

19. JOINT EVALUATION

EVALUATION OF THE EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY OF SPANISH COOPERATION (2007-2014)

SYNTHESIS REPORT



Edition: November 2016

© Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
Secretary of State for International Cooperation and for Ibero-
America
General Secretariat for International Development Cooperation

Cover photo © AECID.

Report made by: UTE formed by the Institute of Marketing and
Communication S.L. and the Institute of Studies of Economy,
Evaluation and Employment with a team formed by: Esther Prieto
Jiménez, Juan Murciano Rosado, Belén Sotillos González, Lidia
Ramos Pascual, Eva Jiménez Taracido, Carlos Bueno Suárez, Joaquín
Ágreda Yécora and coordinated by de José Luis Osuna Llana.

NIPO online: 502-16-179-3

The opinions and views expressed in this evaluation report
are not necessarily those of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and
Cooperation.

It is authorized to reproduce total or partial portions of this
document as long as the source and authors of the copyright are
adequately named.

**If you have any questions about this document, please
contact:**

Evaluation and Knowledge Management Division
General Secretariat for International Development Cooperation
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
C/ Serrano Galvache, 26. Torres Ágora. Torre Norte
28071 Madrid
Ph:+34913948808
e-mail: evaluacion-sgcid@maec.es

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pag 1	1.	INTRODUCTION
Pag 1	1.1	EVALUATION SUBJECT
Pag 2	1.2	EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS
Pag 2	1.3	THEORETICAL-METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND TECHNIQUES
Pag 3	2.	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS
Pag 3	2.1	INTERVENTION RATIONALE
Pag 5	2.2	STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION
Pag 12	2.3	STRATEGY RESULTS
Pag 18	2.4	STRATEGY VALIDITY
Pag 19	3.	CONCLUSIONS
Pag 19	3.1	INTERVENTION RATIONALE
Pag 21	3.2	IMPLEMENTATION
Pag 25	3.3	RESULTS
Pag 27	4.	LESSONS LEARNED
Pag 29	5.	RECOMMENDATIONS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AAPP	Public Administrations
AECID	Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation
AGE	General Government Administration
ODA	Official Development Assistance
AYTO	Municipality / Council
DAC	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD
CAP	Open and Permanent Call for cooperation and development aid activities
AC	Autonomous Community / Autonomous Regions
CICD	Inter-territorial Commission for Development Cooperation
CIS	Sociological Research Centre
CONGDE	Coordination Committee of NGDOs-Spain
CRS	Creditor Reporting System
UCD	University Cooperation for Development
LE	Local Entity
DE	Development Education
FIIAPP	International and Ibero-American Foundation for Administration and Public Policies
GENE	Global Education Network Europe
I3E	Instituto de Estudios de Economía, Evaluación y Empleo
IMC	Instituto de Investigación, Marketing y Comunicación
LOMCE	Organic Law for the Improvement of Education Quality
MAEC	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation
MECD	Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports
€m	Million euros
OCUD	Observatory of University Cooperation for Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
NGDO	Non-Governmental Development Organization
PACI	Annual International Cooperation Plan
PCT	Technical Specifications Document
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
SECIPI	Secretary of State for International Cooperation and for Ibero-America
SGCID	Secretary General for Development Cooperation

I. INTRODUCTION

This document presents the Synthetic Report of the Evaluation of the Education for Development Strategy of Spanish Cooperation (2007-2014) (hereinafter “the Strategy”).

This is an external evaluation carried out by the I3E-IMC joint venture and its management has been led by the Evaluation and Knowledge Management Division of SGCID, in coordination with the Evaluation Programme of FIIAPP.

I.1 EVALUATION SUBJECT

After the commitment made in the 2005-2008 II Master Plan of the Spanish Cooperation (2005-2008), the MAEC published in 2007 the first Education for Development Strategy of Spanish Cooperation with the purpose of turning it into a strategic framework for action for all the actors involved in Education for Development (hereinafter “ED”).

The Strategy resulted from a participatory process and it was intended to be assumed by all the actors involved in its design: AGE, ACs, LEs, NGDOs, Universities, firms and trade unions. Representatives of the MECD, the ED Group of CICD, CONGDE's ED, ED Group and ED experts were also involved in the process.

The Strategy has six chapters; the first one introduces the ED concept; the second provides rationale for the Strategy, data on social awareness on this topic, background and data on ODA allocated to ED.

Chapter three details the regulatory framework and the theoretical framework. The latter defined ED as an education process, its stages, cognitive axis, dimensions (awareness raising, education-training, research and political impact-social mobilization, areas (formal, non-formal and informal), type of actions, governing principles, key concepts and a review of the ED generations until the fifth generation “ED for global citizenship”.

Chapter four presents the intervention framework (objectives, strategic lines and intervention patterns), and links ED to the horizontal and sectorial priorities of the II Master Plan 2005-2008. Chapter five discusses its dissemination and implementation process, and chapter six addresses monitoring and evaluation. An evaluation was to be carried out at the end of the Strategy validity period.

1.2 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

The main objective is to make a critical assessment of the fundamental strategic processes that have configured the work of Spanish Cooperation actors in ED during the 2007-2014 period. The evaluation provides answers to the four main evaluation questions and their sub-questions:

Table 1. Main questions guiding the evaluation

1. To what extent has the strategy been led by an appropriate intervention rationale?
2. Has the implementation of the Spanish Cooperation strategy in the field of Education for Development been the most appropriate, considering the strategic lines, dimensions and areas set as priorities, in view of the resources allocated and the division of work among the different actors?
3. Which are the main results of Spanish Cooperation in the field of Education for Development?
4. To what extent is this Education for Development Strategy relevant in view of the present international and Spanish context?

Source: Terms of Reference of the evaluation

1.3 THEORETICAL-METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND TECHNIQUES

The evaluation has two levels of analysis: the first one is global, with a strategic vision of ED; and the second is operational, providing an overview of the actions implemented between 2007 and 2014. Both include a comprehensive and systemic analysis assessing key context, design, structure, and processes and results aspects, which allows to explain the relations among dimensions and facilitates an integrated analysis.

The theoretical-methodological framework conceives strategies as a dynamic component, and aims at an evaluation that “goes beyond” verifying the application of what was originally planned. This means that the strategy is analysed at different levels: plan, position, perspective and pattern.

Additionally, the evaluation included the application of different techniques:

- 31 interviews.
- 5 discussion groups.
- 3 evaluation sessions with ED Groups.
- Meta-synthesis of 35 evaluation reports on ED.
- Survey conducted to ODA for ED channelling entities: 118 participants (46% response rate).
- Empirical approach to ED interventions with 21 records of 3 ACs and AECID.
- Case studies: City Council of Victoria-Gasteiz, OMAL, Educators for Development Programme, University Group of ONGAWA, and Region of Murcia.

2. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

2.1 INTERVENTION RATIONALE

The analysis carried out on the Strategy's internal consistency shows a comprehensive and remarkable conceptual development of its theoretical framework and reflects stakeholders' previous experience. This is the most valued and best-known aspect..

The intervention framework has some technical limitations as a planning document: insufficient problem identification; lack of accuracy in defining objectives; insufficient planning levels; lack of prioritizing urgent issues; weak identification of responsible actors for each action and uneven reference to ED players. Moreover, there is a lack of attention on issues such as dissemination, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Strategy. These have limited the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Strategy, making it a mostly intention-based strategy, in which it is difficult to separate what part is implemented, deliberate and emerging strategy and what part has been discarded.

Concerning the consistency of the Strategy with other stakeholder's planning documents on ED, the evaluation has analysed those documents of the Spanish Cooperation at central level, ACs and NGDOs.

At national level, the 3rd Master Plan focuses on Education for Global Citizenship; it defines ED as a strategic area, integrates its main strategy lines and establishes a minimum budget commitment -3%-. In the 4th Master Plan ED is integrated within the outcome framework, but only modestly and with little relevance in terms of management indicators.

At autonomous community level, all Master Plans include ED, 8 ACs have their own strategy and some other are either drafting or updating, and 15 mention the Strategy as a reference. All ACs have a similar ED approach than in the Strategy although with some differences.

At the level of implementing actors, half of the NGDO's strategies reviewed include references to the Spanish Cooperation ED Strategy. General objectives are in line, but not specific objectives, which are more targeted. Not all lines and actions are equally developed. References to fundamental operational principles and horizontal priorities are not widespread. Networking appears as a need and they usually include Strategy scope and dimension, as well as some communication elements.

Concerning Strategy's coherence with the regulatory framework of ED call for projects, those of the AECID and the ACs were analysed.

In the case of AECID, the reference to ED in its 2005 Terms and Conditions Order is brief in quantitative terms and limited in qualitative terms. The 2010 Royal Decree mentions ED in only one section, although is addressed separately and research is included as part of ED. The most significant change appears in the 2011 Order: ED has an increased presence and its treatment is improved (activity eligible for funding); however, it is not a specific ED document yet: it includes specific ED grant agreements; it recognizes ED experience as a requirement and introduces better-suited appraisal criteria. The 2010 call for grant agreements includes many of the above improvements and the 2013 and 2014 calls for projects address ED more specifically.

In the ACs, the 2007 and 2008 regulatory framework included a ED which focuses on raising awareness among the population of each region on the causes of poverty in the southern countries. There were fewer references to ED and more to awareness raising actions. This approach has evolved to a new one that addresses the global nature of such issues or the need for intercultural dialogue. In the more recent regulations, ED is conceived as an ongoing education process to encourage a change in attitudes and a critical commitment against all inequalities affecting global society, including participation and transformation tools.

In general, these regulations consider the same dimensions, although the emphasis on research and impact/mobilization is less prevalent. In 60% of the ACs, there are specific ED calls, although they contain general rather than educational appraisal criteria. It is common to finance annual projects and in some ACs multiannual programs; however, currently ACS don't publish multiannual programs. The actions eligible for funding are limited to the area of each region, with the only exception of Andalusia in 2012, which also covered such actions out of the region.

Theory of change provides a model that establishes how and why an intervention is expected to achieve the planned outcomes. No explicit reference is made in the Strategy to theory of change, but it includes elements that may be helpful to define it. Most of the hints are provided in the theoretical framework: definition of ED and its four dimensions. The Strategy outlines outcomes in general terms for each dimension; however, it does not address "how" to achieve them. Moreover, the strategic lines framing the actions fail to define expected outcomes.

All these elements have enabled us to reconstruct the theory of change (developed and chartered in the Final Report) that conveys the Strategy approach, monitoring information (on expected results) and stakeholders' vision. Notwithstanding, we use the term "approach" because it is difficult to identify a theory of change that guides in one direction the ED actions of all Spanish Cooperation actors. Concerning consistency, we can already say that its main weakness is the translation of such theory into final (not intermediate) outcomes. This evaluation reports attempts to address this deficiency by presenting a classification of categories and sets of outcomes.

Education/Training illustrates this theory of change reconstructed in the evaluation. A first level is the availability of pedagogical tools to teachers to apply the ED to implement ED (and that such tools be appropriate, relevant, etc.), and a second level is aiming at integratin ED in the curriculum and philosophy of the educational centre.

Another example is first, succeeding in “bringing” into the media and political agenda global problems that are hardly addressed now; a second level would be ensuring a continued support from government and/or media; a third step would be that as result of all of it some kind of social response or mobilization should emerge to address the relevant global issue.

2.2 STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

Knowledge, usefulness and appropriation

The Strategy is known by 87.3% of the sample that has been surveyed (N=118), with positive results among the different profile groups, except in LEs, where it decreases to 62.5%. Beyond individual knowledge, 59.3% of interviewees consider that this knowledge is “poorly” disseminated among those working in ED. The best-known and applicable aspect of the Strategy is its theoretical framework, and to a lesser extent, its instrumental intervention framework.

Usefulness of the Strategy is conceived in general terms: at the time it was drafted it helped to clarify concepts, establish a common language and delimit the ED scope. Its drafting process generated some “snowball effect” leading to an increase of its importance. This usefulness and impact were stronger in earlier years than in more recent times.

The strong identification of this Strategy with the AECID limited the appropriation levels among other stakeholders. Moreover, its dissemination did not have a strong focus on universities and LEs and their specific role in ED.

Context factors

The implementation context has been affected fundamentally by the economic situation, social mobilization, and more recently, by changes in education regulations. Digital environments, internal work processes of stakeholders, a new LE competence framework and school organization have played a relevant role too.

Resources

The Strategy makes few references to financial-budgetary aspects.

A) Analysis based on Info@OD (CRS 99820)

This official source has been used to proceed to a quantitative analysis of gross bilateral ODA under CRS code 99820 (Promotion of development awareness), which is the standard code to consult funds allocated to ED.

Between 2007 and 2014, €356,3m have been allocated. A substantial reduction has been observed since 2011 [€45,16m in 2007; €54,86m in 2008; €59,96m in 2009; €68,61m in 2010; €50,62m in 2011; €32,46m in 2012; €22,98m in 2013; €21,6m in 2014].

Concerning number of actions, Info@OD reports 12,149 actions or records? between 2007 and 2014 for CRS 99820, with AGE and ACs funding actions with higher budgets, although overall, only 25% of such actions exceed €25,000.

In general, ACs are the main actor in funding DE (57.3%), followed by the AGE. These shares are quite different from those reported in the global figures, not broken down into sectors.

Tabla 1. Gross bilateral ODA by actor

FUNDING ACTOR	GROSS BILATERAL ODA		
		CRS 99820	TOTAL
AGE	78.517.078	22,0%	74,1%
CCAA	204.025.697	57,3%	18,7%
EELL	64.846.335	18,2%	6,5%
UNIVERSITIES	8.900.463	2,5%	0,7%
TOTAL 2007-2014	356.289.574	100,0%	100,0%

AGE. AECID has financed in this period around €64m under the above CRS, 81.6% of all the funds allocated by the AGE (€78,5m). SECIPI has provided funding for €13,5m, 17.2% of the central government's contribution. The amounts allocated by AECID experiences substantial cutbacks since 2011 reach a 63% decrease between 2013 and 2014. The chart below shows additional information on AECID with other information sources.

Additional information on AECID (additional sources other than Info@OD)

NGDO reports (AECID)

88% of AECID funds for ED are channelled through NGDOs.

Particularly ED has seen a decreased of AECID funds to NGDOs:

- • Since 2012, strong decrease of these funds, annual decrease for ED at least 25% higher than global cutbacks.
- • The ED share was 4.74% in 2011 and 2.54% in 2014. Research and development studies under 0.4%, irregular.
 - Funding “country Spain”: Strong reduction since 2010. In 2014 the year on year rate was -67.3%.

Own AECID databases

- Specific ED agreements with NGDOs. Since 2006, €25m allocated by AECID to 19 agreements: 5.3% agreements and 2.2% of total amount. 15 different NGDOs act as leading partner.
- In non-specific ED agreements (2010 and 2014) the budget allocations for ED account for €4,8m, with an average grant per agreement of €45,162 (€38,132 € in 2010, €56,189 € in 2014).
- Projects: 226 projects in Spain (15.1% of all projects, and 6.8% of total amount), strong reduction since 2012.
- CAP: 2007 and 2011 with 388 actions or records? accounting for €42.6m, not all of them ED.

ACs. According to Info@OD, there are substantial differences among ACs both in absolute and in relative amounts per inhabitant. There are ACs with important investments in ED and other ones with expenditure that is more modest or stronger setbacks in recent years.

Catalonia ranks first (€47,4m), followed by Andalusia (€42,1m); the Basque Country (€27,1m), Valencia (€16,8m) and Madrid (€12,1m) are also among the leaders; however, in the last two autonomous communities there have been substantial cutbacks and even cancellation of ED funds in recent years.

In relative terms, the Basque Country leads with €12.50 per inhabitant, followed by Navarra (10.48), La Rioja (8.67), Extremadura (7.40), Cantabria (6.83) and Catalonia (6.39). The bottom positions: Canary Islands (1.21) and Murcia (0.41).

In comparing two periods (2007-2010 and 2011-2014), we can see that in the second one for all ACs there is a 49% decrease in ED over the first one. In some of them the cutback exceeds 70% (Balearic Islands, Cantabria, Castilla-La Mancha, Madrid and Murcia), whereas in others it does not reach a 25% (Andalusia, Basque Country and Galicia).

LEs. 219 different entities allocated funds to this CRS. 11 entities contributed more than €1m, although 2011 was an especially critical year for them too. The top contributors were: Municipality of Barcelona, Provincial Council of Barcelona, Provincial Council of Guipuzcoa, Municipality of Cordoba, Municipality of Bilbao, Municipality of San Sebastian, Municipality of Zaragoza, Municipality of Vitoria, Provincial Council of Malaga, Island Council of Tenerife and Municipality of Pamplona.

Universities. There are still differences in information reporting in these actors. The universities with higher contributions are the Polytechnic University of Valencia, University of Cordoba, University of Valencia, Complutense University of Madrid and University of the Balearic Islands.

Channelling agents. 66% of the bilateral ODA under CRS 99820 is channelled through NGOs/civil society –with 18 entities channelling more than €2m each-, and another 23.4% was channelled through the public sector.

B) Perceptions and appraisals on resources

Consulted actors have recurrently mentioned the sharp reduction of funds and their scarcity as a determining factor of ED objectives and achievable impact. Other critical issues are: available resources are frequently ED non-specific; discontinued nature of funding; little diversification of funding, especially in smaller-sized NGOs (they are dependent upon public subsidies); or complexity in obtaining international funding, with highly competitive scenarios and multisector approaches.

In the survey, material resources are considered to have the highest level of adequacy (67%), way ahead of financial resources (38.1%) and human resources (29.7%). The latter is considered insufficient, lacking stability and poorly specialized.

55% of the surveyed institutions/entities have a specific ED area. There is considerable progress in the allocation of staff to ED, although in a non-exclusive context (multitask), which conditions the scope and outreach of actions; however, most of the staff assigned to ED has received some training. NGOs are the institutions that to a greater extent have staffed ED and structured it into their organizations.

Ways to implement ED

5th generation ED has been assumed by the organizations, but at different speeds, with pre-existing approaches and a somehow biased vision of ED focusing on making cooperation visible and projecting it outwards.

Some organizations have become references in ED and working groups have meant an advancement. There has been a “broadening” of ED, linking it to the local sphere, more solid processes and a more proactive participation.

Actions (Data from Info@OD)

The analysis of interventions under CRS 99820 of Info@OD evidences several issues: larger number of actions of awareness raising and education/ training and less in research and impact/ mobilization; limited use of temrs such as formal, non-formal and informal education. The most frequent types of actions are: course, session, workshop, campaign, exhibition, volunteer, etc. The most frequent key concepts focus on peace, human rights, education in moral values, fair trade and responsible consumption, gender, sustainability and MDGs. The most frequently mentioned horizontal priorities are human rights, poverty, gender and sustainability. In addition, the most mentioned groups are youth, education community and general population.

A) Dimensions, areas and themes

Dimensions. The strategy contributed to understand ED as something “beyond” awareness raising. Actors believe that when ED isn’t complemented by other dimensions, it has a more limited effect and may generate duplicities, although time and economic conditions sometimes hinder the aggregation of more dimensions. Education/training is becoming more continuous and with a wider scope and a growing focus on competences. Research in ED has not received substantial institutional support, Universities have not focused on it either; however, there is an increasing collaboration in this field, e.g. between universities and NGOs.

Regarding impact/mobilization, the current vision goes beyond what is included in the Strategy, and more progress has been made in reflective process than in actual operational aspects. In general, financing agents have not fully assumed this dimension, and there is no full recognition of all the agents addressing this dimension. In organizations, progress in this dimension is uneven and the availability of sufficient and sustained funding for this work remains a key issue.

Areas. They have helped to cast light on the areas where ED can be deployed and to achieve an overall vision and the complementary nature of dimensions. Non-formal and informal environments are addressed by less agents and in a less visible manner.

Themes. Data are scarce and poorly structured to characterize ED based on themes. The local/global approach has brought with it broadening contents and an emphasis on inequality and interdependence. Specialized themes have been developed (e.g. food sovereignty) as well as global ones reaching beyond the traditional ED boundaries (e.g. climate change).

B) Mapping of AECID actions

There are no action plans detailing and scheduling the elements included in the Strategy. This deficit is especially notorious in AECID, since the Agency highlighted in the document.

Direct actions

The programme organized in collaboration with the MECD *Educators for Development* stands out. It was established in 2009 targeting schools supported with public funds throughout Spain in order to generate working networks and areas to exchange experiences. In 2014, the educators network included 150 teachers working under a global citizenship perspective. The case study we have carried out highlights several issues: the award provides recognition, visibility, motivation and training; the presence of different education levels generates cross learning and encourages networking; the initiative is known especially through informal channels; its national scope has been positively valued, although the meetings held show a poor geographical coverage.

In addition to this programme it is worth mentioning the participation of AECID in international networks, in particular the Global Education Network Europe (GENE), and the implementation of the school programme “Nuestro Mundo, Nuestra Dignidad, Nuestro Futuro” (Our World, Our Dignity, Our Future), in 2015 involving schools in different locations.

ED Projects and Agreements to NGDOs

The area most frequently addressed is non-formal education (61% of ED projects), followed by informal education (40%) and formal education (31%). In regards to agreements, 83% addressed formal education (15 out of 18), followed by non-formal (61%) and informal education (50%).

30% of projects and 61% of agreements involve more than one area, but at the same time 1 out of 3 projects focuses on non-formal and 28% of agreements only on formal education.

In terms of dimensions, there are similar patterns for projects and agreements: awareness raising is present in 66% of them, education/training in 50%, research in 25% or less. Impact/mobilization appears more frequently in agreements (50%) than in projects (25%).

There is more interrelation of dimensions in agreements, whereas in projects 25% address only awareness raising and a further 20% only education/training.

The report includes additional specific information on variables such as theme, format, etc.

Qualitative visions

In 2007, the starting situation was very weak; the vision on ED was very simple, with limited resources and skills allocated to it both in AECID and in other entities. The establishment of the ED unit in AECID (2009) is considered a positive milestone, but other factors have also influenced the relevance of ED within AECID: i) insufficient staffing; ii) position and dependence of ED within the organizational chart; iii) management sensitivity or specialization; iv) hierarchical position of managers in the civil service, which determines the dialogue ability and negotiation and decision power of the Unit.

C) Actions at international level

High divergence in knowledge about European reference frameworks on ED; according to the survey 50.8% do not know them and 49.2% do. 47.5% of the interviewed sample does not participate in international ED initiatives, 84.6% in the case of ACs. Universities and NGDOs are the actors that better align with international aspects.

Groups

There is a large variety of participants in ED, and there is a special focus on the general and school population. Unaware population and the social base of organizations (working in changing society for the better, although they are usually more involved in cooperation than in ED) provide an important potential to work with; and in addition to it, there is growing awareness on new target populations and actors.

Methodologies

There is a plural and dynamic vision of methodologies guiding ED, which does not focus any more on just producing materials. More attention is being paid to participatory and change-driving elements.

Coordination and division of work

It is still an important challenge in ED, requiring more attention at institutional level. Working groups – in their various versions – and interinstitutional collaboration in the Educators for Development Programme (AECID-MECD) are two important breakthroughs.

Survey respondents value more the process in dialogue and informal coordination (almost 70% consider it as “very good” or “good”) than the formal one (55.9%). There is substantial room for progress in the collaboration between central government and decentralized cooperation and between universities and all other actors.

They also consider that there is room for improvement in the coordination among Regional Ministries of Cooperation and/or Education. Similarly, the 2016 DAC (OECD) Peer Review highlights the need to reactivate the alliance between institutions and NGOs and to improve the influence level of consultative bodies.



2.3 STRATEGY RESULTS

These outcomes can be approached from perceptions on level of achievement of strategic lines or through the analysis of the achievements of individual actions.

Concerning strategic lines, the survey shows a modest progress, since none of them achieves a grade of 5 (1 to 10 growing scale), with all of them with values between 4.1 and 4.9. The best-valued achievement is the incorporation of crosscutting themes into ED and the one that scores worst is the development of specific mechanisms to grant greater relevance to ED. There is still a need for ED to build its own space and make it more visible, with adapted tools.

Regarding the achieved results in ED interventions, the strategy did not consider a framework of results, it did not include a monitoring system and the information sources available do not provide information on them. Therefore, the first task was to identify categories of results, based on an assessment of around one thousand actions in Info@OD, resulting in 12 specific categories in addition to another one comprising general results. The next task was to identify and document achievements in those categories based on the different techniques that were applied and to survey agents about their perception.

The result categories identified are listed below, together with a some achievements in each of them, as they were identified in the evaluation process.

Result categories and examples of achieved results

1. Knowledge and/or awareness raising of the population (individuals or groups on current global problems and their potential solutions/action proposals).

Achievement (survey): 6,50 over 10 (1st position)

- Participants gain a more real and interdependent vision of the world, they become aware of the global nature.
- International citizen networks develop on global issues, for example among the youth.
- ED actions of organizations are more visible, and they and their materials reach more people (diversity of agents/target audiences).

2. Sufficient visibility and appropriate treatment of these global issues in the media.

Achievement (survey): 4,70 over 10 (9th position)

- Multiple and diverse media mention or report ED topics addressed in actions or campaigns. They capture greater attention.
- For some ED topics, continued presence over time in the media was achieved.

3. Involvement of teachers; they have been provided with ED educational tools; effective management of such tools.

Achievement (survey): 6,48 over 10 (3rd position)

- Schools and teachers participate every year in ED showing their continued commitment.
- Teachers become involved not only in projects but also in ED networks or international volunteer work.
- Material is useful and user-friendly, of good quality and adapted to the school context and the time available.

4. Involvement of education centres in including ED in the curriculum.

Achievement (survey): 5,23 over 10 (7th position)

- ED activities have been incorporated into the annual planning of schools and its methodologies are used in the entire school.
- Life in the school communities has improved.
- Universities include crosscutting ED activities in their curriculums and its methodologies are used across all schools. These contents have to be expanded.

5. Results in political impact and social mobilization.

Achievement (survey): 5,42 over 10 (6th position)

- Actors have their own and explicit advocacy agendas and they agree on common agendas.
- Advocacy reaches important political processes and some reactions are achieved.

6. Studies and research on current global problems.

Achievement (survey): 5,20 over 10 (8th position)

- Research studies are useful and relevant for the work performed by organizations and administrations; they provide clear and precise information to define future strategies.

7. Networking, development and consolidation of coordination strategies among the different ED agents.

Achievement (survey): 6,54 over 10 (1st position)

- Networks and alliances are built, with the participation of various agents (e.g. social movements, European level actors) and the development of common agendas. Longstanding work lines are maintained, in some cases by groups/committees of NGDOs.
- Coordination for project implementation, for example coordination among NGDOs for joint actions.
- Informal coordination is used to ensure success in actions.

8. Internal achievements of institutions/entities (staff training, development of ED-oriented skills, etc.).

Achievement (survey): 6,25 over 10 (4th position)

- Multiannual interventions are better for ED working lines, internal stability of teams and alliances.
- Actions favour ulterior involvement of volunteers.

9. Incorporation of new players into ED, in addition to the traditional ones (for ex. mass media, policymakers, etc.).

Achievement (survey): 5,76 over 10 (5th position)

- A wider range of actors is reached.
- Universities open themselves to NGDOs as information agents for their students.

10. Values-attitudes-habits-practices more focused on solidarity, global citizenship, change.

Not included in the survey

- Participants change their behaviour, with actions such as: i) collection of signatures; ii) increase in the amounts they contribute to their organizations; iii) promotion of associativism.
- Teachers perceive changes in attitudes and beliefs among their students.

Other less relevant blocks: not included in the survey

11. Deeper and more continued relations between North and South societies.

12. Greater social interest towards the work of these organizations.

13. Results expressed in general terms.

- Multiplying effect of actions thanks to the involvement of teachers, media, etc.
- Public administrations are interested in ED in different manners: financing, specific strategies, reflection, relationship with agents, etc.
- Improvement in the quality and diversity of ED.

2.3.1.1 CHANGES IN VALUES AND ATTITUDES

The Strategy included statistical data on the Spanish society's level of knowledge on cooperation for development. Its evolution may be understood as changes in values and attitudes among the population. These changes are multifactorial and require time to take place. This section presents updated data from the CIS and the Eurobarometers on these issues together with new ones that were not available in 2007.

The main trends according to the CIS are:

- Support to the cooperation policy is decreasing: 84% (2005), 72% (2015).
- In view of the unfavourable economic context in Spain, when asked about prioritizing between national and cooperation policies, support to the former is quite large, with slight growth rates year after year.
- 2015: Respondents think that resources for cooperation are scarce, which is negative.
- A large share of the population (60% approx.) questions effectiveness of cooperation.
- The main purpose attributed to NGOs is cooperation with third countries, although their political lobbying and awareness raising work in Spain is well-accepted (35%-40%).
- In 2015, there is an upturn of individual actions by citizens to support cooperation, being occasional contributions (37%) the main one.

Regarding data from the Eurobarometer:

- In 2015, Spain ranked third in the EU28 behind Germany and Portugal, in terms of importance given to these matters.
- Spanish citizens are more convinced than the rest of EU citizens of the value of individual contributions to fight poverty (around 10 percentage points difference).
- However, Spain is below the European average in terms of potential commitment to initiatives such as fair trade.
- Notwithstanding, two thirds of the population, both in Spain and in Europe, do not undertake any individual action to help developing countries –which would justify supporting ED- and Europeans make slightly higher contributions to this purpose.
- Remarkable lack of knowledge on initiatives such as the MDGs or the European Year for Development in the population.



2.4 VALIDITY OF THE STRATEGY

Already in 2011 the DAC Peer Review for Spain pointed out the need to review the ED Strategy, suggesting that it was too broad, outdated and with few specific guidelines. Notwithstanding, for this evaluation the objectives for which this Strategy was drafted are still valid and the Strategy has served organizations as a stronghold in the face of the actual backdrop in ED.

In any case, actors surveyed point at the need to update the Strategy to turn it more useful, since the context has changed in the last decade and ED and players involved have evolved.

Some of the main aspects of the Strategy affecting its present validity that should be updated are as follows:

- Global education is a much broader area than education on development/ cooperation matters.
- It is necessary to involve education authorities.

Other specific elements affecting the Strategy's validity are detailed both in the report and in the recommendations of this report.

3. CONCLUSIONS

3.1 INTERVENTION RATIONALE

C.1. **In internal consistency**, the Strategy poses some problems resulting from the imbalance between a deep theoretical framework build upon a consensus, and an intervention framework with limitations as a planning document for action and little attention to dissemination, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

C.2. **In terms of adequacy to the context**, the Strategy achieves positive results, although it was designed in a growth context with excessively optimistic assumptions and had to be implemented in a context of financial restrictions.

C.3. **As instrument guiding Spanish Cooperation**, the Strategy achieves acceptable results but with limitations, being the outcome of previous work of several actors. It provides better guidance to organizations at central level and less for decentralized or university cooperation. Some instrumental-bureaucratic uses can be perceived (guidance for requirements established in public calls) and it sometimes serves as means to legitimize ED.

C.4. **Coherence among planning documents** must be put into context. Since not all actors had the same opportunities to adjust their strategic approach to ED considering that there was a great diversity in national and autonomic planning scenarios between 2007 and 2014 (some actors developed 4 plans, other just 1).

C.5. **The strategic ED perspective in Spanish Cooperation** through its Master Plans is consistent with the Strategy according to this evaluation, especially in its theoretical framework. The 3rd Master Plan captured better ED as it is described in the Strategy. Although, in the 4th Master Plan, there is a lesser mention to ED.

C.6. **The strategic ED perspective of the ACs, as shown by their ED Master Plans and strategies** is globally consistent with the theoretical framework of the Strategy and its intervention framework; the need of improving coordination is the most relevant similarity. There is a similar approach to ED in all of them, with non-contradictory general objectives and complementary definitions in which the concept of global citizenship is widespread (60%). They share some key concepts and in general, the ED dimensions and areas.

C.7. The strategic perspective of NGOs in their ED strategies presents a global consistency with the theoretical framework of the Strategy. The structure, areas and dimensions of these strategies are very consistent with the analysed Strategy. This appropriation is influenced by the fact that an increasing number of public calls require/value having a strategy on ED. It should be noted that this strategic perspective has evolved from strategies that combined ED with some other communication element to other focusing only on ED.

C.8. ED perspective and position of AECID's regulatory framework governing its public calls has improved in consistency with the Strategy between 2007 and 2014. This is visible in the calls published between 2005 and 2011. Although there is still room for improvement, especially in terms of making them ED specific, as established in the Strategy. In the 2010 call for agreements, there are significant changes, as in the 2013 and 2014 calls for projects.

C.9. ED perspective and position of AC's regulatory framework governing their public calls as improved in consistency with the Strategy between 2007 and 2014. There is room for improvement to optimize the specificity set forth in the Strategy (present in 60% of the AC's). They finance mostly projects, mainly with annual duration. Moreover, although some of them considered multiannual actions (essentially programmes) these longer actions have not been financed since 2014.

The progress made in the definitions and themes of the ED they have financed is not sufficiently reflected in the requirements or appraisal criteria, still largely general or technical rather than specific or educational.

C.10. The ED perspective and position of the actors through their monitoring instruments presents a poor consistency with the Strategy. The Strategy was not provided with a monitoring system and it was not developed later either; and the instruments defined by actors also present deficiencies, which reduce their ability to provide global information on key issues of the Strategy: dimensions, areas or a more comprehensive vision of the results. This mixed picture applied to both AECID and the ACs.

C.11. In the theory of change underlying the Strategy, two core elements have been identified: process vision and integration of ED dimensions. The survey provides moderately acceptable results for both. Although some progress has been identified (multiannual instruments, experiences based on accumulation of projects or consortiums) they are still insufficient. The economic situation has slowed down the promotion sustained by this vision, and shared management of knowledge is barely undertaken.

Concerning integration of dimensions, awareness raising and education/training work achieved some progress, even though multiple situations persist. There is an appeal to link awareness raising to other dimension/s where possible, to be consistent and realistic. Research and impact/mobilization the newest dimensions for actors and the more complex ones to integrate.

3.2 IMPLEMENTATION

C.12. Knowledge of the Strategy by actors is acceptable, even if it is too generic, it presents substantial differences among actors (universities and LEs are less familiar with the Strategy) and it is too focused on the theoretical framework. This evaluation has found an important malfunction in this knowledge: it is mostly identified as the “AECID strategy”, which hinders its application to the area of action of each actor.

C.13. The Strategy is perceived as a “white paper” rather than as a planning document and it was more useful in its first years. Then it became more diluted and new instrumental uses emerged (response to public calls made). This function of “white paper” is positively valued, since it helped to unify languages and meanings, clarify the ED area, defend it as a sector and legitimize/ make it more visible at institutional level, focusing on a 5Th generation and global citizenship model.

C.14. The Strategy lacked sufficient operational levels, resulting in a intention-based Strategy. Some of the factors supporting this conclusion are: limited communication and dissemination after its approval; generic nature of a substantial share of the proposals; assuming that a favourable environment would persist; absence of operational programmes for its implementation; and lack of monitoring mechanisms.

C.15. Three contextual factor had impacted in the implementation of the Strategy: the economic crisis, the social mobilization it triggers since 2011 and the changes in education regulations (LOMCE and competence-based approach). Many other factors also emerged; however, they were associated to specific contexts (NGDOs, schools, universities, and LEs).

C.16. Identifying, clarifying and measuring ED properly emerges as a critical issue that has remained unsolved. It is extremely complex in ED identifying and gathering information on implemented actions and resources allocated to them; this has an impact on its strength and further development as a sector. The commonly accepted CRS (99820) does not comprise all ED aspects and includes elements on which there is no consensus. In universities (OCUD report) there are also substantial deficits in this field.

Priority was given to Info@OD in this evaluation: it is the only source with standardized and structured information on this CRS over the entire period and for all actors even though it only provides limited and fragmented information on actions.

C.17. Between 2007 and 2014, €356 million were allocated to ED (CRS 99820) by all Spanish Cooperation actors (AGE, ACs, LEs, Universities). 3% is bilateral ODA although this percentage varies year to year (Source: Info@OD). Figures decrease sharply after 2011 and the situation stabilizes in 2014. The same trend appears in data on AECID financing to NGDOs and in CONGDE annual reports. This cutback is larger than the ones applied to cooperation as a whole.

According to Info@OD, AC's represented 57% of ED, with Catalonia and Andalusia ranking first in absolute figures, and the Basque Country and Navarra in per capita ratio. AGE finances around 22%, mainly through AECID and followed by SECIPI. LEs financed 18% of total ED, through more than 200 entities, mostly in Catalonia, Andalusia, Valencia and the Basque Country. Universities funded the remaining 2%, although with substantial differences. The top contributors are the Polytechnic University of Valencia, the University of Cordoba, the University of Valencia, the Complutense University and the University of the Balearic Islands.

AGE and ACs financed the largest actions in terms of budget allocations even though ED is implemented through modest actions: Only 25% exceed €30,000 according to Info@OD.

Actions are implemented basically by NGDOs and civil society (two thirds of those €356m) and a further 23% is channelled through the public sector.

C.18. ED working lines in AECID's Agreement (Cooperation/AH) have been better used by NGDOs in 2014 than in 2011, at least in quantitative terms. This is due to budget allocated to ED (from 60% to 66%) and the average expenditure in ED per agreement (from €38,000 to €56,000), as well as the total expenditure per agreement over the maximum allowed (from 43% to 62%).

C.19. DE has been incorporated into the organizational chart of actors, but this is not widespread yet, and we have found scenarios in which it is diluted in the organizational structure or it is secondary to other goals such as communication or fund raising. Even though there is some progress in assigning staff to ED, being NGDOs the player with the larger number of specific ED staff, the overall pattern is not having staff exclusively devoted to it. There are some cases, like the ED unit in AECID, that despite having full time staff for it, the resources allocated to them are insufficient. Thus, according to respondents, there is a lack of skilled human resources. In addition, although most of the staff has received some ED training, it cannot be verified whether it is adequate or sufficient, taking in consideration the lack of ED specialized trainings available.

C.20. Public calls define ED working lines and they emerged in this evaluation as the hinge between the strategic and the operational level. It is where most of the existing "tensions" originate. In project calls stand out the specificity for ED, which was one of the six lines laid out in the Strategy, and is still a demand raised by NGDOs. Despite the substantial progress confirmed by this evaluation, at national level there aren't specific ED call. At regional level the picture is different, it presents 60% of ACs' calls on development. Objectives, requirement and criteria are still poorly adapted to ED.

C.21. There have been important changes in carrying out ED resulting in broadening the view on ED: from raising awareness on the problems of South countries to their understanding as global problems; from more isolated actions to processes in general and educational processes in particular, which involve longer terms and the transition from extensive actions in terms of target population to more intensive ones, in which the support role of channelling entities becomes paramount. However, this evaluation has verified that these changes are more at the

conceptual and discursive level than in actions observed, according to the available sources. This should be put into context, since there are important differences in the ways of doing ED, in the pacers and in the importance awarded to each area or dimension.

C.22. Regarding ED development and its dimensions over this period, there has been a greater development in awareness raising and education/training than in research and incidence/mobilization, which have been undertaken by actors more recently in their actions.

C.23. In awareness raising, there is a trend towards deeper approaches, in line with the Strategy although it has been detected that due to a lack of budget and time, awareness raising actions don't integrate the different dimensions, as established in the Strategy, and so there is a setback in the awareness approach. Actors share the idea that if awareness raising does not go together with other dimensions it has a limited effect.

C.24. Education-training remains an important and well-established line in ED even though fewer instruments and resources were allocated to it over this period. Progress has been recorded in volunteer and NGDO staff training; however, its funding instruments have decreased or entirely disappeared in universities, where EEES succeeded in adapting contents, including ED, with uneven achievements and still under development.

C.25. Research in ED has not been widely integrated by actors, and it has lacked a firm political-institutional support in this period, with only residual presence in the financing call, with just a few exceptions. This evaluation has confirmed that it is more widely implemented only by those with a sounder structure and/or greater experience, and to a much lesser extent by smaller or more modest actors. In universities ED is facing a series of conditioning factors that hinder its widespread implementation, such as poor recognition of research in ED for the professional career of researchers in certain knowledge areas.

C.26. Impact/mobilization is a dimension whose incorporation into the Strategy meant an important milestone, although it was only superficially addressed. According to this evaluation, the current vision is much broader than in 2007, as a result of a long reflections and discussions, and it has become more visible, although it has proven to be complex for few actors willing to undertake it due to issues on how to address it and pertinence of its funding sources.

C.27. The division of ED into different areas set forth in the Strategy has contributed to make it clearer and to provide a comprehensive perspective. The evaluation shows that there is an intervention pattern influencing different areas; however, formal aspects have prevailed. Notwithstanding, Strategy's expectations on mainstreaming and ED integration in formal education have not been fulfilled.

C.28. Participation in cross border initiatives was followed only by some actors and in an uneven manner. AGE, ACs and Coordination Committees are the actors that know better the European framework (i.e. DARE) and the participation of initiatives is not widespread, with very low rates in some of them, such as the ACs. The negative context in terms of resources has damaged knowledge management; with little visibility. Resources, strategic vision and skills are required.

C.29. ED in schools has been carried out only on a goodwill basis. Nevertheless, it has been detected has detected more far-reaching experiences that demonstrate the development of school networks, a more proactive attitude in the implementation of ED and more integrated approaches, as opposed to the traditional isolated actions resulting from NGDO initiatives, or actions focusing on the production of materials. Notwithstanding, many of the approaches still rest on the goodwill of teachers, faced with a legislative framework that does not include specific mandates for ED integration.

C.30. The population participating in ED covers many different profiles, but the challenge of reaching non-aware population persists and there is a need to converge with initiatives not stemming from ED but sharing goals or values. Despite the great diversity of targets, general population and schools have an important presence in these actions. Previous awareness levels and attracting new audiences with profiles different from traditional ones are relevant variables in this field.

C.31. Regarding ED methodologies, a great diversity was recorded in this period. Their common features are flexibility and participation. The evaluation has detected that frequently they are not specific ED approaches, but rather taken from other fields or disciplines (i.e. education science, social and cultural management). Many different factors influence the methodologies applied: participant profiles, intervention contexts, existing skills, topics addressed or interaction among dimensions, among others. In general, they aim at providing an active role to participants in line with the transforming and critical awareness components. Progress has been made in the integration of ED materials within the framework of a project focusing on their adaptability and usability.

C.32. Promoting coordination among ED actors was one of the lines in the Strategy. It has been observed that in this period it has operated more at informal and personal level (based on goodwill) than at formal level (institutional) with few achievements among institutions and administrations (AGE, ACs, LEs, universities). Accordingly, and connected to the above, we are still missing the involvement of governmental authorities with policy-making powers in education (regional ministries of education and specific structures of the MECD). This absence is more notorious when speaking about ED processes and how they to address them comprehensively in schools and their curriculum. Present efforts are still at their initial stage: laying the foundations for the dialogue with these actors.

Although formal meeting structures among actors (TG of the Cooperation Council, AC Groups or coordination committee groups) have meant a step forward, they are not use for coordination. No significant contribution of the CICD to this coordination has been identified and the channelling entities regret the difficulty to be recognized by institutional actors as ED counterparts and agents with their own positions and records of accomplishment.

Interviewed actors consider that coordination is more important than complementarity, and request more areas for training, dialogue and mutual awareness.

3.3 RESULTS

C.33. Definition and concreteness of ED final results is still an unresolved matter. Several elements have caused this: the Strategy does include an outcome level intervention logic and lack of a monitoring system (this applies to the entire sector). ED as a sector has a relatively short history with little visibility; ED has a "polyhedron" nature, with multiple lines and actions. The economic context distracted attention from results' measurement.

Actors demand a broader vision of results that includes quantitative elements and also qualitative ones. It is very frequent to identify activities, mid-term and internal work results. However, actors usually do not understand such achievements as a result of the Strategy or resulting from a single intervention, but rather as arising from a process funded by different sources.

C.34. The strategic lines established in 2007 got a low score in achievement level, especially in terms of recognizing the specificity of ED. The evaluation shows that ED needs to keep working in building its own space and visibility, as well as in developing adapted tools. There has not been much progress in action quality or coherence, or in the generation of knowledge in terms of globalization/interdependence, or in implementing ED in critical cooperation sectors. Incorporating ED as a mainstreaming priority is the aspect that ranks on top within the overall poor scores awarded by the interviewed actors. Satisfaction with the interaction with Regional ministries of education and/or Cooperation is low too.

C.35. ED actions results were classified in this evaluation into 12 categories or major blocks. The survey indicates that the greatest achievements are perceived in; networking and coordination; information and awareness raising; teacher involvement; and classroom tools. And the poorest ones are in involvement of school management teams; studies and research in ED; and treatment of ED in the media. In the absence of sound frameworks for final ED results, which the Strategy does not provide, the classification made in this evaluation may help actors in making deeper identifications and measuring results.

C.36. Concerning the validity of the Strategy, this evaluation has detected that in the theoretical framework some of the contents have become outdated, which makes it less useful in some aspects. All together, this theoretical framework, the major objectives and the background of the Strategy are valid, and only some adjustments are needed. (see recommendations),

As far as the other major part of the Strategy is concerned (intervention framework), its limited implementation come from factors beyond its validity (e.i. appropriation). In any case, it must be mentioned that from the current perspective, these actions are very ambitious and in many cases would require allocation of large resources.



4. LESSONS LEARNED

L.A.1. Strategies are not always homogeneous as a whole, there might be a clear difference between their theoretical framework (which can get a greater consensus amongst actors) and the intervention framework; which is crucial to be known, assumed, prioritized and specified by actors.

L.A.2. There are open debates on the pertinence of working in ED under a new paradigm (6th generation, transforming-emancipating education...), or deepening further in the 5th generation approach, which has not been completed yet.

L.A.3. The purpose of monitoring and evaluation of a strategy remains incomplete when it lacks of action plans addressing priorities, action plans and schedules, to explain the contribution expected from each actor.

L.A.4. Successful implementation of actions is closely related to the availability of ED suited instruments, and to have appraisal criteria that take into account the nature and uniqueness of the sector.

L.A.5. There is a trend among funders to go beyond their role of allies of the beneficiaries, and among channelling entities to strategically design the intervention, in combination with own funds for strategic elements or elements requiring more autonomy.

L.A.6. A broad ED perspective requires NGDOs to share their leading role in the sector with other actors more active in involvement and mobilization.

L.A.7. Implementing continuous interventions enhance results and impacts in ED. Conversely, it is difficult to get sound achievements with isolated or discontinuous interventions.

L.A.8. Impact and mobilization is a complex dimensions from a funding perspective (“where from”), fitting it into the institutional structure and preserving its identity without undermining financial sustainability. Moreover, these are medium and long-term actions that require a sufficient and sustained provision of resources.

L.A.9. Communication shall go beyond mere dissemination to contribute to social change and transformation. There is a risk that communication objectives may outweigh educational objectives and therefore, a good ED communication approach is required.

L.A.10. There is a need to find balance between a holistic ED with a focus on mainstreaming, and an ED with delimited actions and messages segmented by lines and themes. Awareness raising with a general focus -rational and justified- must go together with a more segmented approach addressing different participation profiles.

L.A.11. Including a results framework on ED in order to guide actions towards common goals improves achievements, evaluation and learning.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

I. VALIDITY OF THE STRATEGY

R.1. Reflecting on updating the Strategy. It is necessary to reflect whether in the current situation of ED it is more adequate to undertake a global update of the Strategy and its different elements, or to maintain this strategic framework and focus on its further development such as limiting a number of priorities, that can be assumed in the medium term and providing specific responses to such priorities¹.

II. ED POSITIONING AND DELIMITATION

R.2. Distinguishing between ED positioning exercises and planning exercises. Defending and planning are two different things. The Strategy mixed elements with two different purposes: on the one hand, defending and positioning ED -more extensively addressed- and on the other, a planning exercise (objectives, planning lines, etc.). This “mix” damaged the Strategy and hindered its implementation.

- Defending the sector and planification must be separated, without mixing it.
- Drafting a synthesis document to sum up the main content of the Strategy in order to make it more accessible to decision makers.

R.3. Enriching the traditional ED concept. If there is a will to broaden ED perspective, it is necessary to complement or enrich the concept, to influence global citizenship or global education. Successful debate on ED, it cannot be limited to the terminology, but it is unquestionable that there are conceptual implications.

R.4. Balancing the three areas (formal, non-formal and informal); and in dimensions, dwelling further on contents and guidelines in research and impact-mobilization. The three areas need to be equally developed in both planification and implementation in order to create synergies. Only in this way can all of the synergy potential and capabilities be leveraged.

¹ The decision to be made in this respect may affect the remaining recommendations of this evaluation, since not all of them would apply in the same manner if a global update of the Strategy is decided or if the option is just to develop it further.

Regarding dimensions, as opposed to awareness raising and education/training, which are more traditional and better established, research and impact/mobilization are newer and have shown to be more difficult to address by actors. Therefore, they require a more intensive approach to their contents and focus at operational level in order to integrate them into ED work. They also need a more explicit institutional support with specific instruments.

R.5. In regards to public and private ED players, it is recommended to recognize more explicitly new ones (non-traditional), and incorporate with greater precision those considered in 2007; promoting communication aspects focusing on global citizenship and change; and taking the non-aware population as target, networking and converging with agents not involved in ED yet.

III. STRATEGY PLANNING

R.6. Setting priorities and assigning responsibilities. The Strategy and the documents deriving from it must include an explicit, feasible and prioritized list of actions to be implemented by every actor, assigning responsibilities (who shall do what, instead of “will be encouraged to”) and incorporating some type of reference to expected outcomes.

R.7. Setting priorities, estimating resources and specifying the added and differential value of each actor

- Delimiting a feasible number of priorities.
- Main lines shall go together with financial and human resources to be devoted for their implementation.
- The Strategy should explain the added and differential value of the various actors, at least of the main financing profiles; this should contribute to reinforce and make visible the role of the AGE. It should also explain how the complementary roles of the Central Administration and Decentralized Cooperation is conceived in ED.

R.8. Improving the design of the Strategy planning process. Guaranteeing some minimum criteria:

- Incorporating some diagnostic clues into the Strategy document if a global update is decided.
- Making the assumptions made in the Strategy explicit, and planning for risks, contingencies and changes.
- Detailing to what strategic line, or to what extent contributes each specific objective.
- Intervention patterns should include actions with a similar outreach, avoiding the coexistence of some very specific ones with some very broad ones.

IV. ED INTEGRATION WITHIN INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS, DEVELOPMENT OF SKILLS AND RESOURCES

R.9. Sound working lines require an increase and reinforcement of staff assigned to them: The AECID ED Unit is an example. It is necessary to increase the action capacity of actors, and it is crucial to strengthen AECID ED Unit with more staff so that it can work more in depth in the action lines defined in the Strategy.

R.10. Devoting a larger area to ED in the SGCID and establishing a Sectorial Department in AECID. Despite its relevant policy-making powers, SGCID does not have specialized staff assigned to ED. Being a transversal aspect, ED plays a residual role in the sectorial units of AECID. This hinders the goal of the Strategy of achieving effective mainstreaming of ED in those sectors.

R.11. Analysing in greater detail the qualification and specialization of the staff working in ED and their training needs. A more detailed analysis of the background and specialization of those working in ED is required in order to identify the most pressing training needs so that an appropriate response can be provided.

V. FUNDING

R.12. Enhance multiannual funding. According to actors resources, players should promote interventions longer than a year, encouraging in this way ED as an educational process.

R.13. Funding instruments that promote the establishment of groups or consortiums of channelling entities. Although there are already some experiences, funding entities should explore and where appropriate, promote collaborative action lines, funding the joint work of several NGDOs or other channelling entities, to which each of them can contribute with their own skills and specialization, complementing in this way each other and allowing for greater outreach and impact of DE.

VI. COORDINATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY

R.14. Promoting a dialogue and coordination between AGE and ACs, as a way to achieve a more coherent and ED complementarity.

R.15. Promoting communication mechanisms with ACs' regional ministries of education is a core element to achieve their full integration as ED actors. This should start by identifying the units responsible for ED in the regional ministries of education to open a dialogue and then work on coordination and ultimately complementarity.

R.16. Promoting a dialogue with relevant players out of the formal area, to contribute to a balanced development of all ED areas.

VII. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

R.17. Moving towards monitoring systems that provide standardized, aggregable, comparable and continuous information on themes, participation profiles, dimensions and areas. Without introducing too much complexity, monitoring should be oriented towards the construction of information systems allowing for a global vision on to what extent all aspects of interest have been addressed. Presently, monitoring is not always established as a “system”, and therefore it provides information only at specific action level and not in an aggregated manner.

R.18. Developing monitoring forms as standardized as possible for all actors. There is high diversity in the monitoring systems across administrations, which increases the difficulty of carrying out a joint analysis of the interventions in different regions or contexts. Even though there may be autonomy in designing them, a joint review initiative by all administrations involved could be studied.

R.19. Moving forward in the definition and measurement of results. The different actors should developed a standardized framework for results, similar to the blocks of results identified in this evaluation. This should go beyond the usual approach focusing only on verifying and quantifying the implementation of actions.

R.20. Identifying what is merely awareness raising. Funding entities should identify clearly and precisely the interventions involving awareness raising to evidence progress in 5th generation approaches, thus preventing scattering of resources and duplicities. This can be achieved by means of: specific calls or sections for awareness raising; specific sections in report; monitoring forms and systems; or meetings to exchange information between funding and channelling entities.

VIII. ED AND STRATEGY VISIBILITY

R.21. Institutional communication on work in cooperation for development should not rest on ED exclusively or primarily, it should rather have an own identity within each institution/entity. ED can contribute to explain and disseminate this work in cooperation but it should not turn this work into its main objective, since ED includes a wide range of aspects to influence to (changing values and attitudes, global citizenship competences, transformation, etc.).

R.22. Intense dissemination of the Strategy. If it is renewed or updated, a strong dissemination work should be done, making emphasis on:

- Reaching all central government and decentralized players and integrating universities and LEs, which had a smaller presence in the Strategy, using digital channels.

- Correcting the biased perception that it is the “AECID Strategy”. AGE should explain to all actors that this Strategy had a broader perspective even if AECID plays a more relevant role.

To overcome this vision it is best to include other agents both in the planning process and then in its implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

R.23. Broader and more systematic dissemination of the “Educators for Development Programme”. Use the institutional channels of the MECED in schools to disseminate the Programme, its objectives and the value it provides for schools better.

R.24. At institutional level, developing some initiatives to provide visibility and recognition to the presently scatter and poorly known work in ED performed in university environments (both in the classrooms and in extra-academic activities). It has been evidenced that the work of these educators and organizations has a limited articulation and effect.

IX. INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

R.25. More information and knowledge on European and international approaches and debates. It is important to concentrate training efforts on actors in which the European/international sphere is especially relevant. Moreover, ACs, being important actors in decentralized cooperation, should be more familiar with these issues with either a direct presence in the European ED scenario or, where such presence is not feasible, receiving information from those regularly involved (i.e. AECID).

R.26. Increasing the possibilities for meetings, dialogue and mutual awareness among actors, with the same profile (i.e. ACs, or in universities: faculty, researchers, offices) and among different profiles (i.e. LEs, NGOs) and between cooperation and ED agents, or between ED and actors not involved in cooperation. This will generate a greater mutual awareness of approaches and actions, laying the foundations for potential joint work in the future. These can be face-to-face or digital, with carefully designed formats and contents. Likewise, it would be recommendable to increase the number of publications helping to improve the visibility and disclosing the different records of accomplishment and expertise fields, since a poor mutual knowledge has been detected.

Other related documents in:
<http://www.cooperacionespanola.es/en/publications>

