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Background

ACER has been contracted to assist OMAES in the development of an evaluation framework and tools in order to assess the impact of Bëëkunko, a citizen-led assessment that evaluates students’ literacy and mathematics learning in Mali. Evaluations are increasingly focused on addressing ‘impact’ through the identification of causal attribution, and quantifying outcomes for stakeholders through robust counterfactuals or comparison data. While the goal of citizen-led evaluations like Bëëkunko, is to ultimately improve student learning, it is difficult to establish direct links between the use of assessment findings for policy and decision making, and the link between introduced policies and programs and subsequent student learning. Therefore, traditional evaluation designs intended to address impact require high technical rigor and are costly to implement, and ultimately may not be as useful for evaluating policy change.

OMAES has defined program and evaluation goals for Bëëkunko through the following Bëëkunko frameworks: Theory of Change (Theorie du Changement), Action Plan (Plan d’Action), and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Cadre de Suivi Evaluation). Rather than focusing on outcomes for individual stakeholder groups (e.g. outcomes for parents, outcomes for teachers, outcomes for students), Bëëkunko has as its goal to influence education policy and decision-making for improving the quality of education. Consequently, an evaluation of Bëëkunko program outcomes will mean the influence and effect of OMAES advocacy activities, and will focus on mid and long-term policy goals which have been theorized to influence education policy-making.

Policy and advocacy evaluation is a new and growing field, where evaluation may appropriately address ‘contribution’ rather than ‘attribution’ (California Endowment, 2009). The use of a prospective evaluation approach, which would evaluate progress towards identified outcomes, would be appropriate for the ongoing nature of Bëëkunko assessments and OMAES advocacy activities in a policy-context. The proposed evaluation approaches in this document have been informed by a logic model for Bëëkunko, which was collaboratively developed between ACER and OMAES. Both organizations have jointly developed draft indicators to monitor and evaluate short-term outcomes for OMAES advocacy activities.

In order to address a larger evaluation question of ‘policy impact’, ACER has developed several draft tools to monitor mid and long-term policy outcomes. ACER has drafted tools to evaluate: changes in social norms related to improving children’s learning and education; a strengthened base of support for supporting Bëëkunko and education reform; and changes in the policy-making cycle that address Bëëkunko findings. The tools proposed in this document are suggestions, and should be updated and finalized by OMAES to reflect the specific context of OMAES activities. Also, OMAES should update the proposed tools in-line with their organizational capacity to implement the outlined methodologies. As organizational learning is a key purpose of prospective evaluation, evaluation tools must be useful or OMAES. Lastly, ACER recognizes that policy contexts are liable to change over time, and consequently advocacy activities may also change. The proposed evaluation tools and approaches in this document have been designed to be generic enough to be adapted as needed, and serve as general framework that may guide future evaluation needs.
## Bækunko Suggested Evaluation Approaches for: Shift in Social Norms

### MID-TERM OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIFT IN NORMS/ATTITUDES</th>
<th>Primarily Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge of children’s achievement and how to support learning</td>
<td>Increased activities undertaken at home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach

Citizen-led evaluations like Bækunko, theorize that actors in civil society will be able to improve their knowledge, attitudes, values and behaviors in such a way that supports children’s learning, and exerts pressure on other actors to adopt policies and decisions to improve the quality of education through reliable and valid information about the education system. ACER proposes that parents be considered a primary stakeholder group of interest. Parents are thought to be primary consumers of evaluation data, and who are well-placed to begin to engage in advocacy in order to improve the quality of education.

In Bækunko, parents participate in the implementation of the assessment. Households are sampled during the assessment, and parents of children who participate in the assessment are asked about several issues related to their socio-economic background. Therefore, parents that participate in Bækunko are immediately informed about the assessment and its purposes. In addition, OMAES undertakes a variety of dissemination and outreach activities intended to affect change in parental social norms and attitudes towards their children’s education, with the aim that parents:

1) Value and prioritize their child’s learning;

2) Engage in behaviors to support child’s learning;

3) Exert pressure on other actors to improve the quality of education.

OMAES has five specific program objectives that guide the organization’s activities. These objectives have guided the development of the following Bækunko frameworks: Theory of Change (Theorie du Changement), Action Plan (Plan d’Action), and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Cadre de Suivi Evaluation). Three of these specific objectives relate to impacting outcomes for targeted stakeholder groups, namely local grassroots actors and policy-makers and education decision-makers.
The third Specific Objective, (OS3) outlines expected outcomes for local decision-makers, such that various local actors will change their practices and begin to adopt at least two practices or policies that aim to improve the quality of education in response to the implementation of Beëkunko and dissemination of Beëkunko results. The proposed evaluation of mid-term outcomes, specifically examining parental social norms, will allow OMAES to monitor progress towards reaching this third Specific Objective (OS3). Practically, it may not be feasible to quantify the number of adopted practices that all parents implement after their children participate in Beëkunko. However, the proposed evaluation tool will allow OMAES to generally monitor progress towards changing social norms regarding education in Malian society.

Outcomes

Parents

1. SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

OMAES can re-examine short-term outcomes for Parents using their own monitoring data (as proposed in the Beëkunko Outputs and Outcomes Monitoring Framework). By using data from this monitoring framework, OMAES can examine parental stakeholder coverage for dissemination and advocacy activities by examining:

- Number and location of parents that engage in: town meetings, RV outreach, door-to-door advocacy, Beëkunko Club meetings, etc.

An examination of short-term outcomes can help OMAES to better understand the ways that parents are engaging with OMAES dissemination, which can help to inform ongoing and future advocacy strategies.

Parents

1. MID-TERM OUTCOMES

An evaluation of mid-term outcomes for Parents can examine the knowledge, values and behaviors that are related to improving children’s learning, and generally, and support for improving the quality of education after Beëkunko has been implemented in a geographic area. An evaluation of social norms can include:

1) Knowledge, values and behaviors;

2) Educational resources and supports; and
3) Involvement in school activities and advocacy.

Proposed tools to examine these outcomes are detailed below.

**Target Population**

**Parents**

The village or quarter is the primary sampling unit for Békunko and households are randomly selected for participation according to standardized criteria that are applied for villages/quarters. All children that are eligible to participate, in the selected home, are invited to participate in the Békunko assessment and information from parents is also collected.

It would be of interest to attempt to evaluate mid-term outcomes for parents who participated in the previous Békunko cycle. However, ACER anticipates that it will be quite resource-intensive and unlikely for OMAES to identify and contact the same parents that previously participated in the Békunko assessment 1-2 years after an assessment is conducted. This would further reduce the potential sample size, in addition to issues of non-response. As an alternative, OMAES can invite all parents of school-age children to participate in the evaluation, in villages/quarters that were sampled in the previous Békunko assessment cycle – regardless if the parent’s child had participated in Békunko or not.

As OMAES aims to influence social norms for civil society, or amongst all parents in a community, it would be of interest to evaluate parental social norms in communities where the assessment was conducted, regardless if the parent directly participated in the Békunko assessment or not. Békunko dissemination and advocacy activities widely target members of civil society – not solely the assessment participants. In this way, OMEAS can evaluate parental social norms at the community level, and reduce the sampling and administrative burden of attempting to locate and contact participant parents one or several years after the assessment has been conducted.

**Sampling Approach**

**Parents**

As a sizeable number of villages and quarters are sampled to participate in Békunko (approximately n=1080), OMAES may consider drawing a representative probability sample of geographic areas that participated in the last cycle of Békunko. All parents in a village or quarter may be targeted to participate in an evaluation, through Parent Association meetings, school-student registers, and community centers or town halls, for example.

A sizeable proportion of parents may have low literacy levels. Literacy levels of parents may have implications for the evaluation methodology and sampling methodology. As regards the evaluation methodology, a traditional paper and pen survey may be inappropriate for parents who may be unable to ready the survey instrument. OMAES should give consideration to resourcing and administrative
issues for oral administration of the survey, by a relais for example. Or, the survey may be administered via audio files online or an electronic tablet, which can be brought to villages or quarters. In addition, parents with low literacy levels may not be able to read invitation flyers, emails or announcements. OMAES will need to consider appropriate ways to target parents with low literacy levels, in sampled towns and quarters.

The approach and sample size will depend on OMAES’ available resources and timelines to conduct an evaluation of Parents. However, any drawn sample should vary as much as possible by: jurisdiction (region, commune, town); jurisdiction size (large, medium, size); urban/rural; language(s) of administration; socio-economic index of the geographic area; characteristics of schools in sampled areas (e.g. school type; school size; curriculum, etc.) and socio-economic background of households (literacy levels, available resources).

**Instrument**

**Parents**

The example survey below can be used to evaluate parental social norms towards children’s learning in geographic areas that have participated in a Beskunko assessment cycle. Survey questions can address parental: knowledge, values and behaviors; educational resources and supports; and involvement in school activities and advocacy.

The example survey has been drafted for use with Parents. Survey questions should be revised and finalized by OMAES to accurately reflect the activities and contexts of Parents in line with OMAES dissemination and advocacy activities.

A voluntary survey may introduce non-response bias. This means that Parents who are more involved in their child’s learning and who have more time and resources to participate in an evaluation, will be more likely to respond to a survey compared to Parents who may not be as involved in their child’s learning, and/or who may not have the time or resources to participate in an evaluation.

If the potential non-response bias for Parents is deemed by OMAES to be great, then OMAES may decide to conduct targeted focus group discussions which include both more and less involved parents. Focus group discussions can probe parents about their knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to involvement in their child’s learning. Furthermore, focus group discussion may be able to elicit more contextual information that survey questions may not be able to capture, particularly about issues related to community social capital, such as the parent’s relationship with the school and with other parents in the community. OMAES may decide to use the proposed survey questions as a guide to develop a focus group discussion interview schedule, if that approach is deemed to be more feasible for OMAES.
Example Survey Tool – Parents

I. Information about who is completing the questionnaire

- Location (Region, Commune, Cercle, Ward/Town)
- Age
- Gender
- Education/Literacy Level
- Number of Child/Children assessed in Bɛɛkunko
- Ages/Year levels of children
- School type that child attends

II. Knowledge about Bɛɛkunko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all familiar</th>
<th>Partly familiar</th>
<th>Moderately familiar</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Extremely familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) How familiar were you with Bɛɛkunko before your child was assessed by that program?

b) How familiar are you with Bɛɛkunko now?

III. Knowledge about child’s learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all informed</th>
<th>Partly informed</th>
<th>Moderately informed</th>
<th>Very informed</th>
<th>Extremely informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) How informed did you feel about your child’s reading performance before s/he was assessed by Bɛɛkunko?

b) How informed do you feel about how well your child can read now, after the Bɛɛkunko assessment?
c) How informed did you feel about what your child was able to do in mathematics before s/he was assessed by Bɛɛkunko?

How informed do you feel about what your child is able to do in mathematics now, after the Bɛɛkunko assessment?

d) 1 2 3 4 5

IVa. Values and behavior toward child’s learning – option 1

(Note that the following question combines items with a response scales to obtain information about the people to whom parents may talk with whether they would actually do it; hence gets at behavior and values. The wording of the response options has been taken from the Schwarz value survey (Schwartz 1994a, 1994, Schwartz et al., 2001) which has been shown to have robust measurement characteristics.)

Here, we briefly describe people with whom some parents talk to find out why their child has not done well in reading or mathematics. Please read each description and tick the box on each line that shows how much each parent is like you.

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Very much like me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>Somewhat like me</th>
<th>A little like me</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not like me at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IVb. Values and behavior toward child’s learning – option 2

How often do you talk to the following people about your child's learning in reading or mathematics?

*(Please tick only one box in each row)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never hardly ever</th>
<th>Once twice month</th>
<th>Once twice a week</th>
<th>Every day or almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) To my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) To my child's teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) To the principal of the school that my child attends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) To other parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) To other members of the household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) To other people in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Measures taken by parents to improve learning

How often do you or someone else in your home undertake the following activities with your child?

*(Please tick only one box in each row)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never hardly ever</th>
<th>Once twice month</th>
<th>Once twice a week</th>
<th>Every day or almost every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Tell stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Sing songs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Talk about things you had done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Say counting rhymes or sing counting songs
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

e) Count different things
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

f) Play games involving shapes
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

g) Play board or card games
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

   For literate parents

h) Read books
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

i) Talk about what you had read
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

j) Play word games
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

k) Write letters or words
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

l) Read aloud signs and labels
   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4

Sources: Parent Questionnaire PISA 2009; Home "Learning to Read" Questionnaire PIRLS 2011
VI. Home resources

Which of the following are available to your child in your home?  
(Please tick one box in each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) A private study corner</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A desk or table to do school- or homework</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Newspaper</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Journals or magazines</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Books of his/her very own (do not count school books)</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Stationery (e.g. pencils, paper, erasers)</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Once per week</th>
<th>Twice per week</th>
<th>Three times per week</th>
<th>Four times per week</th>
<th>Five times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) How often does your child have breakfast before s/he leaves for school per week?</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 meal per day</th>
<th>2 meals per day</th>
<th>3 meals or more meals per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) How many meals a day does your child have?</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child does not do any work for the family</td>
<td>Less than 1 hour per day</td>
<td>1-2 hours per day</td>
<td>2-3 hours per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) How much time does your child spend working for the family each day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than 30 minutes per day</th>
<th>30 to 60 minutes per day</th>
<th>More than 1 hour fewer than 2 hours per day</th>
<th>More than 2 hours per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) How much time does it take your child everyday to travel (includes walking, riding, taking the bus) from home to school?
About how many books are there in your home? (Do not count magazines, newspapers, or your child’s schoolbooks).

(Please tick only one box.)

a) None of very few (0 – 10 books) □
b) Enough to fill one shelf (11 – 25 books) □
c) Enough to fill one bookcase (26 – 100 books) □
d) Enough to fill two bookcases (101 – 200 books) □
e) Enough to fill three or more bookcases (more than 200 books) □

Sources: TIMMS 2011 Student questionnaire Year 4

VII. School involvement

During the past year, <from XXX to XXX>, have you participated in any of the following school-related activities?

(Please tick one box in each row.)

a) Volunteered in physical activities, e.g. building maintenance, carpentry, gardening or yard work. Yes □ No □
b) Volunteered in extra-curricular activities, e.g. book club, school play, sports, field trip. □ 1 □ 2

c) Volunteered in the school library or media centre. □ 1 □ 2

d) Assisted a teacher in the school. □ 1 □ 2

e) Appeared as a guest speaker. □ 1 □ 2

f) Volunteered in the school <canteen>. □ 1 □ 2

Source: Adapted from PISA 2012 Parent Questionnaire

**VIII. Participation in advocacy**

<During the past year>, the Béërunko assessment was conducted in households in your village/ward, and a town meeting was held to discuss the children’s learning performance in French, <national language>, and mathematics. Please indicate how often you may have participated in the following activities during the <past year> after the Béërunko assessment.

*(Please tick one box in each row.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never during the past year</th>
<th>1-2 times during the year</th>
<th>3-4 times during the year</th>
<th>Once twice month or a twice week</th>
<th>Once or twice a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Attended a Parent Association meeting to discuss children’s learning performance.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Attended a School Management Committee meeting to discuss children’s learning performance. Contacted the school administration (principal, teachers) to discuss children’s learning performance. Contacted the &lt;Mayor&gt; in my local area about children’s learning performance.</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Contacted the local media (e.g. newspaper, radio, social media) to report on children’s learning performance.

f) Attended a Bęłskunko town hall meeting about children’s learning performance.

g) Attended a Bęłskunko Club Meeting in my local area.

h) Attended a Bęłskunko Public Commitment Ceremony.

Data Collection Plan

Parents

An evaluation approach to measure parental social norms may collect data at identified intervals (e.g. annually, biannually), after a length of time which OMAES would expect for there to be a change in social norms. ACER suggests a year, as this may coincide with evaluation cycles and activities undertaken with parents. Data collection timeframes may also occur at times when it will be more feasible for OMAES to collect survey data, for example, if relais are already scheduled to visit sampled areas, or an OMAES outreach activity is being conducted in a sampled area. This approach diminishes the need to collect baseline data, which would also be more resource intensive for OMAES.

Results will be able to evaluate progress towards mid-term outcomes, after the conclusion of an assessment cycle. Therefore the draft tools proposed in this document can be used to support a prospective evaluation approach, monitoring progress over time in order to improve advocacy strategies for influencing parental social norms, and for supporting organizational learning. Therefore the suggestions in this document are not prescriptive, and any evaluation approach in a policy context should allow for flexibility.

Data Analysis Plan

Parents

OMAES can evaluate parental social norms, using the proposed evaluation tools in the following ways:

1) Analyzing proportions of responses for specified items overall, and by respondent characteristics and identified sub-groups (e.g. gender, location);
2) Responses to items that share the same response scale can be combined to form scales (e.g. values and behavior scale; involvement scale);
3) Descriptive statistics can be calculated for basic scales and reported for identified subgroups (e.g. reporting means and standard deviations);

4) Further analyses can be undertaken to examine predictors of outcomes of interest, such as ‘Participation in advocacy activities’. For example, regression analyses can be conducted in order to identify relevant predictors of increased advocacy activities, such as knowledge, resources or values.

**Reporting and Dissemination**

**Parents**

Evaluation outcomes should be framed and reported according to the overall Bεkunko Logic Model, in terms of identified mid-term outcomes for parents, and progress towards meeting identified Specific Objectives (OS3).

ACER recommends that evaluation findings be reported internally to OMAES staff as soon as possible, in order to help inform ongoing and upcoming advocacy activities, and to support organizational learning, especially during periods of policy-context and program change.

ACER anticipates that it may not be feasible to evaluate impact on stakeholders by collecting data for an identified cohort over time; meaning, pre and post data or longitudinal data from the same stakeholders within a specified timeframe. Rather, it may be more feasible to longitudinally collect data from different cohorts drawn from the same stakeholder group over successive cycles of Bεkunko. Furthermore, OMAES may not be able to evaluate parents that participated in earlier cycles of Bεkunko. OMAES may evaluate parents in geographic regions that participated in Bεkunko. While evaluation sampling procedures may change over evaluation cycles, Parental outcomes may be broadly compared across different evaluation cycles, in order to inform a general picture about parental social norms related to their children’s learning.

For example, proportions of Parents engaging in advocacy activities may be examined across evaluation cycles in order to monitor Parental advocacy levels over time. An evaluation of Parental outcomes should be used to broadly inform ongoing and future Bεkunko engagement and advocacy activities, rather than be used to provide a summative evaluation of the program. In light of these considerations, it is recommended to refrain from significance testing when comparing outcomes for different cohorts of Parents across evaluation cycles and significance testing between stakeholder groups which may be administered the same measure. In addition, it is emphasized to look at as many data points in time as differences between, say, just two time points may merely reflect differences between cohorts. Hence, it is recommended to look for patterns over time, say three or four data collection to increase the likelihood of discovering actual trends rather than idiosyncrasies of particular cohorts (e.g. a cohort of parents who has been particularly influenced by a particular awareness campaign which may have occurred in one year but not the next).
Bëkunko Suggested Evaluation Approaches for: Strengthened Base of Support

**MID-TERM OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTHENED BASE OF SUPPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opinion Leaders, Bëkunko Clubs, School Management Committees, Local Parent Associations, School, Communes, Media</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increased number and visibility of stakeholders who support Bëkunko
- Increased number and visibility of stakeholders who prioritize educational reform
- Increased number and visibility of stakeholders engaging in advocacy

**Approach**

Bëkunko uses a variety of approaches, through dissemination of assessment findings, media and marketing, and mobilizing actors in order to widen and strengthen the base of support of individual stakeholders and stakeholder groups that:

1) Support Bëkunko as a credible assessment tool for monitoring the quality of education;

2) Prioritize and support education reform to improve the quality of education; and

3) Engage in advocacy and outreach activities in order to encourage decision-makers to adopt policies and practices that will improve the quality of education and student learning.

Monitoring program outputs and *short-term outcomes* (outlined in the Bëkunko Logic Model), will help OMAES to identify any gaps or areas for improvement with activities related to dissemination, the use of media and marketing, and strategies to mobilize activities.

An examination of *mid-term outcomes* related to strengthening the base of support will allow OMAES to:

1) Evaluate the effectiveness of Bëkunko advocacy strategies;

2) Assess the depth of support for Bëkunko, education reform, and engagement in advocacy by identified stakeholder groups;

3) Assess the breadth of support for Bëkunko, education reform and engagement in advocacy across different stakeholder groups.
An evaluation of a prioritized stakeholder group can assess the depth of support for that group (e.g. Local Opinion Leaders) by measuring the current level of support and measuring any change in the level of support after Békunko advocacy activities. Evaluating across stakeholder groups (e.g. Local Opinion Leaders, Békunko Clubs, Media, School Management Committees, etc.) can assess the breadth of support overall for Békunko, educational reform and engagement in advocacy. A conceptualization of ‘Support’ includes: support for Békunko and Békunko’s main messages, an increase in prioritization of education reform, and an increase in engagement and participation advocacy activities for improving the quality of education.

OMAES has five specific program objectives that guide the organization’s activities. These objectives have guided the development of the following Békunko frameworks: Theory of Change (Théorie du Changement), Action Plan (Plan d’Action), and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Cadre de Suivi Evaluation). Three of these specific objectives relate to impacting outcomes for targeted stakeholder groups, namely local grassroots actors and policy-makers and education decision-makers.

“OS 3 (Changement de pratiques) : Amener les communautés à la base et autres partenaires de l’école à prendre par an au moins deux (2) mesures conformes aux recommandations des résultats d’évaluations, pour la qualité de l’éducation d’ici juillet 2017.”

The third Specific Objective, (OS3) outlines expected outcomes for local decision-makers, such that various local actors will change their practices and begin to adopt at least two practices or policies that aim to improve the quality of education in response to the implementation of Békunko and dissemination of Békunko results. The proposed evaluation of mid-term outcomes, specifically examining strengthening in the base of support, will allow OMAES to monitor progress towards reaching this third Specific Objective (OS3). Practically, it may not be feasible to quantify the number of adopted practices for all local stakeholder groups. However, the proposed evaluation tools in this document will allow OMAES to generally monitor and describe the depth and breadth of support for supporting this objective. Monitoring progress towards mid-term outcomes across Békunko assessment cycles can be considered a prospective evaluation approach, as the assessment is implemented annually and advocacy activities are ongoing. Findings can be used to inform ongoing advocacy activities, and take into account changing policy contexts.

The proposed tools for evaluating the base of support for Békunko will focus on the following stakeholder groups: Local Opinion Leaders, Békunko Club Members, Gestion Scolaire (School Management Committees, Parent Associations, Mother Associations), and the Media. These suggested tools may be adapted to suit the needs of other identified stakeholders or when the policy context changes and new ‘champions’ emerge and are identified.
Outcomes

Local Opinion Leaders and Бєєkunko Clubs

1. SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

OMAES can re-examine short-term outcomes for 1) Local Opinion Leaders and 2) Бєєkunko Clubs using their own monitoring data (as proposed in the Бєєkunko Outputs and Outcomes Monitoring Framework). By using data from this monitoring framework, OMAES can establish categories for both Local Opinion Leaders and Бєєkunko Clubs over-time to characterize these groups by:

- Number established and where (e.g. region, commune, town);
- Who/what affiliations (e.g. local council members, local business leaders, members from parent associations etc.);
- Number, type and frequency of activities undertaken (e.g. facilitating discussions with schools, local press conferences, organizing debates, etc.);
- Numbers that still actively correspond with OMAES and engage in OMAES supported activities.

These results can help OMAES to better understand the types of stakeholders likely to be engaged in these activities, which can help to inform future recruitment and retention strategies. In addition, these results can provide information about patterns of stakeholder engagement and activity. In this way, OMAES can address shortcomings, and further leverage any groups or strategies that are resulting in increased engagement and support, in comparison to others.

Local Opinion Leaders and Бєєkunko Clubs

1. MID-TERM OUTCOMES

An evaluation of mid-term outcomes for Local Opinion Leaders and Бєєkunko Clubs can examine the effectiveness of OMAES strategies impacting the following outcomes for these stakeholders:

1) Increased knowledge about children’s learning in French, National language and mathematics;

2) Support for Бєєkunko to evaluate the quality of education and for Бєєkunko’s main messages;

3) Increased prioritization of education reform;

4) Increased participation in advocacy activities.

Outcomes for Local Opinion Leaders and Бєєkunko Club Members can be examined by way of a survey to target all initially recruited stakeholders and established clubs. Measuring the depth of support for identified stakeholder groups should include differentiated aspects of support, in order to triangulate outcomes. Differentiated aspects of support can include: a change in knowledge (section II in draft survey tool), prioritization of education reform (sections II and III), participation in advocacy activities.
(sections II, III and VI); degree of support for Beëkunko’s main messages (section IV); degree of support for specified education policies (section V); triangulating outcomes about mobilizing other stakeholders (section VII); and perceived effectiveness of Beëkunko dissemination and advocacy strategies with local-level stakeholders (section VIII).

Proposed tools to examine these outcomes are detailed below.

**Target Population**

**Local Opinion Leaders and Beëkunko Clubs**

While a wide-ranging group of local-level stakeholders have been prioritized by OMAES to evaluate outcomes, it seems important to first evaluate outcomes for two primary stakeholders groups that Beëkunko have identified in their advocacy strategies: Local Opinion Leaders and Beëkunko Clubs. An evaluation of these two groups will examine the extent to which these actors support Beëkunko, prioritize education reform, and have engaged in advocacy activities.

OMAES has outlined that they have created these stakeholder positions and groups in order to better engage in advocacy activities on the ground, and mobilize other local actors to get involved in supporting education reform. These actors may be in a prime position to provide information about the perceived efficacy of Beëkunko strategies on the ground (dissemination, media and marketing, mobilizing other actors), and may be able to triangulate information about impact on other stakeholder groups (i.e. School Management Committees, Schools, Parent Associations), for which OMAEs may not have direct contact and access. Local Opinion Leaders will mean the individuals that were identified, nominated and selected using pre-defined criteria by OMAES. Beëkunko Clubs will include all members who initially participated in the formation of the Beëkunko Club in each commune or village where the club was established.

**Sampling Approach**

**Local Opinion Leaders and Beëkunko Clubs**

If all Local Opinion Leaders and Beëkunko Club Members, or at least the leaders of Beëkunko Clubs, have been identified and can be contacted by OMAES, then a census sampling approach may be feasible for these stakeholder groups. All members of the target population can be contacted by OMAES (e.g. electronically, post) and invited to participate in a survey.

However, a voluntary survey may introduce non-response bias, such that the Local Opinion Leaders and Beëkunko Club Members who are more active, and for which there has been a greater impact on strengthening support, will be more likely to respond compared to stakeholders who have not been engaged in these activities, and for whom there has been little to no impact on strengthening support.
If the potential non-response bias for Local Opinion Leaders and Bєkunko Club Members is deemed by OMAES to be great, then OMAES may decide to conduct focus group discussions and individual interviews alongside a survey, in order to identify the factors that have helped to facilitate participation with active stakeholders, and barriers that have served to discourage involvement with less active stakeholders. Specific to indentifying facilitators and barriers, OMAES may choose to explore in focus group and individual discussions the contextual factors that have impacted on Bєkunko’s outreach and dissemination activities, and factors that may have impacted on stakeholders’ participation in specific advocacy activities. Focus groups may also identify important factors that may then be incorporated into future survey instruments.

This approach and sample size will depend on OMAES’ available resources and timelines to conduct fieldwork. Focus groups may purposefully sample areas with both active and less active Local Opinion Leaders and Bєkunko Clubs, where OMAEs has documented more and less active participation over the course of OMAES outreach activities. A purposive sample of active and inactive Leaders and Clubs should also vary as much as possible by: jurisdiction (region, commune, town); jurisdiction size (large, medium, size); urban/rural; language(s) of administration; socio-economic index of the geographic area; characteristics of schools in sampled areas (e.g. school type; school size; curriculum, etc.).

**Instrument**

**Local Opinion Leaders and Bєkunko Clubs**

The example survey below can be used to evaluate the strength of support among key stakeholder groups, which have been proposed initially for Local Opinion Leaders and Bєkunko Club members. Survey questions can address an increase in: knowledge about children’s learning; support for Bєkunko; increase in prioritization of educational reform; and increase in participation in advocacy. In addition, survey questions have been included which can be used for OMAES to triangulate data about the mobilization of other stakeholder groups (e.g. parent associations, local decision-makers) and to evaluate perceived effectiveness of Bєkunko dissemination and engagement strategies on the ground.

The example survey has been drafted for use with both local Opinion Leaders and Bєkunko Club members. Survey questions should be revised and finalized by OMAES to accurately reflect the activities and contexts of these stakeholder groups. If there is a large difference between Local Opinion Leaders and Bєkunko Club Members concerning activities and roles, OMAEs may consider using the proposed survey as an initial framework to develop distinct surveys or question sets for each group.

If OMAES will undertake evaluation activities using an internal evaluator, every effort must be made to ensure the anonymity of respondents when reporting results within OMAES and to external stakeholders (e.g. aggregating reporting categories to high levels so individual or groups of respondents cannot be identified). Response rates for voluntary surveys are typically low, and will require a concerted amount of time and resources to follow-up with respondents to encourage participation (e.g. emails, phone calls, newsletters, pre-paid envelopes or online administration, etc.). OMAES should identify appropriate strategies to encourage voluntary participation as suited to their capacity.
Example Survey Tool – Local Opinion Leaders; Béékunko Club Members

OMAES is conducting this survey for its own, internal evaluation purposes in order to improve future activities related to Béékunko. No respondent names will be used in any reporting from the survey – total anonymity will be maintained in the reporting. Still, OMAES may wish to obtain further information about your responses to this survey. OMAES may contact you in order to arrange participation in an interview or focus group discussion to obtain more information about your views on and participation in Béékunko activities. Please indicate whether you are happy to participate in focus group or interview discussions by providing your email or other contact details below.

I may be contacted at:

Email: ________________________________________________________________________

Mobile phone/Telephone: ________________________________________________________________________

I. Information about who is completing the questionnaire

- Location (Region, Commune, Cercle, Ward/Town)
- Age
- Gender
- Education Level
- Professional Affiliation (Can be open-ended for coding or pre-defined categories; e.g. teacher, local business leader, parent, religious leader)
- Role in Béékunko (Can be open-ended for coding or pre-defined categories) e.g. Local Opinion Leader, Béékunko Club Leader, Béékunko Club Member)

II. Knowledge, prioritization and advocacy

Please think about yourself now (XXX), in comparison to the beginning of the year (XXX). Please rate to what extent you may have changed in the following ways.

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>To Some Extent</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I am more knowledgeable about children’s achievement in French.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I am more knowledgeable about children’s achievement in &lt;National language&gt;.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I am more knowledgeable about children’s achievement in Mathematics.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Knowledge, prioritization and advocacy - no change component

Thinking about your involvement as a Local Opinion Leader/Beekunko Club Member): how strongly do you agree with the following statements?

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

a) I have made a commitment to address a specific educational issue in my local area.

b) I am aware of the commitments that school partners and local decision-makers have made to address Beekunko results.

c) I have made a specific commitment to help mobilize other members in the community to improve children’s learning.
d) I have helped to monitor that local school partners and local decision-makers follow through with commitments to address Beekunko.

- If you have made a specific commitment to address an education issue in your local area, please write about this commitment and any activities that you have undertaken:

- If you have helped to monitor the commitments of local school partners and local decision makers, please write about these commitments and any activities that you have undertaken:

IV. Support for Beekunko’s main messages

How strongly do you agree with the following statements?

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) The quality of education in Mali needs to be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Students are just not learning in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Beekunko is a useful assessment to evaluate children’s learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Beekunko helps to increase transparency about the quality of education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Parents are responsible for improving children’s learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Neighbors/Communities are responsible for improving children’s learning.

Principal’s are responsible for improving children’s learning.

g) Teachers are responsible for improving children’s learning.

Communes and mayors are responsible for improving children’s learning.

h) School management committees are responsible for improving children’s learning.

The National Ministry of Education is responsible for improving children’s learning.

i) School management committees are responsible for improving children’s learning.


V. Support for specific policies

How likely would you be to support increased (insert level Region/Commune/Cercle/Town) funding for the following programs for schools in your area?

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

a) Feeding programs for children to have meals at school

b) Refurbishment of chairs

c) Refurbishment of desks

d) Programs for every child to have a textbook/Increase the number of textbooks

e) Programs to monitor teacher attendance

f) Programs to monitor children’s attendance

g) Programs to monitor the implementation of the school schedule
h) Programs for teacher’s professional development

i) Programs for school leader’s professional development

**VI. Advocacy**

Below are some activities in which you may have participated as part of being a Beëkunko Local Opinion Leader or Beëkunko Club Member.

Please indicate how often you participated in the following activities during the past year, <from XXX to XXX>.

*(Please tick only one box in each row.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never during the past year</th>
<th>1-2 times during the year</th>
<th>3-4 times during the year</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>More than once a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Attended a Beëkunko Club Meeting</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Volunteered at a Beëkunko event</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Helped distribute Beëkunko materials to the public</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke with parents and members of the community at public events about Beëkunko results</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Contacted (The Mayor; School Principal; Parent Association; School) in my local area to discuss Beëkunko results</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Participated in a Beëkunko press conference to monitor commitments</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Attended (parent association, school management committee meetings to encourage</td>
<td>□₁</td>
<td>□₂</td>
<td>□₃</td>
<td>□₄</td>
<td>□₅</td>
<td>□₆</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
members to address Bɛɛkunko results
Contacted the local media (e.g. newspaper, radio, social media) to encourage reporting of Bɛɛkunko findings
Contacted the media (e.g. newspaper, radio, social media) to encourage reporting on the commitment of policymakers to undertake education reforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 – little to no interest in improving student achievement and involvement in education reform</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 – High level of interest in improving student achievement and active involvement in education reform</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Comité de Gestion Scolaire (CGS)/School management committees</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) School principal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Teachers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Triangulate data about mobilization of other local stakeholders

For each of the stakeholder groups below in your local area, please rate where they are today in terms of interest in improving student achievement and supporting education reform. Note that the option of "Don’t know" has been added here as one strategy of evaluating knowledge of the respondent.

(Please tick only one box in each row.)
VIII. Effectiveness of Bëkunko dissemination and advocacy strategies

Thinking about your involvement as a <Local Opinion Leader/Bëkunko Club Member> over the past year, <from XXX to XXX>:

How useful have the following strategies been for encouraging local stakeholders and community members to address Bëkunko findings?

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Bëkunko national reports</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>RV Dissemination</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Door-to-door dissemination</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Policy briefs

e) Project examples and budgets (i.e. dossier politique)

f) Social media (e.g. Twitter, Facebook

g) Radio

h) TV

i) Bɛɛkunko videos

j) Bɛɛkunko newsletters

k) Bɛɛkunko website

l) Press conferences

m) National debate

n) Public Commitment Ceremonies

Lobby local policy-makers (XXX OMAES to refine with specific examples of activities)

o) Discussions between local decision-makers and education stakeholders (XXX OMAES to refine with specific examples of activities)

- Additional comments:

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
Data Collection Plan

Local Opinion Leaders and Bëkunko Clubs

An evaluation approach to measure the depth of support of Local Opinion Leaders and Bëkunko Club Members suggests longitudinal data collection at identified intervals (e.g. annually, biannually), or at times when it will be more feasible for OMAES to collect survey data, for example, at annually scheduled meetings with Local Opinion Leaders and Bëkunko Clubs.

Considering that OMAES timelines and resources may be quite limited to conduct an internal evaluation alongside the management of Bëkunko assessment cycles, ACER recommends that OMAES conduct evaluations of identified outcomes at the conclusion of a Bëkunko cycle. Results will be able to evaluate progress towards outcomes, relating to the concluded assessment cycle. This approach diminishes the need to collect baseline data, which would also be more resource intensive for OMAES. OMAES should plan to collect data from the following stakeholder groups after an amount of time for which they would expect to see a change in support. ACER has suggested a year, as this may coincide with evaluation cycles and activities undertaken with these stakeholders. A different stakeholder group, and identified outcome (short, medium, long-term) may be selected to be the focus of one evaluation cycle. OMAES may select different evaluation foci over-time, dependent upon their evaluation needs.

While an evaluation of outcomes for a concluded assessment cycle may suggest a retrospective evaluation approach, as Bëkunko is an ongoing assessment program OMAES may continue to evaluate progress toward long-term outcomes, and use findings to improve and refine their ongoing advocacy strategies. Therefore the draft tools proposed in this document can be used to support a prospective evaluation approach, monitoring progress over time in order to improve advocacy strategies and organizational learning. Therefore the suggestions in this document are not prescriptive, and any evaluation approach in a policy context should allow for flexibility.

Data Analysis Plan

Local Opinion Leaders and Bëkunko Clubs

OMAES can evaluate the depth of support for identified stakeholder groups, using the proposed evaluation tools in the following ways:

1) Analyzing proportions of responses for specified items overall, and by respondent characteristics and identified sub-groups (e.g. role, gender, location);
2) Responses to items that share the same response scale can be combined to form basic indices;
3) Descriptive statistics can be calculated for basic indices and reported for identified sub-groups (e.g. reporting means and standard deviations)
4) Factor analyses can be undertaken to form factor scores for outcomes of interest, such as ‘Frequency of participation in advocacy activities’. Regression analyses can be conducted in order to identify relevant predictors of increased advocacy activities, for example.

**Reporting and Dissemination**

**Local Opinion Leaders and Bečkunko Clubs**

Evaluation outcomes should be framed and reported according to the overall Bečkunko Logic Model, in terms of identified mid and long-term outcomes, and progress towards meeting identified Specific Objectives.

ACER recommends that evaluation findings be reported internally to OMAES staff as soon as possible, in order to help inform ongoing and upcoming advocacy activities, and to support organizational learning, especially during periods of policy-context and program change.

ACER anticipates that it may not be feasible to evaluate impact on stakeholders by collecting data for an identified cohort over time; meaning, pre and post data or longitudinal data from the same stakeholders within a specified timeframe. Rather, it may be more feasible to longitudinally collect data from different cohorts drawn from the same stakeholder group over successive cycles of Bečkunko. While evaluation sampling procedures may change over evaluation cycles, stakeholder outcomes may be broadly compared across different cohorts, in order to inform a general picture about Bečkunko’s base of support among identified groups. For example, proportions of stakeholders engaging in advocacy activities may be examined across evaluation cycles in order to monitor stakeholder advocacy levels over time. An evaluation of stakeholder outcomes should be used to broadly inform ongoing and future Bečkunko engagement and advocacy activities, rather than be used to provide a summative evaluation of the program. In light of these considerations, it is recommended to refrain from significance testing when comparing outcomes for different cohorts across evaluation cycles and significance testing between stakeholder groups which may be administered the same measure.

An examination of outcomes for Local Opinion Leaders and Bečkunko Club Members can provide OMAES information about stakeholder support for Bečkunko, stakeholder prioritization of education reform, and engagement in advocacy for reform. The different measures in the survey can be triangulated to report on overall progress in these outcome areas, addressing the depth of support for one stakeholder group, or the breadth of support across stakeholder groups (if more than one group is evaluated). In addition, an evaluation of these stakeholders can also provide OMAES information about perceived effectiveness of Bečkunko dissemination and advocacy strategies on the ground, as well as triangulate information about the mobilization of other stakeholder groups which OMAES may not be as able to directly survey.
Outcomes

Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves)

1. SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

It is less clear if OMAES undertakes any direct advocacy activities with Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves), for which any short-term outputs and outcomes can be readily monitored. OMAES may be able to monitor stakeholder coverage for these groups, for activities that intend to mobilize actors. For example, OMAES may evaluate the types and number of Organes de Gestion Scolaire that are engaging with OMAES outreach activities, specifically: national debates, public commitment ceremonies, and advocacy-dialogue meetings. OMAES may examine the following short-term outcomes for these stakeholders:

- Numbers of Organes de Gestion Scolaire participating in OMAES activities and where (e.g. region, commune, town);
- Types of Organes de Gestion Scolaire participating in OMAES outreach activities (e.g. Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves);
- Frequency of participation (e.g. attendance at an annual national debate; attendance at monthly public commitment ceremonies, etc.);
- Types of activities that stakeholders are participating in (e.g. advocacy-dialogue meetings, national debate, etc.)

These results can help OMAES to better understand patterns of engagement for Organes de Gestion Scolaire, in order to address identified shortcomings for particular stakeholders and to further leverage any strategies that are resulting in increased engagement and support, in comparison to others.

Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves)

1. MID-TERM OUTCOMES

An evaluation of mid-term outcomes for Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves) may be best suited to address:

1) Increased prioritization of education reform;
2) Increased participation in advocacy activities;
3) Increased participation in changing practices and policies (for Comites de Gestion Scolaire)

Stakeholder groups that are involved in school management most likely are more knowledgeable about children’s learning than other groups (parents, policy-makers); therefore a measure of improved knowledge for this stakeholder group may not be informative for OMAES. For Les Organes de Gestion
Scolaire, it may be fruitful to primarily examine stakeholders’ prioritization of education reform and participation in advocacy.

Measuring the depth of support for identified stakeholder groups should include differentiated aspects of support, in order to triangulate outcomes. Differentiated aspects of support can include: prioritization of education reform (sections IV, V, VI, VII in draft survey tool), frequency of participation in advocacy activities (section IX), degree of support for specified school funding and programs (section VIIIb), increased participation in changing practices and policies (section VIIIb), triangulating outcomes about mobilizing other stakeholders (section XI); and familiarity with Bekunko dissemination and advocacy strategies (section X).

Proposed tools to examine these outcomes are detailed below.

**Target Population**

*Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves)*

ACER recommends that stakeholder groups that broadly fit under the umbrella of school management be considered secondary stakeholder groups of interest. While these groups may not be directly involved in OMAES dissemination and outreach activities, they may plan an important role in advocating and encouraging schools and other stakeholders to enact policies for reform, such as parent associations. Or, they may play an important role in deciding the ways in which resources and programs are allocated to schools at local levels, such as school management committees. The target school management committees and parent associations will be any stakeholder groups that reside in the villages and quarters that were sampled to participate in the previous cycle of Bekunko. Members of these groups will mean any member that is registered or affiliated with the association, or any member that attends a committee or association meeting on days in which the survey is announced or promoted to members. Any and all members should participate, while information about any relevant leadership positions held within these groups should also be collected during survey administration.

**Sampling Approach**

*Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves)*

There may not be available information about the total population of existing parent associations or school management committees. Nor is it certain that every school has an established or functioning parent association or school committee. If it is not possible to target all villages and quarters that participated in the last Bekunko assessment cycle, then OMAEs may consider drawing a representative probability sample of schools or geographic areas that participated in the last cycle of Bekunko. Schools can be sampled (if available on OMAES’ sampling framework), then the identification of all existing
school management committees and parent associations affiliated with the sampled school, either by contacting the schools within the sampled geographic areas, or through other means. All members of the school management committee and parent associations should be invited to participate.

**Instrument**

**Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des meres d’élèves)**

The example survey below can be used to evaluate the strength of support among key stakeholder groups, which may include local stakeholders that are involved in school management and administration, such as School Management Committees, Parent Associations, and Mother’s Associations. ACER suggests that these groups be considered secondary target groups, as these stakeholders may not be directly involved in Bëekunko advocacy activities, like Local Opinion Leaders and Bëekunko Club Members. However, these groups may play an important role in education management and local decision-making in a decentralized education context. As such, the proposed draft survey tool has prioritized the measurement of stakeholders’ prioritization of education reform, participation in advocacy, and adoption of specified school funding policies and school programs.

The proposed evaluation tool has been drafted for both School Management Committees and Parent Associations. However in one instance, the draft survey has included differentiated questions for each group. Specifically, the survey below includes differentiated set of questions regarding the extent to which Comités de Gestion Scolaire have addressed specified school programs and policies, and the extent to which Parent Associations support and advocate for the adoption of specified school programs and policies. The tools should be revised and finalized by OMAES to accurately reflect the activities and contexts of these stakeholder groups, and the tools should be updated if the policy contexts for these groups change over time. If there is a large difference between Parent Associations and School Management Committees concerning activities and roles, OMAEs may consider using the proposed draft survey tool as an initial framework to develop distinct survey instruments, or question sets for each group.

**Example Survey Tool – Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (e.g. Comites de gestion Scolaire; Associations des parents d’élèves, Association des meres d’élèves)**

1. **Information about who is completing the questionnaire**

- Location (Region, Commune, Cercle, Ward/Town)
- Age
- Gender
- Education Level
- Professional Affiliation (Can be open-ended for coding or pre-defined categories; e.g. teacher, local business leader, parent, religious leader)
• Association membership (Comités de Gestion Scolaire; Associations des parents d’élèves, Association des mères d’élèves)
• Role in the association (e.g. president, secretary, representative, etc.)
• Length of time active in the association (e.g.: <1 year, 1 to 2 years, 3 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, >10 years)

II. Information about affiliation

What type of school does your association represent?

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

Type d’école:
- Ecole □
- Medersa □
- Franco-Arabe □

Status d’école:
- Publique □
- Prive □
- Communitaire □

Type d’Enseignement:
- Classique □
- Curriculum □

Think about the last 6 months.

How often do you attend <association name> meetings?

- Have not attended any meeting in the last 6 months □
- About every second meeting □
- Every meeting □

III. Attendance at last association meeting

The following questions ask about the most recent <association name> meeting that you have attended. Please answer the following questions in response to the most recent association meeting.

Date of your last meeting: _dd/mm/yy_

Approximate number of attendees: __________

What were the main issues discussed at the last meeting that you attended?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
**IV. Prioritization of education reform**

Were any of the following issues on the agenda, or discussed at the most recent meeting that you attended?

*(Please tick only one box in each row.)*

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a) | Children’s learning outcomes in <national language> | □₁ | □₂ |
b) | Children’s learning outcomes in French | □₁ | □₂ |
c) | Children’s learning outcomes in Mathematics | □₁ | □₂ |
d) | School textbooks | □₁ | □₂ |
e) | School desks | □₁ | □₂ |
f) | Feeding programs for students | □₁ | □₂ |
g) | Teacher attendance | □₁ | □₂ |
h) | Student attendance | □₁ | □₂ |
i) | Class size (Student-teacher ratio) | □₁ | □₂ |
j) | School expenditures and funding | □₁ | □₂ |
k) | Homework | □₁ | □₂ |
l) | Programs to support literacy | □₁ | □₂ |
m) | Programs to support mathematics | □₁ | □₂ |
n) | School building and grounds (e.g. toilets, classrooms, playground, buildings) | □₁ | □₂ |
o) | ICT infrastructure (e.g. computers, internet) | □₁ | □₂ |
p) | Library | □₁ | □₂ |
q) | Teacher qualifications | □₁ | □₂ |
r) | Teacher professional development | □₁ | □₂ |
s) | Out-of-school children | □₁ | □₂ |
t) Parent literacy levels

V. Prioritization of education reform by sub-group

If you ticked “Yes” to any of the issues listed above, please answer the following questions. If you did NOT tick “Yes” to any of the issues listed above, then please skip to question <XXX>.

Were any of the following groups specifically discussed at the meeting?

(Tick as many that apply)

a) No specific groups were identified

b) Girls

c) Boys

d) 1e A

e) 2e A

f) 3e A

g) 4e A

h) 5e A

i) 6e A

j) 7e A

k) 8e A

l) 9e A
VI. Prioritization of education reform

How interested were the majority of meeting attendees in discussing these topics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very interested</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Slightly interested</th>
<th>Not at all interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Prioritization of education reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent was the topic(s) discussed in detail at the meeting by the attendees?

To what extent was there support among the attendees for identifying a solution to the topic(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How likely is it that any planned solutions or activities to address the topic(s) will be implemented by your association?

How likely is it that the topic(s) discussed will be discussed at the next meeting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Slightly likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Villa. Changed practices and policies for Comités de Gestion Scolaire

Think about the activities that you <professional association> has undertaken in the past year, <from XXX to XXX>. To what extent has your <professional association> taken action to address the issues listed below.

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Programs for every child to have a textbook
b) Refurbishment of desks □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

c) Refurbishment of chairs □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

d) Feeding programs for children to have meals at school □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

e) Programs to monitor teacher attendance □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

f) Programs to monitor children’s attendance □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

g) Reduction in class sizes □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

h) Programs to support improved literacy learning □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

i) Programs to support improved mathematics learning □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

j) Refurbishment of school buildings and grounds (e.g. toilets, classrooms, playgrounds) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

k) Improvement of ICT infrastructure (e.g. computers, internet) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

l) Improvements to Library (e.g. new books, chairs, resources) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

m) Improved teacher qualifications (e.g. diploma, bachelor degree, masters degree) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

n) Programs for Teacher professional development (e.g. workshops, mentoring) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

o) Programs for School leader professional development (e.g. workshops, mentoring) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

p) Programs for out-of-school children □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

q) Programs for improving Parent Literacy □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4
VIIIb. Prioritization of education reform for Associations des Parents de’Eleves and Associations des Meres d’Eleves

Think about the activities that your <professional association> has undertaken in the past year, <from XXX to XXX>.

How likely would your <professional association> be to support and encourage schools and Comites de Gestion Scolaire to increase (insert level Region/Commune/Cercle/Town) funding for the following programs for schools in your area?

*(Please tick only one box in each row.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all likely</th>
<th>Slightly likely</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Programs for every child to have a textbook</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Refurbishment of desks</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Refurbishment of chairs</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Feeding programs for children to have meals at school</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Programs to monitor teacher attendance</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Programs to monitor children’s attendance</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Reduction in class sizes</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Programs to support improved literacy learning</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Programs to support improved mathematics learning</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Refurbishment of school buildings and grounds (e.g. toilets, classrooms, playgrounds)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Improvement of ICT infrastructure (e.g. computers, internet)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l)</td>
<td>Improvements to Library (e.g. new books, chairs, resources)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m)</td>
<td>Improved teacher qualifications (e.g. diploma, bachelor degree, masters degree)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
n) Programs for Teacher professional development (e.g. workshops, mentoring) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

o) Programs for School leader professional development (e.g. workshops, mentoring) □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

p) Programs for out-of-school children □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

q) Programs for improving Parent Literacy □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4

IX. Participation in advocacy

Below are some activities that you may have participated in as part of your role in your <professional association>. Please indicate how often you may have participated in the following activities during the past year, <from XXX to XXX>.

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never during the past year</th>
<th>1-2 times during the year</th>
<th>3-4 times during the year</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>More than once a week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Spoke with parents and members of the community about children’s achievement levels.</td>
<td>□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted (The Mayor; School Principal; Parent Association; School) in my local area to discuss Beěkunko results.</td>
<td>□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a Beěkunko press conference to monitor commitments.</td>
<td>□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended (parent association, school management committee meetings to encourage members to address Beěkunko results.</td>
<td>□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contacted the local media (e.g. newspaper, radio, social media) to encourage reporting of Békunko findings.

Contacted the local media (e.g. newspaper, radio, social media) to encourage reporting on the commitment of policy-makers to undertake education reforms.

X. Effectiveness of Békunko dissemination and advocacy strategies

Think about your involvement in your <professional association> over the past year, <from XXX to XXX>. You may have heard about Békunko, a citizen-led evaluation, from the activities listed below. Please rate your familiarity with the Békunko activities listed below.

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all familiar</th>
<th>Somewhat familiar</th>
<th>Familiar</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Békunko national reports</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) RV Dissemination</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Békunko Door-to-door dissemination</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Békunko Policy briefs</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Project examples and budgets (i.e. dossier politique)</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) On Social media (e.g. twitter)</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) On the Radio</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
h) On TV

i) Bėkunko videos

j) Bėkunko newsletters

k) Bėkunko website

l) Press conferences

m) National debate

n) Public Commitment Ceremonies

o) Lobby meetings with OMAES

OMAES led discussions between local decision-makers and education stakeholders

p)

XI. Triangulate data about mobilization of other local stakeholders

For each of the stakeholder groups below in your local area, please rate where they are today in terms of interest in improving student achievement and supporting education reform:

(Please tick only one box in each row.)

1 – Little to no interest in improving student achievement and involvement in education reform

2

3

4

5 – High level of interest in improving student achievement and active involvement in education reform

Don’t know
| a) Comité de Gestion Scolaire (CGS)/School management committees |
| b) School principal |
| c) Teachers |
| d) Parents |
| e) Association des Parents d’Elèves (APE)/Parent Associations |
| f) Associations des Mères d’Elèves (AME)/Mother’s Associations |
| g) Académie d’Enseignement (AE) |
| h) Cellule d’Animation Pédagogique (CAP) |
| i) Public opinion in the town/village |
| j) Mayors of Communes |

- Additional comments:

____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________________
Data Collection Plan

Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des mères d’élèves)

The same guidelines and considerations apply as outlined for Local Opinion leaders and Bēękunko Club Members.

Data Analysis Plan

Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des mères d’élèves)

The same guidelines and considerations apply as outlined for Local Opinion leaders and Bēękunko Club Members.

Reporting and Dissemination

Les Organes de Gestion Scolaire (Comités de Gestion Scolaire, Associations des parents d’élèves, Associations des mères d’élèves)

The same guidelines and considerations apply as outlined for Local Opinion Leaders and Bēękunko Club Members.

Outcomes

Media

1. SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

OMAES may be able to more easily monitor short-term outcomes regarding their own use of different types media for dissemination and advocacy, by reporting on the number, type and frequency of media outputs. OMAES can also examine stakeholder outcomes, by monitoring where possible, the number and types of stakeholders that are engaging with OMAES media outputs. For example, OMAES could easily monitor the number of times a social media outputs is shared by stakeholders on social networks (e.g. number of times a twitter feed is posted or shared by external stakeholders). In addition, OMAES could monitor the intensity of stakeholder engagement with OMAES media outputs. For example, does engagement occur in bursts after media dissemination, or is engagement steady throughout periods of dissemination?

In summary, OMAES may examine the following short-term outcomes for their own use of the media:

- Number and type of media outputs (e.g. number of Bēękunko videos, Bēękunko radio spots or commercials, number of Bēękunko twitter posts, etc.);
- Frequency and intensity of media outputs (e.g. frequency of published newsletters, frequency of public press conferences);
- Stakeholder coverage for media outputs (e.g. number, type and intensity of stakeholder engagement with OMAES media outputs).

These results can help OMAES to monitor if they are meeting their targets for media outputs, and identify any gaps where they may not be meeting their own dissemination and advocacy targets. In addition, monitoring stakeholder engagement where possible may help OMAES to identify patterns of engagement for particular stakeholders, and leverage any media outputs that are resulting in increased stakeholder engagement in comparison to others.

**Media**

**1. MID-TERM OUTCOMES**

From ACER’s own research examining the use of large-scale assessment data, (Best et al, 2013) the use of the media has been identified as an important facilitator to the use of large-scale assessments in policy-making. As such, ACER recommends that an evaluation of Bєєkunko’s base of support also give consideration to evaluating the strength of support of the media. An evaluation of short-term outcomes for the media may focus on OMAES’ own media outputs. An examination of mid-term outcomes should focus on the external media, such as external news agencies (e.g. external newspapers, television broadcasters, radio programs, online news agencies, etc.) and the ways in which these agencies report Bєєkunko results, and support and advocate for educational reform within the media coverage. An analysis solely of the number of external media stories and agencies reporting on Bєєkunko may not be very informative for OMAES. A more in-depth understanding of the ways in which Bєєkunko and education policy issues are framed in the media will be more useful for OMAES to understand the media and policy context in which it is undertaking advocacy activities.

An evaluation of mid-term outcomes for the media may address:

1) The ways in which media outlets report Bєєkunko results and portray OMAES as an organization;

2) Which issues are identified for education reform, and the ways in which these issues are portrayed;

3) The ways in which policy-makers and local-decision makers are portrayed in relation to identified education reform issues.

Understanding how Bєєkunko and education reform issues are portrayed in the media may help OMAES improve their dissemination and advocacy strategies with media outlets. In addition, an evaluation of media outcomes and content may provide OMAES with more reflection and context for the broader policy-context within which Bєєkunko operates, and an important factor that may influence public perception and sentiment around issues related to improving the quality of education.
Approaches for evaluating outcomes for the media are outlined below.

**Target Population**

**Media**

OMAES may consider evaluating outcomes for ‘earned’ media stories, or occurrences where external media outlets have picked up stories and reported on Beékunko and issues related to education reform and advocacy. Most likely it will not be possible to evaluate all forms of external media in Mali, nor consider a sample of media output as representative of all external media coverage. While many external media outlets now make their content accessible online (e.g. newspapers, tv shows, radio programs), it is unknown to ACER the extent to which local media outlets maintain searchable content in Mali, for OMAES to be able to identify and evaluate.

As an alternative, OMAES may consider the media ‘population’ to mean all media stories that are publicly available and searchable through a database. Or, OMAES may prioritize a type of media coverage that has been identified as being of primary importance for helping to mobilize actors, such as tv news stories.

As an initial approach, ACER recommends for OMAES to conduct a search of online newspaper outlets that: 1) reference Beékunko or OMAES and 2) report on education reform and education issues. OMAES may assess the suitability of using a paid-for subscription service that targets and searches all media content for an identified focus, such as education reform in Mali. Dependent upon availability, languages and pricing, OMAES may consider using a media tracking service such as LexisNexis, Factiva, or Media Monitoring Africa.

As an alternative, OMAES may use a free tool such as Advanced Google Search and set search parameters in order to identify relevant media content. Figure 1 below provides an illustrative example of Advanced Google Search.

**Figure 1: Example of Advanced Google Search**
In ACER’s experience, it is important to be more inclusive when undertaking electronic searches, in order to target an unknown ‘population’ of studies, or in this case, media coverage. Casting a wide search net will help OMAEs to better target relevant media, which then can be reduced by using pre-defined criteria to include or exclude material for in-depth evaluation.

**Sampling Approach**

**Media**

Evaluating all external media coverage may be too resource intensive for OMAES to undertake, in terms of identifying the number of media stories and characterizing the content of media stories. An in-depth analysis of a small number of media stories may be more appropriate for OMAES to have a general understanding of the effect of their advocacy activities on the media, and to help inform future dissemination strategies with various media stakeholders.

OMAES may consider developing sampling criteria for electronic searches, in order to select media coverage for more in-depth analyses. Below are suggested ways that OMAES may consider selecting news coverage for analyses, which are not exhaustive of all possible sampling methodologies. Figures 2 and 3 show examples of a search return for ‘Bëëkunko’ and education in Mali’ using Google Advanced Search. The criteria outlined below, could be applied to the example searches in order to sample a body of relevant news stories.

- Selecting a certain number of news stories at identified time points during a set time period, most likely during intense periods of OMAEs dissemination and outreach (e.g. 1-2 stories for reported each month during a six month period);

- Searching for media coverage based on the relevance to pre-identified keywords, and selecting the first X number of media stories that are identified by the database as being most relevant (e.g. ‘Bëëkunko’, ‘OMAES’, ‘Education reform’)

- Searching for media coverage related to specific education policies (e.g. teacher training, early childhood education)

**Figure 2: Example of Media Coverage for ‘Bëëkunko’**

**Figure 3: Example of Media Coverage for ‘Education in Mali’**
The sampling approach and sample size will depend on OMAES’ available resources and timelines to undertake an analysis of media coverage. Even if OMAES has very limited time and resources to undertake this evaluation activity, ACER strongly recommends that OMAES engage in an internal exercise to examine media coverage of Békunko, as the media has been identified as an important factor in facilitating the use of assessment results in policy-making (Best et al, 2013). If possible, ACER recommends that OMAES sample 3-5 news stories for in-depth analysis.

Instrument

Media

Media content should be analyzed in order to determine the extent of coverage (number, type of coverage and placement of coverage) as well as to characterize the ways in which identified issues are framed and argued.

In an analysis of media content, OMAES may consider the following issues and questions, listed below. The considerations for media content analysis listed below had been drawn primarily from the example tools outlined in the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Handbook of Data Collection Tools (Reisman, Gienapp, & Statchowiak, 2007b).

Example External Media Content Analysis Questions

To be applied for each selected media story/instance of media coverage included for analysis.

I. Publication overview

- Media agency and author;
- Date of publication;
- Media type (e.g. online newspaper, newsletter, tv broadcast, etc.);
- Readership (e.g. local, national, international) and frequency (e.g. daily, weekly, monthly).

II. Basic content

- Coverage type (e.g. opinion-editorial, news story, feature article, letter to the editor);
- Size of article (number of words); Length of tv or radio story (number of minutes);
- Placement of story (e.g. front page ; end of the tv broadcast).

III. In-depth content

Beskunko

- Did the story discuss Beskunko?
- Did the story report Beskunko results? Which results were discussed?
- Did the story accurately report and portray Beskunko findings?

IV. In-depth content

OMAES

- Did the story discuss OMAES?
- Or, did the story reference an individual staff member from OMAES?
- How was OMAES portrayed as an organization?

☐ 1 Experts in assessment/education reform
☐ 2 Reliable organization to monitor education quality
☐ 3 One organization among many that are monitoring education reform
☐ 4 Unreliable organization to monitor education quality

IV. In-depth content

Education Reform Issues

- Did the story cover any specific education policy issues?
- If so, were any of the following education reform issues identified?

Resource allocation issues

☐ 1 Number of textbooks
☐ 2 Classroom facilities (chairs, desks)
☐ 3 Feeding programs
Were any other policy issues that are not discussed in Beekunko reports, relevant to education reform, identified in the media coverage? If so, what were they?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Did the media coverage assume a similar position/stance towards the identified policy issues as OMAES?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
• Were any other advocacy organizations (e.g. Save the Children, UNICEF) mentioned in the media coverage?

• Were any education decision-makers (e.g. national education minister) or administrative units (e.g. Les Academies d’Enseignement) discussed in the media coverage?

• What is your overall reaction to the media coverage?

Data Collection Plan

Media

An evaluation approach to measure the depth of support of external media agencies may be conducted after an intense period of OMAES dissemination and advocacy, in order to evaluate media coverage during this time period. Or, data collection can occur during a relatively ‘quiet’ time for OMAES, and evaluate media coverage during an identified time period of active dissemination and outreach. The draft tools proposed in this document can be used to support a prospective evaluation approach, monitoring progress over time in order to improve advocacy strategies and organizational learning. Therefore the suggestions in this document are not prescriptive, and any evaluation approach in a policy context should allow for flexibility.
Data Analysis Plan

Media

The guiding questions and points for consideration in the draft Media Content Analysis Questions can be used to textually analyze, and provide a general characterization of the included media stories in order to address the following evaluation questions:

1) The ways in which media outlets report Bèkunko results and portray OMAES as an organization;

2) Which issues are identified for education reform, and the ways in which these issues are portrayed;

3) The ways in which policy-makers and local-decision makers are portrayed in relation to identified education reform issues.

Reporting and Dissemination

Media

Evaluation outcomes should be framed and reported according to the overall Bèkunko Logic Model, in terms of identified mid and long-term outcomes, and progress towards meeting identified Specific Objectives. ACER recommends that evaluation findings be reported internally to OMAES staff as soon as possible, in order to help inform ongoing and upcoming advocacy activities, and to support organizational learning, especially during periods of policy-context and program change.

ACER anticipates that it may be feasible for OMAES to only undertake a content analysis on a few selected media stories, for example, 3-5 identified media stories. Therefore, the reporting of main findings should be used to inform a general impression of external media coverage, and should not be considered to be representative of all external media coverage. In addition, ACER would encourage OMAES to undertake an internal evaluation of media coverage, no matter how small the sample size, as the media has been identified as an important factor for the use of large-scale assessments to inform policy-making. If OMAES decides to undertake an initial evaluation of media coverage using a small sample, results should be used for internal learning purposes only and should not be disseminated to external stakeholders, nor used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of OMAES advocacy activities that target the media.
**Béekunko Suggested Evaluation Approaches for: Policy Change**

**LONG-TERM OUTCOMES**

**POLICY CHANGE**

National Ministries, Mayors of Communes, Stakeholders at the Regional and Cercle levels, Animation Pedagogique Centers (CAP), Academies d’Enseignement (AE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place improving education quality on the policy agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt policies and practices that address issues identified by Béekunko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement policies with adequate resourcing and supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor and evaluate policies over successive cycles of Béekunko</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approach**

Béekunko uses a variety of approaches, through dissemination of assessment findings, media and marketing, and mobilizing actors, in order to effect long-term policy change for improving the quality of education and student learning. Policy change should not only be defined as the passage or adoption of a specific policy, but can address steps of the policy cycle to evaluate improvements in policy-making (Reisman, Gienapp, & Stachowiak, 2007a).

OMAES has five specific program objectives that guide the organization’s activities. These objectives have guided the development of the following Béekunko frameworks: Theory of Change (Theorie du Changement), Action Plan (Plan d’Action), and Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Cadre de Suivi Evaluation). Three of these specific objectives relate to impacting outcomes for targeted stakeholder groups, and two of the three specific objectives directly target long-term policy change:

« **Objectif spécifique 4** : Amener le ministère de l’éducation et ses services techniques déconcentrés à prendre deux (2) décisions administratives conformes aux recommandations du rapport national Béekunko et à les faire appliquer en faveur de la lecture et du calcul des enfants de 6 à 14 ans d’ici juillet 2017.

**Objectif spécifique 5** : Amener 60% des maires des communes d’intervention à intégrer dans le Plan de Développement Communal (PDC) au moins une (1) action conforme aux recommandations des rapports Béekunko relative à la qualité de l’éducation et affectent les ressources nécessaires à sa mise en œuvre d’ici à juillet 2017. »

The fourth Specific Objective (OS4) outlines expected outcomes for education policy-makers such that the national ministry of education and associated decentralized education bodies will adopt at least two policies or initiatives that address Béekunko findings and support improved student learning in literacy and mathematics.
The fifth Specific Objective (OS5) outlines expected outcomes for local policy-makers such that a majority of Commune Mayors will adopt and integrate at least one initiative into the Commune Development Plan that addresses Bëckunko findings and educational quality, with the necessary resources and funding.

The primary stakeholders relevant to long-term policy change are education decision-makers and bodies, such as the National Minister, Animation Pedagogique Centers (CAP), and Academies d’Enseignement (AE). In addition, local-level policy-makers are also a primary stakeholder group of interest, as they may be involved in the decentralized allocation of resources and supports for implementing education policies, such as Mayors of Communes, Les Assemblees Regionales and Les Conseils de Cercle.

The proposed approaches and tools for evaluating policy-change in this document can evaluate policy change at various stages of policy-making. Consideration has been given to approaches which will be less resource-intensive for OMAES, and can be implemented internally by OMAES. These methodologies do not rely on sampling or securing the participation of external stakeholder groups of interest.

Some approaches to measuring policy change that are used in policy and advocacy evaluation, require the participation of key policy informants, posing challenges for consent and participation. For example, the Bellwether approach looks at the alignment between the advocacy organization’s political stance and current political will through interviews with key informants who are well-placed to discuss the current policy context, such as policy-makers and external lobbyists. It is often very difficult secure the participation of these informants. Another approach, Network Mapping, may be used to evaluate and then visualize the relationships and networks between groups that influence policy-making. For example, Network Mapping could examine the relationships between: the National Minister of Education, Les Conseils de Cercle, and Les Academies d’Enseignement, and how this influences policy-change. However, this methodology is resource intensive and usually requires the expertise of an external evaluator.

Information relevant to evaluation steps has been collapsed in the different approaches, below. This means that specific considerations related to sampling or data analysis for example, will depend upon the stakeholder group that OMAES intends to evaluate, and their selected approach.

**Outcomes**

**National Ministries, Mayors of Communes, Stakeholders at the Regional and Cercle levels, Animation Pedagogique Centers (CAP), Academies d’Enseignement (AE)**

1. **SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES**
An evaluation of short-term outcomes related to policy change (outlined in the Bëlkunko Logic Model), will help OMAES to identify any gaps or areas for improvement with dissemination and advocacy activities that directly target policy-makers and local decision-makers, such as public commitment ceremonies, lobby meetings, national debates, etc. An evaluation of these short-term outcomes can be examined by: number of activities, frequency of activities, and stakeholder engagement, or attendance at OMAES activities.

National Ministries, Mayors of Communes, Stakeholders at the Regional and Cercle levels, Animation Pedagogique Centers (CAP), Academies d’Enseignement (AE)

1. LONG-TERM OUTCOMES
An evaluation of long-term outcomes related to policy change may allow OMAES to:

1) Evaluate the convergence between Bëlkunko findings and OMAES messages with public opinion and the policy agenda;

2) Evaluate the development or adoption of policies and practices that address education reform and educational quality;

3) Evaluate the implementation of adopted policies at local levels, with appropriate resourcing and supports;

4) Evaluate the continuation of policies over-time with ongoing funding and supports.

In summary, an evaluation of progress towards long-term policy change will help OMAES understand the ways that Bëlkunko and Bëlkunko results are and are not being used to inform decision-making, and the ways that assessment results interact with other factors in the policy-context to influence policy-making.

Evaluation Approaches

National Ministries, Mayors of Communes, Stakeholders at the Regional and Cercle levels, Animation Pedagogique Centers (CAP), Academies d’Enseignement (AE)

Intense Period de-Briefs

An Intense Period De-Brief is a methodology (Reisman, Gienapp, & Statchowiak, 2007b; Gienapp & Cohen, 2011) that guides internal reflection about policy outcomes and lessons learned shortly after an intense period of advocacy during a policy window, usually with advocacy staff and other related lobby organizations or stakeholders.

OMAES may undertake advocacy and advocacy activities with a variety of education decision-makers and policy-makers throughout various stages of the policy cycle. To illustrate, OMAES and its partner organizations may engage in any of the hypothetical advocacy activities listed below with varied stakeholders at different stages of the policy cycle:
- Lobby the National Minister of Education to discuss Beékunko findings and place education reform on the policy agenda during Beékunko public commitment ceremonies, or the Beékunko National Debate;
- Lobby the National Minister of Education and other education policy-makers prior to a policy cycle, such as the development of the national education plan or national education budget;
- Lobby and engage in advocacy with local policy-makers such as Mayors of Communes, and decentralized education services such as Animation Pedagogique Centers (CAP), to implement policies and initiatives with appropriate resources and funding; and
- Engage in advocacy to lobby stakeholders responsible for the ongoing legislation, funding and implementation of education policies and initiatives over-time.

After a period of intense activity, such as the hypothetical activities listed above, OMAES should conduct an internal focus group of stakeholders involved in the advocacy activities, in order to reflect on lessons learned and challenges regarding advocacy ‘on the ground’. Findings from intense period de-briefs will be useful to inform future advocacy activities. All internal staff that are familiar with OMAES’ policy goals, and have been involved in OMAES advocacy and outreach activities should be involved in a focus group. The inclusion of any stakeholders that are external to OMAES such as Local Opinion Leaders, may be more willing to participate in a separate focus group discussion or in individual interviews.

An intense period de-brief should be facilitated by an internal or external facilitator, and guide discussion to reflect on the following issues relevant to a particular policy window (Coffman, 2009; Gienapp & Cohen, 2011):

1) Political context and public mood during the policy window;

2) Relevant external events that took place during the policy window;

3) Strategies used by OMAES during the policy window that were perceived to be effective for supporting progress toward the policy goal;

4) Any identified external supporters or allies of OMAES that had a sphere of influence during the policy window; and

5) Identified barriers that made it difficult for OMAES to achieve progress toward policy goal

Findings from the intense period de-brief should be disseminated internally to OMAES staff soon after the focus group discussion. Findings should be reported in relation to identified outcomes and specific objectives that have been outlined in Beékunko frameworks, and the Beékunko Logic Model.

Policy-Maker Ratings

This approach is useful to evaluate the political will for supporting OMAES policy goals, for identified policy-makers and stakeholders. This approach can also monitor levels of political will for identified stakeholders over time, as OMAES evaluates progress towards long-term policy change and outcomes.
While an evaluation of the number of policies is also a strategy for evaluating policy change, rating specified policy-makers can help to evaluate political will at any stage of the policy cycle (i.e. policy agenda, policy formulation, policy implementation, monitoring and evaluation), and can be applied at various levels.

Raters should be internal OMAES staff, and external stakeholders (e.g. Local Opinion Leaders), who have worked closely on OMAES advocacy and dissemination activities, such as advocacy and dialogue meetings with decision-makers or dissemination of research findings to key individuals. OMAES may identify specific policy-makers or local decision-makers that have been targeted by OMAES advocacy activities, or are important for influencing an identified policy goal or outcome. The identified policy goal or outcome may vary depending upon the stage of the policy cycle that OMAES is aiming to influence (e.g. policy development, policy implementation and financing, policy continuation and monitoring, etc.). This approach will capitalize upon OMAES’ deep understanding of their advocacy work, and will not require many resources to implement.

OMAES can identify criteria which internal stakeholders will assess identified policy-makers against, using a rating scale. For example, a rating of political will may consider the following aspects (Coffman, 2009; Gienapp & Cohen, 2011):

1) Policy-maker level of interest – level of interest for a specified issue based on public behavior and interactions, such as attendance at advocacy meetings;

2) Policy-maker level of support – level of support for a specified issue through such behaviors such as voting record on an issue or approved funding for an issue, for example.

3) Policy-maker influence – level of influence that the policy-maker actually has over a specified issue.

4) OMAES staff member’s level of confidence – internal rater assesses their own level of confidence about the accuracy of ratings 1 – 3.

Ratings can be assessed on a 10-point scale for example, or using any scale that is useful for OMAES. OMAES staff members individually rate identified policy-makers. Results can be discussed as a group, to develop an organizational consensus for identified policy-makers. Or, ratings can be averaged across identified policy-makers, and then reported back to OMAES staff (Coffman, 2009). Results from Policy-Makers ratings can be implemented once, or over several evaluation cycles to monitor political will over time. In addition, this methodology has been reported to be useful for organization’s to have an understanding of how far they would need to progress to secure strong support or their policy objectives (Gienapp & Cohen, 2011).

A Policy-Maker Rating approach is a method that is suited for internal evaluation, to support organizational learning. Results and dissemination of findings should occur within the organization, but may not be appropriate for dissemination to external stakeholders.
Policy Tracking

Policy Tracking can examine policy change at any point during the policy cycle, for a specified policy and a specific level (national or local). However, policy tracking may commonly refer to policy formulation and adoption.

It is unknown to ACER the extent to which Commune Development Plans and Education Ministry documents, is publicly available and can be easily obtained and analyzed by OMAES staff to evaluate policy formulation and adoption. Furthermore, it may be resource intensive and unrealistic for OMAES to be able to evaluate the number of policy outputs, especially at the commune level (approximately n=216).

However, it may be possible for OMAES to conduct policy-tracking for national level policies, or policies that are reported on in the public domain. If this is possible, there are several considerations that OMAES can use for policy-tracking. Policy-tracking can be implemented at one point in time, but is particularly useful if monitored over-time. The policy tracking approaches outlined below drew heavily from Reisman, Gienapp, & Stachowiak, 2007.

Policy tracking and analysis can characterize policies by describing the following elements:

- Policy level and jurisdiction (e.g. national, commune);
- Education reform issue that policy targets;
- Key features of the policy;
- Relevant funding and implementation arrangements for the policy;
- Key sponsors of a policy;
- Voting record for a policy;
- Key OMAES activities that targeted policy development;
- Plans for policy implementation and maintenance (e.g. advisory committees, planned evaluations).

Policy tracking can also assess the extent to which OMAES perceives the policy elements to be effective, or meet OMAES criteria for appropriately addressing the education reform issue in question. For example, OMAES can use a scale to rate the perceived effectiveness or satisfaction for the following elements:

- Key features of the policy;
- Relevant funding and implementation arrangements for the policy;
- Plans for policy implementation and maintenance (e.g. advisory committees, planned evaluations).
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