



# Evaluation of Education Programme for girls in nomadic areas of Gao, Mali

Executive Summary

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

June 2007

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB West Africa

Evaluators: Aly Teyeni Mana

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Program Education of the girls in nomadic area in the region of Gao in Mali is an integral part of the Regional Program of Education in nomadic area. This Program covers Burkina Faso, Niger, Liberia, Ghana and Mali. The Program started in Mali in May 2001 and covers 18 schools in 3 circles (Bourem, Gao and Ménaka). The major objective is the improvement of the schooling of girls in the region of Gao. Based on the three major components of Prodec, (Access, Quality and Equity), the program was implemented with the participation of the communities through 3 local NGOs. It yielded very significant results in terms of:

1. Improvement of the rates of schooling with:

- \* an increase in the rate of enrolment of 50,75% including 51,58 in the girls
- \* an average rate of retention of 71% with 67,7% in the girls
- \* a success rate of approximately 38,5%

2. Reinforcement of expertise of the organizations of support to school management, in particular women with an appreciable increase in the number and the level of elimination of illiteracy (1042 women taught reading and writing out of a total of 1077 registered, that is 96,75%).

3. Capacity building of the women in dealing with the schooling of their daughters thanks to the technical and financial support of income generating activities (AGR).

4. Capacity building of the organizations of the Civil Society to carry out an effective advocacy through the creation of an inter-regional coalition of the north for Education For All, gathering the organizations of the civil society intervening in the field of education at the level of the three regions of North-Mali which are Kidal, Timbuktu and Gao.

Moreover, one of the major results of the program is the awakening of the various actors as for the schooling of the children and the management of the school.

However, these results which are still insufficient remain precarious and it is advisable to consolidate them. Indeed, the emulsion generated by the actions of the program involved an unquestionable passion of the populations for the school as long as the taking in charge done by OGB and other PTF (WFP, World Education, etc).

In addition, the program also knew weaknesses and constraints at the time of its implementation which strongly limited the reach of its objectives. The main weaknesses noticed are:

- the absence of a logical framework,
- the absence of a system of follow-up-evaluation of the activities
- the absence of a strategy of perennisation of the activities and the assets
- the absence of a synergy between the interventions of the various actors

One of the constraints of the program is the non mastery of the texts governing the management of the school in a decentralized mode by the OSC implied in the advocacy as well as by the grassroots communities.

In addition, the devolution of the goods and the transfer of the competences promised by decentralization to the local governments are long to come, putting those vis-à-vis responsibilities for which they are insufficiently prepared.

The impact of the program on the populations is not yet an asset because their level of organization is insufficient and their resources do not make it possible to face the very enormous loads of operation of the school, in zones marked by a hostile nature and an incompatibility between the traditional school (fixed) and their nomadic way of life.

On another different plan, the various dialogue frameworks envisaged by Prodec in PISE have problems of operation for reasons of insufficiency of resources at the level of qualified services for this purpose.

All things considered, the consolidation of the assets and the improvement of education in the zone of the Program necessarily pass by:

- the reinforcement of the activities of information, training and sensitizing of the actors on the mechanisms of financing and management of the school;
- the capacity building of the civil society to carry out an effective advocacy;
- the capacity building of intervention of the communities in taking in charge the costs of operation of the school;
- the capacity building of the teachers and the capacities of the decentralized state technical services;
- an interaction between the various actors of the program.

Also, a new phase of the program will have to be directed strategically towards the 4 basic axes which are:

- the advocacy
- the support to the schools and the grassroots communities
- the support to the decentralized state technical services.
- the setting in synergy of the interventions of the various actors for a better management of the partnership by the installation of frameworks of intervention and dialogue between the actors of the program.

## **SYNOPSIS**

---

### **Acronyms**

### **SUMMARY**

#### **A – GENERAL IDEAS**

1. Introduction
2. Context of the mission
3. Objectives
4. Methodology used
5. Tools used
6. Organisation and course of the mission
7. Constraints and difficulties encountered

#### **B – DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAMM**

##### **B1. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMM**

1. Context of implementation of the programme
2. Objectives of the programme
3. Strategies and activities
4. Actors et zones of intervention
5. Extend of the taking into account of the educational policies and trends
6. Influence of education by the national strategies

##### **B2. RESULTS**

1. Improvement of schooling
2. The rates of the education quality
3. Capacity building
  - 3.1. At the level of teachers and state services
  - 3.2. At the level of support and school management structures
  - 3.2. At the level of the Society
4. Impact of the programme on the behaviour changes and the practice of the populations
5. Comparative analysis of the objectives and results obtained
6. Average cost of the taking in charge of one student in the programme zone

#### **C - ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAMME APPROACH**

#### **D – ACQUISITIONS AND LESSONS FROM THE PROGRAMME**

#### **E – STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAMME**

#### **F - PROPOSALS OF NEW STRATEGIC ORIENTATIONS**

#### **G - RECOMMENDATIONS**

---

**H – HYPOTHESES AND RISKS**

**CONCLUSIONS**

---

**APPENDICES**

© Oxfam GB 2007

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email [publish@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:publish@oxfam.org.uk)

For further information on the issues raised in this document email [phd@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:phd@oxfam.org.uk)

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

**[www.oxfam.org.uk](http://www.oxfam.org.uk)**