials, infrastructure &amp; teacher training)</th>
<th>Provision of materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gender, Equity &amp; Diversity (GED) for DEIC members &amp; other District Education Officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Roles and Responsibilities training for DEIC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate school inspections by government inspectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Management Training for DEIC members and other District Education officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Workshops for district and local level government (LLG) education staff to learn about applying the Tuition Fee Free Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• DEIC Review/planning workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mentoring and coaching meetings conducted with female DEIC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• District Maturity Assessment tools developed and used by DEIC members.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome 2: Direct support to schools (materials, infrastructure &amp; teacher training)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supplementary teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Phonics starter kits (consisting of music player, songs, videos and stationary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School start-up kits consisting of stationery and teaching supplies provided to Child Literacy Schools (non-registered schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching aids (containing phonics charts, textbooks and audio materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School start up kits (containing books, pens and textbooks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Standards-based curriculum (SBC) training provided elementary &amp; primary school teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported a multi-grade self-instructional unit training (School administration, curriculum, language and phonics, child development, assessment and reporting) conducted by PNG Education Institute/EHP Division of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteer child literacy teachers training &amp; certification for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training of Trainers (ToT) in phonics and curriculum development provided to 27 teachers (16 female, 11 male).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teacher training in phonics standards based curriculum, grammar and literacy for teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scholarships provided for two teachers to complete teaching diplomas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Literacy teachers supported to do Flexible Open Distance Education (FODE) to upgrade their marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Child literacy assessment and reporting training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other in-service trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outcome 3: Communities are mobilized to support education outcomes (especially for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Training/Workshop</td>
<td>Training/workshop description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community Socialisation   | Introduce CARE, the project, key policies (such as Child Protection), build understanding and engagement in project. A CARE Manual is used for this training. | 3 days
Approximately 35 selected community members (focused on including BOM, P&C, Community leaders, other key community education stakeholders) |
| Community Planning Workshop | Work with community members to identify and prioritise issues to do with education. | 2 days (conducted at the same time as Socialisation, so as a 5-day package)
Same participants as the Socialisation (focused on including BOM, P&C, Community leaders, other key community education stakeholders) |
| Gender, Equity and Diversity Training | What is gender and why is it important for an individual, group, family or workplace? | 5 days.
DEIC members & other District Education Officers, Community members (focused on including BOM, P&C, Community leaders, other key community education stakeholders) |
| BOM training | This is a government training, facilitated by government staff. CARE organises and pays for travel, logistics. It covers roles & responsibilities of BOM members. How to develop a SLIP. | 5 days
Participants are board members, TIC/Head Teacher and other teachers. |
Evaluation overview

Purpose

There were three main purposes driving this evaluation:

- **Documenting** proven or promising gender sensitive approaches for improving community & sub-national governance.
- **Accountability** to the donor, to the Government of PNG and other stakeholders, and to the school communities BG4E has worked with.
- **Learning** - the BG4E team have been deeply engaged in the evaluation process, including analysis and development of recommendations.

Scope

This evaluation was conducted from September-December 2019, so does not include activities implemented in the final 6 months of the project timeframe. To fit within budget constraints, and to align with the learning agenda, the evaluation was conducted as an internal evaluation led by the CARE PNG Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Advisor and using the BG4E staff as members of the evaluation field team. It is a requirement of the ANCP funding mechanism that this project conduct an evaluation.

Audience

There are multiple audiences for this evaluation, including:

- The National/Provincial/District Department of Education and other stakeholders: the BG4E team will present the findings from the evaluation at a workshop to be held in February 2020.
- DFAT (ANCP): evaluation findings will be shared with the ANCP section of DFAT.
- Communities BG4E has worked in: the BG4E team will share relevant findings from evaluation during community meetings and with School Boards of Management (BOMs).
- CARE PNG: CARE will use findings and recommendations to inform future work in education and governance.

Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation focused on answering the following questions:

1. **IMPACT**: Has improved gender inclusive governance led to better service delivery in education?
   - What are the expected/unexpected impacts of the project (both positive and negative) relating to gender-inclusive governance (at community/sub-national)?
   - What impacts has the project had on service deliveries (teachers, BOMs) and quality of education service delivery?
   - Are there any other expected/unexpected impacts of the project (positive or negative)?
2. **MODEL: Has this project produced a proven or promising approach?**
   - Is it replicable? What are the key ‘ingredients’ needed? What are the key enabling factors for change to occur? What are the constraints/challenges?

3. **RELEVANCE: How relevant is the project to the policy context?**
   - Is the project relevant to stated government policy? And to the realities of the context, such as budget constraints, education system, political will?

4. **SUSTAINABILITY: Are the outcomes and impacts likely to be sustained after the end of the project?**
   - Will DEICs continue, and increase in functionality after the project ends? Will DEICs be rolled out across PNG? Will DEICs result in increased accountability and improved spending/management of resources?
   - Will communities continue supporting education and continue being involved in decision-making? Will gender advocates continue to advocate for gender change?
   - Will any improved functioning of BOMs (in project sites) continue? Will school principals continue to run the BOM training?

**Methodology**

The evaluation consisted of a desk review, interviews with relevant Department of Education representatives at National, Provincial, District and school level, and field visits to the four project communities, where interviews, focus group discussions and observations were undertaken. In total, the evaluation team spoke to 191 people (53% women). A detailed matrix (see figure 3), specifically developed for this evaluation, was used to judge the success of the project against expected changes within each domain of CARE’s Governance framework (see figure 1).

**Data collection methods**

The evaluation was conducted over 3 phases:

- **Phase I**: a focussed desk-based review of project plans, reports and other documents (see Annex A for full list of documents). Gaps in data required to answer the Key Evaluation Questions were identified and fieldwork plans and tools were developed to fill these gaps.

- **Phase II**: Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) conducted with: National Department of Education (in Port Moresby); Provincial Department of Education (in Goroka), District Divisions of Education (Yonki, Aiyura, Kainantu, Goroka) and with non-project schools within CARE District (in Obura Station, Yonki & Kainantu). See Annex B for full list of interviews, and Annex C for Interview Tools.

- **Phase III**: Field visit to project sites (Sindeni, Boiko, Ande) to gather primary data from community members, including: Focus Group Discussions (separate male and female) with parents/caregivers; semi-structured interviews with school Board of Management members, P&C members, Head Teachers/TICs, teachers, students, parents and other community members; and, photos/observation of school buildings, inside classrooms and school grounds.
The focus group discussions used flash cards developed by the International Women’s Development Agency\(^5\) (different sets for female and male) to initiate discussion about confidence and participation levels of different women and men in community level discussions and decision-making, in particular in regards to education. A secret ballot was conducted, where participants were asked to vote by placing a piece of paper under the flashcard they feel represented them.

**Table 3: Number of people interviewed** (for full list of interviewees see Annex B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of people interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial (Eastern Highlands Province)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obura Wonenara District</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okapa District</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ande Elementary School Community</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiko Elementary School Community</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindenai Elementary School Community &amp; Gun-Yani Primary School Community</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other schools - non project but within the project district</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL number of people interviewed:</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethics

As an Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) member, CARE is committed to upholding ACFID’s Code of Conduct and ‘to observe the highest ethical standards’ (ACFID Code of Conduct 2016). ACFID’s *Guidelines for Ethical Research and Evaluation in Development* were used during evaluation planning, as a framework to apply principles of ethical research so that the study could achieve its aims, while protecting the safety, rights, welfare and dignity of participants.

Key considerations for this research were identified, were;

- **Informed consent** – interviewers explained the purpose and use of the information, and obtained consent from each participant prior to commencing interviews. Due to low levels of literacy, verbal consent was considered most appropriate. Written records of consent were kept by the research team members conducting the interviews.

- **Cultural competence** - The project team provided guidance to the lead evaluator on cultural aspects including communication styles, time, clothing, gender and space. For example, a relaxed environment was created during interviews and FGDs with community members, by conducting interviews outside under a tree. Babies and small children were welcomed, to allow full participation of their parents. Timing of interviews was very flexible and left up to the community to determine - the evaluation team arrived in a community and stayed for a few days, and waited for community members to be ready to speak.

- **Confidentiality** - Data management processes ensured that confidentiality of individual participants was maintained.

- **Beneficence** - While this evaluation is unlikely to directly benefit the specific communities visited, it aims to inform and improve future projects and the PNG education sector in general, so will provide broad benefits. Lessons learned will be shared with the Government of PNG, will directly inform CARE’s future projects and will be shared with other NGOs working in the sector.

- **Managing evaluator bias** - was a key consideration, since this evaluation was internal, and the evaluation team was comprised of the project team members. To manage this, the staff who were directly involved in implementing in a particular community were not directly involved in interviewing or facilitating FGDs. A detailed matrix was used to make judgments about the success of the project, based on triangulated evidence.

- **Child protection & safeguarding** - This evaluation is subject to CARE’s usual child protection and safeguarding measures. These measures include; training all CARE staff and partners on CARE’s Child Protection Policy and having them sign their agreement to adhere to the policy; recruiting in line with CARE’s child protection human resource procedures (including police checks). Mitigation measures used included ensuring all interviews with children were conducted in line of sight of the head enumerator, with no child ever left alone with a member of the survey team.

---

Limitations of the study

- **Baseline data was not available**, and monitoring data collected throughout the project was incomplete. To counter this, all interview questionnaires developed for data collection included questions to gather data on the situation before CARE’s intervention, such as “has there been any change in the past few years?” While this gives us an indication of the baseline situation, it is not as reliable as data collected at the time, as people may have trouble remembering and articulating the situation several years ago.

- **Using project staff as part of the project team** – may have led to community members reporting positive stories and saying what they think the team want to hear, and may have led to bias in recording stories, as the project staff see and record what they expect to see, rather than the true story. This was countered by using very structured analysis techniques – such as the use of a detailed rubric to judge the impacts of the project, based on multiple examples, from a variety of sources, of specific changes.

- **Translation** to/from local language to Tok Pisin – with over 700 languages spoken in PNG, translation is always a challenge. Women are much less likely to speak Tok Pisin (the common language). When conducting FGDs with women, it was necessary to have a community member act as translator. Using an untrained translator affects the quality of translation.

Data analysis & assessment

A 2-day analysis workshop was facilitated by the lead evaluator, with the BG4E project team (who were also the evaluation team) as participants. During the workshop, the team reviewed and coded pieces of evidence from fieldwork, interviews and desk-review. They mapped them against the Domains of Change for BG4E Inclusive Governance (see figure 2), and used a rubric (see figure 3) to judge the project’s impacts in terms of gender inclusive governance (Key Evaluation Question 1). The rubric was designed by the lead evaluator, and closely aligns with expected outcomes and success measures articulated in key project documentation (design, intended outcomes, donor reports, theory of change, reflection workshop reports) and was validated by the BG4E team. The team then sorted and analysed data against the other Key Evaluation Questions (model, relevance, sustainability) to answer them and to make recommendations. The team also identified unintended positive and negative impacts.
## Figure 3: Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 – Good / Functioning well</th>
<th><strong>Citizens Empowered</strong></th>
<th><strong>Power holders effective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Spaces for negotiation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Effectiveness of education service delivery</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most community members value education (for boys and girls). Community members are well-informed of their rights</td>
<td>DoE (District, Province, National) is transparent, accountable, effective, communication is effective between and to schools District level (DEIC, Inspectors) are accountable, transparent &amp; effective - they understand and have the skills to meet their roles &amp; responsibilities and are successfully and consistently meeting these roles &amp; responsibilities, they make gender-inclusive decisions</td>
<td>Community is aware of, and engaged in, key decisions to do with education; P&amp;C is functioning &amp; strong and enables male and female community members and parents to be involved in decision-making on school matters BOM is functioning and strong and makes gender-inclusive decisions; TIC/Head Teacher values BOM and P&amp;C Community supports events at the school; community and school work together on special projects - community members donate time &amp; resources Women on P&amp;C, BOM and DEIC meaningfully participate in decision-making SLIP plans are developed inclusively and there is a sense of ownership of the SLIP plans by parents, students, teachers, TIC/Head teacher. There is good communication and a sense of shared purpose and trust.</td>
<td>Permanent classrooms Teachers are motivated and engaged SBC Materials; adequate teaching &amp; learning materials Adequate toilets for girls and boys; Student/Teacher ratio not too high School is registered and teacher is paid Most students enrolled in school Equal numbers of girls and boys; attendance is high Regular in-service training for teachers and evidence of teachers attending ToT and training others; teachers are confident Girls taking on leadership roles Students are learning and meeting standards Schools support solutions for girls’ education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community members are well-informed of their rights P&amp;C is strong, meets regularly and actively supports the school Parents feel empowered &amp; demand accountability; communication between community &amp; school is effective The school and community have a productive relationship based on mutual trust Most girls know their right to education; parents are aware of their responsibility to support their children's education and provide support to girls and boys There have been some small but tangible shifts to unequal gender norms &amp; beliefs. Schools are well maintained.</td>
<td>DoE (District, Province) communicates effectively with schools (both ways); TIC/Head teacher is trusted, accountable, transparent &amp; effective BOM has good financial management skills and knowledge of roles &amp; responsibilities, meets regularly, is effective. Spending of school funds is transparent Allocation and implementation of resources are gender inclusive.</td>
<td>DoE (District, Province) communicates effectively with schools (both ways); TIC/Head teacher is trusted, accountable, transparent &amp; effective BOM has good financial management skills and knowledge of roles &amp; responsibilities, meets regularly, is effective. Spending of school funds is transparent Allocation and implementation of resources are gender inclusive.</td>
<td>Permanent classrooms Teachers are motivated and engaged SBC Materials; adequate teaching &amp; learning materials Adequate toilets for girls and boys; Student/Teacher ratio not too high School is registered and teacher is paid Most students enrolled in school Equal numbers of girls and boys; attendance is high Regular in-service training for teachers and evidence of teachers attending ToT and training others; teachers are confident Girls taking on leadership roles Students are learning and meeting standards Schools support solutions for girls’ education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many community members value education (for boys and girls) Community members have some understanding of their rights P&amp;C has many members &amp; meets regularly to support school with gardening and other jobs Parents feel confident and are compliant Communication between community &amp; school is good enough; the school and community have a positive relationship Some girls know their rights to education Parents support their children (including girls) to attend school in some ways; while traditional unequal gender norms &amp; beliefs exist, there are some people who actively challenge them. Schools are well maintained.</td>
<td>DoE [District, Provincial, National] provide enough support to enable schools to run effectively and are somewhat accountable District level (DEICs, Inspectors) have a good understanding of their roles &amp; responsibilities and have the skills required, they are motivated, and are usually able to meet most roles and responsibilities There is some communication between District &amp; school TIC/Head teachers are generally quite well respected, are quite accountable and do their job of teaching and leading the school adequately most of the time BOM meets fairly regularly and has a pretty good idea of their role &amp; responsibilities Spending of school funds is usually transparent.</td>
<td>DoE (District, Province) communicates effectively with schools (both ways); TIC/Head teacher is trusted, accountable, transparent &amp; effective BOM has good financial management skills and knowledge of roles &amp; responsibilities, meets regularly, is effective. Spending of school funds is transparent Allocation and implementation of resources are gender inclusive.</td>
<td>Permanent or well-maintained bush material classrooms Teachers are mostly engaged and motivated Toilets; adequate teaching/learning materials Teacher may be volunteer Low teacher absenteeism Low student absenteeism Students are learning/meeting standards Teachers have been trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Poor / inadequate</td>
<td>Generally, the community doesn't value education very highly, or may value boys' education but not girls' Community don't have a good understanding of their rights; P&amp;C meets sometimes and some community members attend; Parents feel frustrated and concerned; communication between community &amp; school is poor - parents are not aware of important information; there is a relationship of distrust between school and community Girls don't know their right to education; parents provide limited support to their children (esp. girls) to help them attend school; traditional gender norms and beliefs are prominent Schools and grounds are not well maintained (e.g. grass and gardens overgrown)</td>
<td>District level (DEIC, Inspectors) have some understanding of their roles &amp; responsibilities, but do not consistently meet these, due to various reasons Communication between school and DoE happens infrequently and is usually one way (e.g. demand for reports from District) TIC/Head Teacher does not meet responsibilities, accountability is poor; transparency is poor BOM meets rarely and does not meet its responsibilities School fund spending is not transparent - most teachers and parents don't know where money goes.</td>
<td>P&amp;C is expected to support but is not given any opportunity to input into decision-making process BOM is dominated by one or two community members and is not representative SLIP is developed by a few (TIC + BOM member) with some consultation, though copies of the SLIP document are not shared.</td>
<td>Teacher absenteeism and student absenteeism and/or poor teacher quality means that students struggle to learn High teacher/student ratio, inadequate teaching &amp; learning resources Using outdated curriculum (OBE) Students are learning but are not reaching expected standards;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – Dire/problematic</td>
<td>Community members may place low value on education Community don’t understand their rights; P&amp;C is non-existent of not currently functioning; parents feel disempowered; communication between school &amp; community is very poor - misinformation &amp; rumours are common - parents are confused; there is animosity/frustration/anger between school and community Girls don't know their right to education; Parents don't support children (esp. girls) to go to school; Traditional unequal gender norms &amp; beliefs. School and grounds very poorly maintained.</td>
<td>District level (DEIC, Inspectors) don’t understand their roles and responsibilities, or don’t have the skills required, are not motivated or do not adequately do their job School and DoE rarely communicate Inspectors are reluctant to visit, even when invited by CARE or other organisation willing to pay flight costs TIC/Head teacher and/or other teachers often absent (or no teacher is allocated to the school) and/or rarely meets responsibilities of the role Very poor accountability; BOM rarely meets, doesn't know it’s role There are suspicions that funds are not spent properly (possible corruption).</td>
<td>P&amp;C does not have a voice BOM is not involved in decision-making No space for productive discussion between community and school Very little engagement Very limited awareness by community of any decisions that have been made SLIP is not current, or has been developed by the TIC/Head teacher in isolation.</td>
<td>No school (though one is needed) or inadequate school building (Bush materials classroom that is poorly maintained OR permanent classroom that is poorly maintained and not adequate) No toilet. No water Teacher absent most of the time or no teacher has been allocated to the school No teaching materials or limited teaching materials Using no curriculum OR outdated curriculum (OBE) Very high teacher/student ratio Poor attendance. Worse for girls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings & Analysis

1: IMPACT - Has improved gender inclusive governance led to better service delivery in education?

Of the four communities the project worked with intensively, one demonstrated improved inclusive governance leading to better service delivery – characterized by improvements in each of the domains of the inclusive governance framework (Citizens empowered, Power holders effective, Spaces for negotiation, Effectiveness of education service delivery). Key differences between this community and the other three communities was a pre-existing, high level of community cohesion, and a full complement of teachers allocated to the school with high attendance rates. A common factor among the other three communities was poor effectiveness of power holders, characterized by understaffed schools, high absenteeism of the TIC/Head Teacher, and poor accountability mechanisms within the education system.

The project’s focus at sub-national level has been on establishing District Education Implementation Committees (DEIC). In 2018, the project succeeded in establishing DEICs in three districts - Obura Wonenara, Okapa and Lufa. These DEICs are recognized by the National Department of Education. While this is a promising start, implementation has stalled for all three DEICs due to lack of funding and other support from the District and National Department of Education.

1.1 What are the expected/unexpected impacts of the project (both positive and negative) relating to gender-inclusive governance (at community/sub-national)?

Community level:

The BG4E project worked intensively in four school communities, and each of these communities were assessed as part of this evaluation. An assessment of impact relating to inclusive governance at community level, was made by analyzing data against the rubric (figure 3) and giving a rating for each domain of CARE’s Governance Framework ‘before’ the project, and ‘after’ implementation. The project aimed to shift each community to level 4 (functioning well) across all four domains, although achieving level 3 (Ok/adequate) was also considered success for the project. This evaluation showed that this level of success has been reached in one of the four communities (Ande Elementary School Community).

The four communities were:
1) Boiko Elementary School community
2) Ande Elementary School Community
3) Sindeni Elementary School community
4) Gun-Yani Primary School community (which includes Boiko, Ande & Sindeni Elementary schools as feeder schools)
Community 1: Boiko Elementary School community

While there was some improvement in two domains – ‘Citizens Empowered’ and ‘Spaces for Negotiation’, there was no improvement in the critical domain of ‘Power holders effective’. Thus, it is not surprising that there was no improvement in ‘effectiveness of education service delivery’ domain. After the project’s interventions, all four domains remained below the line (below adequate) - assessed as either level 2 (Poor/inadequate) or 1 (Dire/problematic).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Empowered</td>
<td>Poor/inadequate</td>
<td>Good/functioning well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power holders effective</td>
<td>Poor/inadequate</td>
<td>Good/functioning well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces for negotiation</td>
<td>Poor/inadequate</td>
<td>Good/functioning well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of education service delivery</td>
<td>Poor/inadequate</td>
<td>Good/functioning well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain 1 – Citizens Empowered:**

**Impact:**

- Community representation on the Board of Management has improved. Prior to the project, most decisions were made by the Board Chairman and the Teacher in Charge. Now, there are 17 active members of the board who meet regularly.
- Of the 17 board members, 3 are women. The women are given some opportunities to speak during the meetings.
- There has been some improvement in community supporting the school through the P&C. The P&C day (every Thursday) that had been dormant prior to the project, was reported by community members to have been reinvigorated. P&C day is when parents and community members get together to do work to support the school – such as cut the grass, tend the flower gardens, clean the classrooms and do maintenance on the teachers’ houses. However,
observation of the school grounds during fieldwork showed that the gardens and grass were overgrown, and teachers reported that their houses were in much need of repair.

No impact:

- Available enrolment data showed that only a third of students enrolled were girls. When asked about girl’s education, community members listed gender norms (such as being kept at home to help with domestic work) as barriers for girls, but could not list any specific actions being taken by the community to address these.

- There was no change in the importance placed on education generally, with community members saying they have valued education for many years, because they see past students succeeding and returning to the community literate and respected.

- Community members reported feelings of frustration, confusion and disappointment towards the teachers and Elementary school, mainly to do teacher absenteeism.

- While one community member, who had attended the CARE’s GED training, reported changes in his personal attitude towards gender equality, there was no evidence of broad changes in attitudes, beliefs or gender norms. Both women and men explained that women don’t speak up because of traditional norms. 28% of women and 50% of men reported that they feel confident to speak at meetings. Illiteracy was identified as a reason for both men and women being unable to speak up in public.

Domain 2 – Power Holders Effective

Impact:

- There was some change in the school board, in terms of improved knowledge by members of their role and responsibilities.

- There was evidence of improved budget planning and financial management by the school (TIC & BOM).

No impact:

- High teacher absenteeism, shows a lack of accountability and lack of supervision & support for the teachers from sub-national level. The school had been closed for the entire previous term, due to both teachers being on secondment to assist with the Local Level Government (LLG) election. When the evaluation team visited the community, the school had been closed for 2 weeks, with no planned time to re-open, due to an unresolved issue between the teachers and community.

- The systems and processes set by the Department of Education exacerbate challenges for remote schools such as Boiko. The TIC reported needing to travel to Goroka to access school funding (TFF), which is a long journey by foot and road.
• There is poor communication from national, Provincial and District level to the community. Community members expressed stress and confusion about the upcoming 1-6-6 policy, and about a possible opening of Primary extension school in Boiko (which the community understood had been requested and approved, but not yet delivered).
• There had been no visit from school inspectors to this school since 2016 (when CARE facilitated a visit).

Domain 3 - Spaces for negotiation

Impact:
• The P&C is functioning better than before the project, but is still not a decision-making or discussion space. The P&C completes tasks allocated to it by the BOM.
• Decision-making at the BOM level is more inclusive than before. Before the project, BOM decisions were made by the TIC and Board Chairman, now decisions are made at meetings of the 17-person board.
• Community and the school worked together (with CARE’s support) on school improvement projects – iron roofing, vinyl flooring and black boards.
• The TIC has the knowledge to run an inclusive SLIP process (but hasn’t done so yet).

No impact:
• The community has many concerns about education, but they don’t know who to raise these with or how. They feel disempowered.
• Community members do not receive important information from the school or sub-national DoE.

Domain 4 – Effectiveness of Service Delivery

Impact:
• Improvements in school infrastructure – the school now has iron roofing, vinyl flooring and black boards. These were identified by many as significant, as they improved students’ well-being.
• Teachers are more confident, and report they are better skilled in teaching reading and phonics.

No impact:
• Education quality remains very poor. Almost all students from Boiko Elementary who have completed Grade 2, have failed the entrance test for Primary school for the past 3 years.

“Most students in Boiko are left out. This school services nine surrounding villages. There are more than 500 children who should be in school, and they are missing out” (Boiko, male FGD)

“it is a concern with the local community. I’m a local teacher. I think there is a need for sensitization with the community, so they understand the teachers and can support us and respect us and the school. It would be good if the community could understand the roles and responsibilities, and also what is NOT the roles and responsibilities of teachers. When the community confronts us, it is not good. There is a process they should take, through the BOM, but it isn’t working very well. We’re not happy with this. The community are not supporting us with our housing.” Female teacher, Boiko.
• The school is understaffed. There should be 3 teachers at the school, but there are only 2. Student to teacher ratio is high – over 60:1 for students enrolled across the three year levels.
• High student absenteeism – teachers report approximately 50% of enrolled children are absent on any given day.
• High teacher absenteeism.
• Low numbers of female students - approximately two thirds of students are male.

Photos: Boiko Elementary School (inside classroom and outside view of building). While no desks or chairs are present, the school has blackboards, vinyl flooring and an iron room.

Community 2: Ande Elementary School Community
There has been improvement across at least three of the four domains, with all domains now rated as “ok, adequate”. One reason for the significant improvement is the existing community cohesion that provided a springboard for project activities.
Domain 1 – Citizens Empowered:
Impact:

- The level of positive engagement and participation between the school and community is good. This relationship has been strengthened by project activities.
- Strong community participation on BOM.
- P&C are more engaged. Before, parents did not attend P&C days, now there is high participation.
- Two women who participated in CARE’s GED training in Ande have become gender advocates, and went on to co-facilitate the training (with CARE) in another community. Some couples have reported changes in gendered division of labour in the household (with husbands taking on tasks such as cooking, cleaning and fetching water)

"CARE has strengthened the working together culture that exists in Ande community through its presence and the work it has done" (Mr. Terry Kenneth, age; 37, Ande Extension School TIC)
Some women reported feeling more confident and participating more in decision-making around education. Community has raised funds to co-fund WASH project.

No impact:
Before the project, community cohesion was strong and education was highly valued. This has been maintained through the project period.

Domain 2 – Power Holders Effective
Impact:
- BOM operates well.
- TIC and teachers are committed and meeting their responsibilities.
- District DoE has visited the school (supported by CARE)

No impact:
The school and community identified District level participation as a continuing challenge.

Domain 3 - Spaces for negotiation
There was insufficient data to provide a rating for ‘before’ the project.

- During the project period, the community was successful in applying for and receiving satellite classes, so that a Grade 3 and Grade 4 class from Gun-Yani school in Sindeni (a challenging half-day to full-day walk away) is now located in Ande. This has made a significant difference to children’s access to school.
- The BOM and P&C have been successful in negotiating for the DoE (via the Gun-Yani school) and the Member of Parliament (MP) to co-fund projects identified in their SLIP plan (WASH for the school).
- BOM is involved in managing the TFF and SLIP.
- Women’s voice is included in BOM decision-making.

Domain 4 – Effectiveness of education service delivery
Impact:
- Student achievement is good. Most students from Ande Elementary who have completed Grade 2, have passed the entrance test for Primary school for the past three years.
- Students have improved phonics and reading.
- Teacher and student attendance is good.

After the Gender training I am empowered to be able to stand up and talk in public, discuss with men and involve in decision-making. I will say GED has really helped women become confident, speak in public and participate more with men. This is the impact I can see the GED training has had. (Ms. Arina Paul age; 39, Ande women’s rep)

The requirement by the department to upgrade marks is a challenge for my fellow teachers and myself. If we go to upgrade our marks, who will come and continue teaching our students? Ande is very remote and challenging, who will be willing to come and continue teaching in our absence? (TIC, Ande Elementary)

Phonics training has really helped me in my work. I am now able to teach my students with these new skills and tools. I am seeing results in my students being able to form words using letter sounds and connecting these words to read (TIC, Ande Elementary)
- There has been an increased enrolment of girls.
- The school has permanent classrooms, desks, sufficient resources.

Photos: Ande Elementary School (view from inside a classroom and outside). Classrooms are well built, children have desks and chairs, teacher and children were present in class during field visit. Some of the WASH infrastructure supported by the project can be seen in outside view.

**Community 3: Sindeni Elementary School community:**

The situation at Sindeni Elementary school was assessed as ‘dire/problematic’ across each of the four domains of inclusive governance. In two of the four domains (Spaces for negotiation and Effectiveness of education service delivery) the situation deteriorated during the project period. Factors external to the project led to these negative results – previously, there had been three teachers at the school. Around three years ago, one of the teachers died, and one teacher moved away, leaving only one teacher (who is the TIC). The TIC says that she has requested replacement teachers from District, but these have not been approved. The TIC spends much time away from the community. The school has effectively been closed for several months.
Domain 1 – Citizens Empowered:

No impact:
- There is animosity and distrust between community and school (TIC)
- Rumours abound. Parents feel disempowered.
- P&C does not function. The school grounds are overgrown, the school building is not maintained.

Domain 2 – Power Holders Effective

No impact:
- The TIC reported the most recent inspector visit at being in 2016.

She (the TIC) comes here (to Sindeni) to visit, but she goes again. The whole community is very upset with her... She gets paid for the whole year, but she doesn’t teach. Two years now, she rarely teaches. She goes in the classroom, but just writes on the board and leaves... Parents have lost heart. The community is upset. All the kids can’t go on to Grade 3! (Community members, Sindeni).
In spite of repeated requests to the District to replace the two teachers, this has not been done.
- There is no accountability from sub-national DoE for TIC attendance.
- BOM is no longer functioning.

Domain 3 - Spaces for negotiation

No impact:
- Limited space for negotiation between the school and the community.
- P&C is no longer functioning.
- SLIP has not been developed.

Domain 4 – Effectiveness of education service delivery

No impact:
- When the evaluation team visited, the school was closed. Multiple community members said that it had been closed for 9 months. The TIC claimed that the school was only closed during the evaluation visit because she was feeling unwell, she said that the school was, in fact, usually open and operating. Observations of the classroom indicated that the school had not been used for some time (see photos).
- Most students who attended Sindeni Elementary school did not pass their entrance test for Primary school. This was confirmed by the Primary school Head teacher.
- The school building is poorly maintained. The wooden floor had several large holes. The building was dangerous.

The community doesn’t support the school. Community support is not working well. We talk, talk, talk but nothing happens. (TIC, Sindeni Elementary School)

There has been no change brought about by the CARE project. In my school I’m the only teacher. We should have 3 teachers. If we were 3 teachers, then I could use the Jolly Phonics training, but I’m only 1 (TIC, Sindeni Elementary School)

Photos: Sindeni Elementary School (inside classroom and outside view). The doors are broken and large holes in floor are visible.
Gun-Yani Primary School community

There has been some improvement in Gun-Yani community – in the areas of ‘spaces for negotiation’ and ‘effectiveness of service delivery’. Improvements in service delivery can be attributed to teacher training provided by the project, rather than improved governance. Effectiveness of power holders remains ‘dire/problematic’, with high absenteeism of Head Teacher reported by the community, and lack of accountability at sub-national level a core issues.

Domain 1 – Citizens Empowered:
Impact:
- P&C is more active and is supporting the school.
- The community values education and there was some evidence of improved attitude towards girls’ education
- Community has taken actions to demand accountability for school funding (TFF)
- Parents have contributed (coffee) towards school projects (building of toilets, shower block and water source).

We send our daughters to school unlike before because we feel that girls do a good job and not only caring for the family (Male FGD, Gun-Yani School Community)
No impact:
- There is very poor communication between the Primary school and the feeder school communities. Parents from children at feeder schools were poorly informed and confused about key policies. For example, in Boiko parents believed that students were being turned away from attending Grade 3 (first year of Primary school) because the school was full, when in fact, they were being turned away because they were not meeting academic standards. The school communicates by telling students to relay messages to their parents. Messages are not reaching parents – especially in the case of younger children.

Domain 2 – Power Holders Effective
Impact:
- BOM members report being more capable, though the BOM function is reportedly hampered by Head Teacher frequent absence.

No impact:
- The Head Teacher is often absent from the school, spending a lot of time in town (Goroka). This has been ongoing, with no action from sub-national DoE.
- Inspectors are reportedly reluctant to visit, even when CARE staff offer to cover costs and bring them along on project trips.

Domain 3 - Spaces for negotiation
Impact:
- SLIP development is more inclusive, with students, parents, teachers and BOM included in most recent SLIP process.
- P&C meet regularly and are informed of decisions by BOM

Domain 4 – Effectiveness of education service delivery
Impact:
- Improved infrastructure (toilets, shower, water supply)
- Teachers report improvements in their ability to teach reading through phonics, and an improvement in students’ reading.
- Outdated curriculum (OBE) was used before the project’s interventions, and current curriculum is now used (SBC)

No impact:
- Many children in the area are missing out on Primary education, due to distance needed to travel to school.

“One challenge we always have is when they finish elementary, where do they go? It is far to go to Primary. So usually, they stay here” (Boiko Male FGD)
Photos: Gun-Yani Primary School (outside view classrooms, and shower block that was being built during the visit).

Change at sub-national level:

The project’s focus at sub-national and national level has been establishing District Education Implementation Committees (DEICs). In 2018, the project succeeded in establishing DEICs in three districts - Obura Wonenara, Okapa and Lufa. These DEICs are recognised and supported by the National Department of Education, and before this, only one DEIC (out of 89 total districts in PNG) had been established. While this is a promising start, implementation has stalled for all three DEICs due to lack of funding and other support from the District and National Department of Education.

**DEICs**

*Impact:*

- With support from CARE International in PNG the first DEICs were established in 2018. The three DEIC were formalised and launched by the Secretary of the NDoE.
- DEIC (District Education Implementation Committee) have been registered in 3 districts (Lufa, Okopa and Obura Wonenara).
- DEIC members report understanding their roles and responsibilities, and feeling confident.
- Women DEIC members, in particularly, report feeling more confident to speak up. They report being listened to by male DEIC members.

*Challenges/ left unresolved:*

- Implementation has stalled for all 3 DEICs. In Obura Wonenara District this is because there isn’t currently a District Education Manager (DEM). In Lufa and Okapa the BG4E team believe the issue is the MP not supporting the DEIC as he is unaware of their function.

"With the support of CARE (BG4E), Lufa and Okapa Districts were able to setup DEIC but currently it is stagnant due to lack of funding from relevant authorities. Obura Wonenara district DEIC has no district education manager and currently being managed by two teachers. DEIC is set up based on the assumption that the district will support which is currently not the case. DEIC is the nerve center for education in the districts". (DEIC Chair, Okapa)
• DEIC members see this role as something additional to their existing jobs. This might be solved if DEIC membership was tied to exiting positions.
• Budget for the DEICs to function. Funds are needed for things like data collection (transport), meetings (transport, coffee, etc.), Per diems (for when they need to travel overnight) & resources (office space in the case of Obura-Wanenera District)
• DEIC members reported a lack of support from the District, in terms of oversight and allocation of funding to allow the committee to continue its work, and a lack of understanding of the role and responsibilities of the DEIC – from school level to national level.

Promising signs:
• DEIC members are motivated and interested. They see the gap and the value of DEIC work.
• Representatives from national and sub-national DoE consistently told the evaluation team of the value and need for DEICs across PNG.

1.2 What impacts has the project had on service deliverers (teachers, BOMS) and quality of service delivery (education)?

The project trained 746 teachers and volunteer teachers (412 male & 334 female) in schools in Obura Wonenara District. Teachers who were interviewed for this evaluation said that the training improved their ability to teach and improved children’s learning. Of the 4 schools visited during the evaluation, teaching and learning had improved in 2 (Effectiveness of service delivery domain). Some teachers in schools outside the 4 focus communities, noted that the project did not do monitoring of results or any follow up, after conducting the trainings. The Jolly phonics program used by BG4E was very popular with teachers.

1.3 Are there any other expected/unexpected impacts of the project (positive or negative)?

Negative impact:
Benchmarking is part of the National Department of Education’s Standard’s Based Curriculum (SBC) reforms. This project facilitated trainings (led by the District Education Coordinator) that introduced benchmarking for children entering Primary school (grade 3) in Gun-Yani Primary School. As a result of the introduction of the benchmarking process – where students who don’t meet expected benchmarks are not allowed to enter Grade 3 – for the past 3 years, most students from Boiko and Sindeni (and other Elementary schools according to the Primary School Head teacher) have been excluded from entering primary school. Parents are not being made aware of the reasons their children are being excluded. Some students are repeating Elementary Grade 2, some students are staying at home. Each year this happens, the Elementary Grade 2 classes become larger, putting more and more pressure on schools that are already failing.

I thank CARE for the recognition given to me by the inspectors....For me personally, I have more experience and am more confident now to do my work. As a women I am able to speak at meetings and public gathering like P&C meetings (DEIC women’s rep, Owan)
2: MODEL - Has this project produced a proven or promising approach?

2.1 Is it replicable? What are the key ‘ingredients’ needed? What are the key enabling factors for change to occur? What are the constraints/challenges?

The BG4E ‘model’ is a package of four community trainings (outlined in Table 3), in addition to teacher targeted training in SBC, phonics and numeracy. This evaluation has found that the model is not sufficient in achieving its goal (of improved gender-inclusive governance leading to improved service delivery). However, some promising approaches and important lessons for future programming have emerged.

Aspects of BG4E model that worked well:

- Working with and through the Board of Management was effective and necessary, as they are an influential group within the school community.
- Using the government’s existing training and trainers built ownership and improved likelihood of sustainability.
- SLIP development proved to be a good opportunity to bring stakeholders together to agree on priorities. BG4E used the community entry workshop for this, and it worked well.
- Teacher training is necessary, particularly where there is a change in curriculum/policy, as this training is not available otherwise. Training is highly appreciated by teachers.
- Linking schools to existing funds (such as MP funds) worked well and built a potentially sustainable practice. Community contributions are also vital for ownership.
- To mobilize community support for the project, it was important to have tangible aspects of the project (such as WASH infrastructure support to schools) to combine with trainings and workshops.
- Engaging national and provincial government early built ownership and awareness for the project, which made gaining the required approvals and support to work at District and school level much easier.

Lessons learned based on BG4E model limitations:

- There is a strong need for ongoing monitoring, follow-up, and targeted support for all projects, in particular pilot projects. The costs of travelling to and from the project sites restricted the monitoring and follow up activities of BG4E. A key lesson here is that if CARE cannot afford proper monitoring and follow-up support, it cannot afford to work in these remote and difficult to access communities. Proper allocation of resources to monitoring and follow-up coaching is vital for a project’s success.
- Linked to the above point, more time and inputs (such as training) were needed with each community to achieve the level of change expected. The project team reported visiting each of the school communities approximately once every 6 months, for approximately 2-3 weeks at a time. This was insufficient. In future, similar projects, CARE PNG should consider planning longer field visits - up to one or two months in each community.
• Inadequate ongoing monitoring led to a situation where key assumptions on which the project’s theory of change relied were only discovered to be incorrect at the time of this end of project evaluation. Had the project learned these lessons earlier, it could have adapted its theory of change and activities and achieved more results.

• As this project relied on having teachers in place at each of the target community’s schools, the project should have advocated strongly to District and Provincial level for teachers to be posted to fill vacant positions.

• For future project, in addition to providing training to teachers on classroom methodologies and skills, consider working to build their motivation, attitudes and positive practices - such as encouraging teachers to minimize their absenteeism.

• The Gender, Equity & Diversity (GED) training was well received and was transformational for some participants, however, BG4E underutilized this training as it conducted it just once in each community, and only with leaders and key stakeholders. There was keen interest in this training, and a demand in all communities to do more training. Future projects should conduct more extensive GED trainings that reach a large enough proportion of the community to enable community level change. One option would be to run it as a TOT (Training of Trainers), with support to community trainers to enable them to run the training themselves.

• Running teacher trainings during class time reinforced the practice of teacher absenteeism that is a major challenge for education in Papua New Guinea. It would have been better to plan trainings for teachers outside of class time.

• Socialising through the Councillors (elected local level government) was a challenge, because when they changed all socialisation activities need to be repeated with the newly elected councillor. It would have been better to use other stakeholders, such as (non-elected) community leaders with an interest in education, for this role.

• DEICs are not supported through current DoE systems, staffing, budgets, etc. (even though they fit within the TFF policy). Any future project working to establish or improve DEICs will need to work to address this.
3: RELEVANCE - How relevant is the project to the policy context?

*Is the project relevant to stated government policy? And to the realities of the context, such as budget constraints, education system, political will?*

This project is highly relevant, both to the stated government policies and the realities of the context. The consensus between representatives from NDoE and PDoE interviewed was this project closely aligns with the relevant policies, and contributes to filling a gap in government capacity. They explained that the government does not have the budget or resources to fully implement some policies – such as establishing DEICs to monitor school expenditure (TFF), rolling out the current curriculum (SBC), providing regular teacher training and support (especially to remote schools) and supporting gender equality. The BG4E project not only aligned with major policies, but also supported government systems, staff and practices through using DoE training guidelines and trainers to conduct BOM and DEIC training, and providing training for teachers that has been officially sanctioned (Jolly Phonics and SBC). The project’s commitment to supporting government systems and policies has led to CARE being seen as a partner by the Department of Education.

**Working to improve governance is highly relevant**

PNG is ranked 135 on the Transparency International Perceptions of Corruption Index (Transparency International Perceptions of Corruption Index, 2017) and faces significant governance challenges, including addressing corruption and maintaining rule of law. Cultural diversity increases the complexity of building and sustaining good governance in varied sites across the country. Despite efforts at decentralisation, the government has been unable to extend its authority across the country, as shown in its inability to deliver basic services, enforce its own laws, and control violent and criminal behaviour in families and communities.

**Working to establish DEICs is highly relevant:**

DEICs have been part of official policy since 2016, and are an integral part of administering the current system of education financing. Prior to the BG4E project, only one DEIC had been established (the original pilot in NCD) out of 89 Districts across the country. The Tuition Fee Free (TFF) is a government

---

7 See https://www.transparency.org/news/feature/corruption_perceptions_index_2017
policy initiated in 2011 and first implemented in 2012. Originally schools received 100% of their TFF (40% for administration, 30% for infrastructure and 30% for learning materials). A revised policy for Tuition Free Fee Subsidy took effect in 2016 where schools were only directly paid the 30% administration component, with the 30% infrastructure component held at the district treasury to be overseen by the DEIC, and the 30% teaching and learning component managed by the Provincial Education office. The DEIC’s role is to monitor schools’ functions as per its TFF disbursement and perform other functions for the NDoE such as collecting raw data at the district level.

Working to improve education service delivery in remote areas is highly relevant:

Improving education outcomes is a stated government priority. A recent study of Elementary education in 10 Provinces (including Eastern Highlands Province) found that literacy and numeracy outcomes were well below the stated national standards. In EHP, most teachers had completed a CET but more than half did not have a high school certificate and many did not receive frequent in-service training or professional development. Monitoring visits or inspection were found to be rare in elementary schools and the majority of elementary schools did not have a SLIP. In EHP, over 90% of schools were found to have no access to electricity, 64% have no access to fresh water and 95% did not have a school library or book borrowing facilities. The situation for schools in rural and remote areas was found to be significantly worse than schools close to, or in, urban areas.

Working to improve gender equality and women’s voice is strongly relevant:

PNG is committed to gender equality, as demonstrated through its international agreements, Constitution, and policy and legislation. The second principle of PNG’s Five National Goals and Directive Principles contained in the PNG Constitution is equality and participation (principle 2). PNG is a signatory to the Convention of the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women. The Medium Term Development Plan III 2018-22 acknowledges the problem of PNG being one of only five countries in the world that has no female members of Parliament (p34). PNG’s Development Strategic Plan 2010-30 states “All citizens, irrespective of gender, will have equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from the development of the country (p111). PNG’s public service has a gender equity and social inclusion (GESI) policy, reinforced through revisions to the Public Service (Management) Act. DEIC’s are required to have female representatives, so the project’s approach to working with male DEIC members to improve their willingness to respect and listen to women, while simultaneously building women DEIC members skills and confidence, aligns with this government requirement.

---

8 Save the Children, RISE Rapidly Improving Standards in Literacy, Literacy & Numeracy Boost Assessment Baseline Report, 2018

(When asked if supporting DEICs fits within the Governments policy and priorities) Yes, it definitely fits in. It makes sure data is correct. At the moment, we don’t know. When you have this committee established, at the District themselves they can check the data and report to us if there is a problem. We really need to establish these committees in every district, but because of funds, we cannot. DEICs are a very important group! Other DEICs have submitted names but they are not recognized as functional yet. In the country we have only 4 DEICs functional out of 89 Districts (Betty Napil - Assistant Executive Director, TFF, National Department of Education)
4: SUSTAINABILITY - Are the outcomes and impacts likely to be sustained after the end of the project?

Will DEICs continue, and increase in functionality after the project ends? Will DEICs be rolled out across PNG? Will DEICs result in increased accountability and improved spending/management of resources?

In the words of the Obura Wanenera District DEIC Chair, currently DEICs are in their ‘infant stage’. While the three DEICs (Obura Wonenara, Okapa and Lufa) have been registered and recognized by the NDoE, and the members have been trained, they are not yet fully functional. Of the four DEIC members interviewed (from Obura Wonenara and Okapa District DEICs) during this evaluation, all four said that the DEICs would be unlikely to continue beyond the end of the project. Reasons given were a lack of support from the District, in terms of oversight and allocation of funding to allow the committee to continue its work, and a lack of understanding of the role and responsibilities of the DEIC – from school level to national level.

The BG4E team plan to share the experience of the 3 DEICs with other districts, with the Province and the national level DoE, which may trigger support from the DoE to establish, train and resource DEICs across the country.

Will communities continue supporting education and continue being involved in decision-making? Will gender advocates continue to advocate for gender change?

Of the four communities that were the focus of the project’s governance strengthening work, one was assessed as achieving improved gender inclusive governance. While this community has requested ongoing involvement from CARE, some community members the evaluation team spoke with felt that they will continue supporting education regardless. Others said that more support was required. The project linked the school communities to financial support provided by the local MP, which may continue beyond the project. Gender advocates were only found in one community (the same community with improved governance). The evaluation team spoke to one of these gender advocates, and she said that she will continue working to raise awareness of gender. Considering gender more broadly, while the evaluation team uncovered some examples of individuals changing their attitudes and beliefs (and in a few cases behavior) towards gendered decision-making and workloads, these examples were not widespread enough to enable sustained, community-level change. To provoke this level of change, the project would have needed to provide training to many more community members.

“My personal view looking on how things will turn for the committee, I think DEIC will not be functional if CARE decide to leave. This is due to the existing unclear priorities from the department on TFF and in effectively supporting the committee. In order for the committee to be sustainable I suggest DEIC and its functions has to be well socialized within the provincial as well as district education offices, whoever coordinating this committee has to be effective in following up and moving the committee, if not there has to be a position created to ensure this committee is implementing. The supervisor of the committee has to arrange for district meet at the district” (Okapa, Female inspector & DEIC member)

The community will look after the (WASH) projects because the community also contributed towards these projects. We are grateful to CARE to connect the community with the MP to support these projects. (Ms. Arina Paul, Women’s Rep, Ande)
members (instead of the approximately 30 community leaders/education stakeholders trained in each community), and provided ongoing support (beyond the stand-alone 5-day training workshop).

Will any improved functioning of BOMs (in project sites) continue? Will school Teachers in Charge (TICs) / Head Teachers continue to run the BOM training?

Across the 4 school communities, 3 of the schools had active BOMs. Of these, all reported improvements in skills and understanding of their roles & responsibilities. Of those, the member from one board indicated the improved functioning would continue, one said it certainly would not (without CARE’s help) and one did not comment on sustainability. None of the TICs or Head teachers mentioned that they intend to continue providing trainings, although one of the primary school teachers who had attended a Jolly Phonics ToT had run a training session for colleagues in surrounding schools within the past year.

Recommendations for CARE PNG

1. Ensure all projects have adequate budget and resources for ongoing monitoring, evaluation and adaptive management. When working in fly-in sites, budget must be allocated for regular monitoring visits.
2. Ensure all projects have a well-articulated theory of change, including assumptions and risks, that is reviewed 6-monthly based on strong monitoring data.
3. Consider allowing project teams to spend more time in the field for each field visit - up to one or two months.
4. Include actions to address high teacher absenteeism in projects aiming to improve classroom teaching & learning.
5. Ensure GED trainings reach a large enough proportion of the community to enable community level change, where that is the goal.
6. Schedule all project activities involving teachers outside of class time, to avoid negatively affecting students’ learning.
7. Future projects working to support DEICs must address the issue of DEICs not being supported through current DoE systems.
8. Future projects working to improve education governance should carefully consider the points listed under the Model Section: “Aspects of BG4E model that worked well” and “Lessons learned based on BG4E model limitations”.
Annex A: List of BG4E Documents Reviewed

- BG4E Project Monitoring Evaluation & Learning Framework – 2019
- Project Reports
  - FY17 ANCP Annual Report (to donor)
  - FY18 ANCP Annual Report (to donor)
  - July-Dec 2016 Interim Report (to CARE Australia)
  - July-Dec 2017 Interim Report (to CARE Australia)
  - July-Dec 2018 Interim Report (to CARE Australia)
  - Activity reports
  - Partner reports – Govt. Quarterly reports (standard report from CIPNG)
- Annual Plans
  - AdPlan FY17 (to donor)
  - AdPlan FY18 (to donor)
  - AdPlan FY19 (to donor)
  - AdPlan FY20 (to donor)
- Theory of change (ToC) & design documents
  - ToC diagram – by Rebecca Robinson at beginning of project
  - ToC diagram – by CARE Australia
  - ToC diagram – by project team
- DEIC Review workshop Report
- Country Portfolio Discussion Notes 2018
- Annual Reflection Workshop Report 2017
- 4 x thematic case studies: Governance, Quality Education, Barriers to girls education, TFF
- 2 x PowerPoint presentations presented at the PNG Update August 2019, University of PNG, Port Moresby.
- Project’s Activity Tracking Database
- Case studies collected by the CARE Australia Fundraising team in 2018
Annex B: List of Interviews Conducted

Redacted for privacy
redacted for privacy
Annex C: Data collection tools

BG4E Project: Provincial/National Department of Education

Interview Template

Introduction and consent

My name is ____________ and I’m from CARE International in PNG. I am here today to talk with you about CARE’s BG4E project. I’m leading an internal end-of-project evaluation for the BG4E Project, and we would like to include your views, in our analysis of what worked, and what didn’t. The focus of the evaluation is learning, sharing and improvement. CARE will hold a stakeholder workshop in February, to share the findings with District, Province and National level stakeholders in education.

If you are happy for me to do so, I may include some direct quotes from you, representative of the Department of Education. If you would prefer, I can keep your comments confidential, and not include your name.

We expect the discussion will take about 1 hour.

Are you happy to continue?

Details of Story Teller:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of storyteller:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (M/F):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Education Department:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of person recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the story:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of recording:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Record anything else worth noting about the story teller*
**Question 1:** Tell me about your experience with CARE, and with this BG4E project...

Prompts
- What do you know about CARE?
- What has been your experience?
- Have you attended CARE trainings?
- Have you been involved in CARE events?

**Question 2:** What changes, if any, have you noticed as a result of this project (BG4E)?

Prompts
- Any improved communication? Coordination?
- Any changes you’ve noticed at District/Province? Women being involved?
- Any changes in how levels of department engages?

**Question 3:** Of the changes you have talked about what has been the most important change and why?

**Question 4:** What else has happened that may have also contributed to (all) of these changes?

Prompts:
- Any other non-CARE training?

**Question 5:** Could you describe what has been the situation like before this project?

Prompts:
- In regards to changes listed.

**Question 6:** In your opinion, will these changes brought about by the project will be sustained?

Probing questions:
- Do you think DEICs continue to operate? WILL THEY EXPAND?
- What ongoing support would be needed for DEICs to continue?
- What do you see as the main challenges?

**Question 7:** Is this approach relevant in this context? What do you think of this approach?

- Does this approach align with government policy? How?
- Does this approach match the context?
- Gender focus relevant? DEIC support relevant?
- What are the challenges/limitations in your view?

**Question 8: What is your role (role of Province/National DoE) in delivering education?**

**Question 9: Do you have any questions for me? Or anything else to add?**

Thank you for your time, and for sharing your story with us.

---

**BG4E Project Participant: DISTRICT LEVEL**

**Interview/Story of Change Template**

**Introduction and consent**

My name is ____________ and I’m from CARE International. I am here today to talk with you about CARE’s BG4E project. The reason for this interview is to help us better understand the experiences of people who have participated in this project, and talk about how your life may have changed. This will help CARE PNG understand how our work can be improved.

Everything that we discuss today is confidential. Though we will be writing notes and recording you in order to remember the main points, no information will be presented by name in the final report. It will all be anonymous and be used for a Care report. We would like to have a conversation and I will start this by asking questions. There are no ‘right or wrong’ answers. If there are questions that you do not feel comfortable answering, they do not have to answer.

We expect the discussion will take about 1 hour.

Are you happy to continue?

**Details of Story Teller:**

| Name of storyteller: |  |
| Gender (M/F): |  |
| Age (estimate): |  |
| Job title: |  |
Number of years working in District Education Department:

Name of person recording the story:

Location:

Date of recording:

*Record anything else worth noting about the story teller*

**Question 1:** Tell me how you have been involved with Care and the BG4E project, and what your current involvement is?

Prompts

- Have you attended CARE trainings?
- Have you been involved in CARE events?
- Have you taken on additional Roles through the CARE project?

**Question 2:** What have been some changes that you have seen or experienced as a result of being a part of this CARE (BG4E) activity?

Prompts:

- Any changes in your own personal skills, attitudes, behaviour?
- Changes in how you perform your job? Do you do anything differently now?
- Any changes in how decisions are made at district level?
- Any changes in how women are included in decisions?
- Any changes in how you/District Department of Education engage with schools or PDoE?

**Question 3:** Of the changes you have talked about what has been the most important change and why?

**Question 4:** What else has happened that may have also contributed to (ALL) of these changes?

Prompts:

- Any other non-CARE training?
- New policies, new people in DoE?

**Question 5:** Could you describe what has been the situation like before this project?

Probe
- Ask probing questions in relation to the changes listed (this is to give us an understanding of the baseline situation)

**Question 6: In your opinion, will these changes brought about by the project will be sustained?**

Probing questions:

- Do you think DEICs continue to operate?
- What ongoing support would be needed for DEICs to continue?
- What do you see as the main challenges?

**Question 7: Do you have any questions for me? Or anything else to add?**

Thank you for your time, and for sharing your story with us.
Question 1:
Tell me how you know about Care’s and the BG4E project, and what your current involvement is?

Prompts:
- How are you involved in CARE’s work to support DEICs?

Question 2: What have been some changes that you have seen within the District Education Department as a result of being a part of this CARE (BG4E) activity?

Prompts:
- Changes in staff skills, attitudes? Changes in structures? Changes in how things are done?

Question 3: What else has happened that may have also contributed to these changes?

Prompts:
- Any other projects, policies, trainings, etc.

Question 4: Could you describe what has been the situation like before this project?

Prompts:
- In relation to changes discussed above.

Question 5: Of the changes you have talked about (list them from Q2) what has been the most important change and why?
Question 6: In your opinion, will these changes brought about by the project will be sustained?

Questions 7: - Do you think DEICs continue to operate after CARE’s project finishes? What is currently in place to ensure DEICs continue (e.g. ongoing training/support)?

Question 8: What do you see as the main challenges to DEICs functioning well and continuing?

Question 9: Do you have any questions for me? Or anything else to add?

Thank you for your time, and for sharing your story with us.
Details of interviewee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of interviewee:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (M/F):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (estimate):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role in school/community:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years working in this school:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education level achieved:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District &amp; school name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of recording:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Record anything else worth noting about the story teller*

**Interview questions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your school have a BOM?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many members on the BOM?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many of those are women?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role does the BOM play in your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many meetings does the BOM have annually?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If rarely, what was the reason?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sorts of school decisions do BOM participate in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are BOM members confident in performing their role? If no, why not?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the BOM received training on how to complete their role? IF so, please give details (when, what was covered in training, who provided the training, how many days was it, when was it, how often):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the BOM have enough financial, management and other skills and knowledge needed to do the role or do they need training?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any other challenges faced by the BOM in meeting their roles/responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your school have a P&amp;C?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many member on the P&amp;C?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many of those are women?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many annual meetings do P&amp;C have? If rarely, why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What role does the P&amp;C play at your school?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sorts of school decisions do P&amp;C participate in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your school have a SLIP? If so, please describe how it was developed (who was involved in writing it)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were parents/community members involved in writing the SLIP? If so, how?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the BOM, P&amp;C or other teacher seen the SLIP? If so, do they have a copy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many visits/inspections has your school had from inspectors/District Education in the past year?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you provide reports to District DoE? Please describe (what sort of reports, how often)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you provide reports, do you receive any feedback/response from DoE? Please describe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past few years, have you noticed any differences in the way the District DoE (or PDoE) engages with you? If so, describe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you received any training to perform your leadership role as TIC? Please describe (how often, duration of training, what does training cover, who provided it):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have you and/or teachers at your school received in-service teacher within the past year? If yes, please describe. If no, how long ago was the last in-service teacher training you received?

Do you have any questions for us? Do you have any further comments you’d like to make?

If possible, please take a copy of the SLIP. This could be a photo of each page. Please also take some photos of the school building/grounds/facilities/classrooms - with no children in the photos)

BG4E Project FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION – Parent/Caregiver

SEPARATE GROUPS (Male & Female)

(Make sure you have one person as facilitator, and one person as note-taker)

Introduction and consent

My name is ____________ and I’m from CARE International. I am here today to talk with you about CARE’s BG4E project. The reason for this meeting is to help us better understand the experiences of people who have participated in this project, and talk about how your life may have changed. This will help CARE PNG understand how our work can be improved.

Everything that we discuss today is confidential. Though we will be writing notes and recording you in order to remember the main points, no information will be presented by name in the final report. It will all be anonymous and be used for a Care report. We would like to have a conversation and I will start this by asking questions. There are no ‘right or wrong’ answers. If there are questions that you do not feel comfortable answering, they do not have to answer.

We expect the discussion will take about 2 hours.

Are you happy to continue?

Details of FGD:

Date of FGD:
Gender of group (M/F):

Number of people in FGD:

Number of FGD participants who have been directly involved in CARE activities:

Name of person recording the story:

Location:

1. Introductions of the members of the small groups. 
Ask: 
a. Name 
b. Have you been involved with any CARE programs? If so, how (what activities/meetings)?

2. In your community, what sort of involvement do community members and parents have with the school? 
Prompts: 
- Does the community help the school? (e.g. cutting the grass? Building structures?)

3. Is there a P&C? What is the role of the P&C? How many people are involved? When was the last meeting? What sorts of things were discussed? What decisions were made? (if no P&C, identify a recent time a decision was made for school – e.g. meeting about school infrastructure)

4. Has community relationship with the school changed over the past few years? If so, how/why?

5. How do people in this community feel about education? 
Do people think it’s important for children to go to school? Why, why not?

6. Has this changed over the past few years? If so, how/why?

7. In this community, is it seen as equally important for girls to go to school as boys? Why/why not? 
Prompts: If yes, what actions do parents and the community take to support girls?

8. Has this changed over the past few years? If so, how/why?
9. ACTIVITY: FLASHCARDS

To help participants understand the meaning of this card, explain each of the cards. Cards 1a to 1d for women’s FGD group, Cards 1e to 1h for men’s group. As facilitator, you need to refer to the recent P&C meeting or school Decision-making that you identified in Question 3

1a) & 1e)
- This card shows a woman/man in the community who is NOT involved in the P&C meeting.
- Maybe s/he is not invited, or for some other reason s/he is excluded.
- Maybe s/he isn’t interested in attending, or doesn’t have time.

ASK:
Are there women/men in this community that do not attend or are not invited to these meetings (P&C)? What are some reasons?

1 b) & 1f)
- This card shows a woman/man who attends the P&C meetings. S/he has something to say, but for some reason s/he doesn’t speak. Perhaps s/he is too shy, or for some other reason is not able to speak up.

ASK:
Are there women/men in this community who attend meetings (P&C) but don’t speak? Why?

1 c) & 1 g)
This card shows a woman/man in single-sex groups, and the women/men are only comfortable and able to speak in front of other men/women. Perhaps the women got together before the P&C meeting, to discuss.

ASK:
Are their women/men in your community who are like this? What sort of women/men? Why?

1d) & 1 h)
This picture shows a P&C/meeting, with a woman/man who is confidently speaking in front of everyone. S/he is being listened to and respected.

ASK:
Are their some women/men who are like this? What sort of women/men? Why?

10. FIRST VOTE: NOW

Provide each participant with 1 token (piece of paper) and set up a voting station (so that others cannot see what the person is voting).

In the most recent P&C/School Meeting, which picture best shows you?

(Allow each person to secretly vote. Then count the votes and report back to the group)

Recording table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a/1e – not at meeting</th>
<th>1b/1f – shy/don’t speak</th>
<th>1c/1g – only speak in front of other women/men</th>
<th>1d/1h – confident to speak up in meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

SECOND VOTE: BEFORE

11. Run the vote again, this time ask: What was the situation for you 3 years ago?

(Count and share with group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a/1e – not at meeting</th>
<th>1b/1f – shy/don’t speak</th>
<th>1c/1g – only speak in front of other women/men</th>
<th>1d/1h – confident to speak up in meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discuss Why? If any difference, what has caused the change?
12. Do you want to move from one picture to another in the future? Why? What are your challenges to moving?

Thank you for your time, and for sharing your stories with us.

BG4E Project Participant SCHOOL Interview (BOM, TIC, Teacher)

Interview/Story of Change Template

Introduction and consent

My name is ____________ and I’m from CARE International. I am here today to talk with you about CARE’s BG4E project. The reason for this interview is to help us better understand the experiences of people who have participated in this project, and talk about how your life may have changed. This will help CARE PNG understand how our work can be improved.

Everything that we discuss today is confidential. Though we will be writing notes and recording you in order to remember the main points, no information will be presented by name in the final report. It will all be anonymous and be used for a Care report. We would like to have a conversation and I will start this by asking questions. There are no ‘right or wrong’ answers. If there are questions that you do not feel comfortable answering, they do not have to answer.

We expect the discussion will take about 1 hour.

Are you happy to continue?

Details of Story Teller:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of storyteller:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (M/F):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (estimate):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job/Role within school:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years working in District Education Department:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of person recording the story: 
Location: 
Date of recording: 

*Record anything else worth noting about the story teller

**Question 1:** Tell me how you have been involved with Care and the BG4E project, and what your current involvement is?

Prompts:
- Have you attended CARE trainings?
- Have you been involved in CARE events?
- Have you taken on additional Roles through the CARE project?

**Question 2:** What have been some changes that you have seen or experienced as a result of being a part of this CARE (BG4E) activity?

Prompts:
- Any changes in your own personal skills, attitudes, behaviour?
- Changes in how you perform your role? Do you do anything differently now?
- Any changes in how decisions are made at the school?
- Any changes in how women are included in decisions? Able to speak?
- (If interviewing a woman) are you more confident to speak?
- Notice any changes in students? Parents? Board? Teachers?
- Changes in how the school communicates/is linked with District? Other schools?

**Question 3:** Of the changes you have talked about what has been the most important change and why?

**Question 4:** What else has happened that may have also contributed to (all of) these changes?

Prompts:
- Any other non-CARE training?
- New policies, new staff at school, changes in community?

**Question 5:** Could you describe what has been the situation like before this project?

Probe:
- Ask probing questions in relation to the changes listed (this is to give us an understanding of the baseline situation)
Question 6: In your opinion, will these changes brought about by the project will be sustained?

Probing questions:
- Will new skills be maintained? New ways of doing things?
- What are the challenges to these changes continuing?

Question 7: Do you have any questions for me? Or anything else to add?

Thank you for your time, and for sharing your story with us.
Job/Role within community:  
Number of years working in District Education Department:  
Name of person recording the story:  
Location:  
Date of recording:  

*Record anything else worth noting about the story teller*

**Question 1:**  
Tell me how you have been involved with Care and the BG4E project, and what your current involvement is?

Prompts:  
- Have you attended CARE trainings?  
- Have you been involved in CARE events?  
- Have you taken on additional Roles through the CARE project?

**Question 2:**  
What have been some changes that you have seen or experienced as a result of being a part of this CARE (BG4E) activity?

Prompts:  
- Any changes in your own personal skills, attitudes, behaviour?  
- Changes in how you engage with the school?  
- Changes in how you understand education?

**Question 3:**  
Of the changes you have talked about what has been the most important change and why?

**Question 4:**  
What else has happened that may have also contributed to (all of) these changes?

Prompts:  
- Any other non-CARE training?  
- New staff at school, changes in community?

**Question 5:**  
Could you describe what has been the situation like before this project?

Probe:  
- Ask probing questions in relation to the changes listed (this is to give us an understanding of the baseline situation)
Question 6: In your opinion, will these changes brought about by the project will be sustained?

Probing questions:
- Will new skills be maintained? New ways of doing things?
- What are the challenges to these changes continuing?

Question 7: Do you have any questions for me? Or anything else to add?

Thank you for your time, and for sharing your story with us.
Annex D: Term of Reference

CARE Papua New Guinea

Better Governance for Education (BG4E) End of Project Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

September – December 2019

BACKGROUND

The Better Governance for Education Project is a 4 year project (July 2016 – June 2020) funded through DFAT’s Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP). The total budget for the project is AUD1,700,000. The project team is small – made up of only five full-time staff. While the team includes a Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning (MEL) Officer, this position has been vacant for some periods during the project timeframe, which has led to some gaps in monitoring data. A baseline was not conducted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Goal:</th>
<th>Better education outcomes in Obura Wonenara through improved gender-inclusive community and sub-national governance.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of Project Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Communities are mobilised to support education outcomes for their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Targeted Government officers and representatives have improved skills, confidence and better functioning structures to undertake education related responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Project Outcome 3:</td>
<td>Schools provide better learning environments for boys and girls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

There will be three main purposes driving this evaluation:

- Documenting proven or promising gender sensitive approaches for improving community & sub-national governance, leading to better service delivery.
- Accountability to the DFAT as the donor, to the Government of PNG and other stakeholders, and to the school communities BG4E has worked with.
- Learning: the BG4E team will be deeply engaged in the evaluation process, including analysis and development of recommendations.
AUDIENCE
There will be multiple audiences for this evaluation, including:

- The National/Provincial/District Department of Education and other stakeholders: the BG4E team will present the findings from the evaluation at a workshop to be held in February 2020.
- DFAT (ANCP): the full evaluation report will be submitted to the ANCP section of DFAT.
- Communities BG4E has worked in: the BG4E team will share relevant findings from evaluation during community meetings and with School Boards of Management (BOMs).
- CARE PNG: CARE will use findings and recommendations to inform future work.

SCOPE
This evaluation will focus on CARE PNG’s BG4E activities over the total project period. Due to the small budget for evaluation (approx. AUD 13,500) the evaluation will be conducted as an internal evaluation, led by the CARE PNG Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Advisor and including the BG4E staff as members of the evaluation field team.

SPECIFIC EVALUATION QUESTIONS & SUB-QUESTIONS

1. IMPACT: Has improved gender inclusive governance led to better service delivery in education?
   - What are the expected/unexpected impacts of the project (both positive and negative) relating to inclusive governance (at community/sub-national/national level)?
   - What impacts has the project had on service deliverers (teachers, BOMS, SMTs) and quality of service delivery (education)?
   - Are there any other expected/unexpected impacts of the project (positive or negative)?

2. MODEL: Has this project produced a proven or promising approach?
   - Is it replicable? What are the key ‘ingredients’ needed? What are the key enabling factors for change to occur? What are the constraints/challenges?

3. RELEVANCE: How relevant is the project to the policy context?
   - Is the project relevant to stated government policy? And to the realities of the context, such as budget constraints, education system, political will?

4. SUSTAINABILITY: Are the outcomes and impacts likely to be sustained after the end of the project?
   - Will DEICs continue, and increase in functionality after the project ends? Will DEICs be rolled out across PNG? Will DEICs result in increased accountability and improved spending/management of resources?
   - Will communities continue supporting education and continue being involved in decision-making? Will gender advocates continue to advocate for gender change?
   - Will any improved functioning of BOMs (in project sites) continue? Will school principals continue to run the BOM training?
EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will include:

- **Phase I**: a focused desk-based review of Project plans, reports and other documents. Gaps in data required to answer the Key Evaluation Questions will be identified, and fieldwork plans and tools developed to fill these gaps.

- **Phase II**: Key Informant Interviews will be conducted during this phase – in Port Moresby (National Department of Education), in Goroka (Provincial Department of Education) and in non-project schools within CARE District.

- **Phase III**: field work to project site to gather primary data from community members, including school Board of Management members, School teachers, students, parents and others.

The combination of methods used will be decided following the desk review, but will likely include: collection of Most Significant Change stories; Focus Group Discussions of school community members (parents) using participatory tools, and semi-structured interviews of BOMs, Head teachers and other key community members.

DELIVERABLES

The key deliverables for the evaluation are as follows:

- Final detailed Evaluation Plan including methodology and tools.

- Final Evaluation Report (up to 30 pages plus any annexes and case studies), in electronic format and including an Executive Summary of no more than 4 pages.

TIMEFRAME

Indicative timeframes for completion of key milestones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I (Port Moresby, Goroka, Obura Wonenara District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed by 13 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 11 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed by 25 October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II (field-visit to remote project sites)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completed by 1 November</th>
<th>In-country field work (approximately one week)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed by 22 November</td>
<td>2-day Data Analysis and Validation workshop with Evaluation Team (BG4E Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed by end November</td>
<td>Submission of Draft Evaluation Report (to Priscilla and others for review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed by end December</td>
<td>Evaluation Report finalised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATION TEAM**

Katie Robinson (MEL Advisor) – Lead Evaluator, report writer.

BG4E team – Field researchers.