

**Review of DFID's Work to Build Support for
Development through the Development
Awareness Fund and the Mini Grants
Programme**

Final Report June 2009

**Hilary Thornton and Shaun Hext
Verulam Associates Ltd.**

Acknowledgements

This review was undertaken and the report prepared by Dr Hilary Thornton and Shaun Hext of Verulam Associates Ltd. Coordination within DFID was provided by Jenny Yates, Head and Cathy Welch, Programme Manager, of the Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team within Communications Division. Thanks are due to them and all those within the Communications Division who provided support during the review. A number of current and former DFID staff were interviewed together with key informants from a wide range of organisations. Thanks are also due to the managing agents of the Development Awareness Fund and Mini Grant Programme. The authors are grateful to all those interviewed for giving so generously of their time and for sharing their views so openly. Thanks are also due to the consultants who undertook the other three related reviews who sharing information and provided mutual support at key points.

Though the review was commissioned by DFID, full responsibility for the text of this report rests with the authors. In common with all reviews and evaluations commissioned by DFID, the views contained in this report do not necessarily represent those of DFID or of any of the people consulted.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ii
Contents	iii
Acronyms and Abbreviations	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. RELEVANCE	7
3. EFFECTIVENESS	13
4. EFFICIENCY	25
5. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY	32
6. LESSONS LEARNT	35
7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
Annexes	
Annex 1: Terms of Reference	42
Annex 2: People Interviewed	47
Annex 3: DAF/Minigrant recipients visited/interviewed	48
Annex 4: Mini Grant Applications and Awards 2003/04 to 2009/10	49
Annex 5: Development Education Centres Survey	50

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AFP	Asian Foundation for Philanthropy
BME	Black and Ethnic Minority
BSDS	Building Support for Development Strategy
BSD	Building Support for Development
CFD	Connections For Development
CGE	Centre for Global Education
CSCF	Civil Society Challenge Fund
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DAF	Development Assistance Fund
DEA	Development Education Association
DEC	Development Education Centre
DEP	Development Education Project
DFID	Department for International Development
DVI	Diaspora Volunteering Initiative
EES	Enabling Effective Support
ESDGC	Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GSP	Global Schools Partnership
GTF	Governance and Transparency Fund
ICSD	Information Civil Society Department
IDEAS	International Development Education Association Scotland
MA	Managing Agents
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MGS	Mini-Grant Scheme
NGO	Non-Government Organisation
ODA	Overseas Development Administration
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PPA	Partnership Programme Arrangement
QCA	Qualification and Curriculum Authority
SA	Strategic Agreement
SGA	Strategic Grant Agreement
TLC	Triple Line Consulting
TU	Trade Union
TUC	Trade Union Congress
VSO	Voluntary Services Overseas
WAG	Welsh Assembly Government

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The White paper on International Development published in 1997 set the direction for DFID strategy. This was followed by the publication in 1999 of the Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) which articulated the Government's commitment to building greater awareness and understanding of international development in the UK. The Development Awareness Fund (DAF), a competitive funding mechanism under which not for profit organisations could apply for funding to implement projects focused on raising awareness of international development, which was set up in 1998, was identified as a key tool for supporting the delivery of the BSDS. An associated fund, the Mini Grants Scheme (MGS) which provided opportunities for smaller organisations to access funds for development awareness was also incorporated into BSDS. The funding levels were set at a maximum of £100,000 per year for up to 3 years for the DAF and £10,000 per year for up to 3 years for the MGS.
2. This review looks back over the twelve years since the first competitive funding scheme came into being in 1996, focusing particularly on the period after the publication of the BSDS in 1999. It considers the relevance of the DAF and MGS to the wider BSD strategy; the effectiveness of the fund, with respect to target groups, the individual projects and the fund as a whole; efficiency in terms of management and value for money of the fund; and the impact of the fund at objective level and on organisations it engages with. Finally sustainability related to individual projects and the fund as a whole is considered.
3. The DAF and MGS have been relevant to the BSD strategy in that they have provided opportunities to explore the way in which development awareness can be delivered in a variety of contexts. They have allowed innovation and experimentation and appear to have worked effectively in some areas, notably in formal education and less effectively in others, e.g. with Trade Unions, Business and Faith. Little is known about the overall effectiveness and impact since regular review and lesson learning were not effectively integrated into the programme. This review has made an attempt to capture some of the learning but it can only go so far. What has emerged is a fragmented programme that serves some better than others.
4. Formal education has remained central to the DAF and MGS scheme over the last 10 years. The funds have provided an opportunity for organisations to explore different approaches to integrating the global dimension into schools, including whole school approaches, support to curriculum implementation and inputs into teacher education, both initial and in-service. Through review of documentation, visits to DAF and MG recipients and discussions with the managing agents it is clear that a significant amount of work has been done. However assessing the effectiveness and impact of this work is problematic given the lack of monitoring and evaluation of the DAF and MGS.
5. The other priority groups identified in the BSD strategy, faith and the churches, business and trade unions and the media have been less well represented in the DAF and MGS. The dominance of education may be one factor but there are others. Media as a tool to deliver the global dimension in education has been well integrated but there are options to access other funds from DFID for media as communication and these have been utilised, even by DAF applicants. Trade Unions have emerged as an interesting new group but development awareness

is a new agenda and they need support to increase their interest in engaging with this agenda and to increase their skills and expertise to identify and deliver effective projects.

- 7 For small organisations, like faith based organisations, BME and Diaspora groups the competitive funding process itself has been challenging, though there has been increased interest leading to more successful applications from BME groups in recent years. More generally, their skills in proposal preparation cannot match those of organisations with extensive expertise in this area. The need for capacity building and support has emerged as key to engaging such groups, not just for proposal writing but for enhancing project delivery as well.
- 8 Examples of excellent projects were identified by the team, particularly those run by DECs in formal education, which demonstrated lesson learning and had the potential to be rolled out and those which were well linked institutionally to wider networks within the community. However, the approach of the DAF which emphasises innovation and experimentation and requires projects to be limited to three years does not encourage the development of tried and tested ideas. Particularly in formal education, a more strategic approach is needed which builds on the successful projects and explores how learning can be shared and developed with education providers throughout the UK.
- 9 Contracting out the management of the DAF in 2006 has led to greater efficiency and has been a sound move in terms of value for money. However, there is less clarity over the respective roles of the managing agents and DFID. This lack of distinction has resulted in a duplication of tasks and too much involvement in day to day management on the part of DFID.
- 10 The management of the MGS has evolved in different ways in all four countries with some appearing to be more efficient than others. The decision taken by the managing agents to only allow applicants to apply for one year grants in N Ireland and to a certain extent in Wales has led to too many very short term projects and raises questions for their sustainability. The limited size of the development education community in all countries but England has led in some cases to conflict of interests, with appraisers knowing applicants and managing agent themselves being awarded mini grants. This has restricted objectivity and led to an inward looking fund that is not reaching as many groups as it could.

Recommendations

- 11 :At the strategic level funding instruments like the DAF should follow the establishment of strategic outcomes and institutional relationships.
- 12 At the operational level to improve the provision of financial support for development awareness
 - The DAF should be gradually phased out over the next 3 years and replaced with larger longer term grant support for key target groups who are central to the BSD strategy and who are currently supported under the DAF

For Education

- The proportion of funds currently being spent on formal education in the DAF should be used to contribute to support for more strategic interventions within education. This should include further and higher education and the youth service.

- Funds for education should be for agreements at national level for the four countries, with consideration given to how regional delivery is managed particularly within England. For example, groups of DECs may be identified to play a role in implementation in the different regions.
- Given the integrated nature of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), consideration may be given in Wales to funds being allocated to the WAG to support delivery of the ESDGC strategy.

For Media Groups

- Media groups have not effectively accessed the DAF and MGS. Consideration should be given to enabling media organisations focusing on development awareness to access grant funds through other DFID media funding channels

For Trade Unions

- Small Grant Support for development awareness work with Trade Unions is more effectively placed within the PPA with the TUC. The PPA may be expanded to encourage the TUC to provide more funds for small grants focused on development awareness.

13 The phasing out of the DAF and the move to more strategic interventions in education, media and the Trade Unions will result in more limited opportunities for other key target groups that the DAF has focused on, e.g. BME, Diaspora, Faith and the Churches and more local level community groups. These groups have an important role to play in delivering development awareness at the local level and engagement with them provides an entry point for DFID to engage with the wider BME and community agendas. To enable them to continue to access funds and contribute to building support for development it is recommended that the Mini Grants Scheme should be developed as a larger competitive fund.

- To facilitate this, a more detailed review of the Mini Grants Scheme should be undertaken which looks at options for expansion and for improved management of the fund. Expansion and development of the MGS may include:
 - Increasing the level of funding for individual projects to a maximum of £25,000 per annum for a maximum of 3 years.
 - A focus on specific locally based target groups outside the formal sector, e.g. voluntary and community groups, BME groups and Diaspora and Faith Based Organisations
 - Increased capacity building support to organisations applying for and receiving grants for preparation and implementation of projects
- Options for improving the management of the MGS should include:
 - The appointment of organisations who have the capacity to manage the fund effectively and who can add value through offering capacity building support to applicants and grantees. Consideration may be given to organisations presently managing the fund after careful evaluation of their performance to date
- Close attention should be paid to monitoring and evaluation of the programme as well as to assessing impact and lesson learning.

14 To enable effective management of the changes:

- TLC should continue to manage the DAF through the phasing out process in order to maintain continuity for existing grant holders
- The transition should be managed by DFID, if possible drawing on expertise in social inclusion, to ensure effective understanding and engagement with the groups targeted under the expanded Mini Grants Scheme.
- DFID should take a strategic approach to fund management. A clear strategy for the management of the expanded Mini Grants Scheme should be agreed with clear delineation of tasks between DFID and the organisations managing the fund on their behalf. As much responsibility as possible should be given to the organisations with DFID's role restricted to key decisions and monitoring at an output to purpose level.
- Education expertise should be made available to support the work in the formal sector with a brief to improve communications, collaboration and learning across the sector.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This is the report of a Review of the Development Awareness Fund (DAF) and Mini Grants Scheme (MGS) which form part of DFID's Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS). This review is one of four reviews of the strategy being undertaken.

1.2 The White paper on International Development published in 1997 set the direction for DFID strategy. This was followed by the publication in 1999 of the Building Support for Development Strategy (BSDS) which articulated the Government's commitment to building greater awareness and understanding of international development in the UK. The Development Awareness Fund (DAF), a competitive funding mechanism under which not for profit organisations could apply for funding to implement projects focused on raising awareness of international development, which was set up in 1998, was identified as a key tool for supporting the delivery of the BSDS. An associated fund, the Mini Grants Scheme (MGS) which provided opportunities for smaller organisations to access funds for development awareness was also incorporated into BSDS. The funding levels were set at a maximum of £100,000 per year for up to 3 years for the DAF and £10,000 for up to 3 years for the MGS.

1.3 This review looks back over the twelve years since the competitive funding schemes came into being in 1996, and particularly on the years since the BSDS was published in 1999. The approach is based on the evaluation criteria developed by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), those of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. This report takes each in turn. It considers the relevance of the DAF and MGS to the wider BSD strategy; the effectiveness of the fund, with respect to target groups, the individual projects and the fund as a whole; efficiency in terms of management and value for money of the fund; and the impact of the fund at objective level and on organisations it engages with. Finally sustainability related to individual projects and the fund as a whole is considered.

1.4 The scope of work for the review is outlined in the Terms of Reference which are included as Annex 1. The team reviewed relevant documents provided by DFID, the fund managing agents and other stakeholders, including documents related to policy, to management of the fund and calls for proposals and specific project related documents. Interviews and discussions were undertaken with staff of DFID in London and East Kilbride, with the managing agents and projects appraisers in England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales and with other stakeholders. 19 DAF major grant recipients and 14 MGS recipients were interviewed and project documentation reviewed. (A list of interviewees is included at Annex 2 and of projects visited at Annex 3.) The sample of projects was purposively selected to give a wide coverage of types of groups managing the projects, project target areas and location. Two questionnaires were developed; the first, to elicit information regarding all strands of the BSD strategy, including the DAF and the MGS and the second covering the Development Education Centres (DECs). Finally three regional consultations were held in England through the Development Education Association (DEA) to give an opportunity for stakeholders to feed in to the review. Triangulation of data from all sources was undertaken to help ensure reliability and validity of findings.

1.5 The report is divided into 7 chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the study and Chapter 2 goes on to outline the history of the fund and explore its relevance to the wider BSD strategy. Chapter 3 focuses on the effectiveness of the fund whilst and Chapter 4 considers its efficiency. Chapter 5 looks at the issues of impact and sustainability. The final two chapters reflect on the findings with Chapter 6 drawing out the lessons learned and Chapter 7 presenting conclusions and recommendations of the review.

2. RELEVANCE

2.1 In this chapter the relevance of the DAF and the MGS to the wider BSD strategy is considered. The chapter starts by presenting the DAF and its objectives before outlining its history and development. It moves on to give a strategic analysis which looks at how gender and BME have been addressed in relation to the DAF and the extent to which these groups have engaged over the years. It concludes by reviewing a wider set of funding mechanisms which relate to the BSD strategy and considering how they link with the DAF and MGS.

2.2 **The Development Awareness Fund** As stated in the introduction the DAF was identified as an appropriate funding mechanism to support the delivery of the BSD strategy through awarding grants to not for profit organizations to undertake projects focused on development awareness. The priority areas identified in the strategy, formal education, the media, business and trade unions, and churches and faiths, became the priority target groups for the DAF. The DAF and MGS also aimed to capitalise on opportunities to work with other groups, particularly youth, adults and higher education

2.3 The DAF shared the same overall objectives as the strategy and hence focused on supporting activities that promoted the following:

1. Knowledge and understanding of the major challenges and prospects for development, in particular the poverty reduction agenda; but also of the developing countries themselves.
2. Understanding of our global interdependence and in particular that failure to reduce global poverty levels will have serious consequences for all of us.
3. Understanding of and support for international efforts to reduce poverty and promote development including the international development targets. Recognition of progress made, and that further progress is both affordable and achievable.
4. Understanding of the role that individuals can play; enabling them to make informed choices.

2.4 However, whilst it shared the overall objectives and target groups as the strategy, it did not adopt the more specific objectives of the strategy related to each of the target groups. This was understandable given the anticipated wide reach of the fund. The specific objectives of the strategy were:

Formal Education:

1. To ensure that global issues are adequately incorporated in curriculum provision and guidance across the UK.
2. To ensure provision of good quality materials and resources to facilitate teaching in schools.
3. To reinforce school-based work through the teacher training, inspection and awarding bodies.
4. To encourage whole school or community-based activities with a development focus.

Media:

1. To concentrate our own work with the media around key issues and themes.

2. To research and strengthen television coverage of development issues.

Business and Trade Union;

1. To raise awareness with the business community and among trade unions.
2. To seek ways to work with business and trade unions to raise public awareness of global and development issues.

Churches and Faiths:

1. To build and support a worldwide alliance with the Christian church and other faiths to eliminate poverty.

2.5 History of the DAF The DAF has its origins in a Mini Grant programme that was set up to provide funding for Development Education Centres (DECs)¹ throughout the UK in 1996. The programme which ran from 1996 to 1997 was operated by the Development Education Association (DEA) on behalf of the then Overseas Development Association (ODA), now DFID. The scheme, which provided small funds, was used primarily for the DECs to deliver development education through the formal education system.

2.6 The creation of DFID in 1997 and the development of the BSD strategy led to significant changes to the programme in 1998. Information available suggests that these changes included a programme specifically aimed at Black and Ethnic Minority (BME) Groups being launched in England and the Mini Grants programme being opened up to a wider range of organisations beyond the DECs. In addition the management of the programme was devolved through appropriate networks in England, Northern (N) Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Also in 1998 the BME programme was incorporated with the wider reaching Mini Grants programme, though the reason why was not evident; the whole became known as the Mini Grants Scheme (MGS). Funding levels were set and organisations were able to apply for funding for projects costing between £1,000 and £10,000 per year for up to three years.

2.7 1998 also saw the introduction of the DAF, a much larger mechanism intended to fund development awareness projects up to £100,000 per year for up to three years. The MGS became closely aligned with the DAF since it shared the same objectives and targeted the same groups. The publication of the BSD strategy highlighted that the DAF would continue to be used as a tool to support activities focused on building support for development.

2.4 Target Groups: Formal education figured strongly from when the DAF started, reflecting the origins of the fund when the mini grants programme focused on supporting the DECs who worked extensively in formal education. It also reflected the emphasis in the BSD strategy which highlighted that 'our top priority will be work through the formal education system'.

2.8 The BSD strategy recognised the need to spread the net more widely if the strategy's objectives were to be achieved. This included working with priority groups, media, faith and the Trade Unions as well as seeking other opportunities, including

¹ DECs were originally established in the 1970s as local centres delivering development education and development awareness. Over the years the number of DECs grew to 45 though the number has changed recently. They are key players in delivering the BSDS. Further details can be found in Annex 2 which gives details from the survey of DECs carried out as part of this review.

through youth work. The strategy also stated that ‘we must ensure that our work is inclusive and that ethnic minority groups are fully involved’ (DFID, 1999). Hence the target was to ensure that efforts were made to cover all groups and not just focus on formal education. The DAF (together with the associated MGS) as instruments aimed to make sure that these priorities were reflected in the selection process.

2.9 Management of the DAF and MGS The main difference between the DAF and the MGS related to the way in which the two programmes were managed. The DAF (up until 2006) was managed directly by the BSD team in DFID’s Information and Civil Society Department (ICSD) in East Kilbride whilst the MGS’s relationship to the DFID BSD team was mediated through key development awareness raising organisations in the four countries. In England, management responsibility remained with the DEA, whilst responsibility in the other four countries was taken up by the One World Centre² in N Ireland, the International Development Education Association (IDEAS) in Scotland and Cyfanfyd in Wales. The rationale for devolution of MGS management was to encourage more organisations to apply for grants in each country, to provide support to potential applicants and to ensure that national level priorities with regard to education were reflected in each country.

2.10 In 2006 the management of the DAF was contracted out to a private company called Triple Line Consulting (TLC) who also manage the Civil Society Challenge Fund (CSCF) and are part of the consortium managing the Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF). The rationale, which is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4, related to down-sizing in DFID and the need to find a more efficient mechanism for managing the fund. The move to TLC saw a number of changes including the introduction of regional seminars (3 per year in different venues throughout the UK) to encourage more applicants from a wide variety of groups and explain the DAF applications process; a more streamlined assessment process with a team of dedicated assessors with expertise in Education, BME and Diaspora, Faith, Media and Business and Trade Unions; the development of a more results based focus to the applications process and proposal requirements and the instigation of a more effective system for collating performance reports from DAF projects to give an indication of project progress overall for the DAF. A further step being taken to capture progress is the production of a synthesis report of project completion reports to be completed by TLC later this year.

2.11 Fund Value The value of the DAF was set at about £1.5m when the fund was established in 1998. Since then it has grown steadily, and the last 3 years have seen the total fund value rise from £3.1m in 2006/07 to £4.3m in 2008/09. The MGS fund value has risen from £400,000 to £500,000 in the same 3 year period. Records available indicate that 182 DAF projects were funded over the 7 years between 2002/03 and 2008/09 at a total cost of approximately £21.6m.³ Despite inflation there has been no change in the level of funding that organisations can apply for over the 10 years that the fund has been operating: the maximum values for MGS and DAF projects remain at £10,000 per annum and £100,000 per annum respectively for up to 3 years.

2.12 Strategic Analysis There were two broad purposes to the BSDS. The first was political: DFID leadership needed to increase legitimacy and gain wider public

² Renamed the Centre for Global Education in 2002

³ Estimated value based on backwards projection from known figures presented by DFID

support if the new administration was to meet White Paper commitments and eventually achieve a budget allocation of 0.7% GDP, a target agreed with the UN.

2.13 The second was moral: children and schools were considered an important target audience. The strategy followed the Crick Report (1998), an influential study that recommended the teaching of citizenship and democracy in schools. In this sense, the purpose was to 'build a better society' (DFID, 1997) by shaping the values of the young. Hence from the inception of BSDS the DAF focused strongly on support for formal education as a means to promote this outcome for children in school.

2.14 The strategy did not articulate a particular definition of development. This ambiguity has left the terms 'building support for development' and 'development awareness' open to interpretation. For instance, some DAF recipients tended to understand 'building support for development' as a process of embedding the global dimensions curriculum in schools. Projects in this case focused on strategies which would enable children to learn a set of values and to become 'good global citizens'. Whereas other DAF recipients focused more on 'building support for development' as promoting development awareness; a process of increasing understanding of development issues characterised by projects that focus on one topical issue such as climate change or the MDGs.

DAF and Changes in Development Policy

2.13 **Gender** The DAF guidelines do not consider the importance of gender equality for development and there has been no specific focus on encouraging groups working on promoting gender equality to apply. Applicants are, however, required to show evidence of Gender Equality policies as part of their organisational governance screening process and some attempt has been made by TLC to monitor whether gender is reflected as a theme in project applications and awards.

2.14 The publication of DFID's Gender Action Plan in 2007 did not stimulate change in the gender focus of the DAF. The Gender Action Plan seemed to be more relevant for country programmes rather than to domestic programmes, not least because UK work was already governed by a robust European legal framework.

2.15 **Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Groups** The DAF guidelines did not articulate a particular target group focus on BME groups as it did say for churches and faiths. The funds specifically targeted at BME groups set up in 1998 was short-lived and in the early years of the strategy, DAF applicant and recipient profiles featured few BME groups; of those that did submit proposals, many were unsuccessful.

2.16 However, reaching and engaging with BME groups has remained a priority since the DAF started and a number of studies and initiatives have been undertaken to encourage greater engagement. A report produced for DFID attributed low levels of engagement to issues such as lack of specialist language and cultural sensitivity in the grant guidelines (Thakrar & Chikezie, 2005). Others cited lack of interest in development, weak organisational capacity and an inability to absorb and manage funds as impediments.

2.17 The lack of BME take up also contributed to DFID establishing an umbrella organisation for the sector, Connections for Development (CfD). CfD was created to facilitate the involvement of smaller BME groups in building support for development. A further strategy to encourage BME groups to apply for DAFs was through the

regional seminars run over the last 3 years by the managing agents, for both the DAF and MGS.

2.18 Prevent and Cross-Whitehall Agenda The nomination of a Civil Society Department (CSD) lead to take forward the Cross Whitehall Prevent agenda was a positive move for the BSD strategy. The DAF and MGS provided an entry point for Ministers and senior civil servants to engage with Diaspora organisations; particularly those with a youth, Asian and Muslim focus through Ministerial visits to DAF and Mini Grant projects. More recently Diaspora Volunteering Initiative members have been accessing DAF grants.

2.19 Whilst the DAF has been used increasingly to engage with the Prevent agenda there was little engagement with the Community Cohesion agenda. In terms of policy influence, this could be a reflection of the perceived absence of an international dimension to the agenda and also the lack of traction DAF grants had with third sector groups focused on areas of social deprivation and community tension.

2.20 DAFs & Changing funding instruments Since the inception of the DAFs at least six other funding instruments have been developed that have either partially or fully contributed to BSD strategic objectives. The mechanisms which link to the DAF are detailed alongside the DAF and MGS in Table 1 below

Table 1: Funding mechanisms related to BSD

Grant Mechanism	Start Date	Managing Agent	Core recipient groups in UK
Development Awareness Fund (DAF)	1998	Triple Line	Children/Teachers
Mini Grant Scheme (MGS)	1998	DEC/NGO	Children/Teachers
Enabling Effective Support (EES)	2001	DFID	Teachers/DEC
Programme Partnership Agreement (PPA)	2001	DFID	Children/Adults
Strategic Grant Agreement (SGA)	2003	DFID	Adults
Strategic Agreement (SA)	2006	DFID	Policy makers
Diaspora Volunteering Initiative (DVI)	2007	VSO	Diaspora Youth

2.21 The mechanism that relates most closely to the DAF is **Enabling Effective Support (EES)**, a regional mechanism to encourage engagement over development education with the formal sector. Many DAF holders, particularly the DECs are engaged in EES activities and DAF projects in the formal sector are required to link into or complement the EES. **Strategic Agreements (SAs)** held with DEA in England and Cyfanfyd in Wales, which support their role in engaging in policy dialogue around integration of the global dimension into formal education, provide further link to EES and the DAF in the formal sector, in that they aim to strengthen the policy environment to enable more focused working at the local level around the global dimension in schools and other educational institutions.

2.22 There are synergies too between organisations in receipt of DAF grants. A number of organisations who hold **Programme Partnership Agreements (PPA)** with DFID (e.g. Oxfam, Christian Aid) were early DAF recipients and have traditionally provided funding to the DECs to support their work in development awareness. Whilst as PPA holders they have not been able to access DAF funding since 2005, many still have significant programmes focused on development awareness and maintain links with DAF holders.

2.23 DAF and MG instruments are primarily focused on funding initiatives targeted at UK audiences. Other grant mechanisms such as **Strategic Grant Agreements (SGAs)** and PPAs also enable funds to be used to promote awareness internationally. In all cases, the recipient organisation will be far larger and able to absorb a significantly higher value agreement. More often than not these agreements also contain a significant organisational capacity development component, particularly in areas such as strategic planning and project development.

2.24 DAF and MGS funds are accessible to the same organisational groups. For instance CGE in Northern Ireland have submitted separate proposals to each instrument during the same year. Larger International NGOs, such as Mercy Corps, have also accessed both funds, albeit during different years. Larger SGA partner such as TUC or Groundwork have also been able to successfully access DAFs for smaller pieces of work, as were members of the Connections for Development (CfD) organisation such as Afford. In recent years many former CfD members who have since become **Diaspora Volunteering (DVI)** partners, such as the Asian Foundation for Philanthropy (AFP), have also been awarded DAF grants. In this respect both the DAF and the MG schemes can be seen to work in concert with other instruments and reinforce the BSD strategy as a whole.

3. EFFECTIVENESS

3.1 This Chapter considers the effectiveness of the DAF and the MGS. It starts by considering how effective it is in terms of reaching the priority groups outlined in the BSD strategy and on achieving regional coverage. It moves on to consider how effectively the applications and appraisals processes contribute to the range of groups applying for and successfully gaining funding. It moves on to consider how effectively projects within the DAF have performed and finally considers the effectiveness of relationships between key stakeholders related to the DAF and MGS.

3.2 **Target Groups:** As discussed in Paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 the DAF and MGS were aimed at the key target groups identified in the BSDS. Formal education was the highest priority but emphasis was also placed on the other key target groups identified, Business and Trade Unions, Faith Groups and the Media, and on reaching BME and other community groups.

3.3 Tables 2 and 3 below demonstrate how the applications and awards have changed over the years from 2002/03 to 2009/10⁴ with respect to target group. Whilst the emphasis on formal education remained (widened to include Higher Education in the table), and accounting for between 56% and 68% of applications and 46 % and 71% of awards from 2004/05 to 2009/10, the representation of other target groups as envisaged in the strategy was limited. In the case of Media this was maybe expected since DFID had ear-marked another pool of funding directly for Media projects. However, in the case of projects targeting Business and the Trade Unions and Faith Groups, whilst there was a growth in applications, very few were successful.

Table 2: DAF analysis applications 2004/05-2009/10 by Target Group

Year	Total	Formal Education	Youth	Business and TUs	Faith Groups	Media	BME/ Diaspora	Other
2004/05	67	38 (57%)	3 (4%)	9 (13%)	3(4%)	3 (4%)	2 (3%)	9 (13%)
2005/06	90	61 (68%)	7 (8%)	6 (7%)	2 (2%)	5 (6%)	9 (10%)	9 (10%)
2006/07	96	54 (56%)	8 (8%)	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	11 (11%)	16 (17%)
2007/08	119	70 (59%)	15 (13%)	9 (8%)	3 (3%)	4 (3%)	6 (5%)	12 (10%)
2008/09	109	61 (56%)	14 (13%)	6 (6%)	2 (2%)	5 (5%)	15 (14%)	6 (6%)
2009/10	134	75 (56%)	19 (14%)	10 (7%)	3 (2%)	5 (4%)	8 (6%)	14 (10%)

Source: collated from project outlines from DFID and Triple Line⁵

Table 3: DAF analysis awards 2002/03-2009/10 by Target Group

Year	Total	Formal Education	Youth	Business and TUs	Faith Groups	Media	BME/ Diaspora	Other
2002/03	31	22 (71%)	4 (13%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
2003/04	22	11 (50%)	6 (27%)	3 (14%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
2004/05	22	14 (64%)	0 (0%)	3 (14%)	2 (9%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
2005/06	21	15 (71%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
2006/07	32	22 (69%)	7 (22%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)
2007/08	28	15 (54%)	4 (14%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)
2008/09	26	12 (46%)	5 (19%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)	5 (19%)
2009/10	40	26 (65%)	7 (18%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	1 (3%)

⁴ Data for 2002/03 and 2003/04 applications was not available

⁵ The headings identified are the most appropriate for the projects - some target more than one sector

3.4 The situation with applications targeting BME and Diaspora groups shows slightly different patterns. There were a steady number of applications in the first few years but few awards were made. However, the last 3 years has seen more projects targeting these particular groups being successful. A number of reasons for this have been identified, including the greater attention to applications focused at BME groups by project appraisers, the marketing strategies to encourage BME groups to apply, including the seminars run by Triple Line and the awareness raised through other BSD funding mechanisms aimed at BME groups including CfD, Platform 2 and DVI. It would seem that this effort is now paying off and that BME and Diaspora groups are becoming more engaged with the development awareness agenda through the DAF.

3.5 The **mini grants** are also aimed at the same target groups in line with the BSD strategy. Data available on applications is limited (see Annex 3) but the data available for Scotland and N Ireland reveals similar patterns to the DAF major grant data. Most applications focus on education and youth in all years though the last two years reveal a widening out of target groups in both countries.

3.6 Data related to awards is more reliable. Education dominates in all four countries and youth is significant in England and Wales. In the latter this relates to the fact that the youth service is integrated into the wider Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDGC) strategy and hence there is a demand for projects targeting youth as an under-served areas within the strategy. Business and Trade Unions, Faith groups and Media hardly figure at all whilst representation of projects targeting BME groups is strong only in England.

3.7 **Effectiveness of targeting in the DAF and MGS** Education providers have been effectively targeted by both the DAF and the MGS. However, the other priority groups highlighted in the BSD strategy are poorly represented and there have been no projects targeted at faith or media groups in either the DAF or the MGS in the last 2 years. To some extent this is not surprising with media – media projects tend to be large and relatively more expensive and most are targeted at other groups e.g. the target group of the project submitted by the media group Mediae is school children. Hence looking at target group may slightly distort the picture with respect to media. A similar analysis could be applied to faith groups – however, the small number of groups even targeting faith communities does give cause for concern. Trade Unions and Business fare marginally better but the numbers are still low. However, here there is significant scope to engage but the interest does not appear to be there. The targeting of BME groups has become more effective recently, particularly by the DAF and by MGS in England. In the other countries the low number of projects overall makes assessment of the effectiveness of BME targeting difficult to comment on.

3.8 **Regional Distribution of DAFs** The holistic UK wide nature of the strategy and the importance of engaging effectively with the different government bodies working on Global Citizenship and Sustainable Development in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales are highlighted in the Formal Education section of the strategy. The distribution of DAF applications and awards across the four countries however, does not reflect this emphasis on UK wide working and it is only in the last two years that all three countries have been successful recipients of the DAF (see table 4). Whilst there are a significant number of awards working 'UK wide' most of

these DAF recipients are located in England and hence there is a bias in implementation against the other three countries.

Table 4: DAF Analysis 2002/03 to 2009/10 by Regional Location

Year	Total Applications	UK Wide	England	N. Ireland	Scotland	Wales	Total Awards	UK Wide	England	N. Ireland	Scotland	Wales
2002/03							31	9 29%	21 68%	0 0%	1 3%	3 10%
2003/04							22	7 31%	11 50%	1 5%	1 5%	2 9%
2004/05							22	11 50%	9 41%	0 0%	2 9%	0 0%
2005/06							21	5 23%	11 52%	3 15%	3 15%	0 0%
2006/07							32	8 25%	20 63%	1 3%	3 9%	0 0%
2007/08	119	50 47%	56 47%	2 2%	6 5%	5 4%	28	10 35%	15 54%	0 0%	2 7%	1 4%
2008/09	109	35 42%	46 42%	6 6%	14 13%	8 8%	26	5 14%	14 54%	3 12%	2 8%	3 12%
2009/10	134	51 46%	61 46%	5 5%	10 7%	7 7%	40	15 37%	20 50%	1 3%	2 5%	2 5%

Source: collated from DAF information from DFID and Triple Line⁶

3.9 Regional spread reveals a bias towards England and UK wide projects, many of which are based in England. The applications suggest that reach is not particularly good outside of England. With respect to number of applications the success rate is reasonable in N Ireland and Wales, though the ratio of applications to projects in Scotland is low. Overall it would appear that more successful targeting is needed outside of England to ensure effective cover of the DAF across all four countries.

3.10 **Who applies for Funding – the reach of the DAF** The DAF attracts a wide variety of not for profit organisations who are interested in running projects focused on raising development awareness in UK. The DAF Guidelines and Procedures which are intended to help organisations or networks prepare grant applications for projects under the DAF are posted on the DFID website. Organisations applying for mini grants are directed to the managing agents, who manage the Mini Grants Scheme on behalf of DFID in England, N Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Organisations are attracted through a variety of strategies which include: information sent to the membership of the Development Education Association in England and similar bodies in N Ireland, Scotland and Wales; other NGO networking organisations and regional seminars run by the Managing Agents for both DAFs and mini grants. Knowledge of the fund has increased over the years and applications have steadily increased from 67 in 2004/05 to 134 in 2009/10 for DAF funding (see Table 2).

3.11 The call for proposals for the DAF grants attracts a wide range of organisations from small NGOs, Black and Ethnic Minority (BME) groups and Faith Organisations to international NGOs and Development Education Centres (DECs).

⁶ No information available before 2007/08 indicating split by country for applicants

Given the focus of the fund on raising development awareness, the DECs and development NGOs have consistently sent in the largest proportion of applications for the major grants. The number of applications from smaller organisations such as BME groups, faith groups and Diaspora has increased over the last 3 years for both the DAF and Mini Grants Schemes; it is likely that the emphasis placed on advertising the seminars run by TLC widely through the DEA network has had an influence here. Balance of applications and the extent to which applicants are successful is discussed in greater details below.

3.12 The guidelines and procedures for the major DAF grants and the mini grants have seen few fundamental changes since the fund was established over 10 years ago. Some steps have been taken to streamline the applications process and this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

3.13 **The project appraisal process** The appraisal process for the DAF was, until the 2007/08 round, undertaken by the BSD team in East Kilbride. Subsequently the role passed to the managing agent, Triple Line Consultancy (TLC). Discussions with both DFID and appraisers appointed by TLC indicated that the better proposals come from organisations who had worked extensively in development education, such as the DECs, or from larger organisations, experienced at proposal writing and with the necessary resources to devote to the applications process. The list of successful applications by organisation given in Table 5 below supports this finding.

Table 5: DAF Awards 2002/03 to 2009/10 by applicant organisation type

Year	Total	DEC	International NGO	NGO	Community Groups	Faith Groups	Adult Ed Inst.	Youth Organisation	BME group	Trade Union	Media Group	Professional Assns	Other
2002/03	31	15	4	3	1		2	1		2	3	1	2
2003/04	22	9	4	5			3	1	1	1			2
2004/05	22	8	8	3			1		1	1			
2005/06	21	8	2	4	1	1	4			1		1	
2006/07	32	13	5	6			5		2	1		1	1
2007/08	28	12	5	4			5		1	2			
2008/09	26	9	3	6		2	3		1	1			4
2009/10	40	14	4	7	3		5		3	2	1	1	2

Source: collated from DAF information from DFID and Triple Line

3.14 Small organisations, particularly those who were community based, from the BME or faith communities, in general did not seem to have the necessary skills and experience to put the proposals together. The proposals they produced revealed a number of weaknesses: sustainability was not effectively addressed, the development awareness dimension was weak and projects had not carried out sufficient consultation with the target group⁷. Whilst the seminars gave helpful guidance and encouraged people to submit applications, it was felt that capacity building was needed to help these smaller organisations build up the necessary understanding and skills to develop projects which could compete with those from larger and more experienced players. There was some evidence to suggest that support had been given to some smaller organisations through key partners; this

⁷ Notes from the TLC appraisers

included DEC's supporting one another in putting proposals together and the TUC using its strategic agreement, in part, to encourage smaller union/business organisations to prepare proposals and submit them for funding.

3.15 For the mini grants programme, an appraisal process takes place in all four countries. Successful organisations again include the DEC's and there is greater representation of smaller voluntary/community based organisations being awarded grants. There was anecdotal evidence of support being given outside the seminars to some BME organisations preparing proposals and of networking between smaller organisations who helped each other in proposal preparation. Some MGS managing agents reported that they now devote a far greater amount of time to offering this kind of support as applicants prefer one to one coaching.

3.16 **DAF Awards** The most successful applicants to the DAF have consistently been the DEC's and awards to DEC's account for about 35-40% of total grants per year in numerical terms (see Table 5). The traditional development education International NGOs, who initially were awarded DAFs but now have PPAs, have given way to other International NGOs including those focusing on Youth, like Y-Care International and Mercy Corps, and on campaigning, such as Anti Slavery International. Other organisations include those who focus on Fair Trade, such as the Fairtrade Foundation and Young Cooperatives. Whilst there has been an increase in the targeting of BME groups this was not matched by a significant increase in the number of BME groups being awarded DAFs until this year. Faith and Media groups until 2009/10 were notable by their absence and no increase was seen in the number of DAFs awarded directly to Trade Unions.

3.17 Less reliable data was available for the mini grants in England but the information available suggests that a substantial proportion (about 25%) each year tend to be DEC's. There would appear to be more BME groups applying for mini grants than for DAFs (17% in 2007) and strong representation of voluntary organisations. For Wales, applications from voluntary sector groups dominate. There are also applications from DEC's, local authorities and schools, BME organisations and Trade Unions. Faith groups have submitted only 4 applications in the 11 years since the mini grants started. In N Ireland DEC's and Development NGOs are the main applicants though the number of voluntary/community groups applying is also significant. It is interesting to note the absence of faith groups applying in an environment very strongly characterised by faith schools. The limited data on applications available for Scotland indicates similar patterns to N Ireland with an emphasis on DEC's and voluntary/community groups applying.

3.18 **Objective Level Effectiveness** Measurement of the overall effectiveness of the DAF against the objectives of the fund is problematic. Firstly there has been no aggregate assessment of the effectiveness of the projects supported under the DAF from which a broader assessment of effectiveness of the fund as a whole can be made. Secondly the objectives of the DAF themselves pose a problem when it comes to overall assessment of the fund. As explained in Chapter 2 the DAF objectives are the same as those in the wider BSD strategy. These are stated in more detail in the guidelines of the call for proposals which say that DAF projects should support the achievement of one or more of the following:

- **Challenges and prospects for development and poverty reduction:** Building long term knowledge and understanding of the major challenges and prospects for development, in particular the poverty reduction agenda.
- **Interdependence and the global consequences of poverty:** Generating understanding of our global interdependence and in particular that failure to reduce global poverty levels will have serious consequences for us all.
- **International efforts to reduce poverty and promote development:** Generating understanding of and support for international efforts to reduce poverty and promote development including the Millennium Development Goals. Promoting recognition of the progress so far made, and that further progress is affordable, achievable, and most of all vital.
- **The role of individuals in working towards poverty reduction:** Promoting understanding of the role that individuals can play; enabling them to make informed choices with the knowledge of how their actions impact on the world around them

3.19 The objectives should be central to each project, as articulated in the guidance to appraisers, which states that the ‘contribution to the achievement of the DAF objectives should be central to the project, not peripheral’. Whilst a review of project appraisals⁸ reveals that successful proposals demonstrate ‘strong’ or ‘adequate’ fit with the DAF Objectives most proposals relate to two or more of the DAF objectives with a minority relating to all four. However, discussions with DAF recipients demonstrated that the objectives played a limited role when it came to implementation of the project. Whilst many projects continued to be in line with the objectives few recipients interviewed could remember which objectives the projects was supposed to be in line with and a number had no recollection of overall objectives for the programme at all. It was only the professional staff in the DECs who demonstrated a clear understanding of the four objectives and could talk confidently about them - however, even they could not always articulate the fit between the project and the objectives. The fact that there are four programme objectives appears confusing for those implementing the projects and further complicates the process of assessing the effectiveness of the DAF as a whole

3.20 The objectives are set at a strategic level rather than at a more practical level which individual projects could relate to. The specific objectives related to the individual priority groups identified in the BSD strategy, for education, the media, Unions and faith groups are at a more appropriate level but the separation by priority groups indicates that these would not have worked for the fund as a whole.

3.21 Overall the objectives do not lend themselves to effective monitoring of the DAF as a whole, due to the strategic level at which they are set and to the fact that projects are relating to multiple objectives which detracts from the focus on a single objective for the fund as a whole.

3.22 **Project Level Effectiveness** TLC review all annual reports submitted by the DAF projects and compile them into a book entitled ‘Performance Assessments’. For each project a summary is prepared based on assessment against the annual report submitted. The assessment form is divided into 7 sections: Project Summary,

⁸ DFID DAF 2009 Proposal Appraisals prepared by Triple Line Consulting

Summary of Progress, Lesson Learning, Issues of Relevance to DFID, Feedback to Organisation, Significant Issues Related to Budget/Fund Mechanism and Potential Case Study. The summary of progress is mainly based on whether activities have been delivered as planned and there is no specific section focusing on achievement of outcomes or contribution to the DAF objectives. However, the actual annual reports require DAF recipients to comment on organisation linkages, achievement of objectives and impact on the target group.

3.23 In line with TLC's role as managing agent it is more of a management tool than a tool for assessing effectiveness of the project. However, reading through a complete set of performance assessments does give an indication of effectiveness of individual projects and an overview of key issues arising which hint at overall performance of the DAF. There is no such compilation for the mini grants though DEA does compile a set of brief summaries each year based on annual reports of mini grants projects. Hence this section concentrates mainly on the DAF, drawing in information from the Mini Grants Projects as appropriate.

3.24 From the projects reviewed both through discussion with recipients and through reports, it would appear that the majority of projects are on track in terms of delivering the activities identified at the outset. For a number there are delays in project progress and for others activities do not proceed as planned. In addition there were a number of key criteria that the review team identified that appeared to contribute to projects being particularly effective and enabled them to contribute to the wider objectives of the fund. The team found that the most effective projects were:

- Institutionally linked (faith/Unions/statutory education etc.)
- Engaged with a reasonably wide audience (both immediate target and wider networks)
- Were part of and reinforced an organisation's core principles/work (particularly with regard to development awareness)
- Demonstrated learning with the potential for roll out
- Had outputs that were sustainable (e.g. activities that would continue and be developed, materials that could be rolled out)

3.25 ***Intuitional linkages*** A number of projects were institutionally linked to networks which ensured that project outcomes were able to be delivered. This was especially evident in the case of organisations where there was a clearly defined community linkage. For example the Jewish Global Citizen Project run by the organisation Tzedek, was closely linked to the network of synagogues and Jewish Schools. This enabled the necessary support for the project to access the target group and ensured that the project was grounded in the needs of the faith community it sought to serve. To a certain extent Education Matters, the mini grant project run by the organisation Muslim Aid, was effectively linked to the Muslim community and to one of the networks of Muslim schools in the area in which it was working.

3.26 Institutional linkages in the formal sector were more complex and tended to play out in terms relationships and links which gave the most leverage. Projects run by the DEC's drew significantly on their relationships and networks at local level. For example Cheshire DEC used its membership network of 300 schools, local

authorities and individual members to show case the project and generate enthusiasm; hence they were able to extend the project to more schools than anticipated across Warrington.

3.27 The key institutional linkage for projects working in the formal sector was expected to be their relationship to the Enabling Effective Support (EES) network which would support them in gaining access to key stakeholders, particularly in the local authority; in turn the projects would support EES in extending its reach regionally. With DEC's being key players in the EES networks and with them running a significant number of DAF and mini grant projects, there was an expectation that there would be synergies between the DAFs and EES.

3.28 A number of DAF projects were not well integrated with the EES network and were being implemented with reference to local target groups, with little lesson learning extended to the wider EES network. In one of the DEC offices the project coordinator for the DAF project worked in the same office as the EES coordinator but there was no collaboration over the DAF project. An EES coordinator interviewed explained that she met with applicants at the outset and was required to send a supporting letter on their behalf. However, once the award was made, she had little contact with most DAF projects. She had a closer relationship with some of the MGS recipients, and there was some evidence of joint working here.

3.29 The picture was more positive in Scotland and N Ireland. In Scotland, a DAF grant was used to support an initial teacher education programme that enabled the EES network to ensure extensive local authority buy-in to global citizenship in the curriculum. A similar outcome was achieved in N Ireland where the Centre for Global Education used a DAF grant to effectively engage with a network of eight local education authorities across Ireland. This initiative involved education authorities and teachers in the development of a cross Ireland resource to enable secondary teachers to use active learning materials on interdependence and social justice at Key Stage 3.

3.30 A number of DEC's were effectively engaged in joint working over DAF projects. For example the Development Education Project (DEP) in Manchester was working with Liverpool Hope One World to deliver a DAF project focused on Initial Teacher Education, drawing on lessons learnt from a similar DAF project that DEP had just completed. Three DEC's in the south of England had collaborated over a DAF project and one of them indicated that 'this has helped to strengthen our relations and practice'; another expressed that 'Sharing ideas on this project has been an unexpected but much appreciated bonus'. In regions where there were few DAF projects this sort of joint working was not possible whilst in others the DAFs tended to remain separate from other collaboration across DEC's. There was less evidence of collaboration between DAF recipients other than DEC's running formal education projects.

3.31 The weakness of institutional linkages became evident in the case of establishing the necessary relationships with the target group. A number of projects underestimated the importance of building the necessary relationships with project partners before starting the project. There were instances where schools that had been identified dropped out or where higher education institutions had other more pressing priorities which meant that they were not able to engage effectively with the project. There was a sense that some DAF recipients did not know their constituency well and had selected on the basis of developing a 'good project' rather than

focusing on tried and tested partnerships. This was even a problem for some DEC; whilst they had been based in the area for a considerable period of time they did not seem to really be engaged with their local membership base and have knowledge of the network of local schools.

3.32 Engagement with reasonably wide audiences Many of the DAF projects were quite small scale with their emphasis on high quality outputs rather than reach. There were, however, some that did manage to reach quite a wide range of stakeholders and still maintain their quality.

3.33 In Scotland a DAF funded initial teacher education project was successful in building staff capacities across seven teacher training faculties across the country. At the time there was no long term approach to engaging with development education through tertiary education as large NGOs had historically had an ad hoc approach. The DAF enabled a more strategic approach that ensured many thousands of students studying in the education faculties of Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, North West Scotland, Sterling and Strathclyde would have the capacity, skills and confidence to deliver the global citizenship curriculum.

3.34 Increasingly project stakeholders are using the internet to extend reach and some projects have had a large take up of materials posted on line, particularly those that have also gained legitimacy through other links. For instance, War Child used a DAF project to develop curriculum materials which were subsequently uploaded to the organisation's website. Pick up by the Times Educational Supplement ensured that the site received wide coverage across a core audience resulting in more than a thousand downloads over a three month period. Whilst download figures are often impressive, the quality of materials, whether teachers use materials and how they use them are unknown and hence there are questions over using this approach to indicate effectiveness.

3.35 Peer education has also proved a popular approach to ensure wider coverage. Two youth focused projects in Edinburgh have been successful in ensuring wider than planned reach through such a model. The Scottish Youth Parliament has used this model to reach children in youth clubs, scouts and other less formal setting and Mercy Corps has used a peer education approach to create a 'global citizen corps' that has already far extended its planned reach and engaged with more than 4000 children in Edinburgh.

3.36 Others attempted to reach widely but spread themselves too thinly. For example the project Mukatano Junction focused on networks of DECs for rolling out its project which used media in the form of a Kenyan soap opera as a tool for raising development awareness in schools. Whilst the idea of working with 5 DEC networks (a total of 25 DECs in all) had the potential for wide reach, the fact that each DEC was only required to work in one school limited the scope for consolidating the project more widely across the region.

3.37 Being part of reinforcing the organisation's core principals The strength of many DAF projects was their grounding in the core principals of the organisation. Work with schools in particular reflected the deep experience and quality of work of many of the organisations, particularly the DECs with regard to formal education. The work of Cheshire DEC is highlighted in the document, 'The global dimension in action: a curriculum planning guide for schools' published by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA). It highlights the project work done by the DEC saying:

Cheshire Development Education Centre...began by matching the school's aims to the five outcomes of Every Child Matters, focusing particularly on 'enjoying and achieving' and 'making a positive contribution'. They then integrated global learning into the schools development plan and set about embedding it in the curriculum

3.38 The report goes on to discuss the way in which children were taking the lead, including requesting an assembly to address 'what is poverty'. The fit with Cheshire DEC's principle of 'promoting an understanding of and respect for the lives and cultures of everyone' is evident in the approach. The success of the intervention is captured in the school's Ofsted 2007 report which notes that 'Students' spiritual, moral, social and cultural development is outstanding – the care and consideration they show to others as well as their appreciation of other's needs, demonstrate maturity beyond their years'.

3.39 In Scotland, the DAF funded a project delivered by Mercy Corps, an International INGO that operated global citizenship projects in Edinburgh which were strongly premised on the organisation's fundamental principles of building trust, respect, integrity and shared values among youth. These values are clearly articulated by project staff, partners, peer educators and others with a direct involvement. The values are also evident in the material used and in the learning outcomes.

3.40 The Asian Foundation for Philanthropy also found that its strong Asian value base, premised on cross-faith principles of Dhaan (giving) and Sewa (Volunteering), has also provided it with a firm set of principles that underpin its projects. The impact of this value system was evident in the DAF funded Sudarshan Project and the recently launched Naitika project. Of equal importance is the fact that these values are also a shared by project partners: the Indian small business community in the UK and India.

3.41 ***Demonstrate learning with the potential for roll out*** Many of the DAF projects result in learning that has the potential to be rolled out. One significant example comes from the Reading International Solidarity Centre and their DAF project 'Measuring Attitudinal Change in Schools'. The project was the culmination of extensive work carried out by the centre on measuring the change in children's attitudes brought about by Global Citizenship work within the classroom. The 'tool kit for measuring attitudinal change in global citizenship from early years to KS5', 'how do we know it's working', produced and tested through the DAF, which was completed in 2008 is still being used to test the effectiveness of global citizenship interventions in the classroom and more widely. For example, the DAF project Makatano Junction is using the tool-kit to capture children's attitudes at the start of activities in schools and will use it again at the end of the activities to assess the effectiveness of learning and the extent to which it has brought about change. The work carried out under the DAF was brought to the review team's attention in a number of interviews and has the potential to be used widely as a tool to measure impact. Applying such an approach to the measurement of projects supported under the DAF and mini grants scheme could provide an exciting opportunity to capture the change in attitudes, and capture the impact of projects supported under the fund.

3.42 An example of a project that has already been rolled out is the Mercy Corps global citizen corps model which has already been replicated in five countries. In

turn their global programming presence ensures that learning from countries such as Sudan and Lebanon feed into the Scottish project.

3.43 *Have outputs that are sustainable (e.g. activities continue and are developed, materials are rolled out)* The mini grant project, delivered by Dolen Cymru (Wales – Lesotho link organisation), in collaboration with Mencap, Cymru, has in one year developed a sustainable approach to integrating the global dimension into the activities of the 68 Gateway Clubs for people with learning difficulties throughout Wales. Simple materials have been produced, focusing on tangible issues such as fair trade, that can be used as starting points to generate discussion amongst the adults that attend the groups. This has provided an opportunity for those attending to think outside their own environment and resulted in Gateway Clubs carrying out fundraising activities. The simplicity of the approach is understood by group leaders and the link with Mencap ensures that the work will continue beyond the year's funding. Overall the project demonstrates that a small-scale project, carefully structured and targeted effectively, can be sustainable.

3.44 Projects focusing on fair trade were particularly successful with regard to sustainable outputs since the fair trade agenda was well understood and was supported beyond the DAF by local campaigns. A number of projects reviewed focused on this including that implemented by the International Centre for Reconciliation at Coventry Cathedral. Fair Trade was also a recurring theme in formal education projects and those run by community and voluntary organisations.

3.45 *Management and implementation of the DAFs* From review visits and documentation provided by TLC it appeared that the projects were generally well managed and had sufficient staff to deliver the outcomes, though staff changes seemed to be quite a regular occurrence. They were able to talk knowledgeably about the activities but were less clear when it came to identifying how the project would achieve its outcomes, what the impact had been or where the project fitted with the DAF objectives. There was a tendency to focus on activity level rather than at outcome level and much of the reporting related to whether their work plan and associated budget was in line with the original proposal. Most of the project staff and key players in the organisations were very enthusiastic about the projects; they worked hard and talked knowledgeably about what they were trying to achieve.

3.46 *Limitations of the project approach* Many of those interviewed were keen to get DAF funding but unhappy about the project approach. For DECAs in particular DAF grants are one of the biggest funding sources available and hence many of them submit proposals on a yearly basis. The DEC survey (see Annex 5) only pointed to over-reliance on DAF funding in one case. However, when combined with EES funding, it was evident that most DECAs were reliant to some extent on DFID funding which accounted for between 5% and 80% of funding for those submitting the financial breakdown in the last financial year. Ideally DECAs would like funding to develop their core work so that they can move away from the project approach but attaining this was almost impossible in the current climate.

3.47 Most projects seemed to work on a 'supply side' model. They designed the project then went out to find their target group. One person commented that 'we have to make sure that we select the schools who are interested or we will not be able to deliver our objectives'. Many felt strongly that they had a 'good product to sell' and were confused when those they were targeting were not interested in buying (even when it was free). The strongest evidence of 'demand' by stakeholders

was in Wales where Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship (ESDGC) is integrated across all schools and youth services. Here the 'demand' is for ESDGC input to ensure that they can deliver on the curriculum and that they are prepared for inspection. However, Wales has few DAFs and only a limited number of mini grants – though most of these are focusing on ESDGC.

3.48 A significant problem with regard to 'demand' side is the nature of the projects. The process of finding out what stakeholders are interested in and how to engage them on their terms is a lengthy process which does not sit comfortably with a project model. The DAF guidelines, in particular the statement that 'Funding will not normally be provided for follow-on phases of DAF projects as the DAF is intended to give priority to projects working with new partnerships rather than funding existing partners with projects entering a second phase' is also problematic when it comes to creating demand for services. Organisations seemed to be translating the guidelines as 'having to come up with a new idea' or 're-invent an old idea but with a new group' to secure further DAF funding. What has resulted is a plethora of 'pilot' projects which last for up to 3 years, then disappear to be replaced by the next 'pilot'. For some groups this has resulted in looking for different entry points which do not always fit with their core work. .

3.49 The importance of 'champions' was identified by many respondents as a significant factor with regard to the delivery of the project. They tended to be instrumental in allowing things to happen and their enthusiasm carried the project forward. However, with the demand to work with new groups, new champions were constantly needed and the importance of solid relationships built up over time was marginalised.

4. EFFICIENCY

4.1 This chapter looks at the efficiency of both the DAF and the MGS. It takes each in turn and considers the efficiency of the management including the appraisal process and day to day management of the funds. It also looks at whether contracting out gives value for money for both mechanisms. Finally it compares the DAF and MGS with other competitive funding mechanisms and highlights lessons for improving efficiency.

4.2 **Management of the DAF** As discussed in Chapter 2 the process of managing the DAF rested solely with DFID's ICSD in East Kilbride until 2006. Responsibilities were divided up between the formal and informal sectors and there was no one person responsible for the DAF as a whole.

4.3 **Transition from DFID to the Managing Agent** In 2005 DFID took a number of steps to improve the DAF process. This included advertising the DAF through the 'grant finding agencies', leading to an increase in the number of applications from 67 in 2004-05 to 90 in 2005-06⁹. The proposal appraisal process for the 2006-07 round was also improved through (a) the adoption of a grading system and (b) the establishment of a Funding Panel, chaired by the 'Head of Building Support for Development, comprised of ten staff ... from the BSD team. The panel met every two to three weeks between November and February to discuss all the proposals and grade them ... with a full written assessment form completed by each assessor for each project.' (DFID, Minute 17 March 2006). Whilst the introduction of the grading system indicated an improvement on the less objective system of previous years it did suggest a very time consuming process which relied on a large team of staff available on a regular basis.

4.4 The need to balance an effective appraisal process with staff availability and time was not sustainable particularly as pressure in DFID to downsize mounted. By 2006 a decision was taken to contract out the DAF and Triple Line Consultancy (TLC), with their experience of managing the Civil Society Challenge Fund, were awarded the contract.

4.5 **Contracted out Management of the DAF** TLC took over a fund which was already up and running and they approached the fund management role as a process of gradual change, building on what had already been done and initiating change as required in consultation with DFID. While the move to TLC resulted in both the appraisal process and the fund management being strengthened the gradual approach led to some confusion as each year saw changes in the applications and reporting processes. This did not present a problem for most applicants and grantees but some respondents interviewed during the review, particularly those less experienced with applying for and running projects, found the changes confusing.

4.6 Changes to the applications process were the most significant. They included:

1. Running seminars for prospective applicants
2. Providing constructive feedback to the previous year's unsuccessful applicants

⁹ Internal memo ICSD, 2005

3. Making a concept note mandatory (from the 2007-08 round) and giving feedback on concept notes to improve proposals presented
4. The introduction of a strengthened results based project focus for applicants
5. The requirement that a logical framework be submitted as part of the application (compulsory from the 2009/10 round)

4.7 The seminars for prospective applicants held regionally within the UK were particularly important in raising the profile of the DAF and attracting a wider audience. Those interviewed during the review spoke positively of the seminars and indicated that they had been instrumental in encouraging them to apply. Similarly the requirement to make concept notes mandatory was appreciated; submission of concept notes was seen as a relatively straightforward process and prospective applicants indicated that they would prefer to know at the concept stage that they had little chance of being successful rather than go through the lengthy and time consuming process of putting in a proposal if they were unlikely to be successful. However, the DAF was still seen as unduly competitive and many respondents thought that there should be more 'weeding out' at the concept note stage. The greater emphasis on feedback was also appreciated, especially where it was timely as in the case of feedback on concept notes.

4.8 The rationale for strengthening the results based approach was premised on the fact that the measurement of achievement and impact in particular were a particular weakness of most DAF projects. It was felt that a logical framework would help focus the applicant's thinking on a logical approach which included clear outcomes with associated verifiable indicators. However, this move and the logical framework in particular promoted an approach set even more strongly in the language of development – 'outcomes', 'sustainability of impact', 'verifiable indicators' etc. Feedback from the TLC assessors and from mini grant recipients thinking about applying for DAFs indicated that organisations who had traditionally been underrepresented in the DAF, including BME, Faith, Unions, Diaspora and Media groups and smaller organisations in general, found the language confusing. Interestingly 2009/10 reveals an increase in the number of such organisations applying and no significant decrease in those being successful (see Table 5). However, the move to make DAF projects more results based reinforced the emphasis on individual projects achieving their own particular outcomes and did not help to emphasise the importance of being linked to the broader DAF objectives and being seen as part of a whole. With little learning being shared and no real attempts to network, the project focus led to an inward looking approach which excluded the very groups it was keen to reach.

4.9 Changes to financial management included:

1. Dropping the requirement for matched funding for the 2008-09 round
2. Tightening up on financial sustainability criteria for applicants

4.10 Whilst there appears to be no record of why the matched funding was dropped, the primary reason stated by respondents seemed to be the need to simplify the complex financial reporting system related to matched funds. A further reason was the need to open the scheme up to groups with limited financial resources though this seemed to be at odds with the pressure to tighten up on the financial standing of applicants. The removal of the matched funding requirement, whilst welcomed, does have implications for the sustainability of projects.

4.11 Changes to the management process were positive and grant recipients spoke positively of TLC's management of the fund, particularly with regard to support for and, from 2008/09, the simplification of the financial reporting. However, the changes put significant demands on TLC as they made new suggestions to refine the process which led to more work for the company. The effort put into delivering feedback on concept notes and reports was appreciated by projects though a number of respondents complained about having to wait for 9 months to receive feedback on annual reports. By the time the feedback had come another year had gone by and it was too late to incorporate the helpful suggestions from TLC.

4.12 In terms of costs the move to TLC was certainly justified. The management fee has remained under £200,000 or 5.3% of the Grant Value (see Table 6) which, given the high levels of input by TLC to the appraisal, project assessment and day to day management processes, all tasks that would previously have been carried out by DFID staff, represents good value for money. The amount of DFID staff time devoted to the DAF has been considerably reduced which further justifies this move.

Table 6: DAF Grant value and management costs 2006/07 to 2008/09

	2006/07			2007/08			2008/09		
	Grant value	Mgt fee	Mgt fee as % of grant	Grant value	Mgt fee	Mgt fee as % of grant	Grant value	Mgt fee	Mgt fee as % of grant
DAF	3128884	78213	2.5%	3397672	181620	5.3%	4328240	176139	4%

4.13 **Limitations to the Management of the DAF** Transfer of management to TLC was only partial and their role in decision making was limited with DFID still taking most decisions. There appeared to be quite a lot of duplication between the TLC and DFID management roles, for example whilst TLC prepared all the letters to tell applicants whether they had been successful or not for both concept notes and proposals, these were again reviewed and eventually signed by DFID. DFID were also responsible for making the decision as to whether proposed changes to project activities or carrying over funding from one year to the next could take place based on TLC's recommendations. There was regular interaction between DFID and TLC which escalated as the funding round approval round date neared. Much of this appeared to be random requests for information required for the presentation of the list of approved projects to the Minister. The requirement that the list goes to the Minister and the high profile nature of the fund however, does to some extent justify the hands on approach of DFID.

4.14 **Project finances** Project invoices were sent to Triple Line and from there to DFID for approval. DFID prepared an invoice, indicating which projects need to be paid, for the Crown Agents who in turn paid the projects. The DFID Programme Officer felt that the process was inefficient and this view was supported by a number of respondents who complained about regular late receipt of payments (by 3-4 weeks) since Crown Agents had taken over from DFID with respect to payment to projects. A further complication with payments appeared to be the operation of two systems, that of advance payment and payment in arrears. Whilst the advance payment process was introduced to support smaller organisations with limited turnover, many of the organisations who had opted for advance payment had experienced difficulties with the advance payment process. They indicated that payments still took some considerable time to come through and that they found the process of claiming in advance complex. With hindsight most of them felt that they

should have opted for the payment in arrears process which looked more straightforward.

4.15 The decision making process There were considerable delays to the start date to projects due to the length of time taken to make decisions about which projects to fund. In some cases the decision was conveyed to successful applicants in the first week of April, after the proposed start project start date of 1 April. This led to problems for organisations including the withdrawal of some project partners and for projects in formal education a need to restructure inputs in relation to the school year. The process up until the final approval by the Minister appears to be well managed by TLC and DFID and it is reaching agreement on when to present the list of proposals to Minister and ensuring that all information is in place that seems to delay the process. It was not clear to the review team why different decision making processes were applied to different funding mechanisms (discussed in Para 4.24 and presented in Table 8 below) and it is suggested that movement to as full decision making as possible for DFID prior to ministerial approval be explored to expedite the process more effectively.

4.16 Management of the Mini Grants Scheme Management of the MGS is devolved to four regionally based Managing Agents (MA), in England, N. Ireland, Scotland and Wales. DFID's role is limited to the final approval of the list of successful projects for each region and making payment to each of the MAs for projects in their particular region. The Minister is informed of decisions and comments on the final list.

4.17 There are similarities in the process of management in all four countries; they run seminars for potential applicants, manage the appraisal of projects and present a final list of projects to DFID for approval. They also manage all financial aspects including making payments to projects and review the annual project reports.

4.18 However, in terms of value for money there is significant variation across the four countries. As can be seen from Table 7 management costs vary from 4.5% in 2008/09 to 21.7% in N Ireland in 2007/08.

Table 7: MGS grant value and management costs 2006/07 to 2008/09

	2006/07			2007/08			2008/09		
	Grant value	Mgt fee	Mgt fee as % of grant	Grant value	Mgt fee	Mgt fee as % of grant	Grant value	Mgt fee	Mgt fee as % of grant
England	£269349	**		£277252	£16982	6.1%	£304128	£23242	7.6%
N Ireland	£36117	£6130	17%	£39151	£8480	21.7%	£49975	£8735	17.5%
Scotland	£38283	£5790	15.1%	£31676	£6425	16.4%	£64894	£6875	13.8%
Wales	£58969	£3865	6.6%	£53821	£3966	7.4%	£91898	£4094	4.5%
Total	£402,718			£401,900			£510,895		

Source: DFID data ** figure not available

4.20 Each MA submits a budget to DFID annually indicating the costs to be incurred for managing the funds; DFID reviews and pays the agents accordingly. It would appear that no standardisation has taken place to bring the four programmes in line and to ensure that there is sufficient budget to deliver the services required. In both Wales and England the MAs explained that the management fee was not covering their costs. However, both these countries had entered in to strategic agreements with DFID under which they were able to charge some of the salary costs of permanent staff. This was not so in Scotland and Ireland where the

management fee was used for this purpose which gives some credence to the higher percentage management costs.

4.21 Similar assessment processes are run in all four countries. In Wales the assessor role is an honorary one whilst all other countries provide small remuneration. The assessors (usually 3) are sent all the proposals which they grade individually. The assessors spend a day (or 2 in the case of England) reviewing all the projects, generally with DFID in attendance, and the MA acting as facilitator. Decisions as to which projects should be funded are made on the day and the list forwarded to DFID for final approval.

4.22 The review team were concerned about the objectivity of the assessors and of the assessment process. In Scotland, Wales and N. Ireland the criteria for selection of the assessors were that they were engaged in development education. Given the small development education community in each country, applicants tended to be known by assessors which could bias their thinking. More concerning was that the managing agent was acting as assessor in N Ireland, though he did not appraise the projects submitted by his organisation. There seemed to be a conflict of interests in this case with the organisation acting as managing agent, assessor and submitting and being awarded mini grant funding. The assessment process itself did not seem that efficient, particularly in England where there were 75 proposals for 2009/10. All proposals were assessed by 3 assessors and by DFID staff. Decisions about grades were then made on the day with all proposals being considered. It was felt that assessment by 2 assessors should be sufficient with a third only considered where there was significant disagreement. Carrying out some of this process prior to the day could enhance efficiency.

4.23 There were different interpretations of the time-length of projects. In England and to a certain extent Scotland most projects approved were for 3 years; funding for years 2 and 3 was automatically made on approval of the annual report. In Wales the process seemed to be in state of flux. All mini grant recipients met had funding for 1 year only. However, one had been successful on 3 occasions, twice in consecutive years for the same project. It appeared that there was no automatic approval for years 2 and 3 and that the project again was considered alongside other new projects. N Ireland by contrast only offers 1 year grants. The rationale for this is that with such a small pot of money it gives an opportunity for different organisations to secure funding. The downside is that there is little sustainability to interventions if projects are only funding for 1 year.

4.24 **Comparison with other competitive funding mechanisms** DFID operates a number of competitive funding schemes in addition to the DAF and Mini Grants Scheme. The two schemes which operate in similar ways in the UK are the Civil Society Challenge Fund and the Governance and Transparency Fund. Comparison of all four funding mechanisms with respect to roles of the managing agents, DFID and the Minister are outlined in Table 8 below.

4.25 The fund that has the greatest degree of autonomy is the mini grants scheme; here DFID is only responsible for final approval of the projects and for forwarding payments to the managing agent. However, as discussed above the degree of autonomy has led to practices which appear to be less efficient and to questions regarding conflict of interests of managing agents. By contrast the Civil Society Challenge fund has very little input from the managing agent and DFID has a close relationship with the 38 projects currently supported under the fund.

Table 8: Competitive Funding Schemes supported by DFID

	Development Awareness Fund (DAF)	Mini Grants Scheme	Civil Society Challenge Fund (CSCF)	Governance & Transparency Fund (GTF)
Managing Agent (MA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seminars for potential applicants • Appraisal of Concept Notes and Proposals • Recommendation for funding to DFID • Mgt of financial and programme reporting for projects • Processing of invoices from projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seminars for potential applicants • Appraisal of Proposals • Recommendation for funding to DFID • Mgt of financial and programme reporting for projects • Payments to projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraisal of Concept Notes and Proposals • Assessment of project completion reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appraisal of Proposals • Review of annual reports • Payments to projects
DFID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final approval of Concept Notes and Proposals • Communication with applicants regarding project approval • Decisions on changes to projects • Payments to projects (through Crown Agents) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final approval of Proposals • Payments to MAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seminars for potential applicants • Final approval of Concept Notes and Proposals – including liaising with country offices • Management of Projects • Payments to projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and selection of projects in conjunction with policy division and country offices • Decisions on ‘grey’ areas – questions the MA is not confident to decide on • Payments to managing agents
Minister	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full list of projects go before the Minister for comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final list of projects go before the Minister for comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final list of projects go before the Minister for comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister approves final list and signs off on projects

4.26 The Governance and Transparency Fund (GTF) throws light on how the efficiency of the DAF might be improved. The payments process is more straightforward with all payments made directly to projects by the managing agent. The DFID manager responsible for GTF explained that all payments are ‘in advance’ and that money for payments in advance is not generally allowed go straight from DFID to for profit companies due to companies accruing interest. However, DFID agreed an exemption from the rule with the Treasury for GTF and there were discussions at the time with the officer responsible for managing the DAF regarding

applying for a similar exemption. In the event responsibility for the DAF moved to London and the discussions were lost. However, there is no reason why DFID should not pursue the option of applying for the exemption so that all payments can be made directly by the managing agent, thus reducing the amount of time that DFID needs to spend on the management of the fund.

4.27 Assessment of Efficiency The efficiency of DAF management has improved considerably since the appointment of a managing agent in 2006 and now represents good value for money. However, a less hands on approach by DFID and clearer delineation of roles could further enhance efficiency. The inclusion of a third agency has created inefficiencies and payment processes could be improved through learning from experience of other funding mechanisms. Management of the MGS appears less efficient with variations in terms of processes and significant variation in terms of value for money across the four countries.

5. IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.19 **Impact at objective level** There has been no impact study of the DAF and MGS since they were started in the late 1990's. There has been constant discourse about the need to evaluate the programme and about the need to capture lessons learned. However, this year is the first time that a synthesis of Project Completion Reports is being prepared (by TLC) for submission to DFID. It is hoped that this will capture stories about impact at the project level which will in turn contribute to assessment of objective level impact of the fund as a whole. However this will be based on the project's self reporting rather than any external measure of impact.

4.20 At the project level, there have been attempts to capture impact through recording what children or adults engaged in the project say about the activities they have been engaged in and through identifying changes in behaviour as a result of DAF engagement (Some of this is captured in the projects' own internal evaluation reports). In a number of cases, behaviour change in individuals or groups was interpreted as 'taking action'. Examples include; raising funds for development activities in developing countries and running events like Fair Trade Days or ethical fashion shows to raise awareness of sustainable development and global interdependence. However, these do not aggregate up to give evidence of the impact at the level of the DAF objectives.

4.21 **Impact on people and organisations** At a broader level the DAF and MGS have over the years, reached thousands of stakeholders; when combined with other BSD activities, potentially the impact is highly significant. The BSD and projects under the funds have impacted on:

- School children at primary and secondary level at schools throughout the country – enhancing their understanding of their place in the world and how what happens in other countries impacts on them
- Teachers and Initial Teacher Training students from schools and colleges – bringing the global dimension into the classroom
- Head teachers and the whole school community – through projects focusing on whole school approaches to sustainable development and global citizenship
- Youth groups and links with volunteering schemes – less marked than in formal education but gradually reaching such groups, particularly within Diaspora communities and in Wales where Youth Work is included in the ESDGC strategy
- Trade Unions and business - to a limited extent but the DAF and MGS are reaching some groups not traditionally involved in international development.
- Community and BME groups – spread quite thinly throughout the countries but lessons learnt for other groups could be captured.

5.4 There is least evidence of impact with:

- The Media – though DFID's funds targeting the media have had more impact and high profile campaigns like Comic Relief keep development strongly on the agenda

- Churches and Faith Groups who have not engaged effectively with the DAF and MGS, hence impact and lesson learning are limited even further

4.22 What is vital now is that the lessons from all these groups are captured and the impact assessed. Whilst the projects have reached a significant number of stakeholders, have they been doing the right thing, could they have done it better and what is the impact?

4.23 **Impact on availability of resources** The projects have produced a significant body of resources particularly for schools, teachers and youth groups. Some of the resources reviewed are of a very high quality and a few key resources were repeatedly seen in different DEC's visited during the review. However, most materials produced as part of the DAFs or MGS do not seem to be disseminated widely or shared with others within the development education network. The questions arise as to how to capture this body of work? Is there duplication and could some of the resources be published? The opportunity offered now that Global Citizenship is on the curriculum in England and by ESDGC in Wales could be seized but again the learning needs to be captured if the resources are to be integrated with the curriculum and used more widely

4.24 **Organisational Impact** Very few national level organisations have used their DAF funding to work across organisations or to support networking at the local level. Even where the project aims at wide coverage, success in achieving the aim has been limited. Thus the main impact has been at local level through organisations like the DEC's and through community based organisations, voluntary organisations and NGOs. For many of these smaller organisations the DAF, and for the smallest organisations the MGS, have become major sources of funding, allowing them to undertake more significant pieces of work to further their aims. For the DEC's its significance has increased since the larger development NGOs ceased providing core funding and since other key sources of funding like lottery funds and EU funding have become harder to access. One DEC was reported to have closed because it did not secure DAF funding and most DEC's were concerned about the stability of funding (see Annex 5 for analysis of DEC funding).

4.25 The performance of the DAF in the formal sector has been greatly influenced by the work of the DEC's at local level. Whilst some DEC's have collaborated over DAF projects most do not and there is a concern that the competition is restricting networking and sharing of resources and ideas more widely. A less competitive approach to funding which encourages networking can be seen in the EES, but as indicated before synergies between the EES and the DAF have been limited. The impact of competitive funding on this small network of organisations has, in institutional terms, had an adverse effect on the network and not promoted the positive approaches to networking envisaged in the wider BSD.

4.26 **Promoting DFID's agenda and engagement with DFID** There was a clear indication amongst DAF and MGS recipients and others interviewed that the objectives of projects supported by the funds should be focused on promoting development awareness and not on generating understanding of aid policy architecture and the role of the UK government including DFID. A review of project summaries from 2005/06 to 2008/09 reveals an emphasis on engaging with issues at a more operational level with little reference to the aid policy agenda. There was some understanding of the place of aid, e.g. the project coordinator of Youth for Fair Trade run by the International Centre for Reconciliation was aware of the importance

of promoting a broader understanding of the trade agenda and how governments, particularly our own government engaged with it. However the project itself was focused at a lower level and aimed to 'enable people to become advocates for fair trade'.

4.27 Some projects were very conscious of the fact that they were supported by DFID. They advertised the logo on documents and communicated with DFID regarding events they were holding – the lack of response on a number of occasions led to confusion and disappointment. Those few projects who had received ministerial visits felt more closely connected to DFID though again cancellations of visits did not support the relationship.

4.28 There was concern that DFID was not really interested in engaging or learning from the programme. Despite the whole relationship with DFID being mediated through TLC, there was an expectation that DFID should have a relationship with grant holders and be able to convey their expectations in terms of their current objectives and strategies. For some DEC's surveyed, the relationship was termed to be good if they were awarded funding whilst for others they saw little relationship at all, which given their high profile position within the DAF, MGS and EES strategies was particularly frustrating.

4.29 **Sustainability** Without any assessment of impact it is difficult to comment on the extent to which the DAF outcomes are sustainable. It is to be hoped that many of the ideas and resources will remain beyond the DAF and MGS projects but without any evaluation of these tangible outputs they are likely to 'get lost' in the organisation and be re-invented or replicated at a later date.

4.30 In the formal sector the main hope for sustainability of impact lies with curriculum change and the incorporation to a greater or lesser extent of citizenship and sustainable development dimensions in the curricula of all four countries. The perceived increase in the number of 'champions' for development awareness in the formal sector who have been engaged through DAF and MG projects provides hope for sustainability of outcomes, but whether a critical mass, sufficient to place the global dimension firmly at the heart of education, has been reached is beyond the scope of this review. It remains a question to be answered by an impact assessment of development awareness activities in the formal education sector.

4.31 In other priority areas sustainability presents a challenge. Given the limited coverage of projects targeting faith, media, the Trade Unions and BME groups in the DAF and MGS sustainability of impact is unlikely without further significant strategies aimed at promoting the development awareness agenda.

5. LESSONS LEARNT

5.1 Reviewing funding mechanisms like the DAF and MGS, which have been running for over ten years and have never been exposed to any lesson learning or evaluation, inevitably results in a significant number of lessons emerging. This chapter makes an attempt to capture the key lessons.

5.2 **Target groups and DAF recipients** it is clear that the DAF and MGS have not reached all groups equally and lessons have emerged related to who accesses the fund and whether the fund is the right tool for everyone. These lessons are:

- Formal education has benefitted most from the DAF and MGS and has dominated both funding mechanisms – some people see the DAF as a fund for development education (in formal settings) and have little understanding of the wider reach of the fund
- The DEC's have been a key player throughout the life of the DAF and MGS. They have brought in-depth understanding of the development awareness agenda and have made a significant contribution, particularly in the formal education sector
- Formal education's dominance of both the DAF and the MGS has led to other groups being spread too thinly for the funds to engage effectively with the group's agenda as a whole. What works for the majority does not necessarily work for groups who are in a minority
- Faith Groups have not engaged significantly with the DAF or MGS either as applicants to the fund or as recipients of funds.
- Media as a tool for promoting development awareness with groups such as school children, young people or groups of adults, has effectively contributed to DAF projects. Media as a vehicle for communicating more widely with the public has not engaged effectively with the DAF, possibly because of the option of accessing funds through other channels from DFID.
- Groups whose background is not traditionally in international development need support structures to effectively engage with the development awareness agenda. For the Trade Unions this support may come from working together on the same agenda through the TUC

6.3 **Applying for and developing DAF and MGS projects** Lessons on how to be successful and what counts against some groups have strongly emerged. These lessons are:

- Strategies to attract applicants to the fund like the seminars have had a positive impact, particularly on BME groups. However, reach may not always be the problem – more analysis of target groups is needed to discover whether competitive funding models are right for them or if other models of engagement make more sense.
- The applications process for DAF funding has favoured groups with dedicated proposal writing expertise and 'long term' DAF recipients who 'know what works' and understand the 'language of projects'
- Small organisations, particularly from non development education backgrounds like faith and BME groups have been less successful in securing

DAF funding – they need support to develop proposals, plan, prepare and implement DAF projects

- The applications process for MGS funding has been more accessible to small groups – but success has not always followed. Support is still needed for proposal writing, planning, preparation and implementation, even for smaller projects
- The need to be ‘constantly innovative’ through thinking up ‘new’ projects every three years does not sit comfortably with organisations, like the DECs, who have in depth understanding of their focus target group and of ‘what works’, and who have developed effective projects based on tried and tested ideas which should be rolled out and developed.
- Packaging up development awareness into projects can detract from high quality work which achieves sustained impact – such work needs to be part of a more strategic approach which builds and develops ideas and promotes ‘learning’ throughout the development education network
- Joint preparation and implementation of projects can significantly enhance opportunities for learning and developing as organisations, **however** the competitive nature of the fund has in many cases led to less collaboration with others who are competing for the same resources
- The DAF and the MGS have allowed ‘1000 flowers to bloom’. Now is the time to take stock, review what has and has not worked and develop new more strategic approaches to move forward into the future

6.4 Management of the DAF and MGS Finally there are lessons for DFID that have emerged from two very different contracting out processes. A few of the lessons are included here:

- Contracting out the management should not mean contracting out the relationship. DFID has been less engaged with the organisations and networks delivering the DAF and MGS projects – recipients are interested in what DFID has to say and in what it wants for the future, they want to engage. Lesson learning seminars for DFID where learning can be shared and where DFID can engage with DAF and MGS recipients could prove a useful tool for furthering the relationship.
- Changes in the applications, reporting and fund management processes on a regular basis can undermine the effectiveness of funding mechanisms. While change can strengthen the way in which the DAF operates, agreement should be reached between DFID and the managing agents over which changes are needed and a systematic process of change introduced in a planned manner
- Organisations managing funds for DFID need to be managed and supported especially where they are loosely linked, as in the case of the regional development organisations managing the Mini Grants.

1.5 Impact and Lesson Learning

- Where practice was shared, groups networked and organisations worked together learning followed. However, such practice was ad hoc and limited to a few isolated instances. Few lessons from DAF and MGS projects have been captured and a vital opportunity to disseminate this learning has been lost

- Good practice, impact of interventions and lessons from experience need to be captured and disseminated to find out what works, to enable individuals and organisations to celebrate their achievements, to acknowledge how to improve what has not gone so well and finally to plan next steps for the future.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 The DAF and MGS have provided an opportunity to explore the way in which development awareness can be delivered in a variety of contexts. They have allowed innovation and experimentation and appear to have worked effectively in some areas, notably in formal education and less effectively in others, e.g. with Trade Unions, Business and Faith. Little is known about the overall effectiveness and impact since regular review and lesson learning were not effectively integrated into the programme. This review has made an attempt to capture some of the learning but it can only go so far. What has emerged is a fragmented programme that serves some better than others.

6.2 Formal education has remained central to the DAF and MGS since it was established. The funds have provided an opportunity for organisations to explore different approaches to integrating the global dimension into schools, including whole school approaches, support to curriculum implementation and inputs into teacher education, both initial and in-service. Even though no overall evaluation or impact assessment has been carried out, it is clear that a significant amount of work has been done. Much has responded to curriculum change, particularly to ESDGC in Wales. Whilst the DAF itself has not been instrumental in achieving the first education objective of the BSDS, 'to ensure that global issues are adequately incorporated in curriculum provision and guidance across the UK', it has contributed to the implementation of curriculum change at the school level. In addition many of the good quality materials and resources developed have contributed to the achievement of the second BSDS education objective.

6.3 The other priority groups identified in the BSD strategy, faith and the churches, business and Trade Unions and the media have been less well represented in the DAF and MGS. The dominance of education may be one factor but there are others. Media as a tool to deliver the global dimension in education has been well integrated but there are options to access other funds from DFID for media as communication and these have been utilised, even by DAF applicants. Trade Unions have emerged as an interesting new group but development awareness is a new agenda for most of them and they need support to increase their interest in engaging with this agenda and to increase their skills and expertise to identify and deliver effective projects

6.4 For small organisations, like faith based organisations, BME and Diaspora groups the competitive funding process itself has been challenging. Their skills in proposal preparation cannot match those of organisations with extensive expertise in this area. The need for capacity building and support has emerged as key to engaging such groups not just for proposal writing but for enhancing project delivery as well. Having said this there has been a rise in the number of BME and Diaspora groups accessing grants which reflects the different approaches used by DFID (through CfD, DVI and Platform 2) as well as the emphasis given by TLC to engage more BME groups through the seminars.

6.5 Contracting out the management of the DAF has led to greater efficiency and has been a good move in terms of value for money. However, there is less clarity over what is the managing agent's role and what is DFID's role resulting in

duplication of tasks and too much involvement in day to day management on the part of DFID.

6.6 The management of the MGS has evolved in different ways in all four countries with some appearing to be more efficient than others. The decision taken by the managing agents to only allow applicants to apply for one year grants in N Ireland and to a certain extent Wales raises questions for sustainability of projects. The limited size of the development education community in all countries but England has led in some cases to conflict of interests, with appraisers knowing applicants and managing agent themselves being awarded mini grants. This has restricted objectivity and led to an inward looking fund that is not reaching as many groups as it could. In terms of value for money there is a significant difference between Scotland and N Ireland who charge high management fees and England and Wales where the amount is lower.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.7 At the strategic level funding instruments like the DAF should follow the establishment of strategic outcomes and institutional relationships

7.8 At the operational level, to improve the provision of financial support for development awareness

- The DAF should be gradually phased out over the next 3 years and replaced with larger longer term grant support for key target groups who are central to the BSD strategy and who are currently supported under the DAF

For Education

- The proportion of funds currently being spent on formal education in the DAF should be used to contribute to support for more strategic interventions within education. This should include further and higher education and the youth service.
- Funds for education should be for agreements at national level for the four countries, with consideration given to how regional delivery is managed particularly within England. For example, groups of DECs may be identified to play a role in implementation in the different regions.
- Given the integrated nature of the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG), consideration may be given in Wales to funds being allocated to WAG to support delivery of the ESDGC strategy.

For Media Groups

- Media groups have not effectively accessed the DAF and MGS. Consideration should be given to enabling media organisations focusing on development awareness to access grant funds through other DFID media funding channels

For Trade Unions

- Small Grant Support for development awareness work with Trade Unions is more effectively placed within the PPA with the TUC. The PPA may be expanded to encourage the TUC to provide more funds for small grants focused on development awareness.

7.9 The phasing out of the DAF and the move to more strategic interventions in education, media and the Trade Unions will result in more limited opportunities for

other key target groups that DAF has focused on, e.g. BME, Diaspora, Faith and the Churches and more local level community groups. These groups have an important role to play in delivering development awareness at the local level and engagement with them provides an entry point for DFID to engage with the wider BME and community agendas. To enable them to continue to access funds and contribute to building support for development it is recommended that the Mini Grants Scheme should be developed as a larger competitive fund.

- To facilitate this, a more detailed review of the Mini Grants Scheme should be undertaken which looks at options for expansion and for improved management of the fund. Expansion and development of the MGS may include:
 - Increasing the level of funding for individual projects to a maximum of £25,000 per annum for a maximum of 3 years.
 - A focus on specific locally based target groups outside the formal sector, e.g. voluntary and community groups, BME groups and Diaspora and Faith Based Organisations
 - Increased capacity building support to organisations applying for and receiving grants for preparation and implementation of projects
- Options for improving the management of the MGS should include:
 - The appointment of organisations who have the capacity to manage the fund effectively and who can add value through offering capacity building support to applicants and grantees. Consideration may be given to organisations presently managing the fund after careful evaluation of their performance to date
- Steps should be taken to understand the needs and agendas of the specific groups which the expanded Mini Grants Scheme is targeted at.
- Close attention should be paid to monitoring and evaluation of the programme as well as to assessing impact and lesson learning.

7.10 To enable effective management of the changes:

- TLC should continue to manage the DAF through the phasing out process in order to maintain continuity for existing grant holders
- The transition should be managed by DFID, if possible drawing on expertise in social inclusion, to ensure effective understanding and engagement with the groups targeted under the expanded Mini Grants Scheme.
- DFID should take a strategic approach to fund management. A clear strategy for the management of the expanded Mini Grants Scheme should be agreed with clear delineation of tasks between DFID and the organisations managing the fund on their behalf. As much responsibility as possible should be given to the organisations with DFID's role restricted to key decisions and monitoring at an output to purpose level.
- Education expertise should be made available to support the work in the formal sector with a brief to improve communications, collaboration and learning across the sector.

© Verulam Associates Ltd. 2009.

Documents reviewed

Bourn, D, Research on Global Dimension and the Understanding of International Development within Formal Education (draft)

DAF and mini grant guidelines to applicants, and reporting requirements

DAF and mini grant assessment criteria used by grant assessors

DAF project documentation on selected projects: application, progress and final reports

DAF Proposal Appraisals for selected years, prepared by TLC

DAF Performance Assessments for selected years prepared by TLC

DEA, Development Education Centres – Survey Report 2007

DFID White Papers 1997, 2000 and 2006

DFID Building Support for Development Strategy Paper 1999

DFID Communications Strategy

DFID Gender Action Plan

DFID Enabling Effective Support, Responding to the Challenges of the Global Society for the Global Dimension in Schools

DFID Information Notes to DFID ministers at the close of each funding round

Knowles, E. (2008), DECs Conference Report: 'Securing the Futures of DECs'

QCA (2007) The Global Dimension in Action: a curriculum planning guide for schools

Sfez, P and Sherlock, K, General Evaluation of Actions to Raise Awareness of Development Issues in Europe

Chikezie, C. and Thakrar, B. (2005). Framework for DFID-Diaspora, AFFORD/AFP

Welsh Assembly Government, Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship, A strategy for Action – Updates (January 2008)

Extensive project documentation and publications from DECs, DAF and MG recipients visited

Terms of Reference

Review of DFID's Efforts to Build Support for Development through with Development Awareness Fund and the Mini Grants Programme

Background

1. The Development Awareness Fund (DAF) is the main funding mechanism through which DFID funds development awareness activities in the UK. Established in 1998/99 it is a competitive fund and applicants can apply for grants of between £10,000-100,000 per year for a maximum of three years. In recent years around £1-1.5 of funding for new projects has been made available annually for the DAF. It has been administered for DFID by TripleLine Consulting since November 2006.
2. The overall aim of the DAF is to build support for development by generating greater levels of awareness and understanding of international development issues across different audiences and geographical regions within the UK. It focuses funding on the priority areas identified in DFID's 1999 Building Support for Development Strategy Paper (BSDSP), namely formal education (DFID defines projects working in formal education as those seeking to embed global issues into the curriculum and around 60% of DAF funded projects aim to do this), the media, business and trade unions and faith groups. It also looks for creative new project concepts which help to extend the reach of the DAF to new audiences in new ways.
3. DAF projects must support activities that achieve one or more of the following:
 - **Challenges and prospects for development and poverty reduction:** Building long term knowledge and understanding of the major challenges and prospects for development, in particular the poverty reduction agenda.
 - **Interdependence and the global consequences of poverty:** Generating understanding of our global interdependence and in particular that failure to reduce global poverty levels will have serious consequences for us all.
 - **International efforts to reduce poverty and promote development:** Generating understanding of and support for international efforts to reduce poverty and promote development including the Millennium Development Goals. Promoting recognition of the progress so far made, and that further progress is affordable, achievable, and most of all vital.
 - **The role of individuals in working towards poverty reduction:** Promoting understanding of the role that individuals can play; enabling them to make informed choices with the knowledge of how their actions impact on the world around them
4. DFID's Mini Grants scheme is a complementary mechanism to the DAF. It is also a competitive funding scheme seeking to build development awareness, but provides grants to smaller initiatives and, unlike the DAF, can include funding for organisational capacity building. It funds 1-3 year projects of between £1,000-10,000 and is administered separately in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. DFID provides around £500,000 of funding to it each year for new and existing projects.

Objective

5. To assess the impact of the DAF and Mini Grants funding to date, and to make recommendations on how impact might be improved and whether the implementation and management should be changed.

Recipient

6. The recipient of the consultancy services is DFID.

Scope

7. The review should cover three broad areas, as follows, and provide recommendations for the future in relation to each of these:

History and Impact of the DAF to Date

- **the history of DFID's efforts in to build support for development through the DAF and Mini Grants schemes**, covering the rationale for their development, and what human and financial resources have been employed. How the schemes have been administered should be laid out and analysis should be included of the strengths and weaknesses of the schemes' administration. Whether priorities for funding through the DAF / Mini grants schemes have changed or evolved should also be covered e.g. when, why and how did support to black and minority ethnic (BME) organisations become a priority for the DAF and what have been the implications of this. Which groups and regions have generally applied to the fund and of these, which have / have not been successful and why?
- **the implementation of the BSDSP**: how have the DAF and the Mini Grants schemes contributed towards the implementation of the BSDSP?
- **definitions**: in the DAF projects that DFID has funded how have 'development awareness' and 'support for development' tended to be defined? How should they be defined in future?
- **gender**: have DFID funded interventions to build support for development drawn attention to the importance of gender equality for development? How could and should this be done better in future?
- **the impact of the DFID's efforts to date**. What do we know about this? What positive changes have occurred as a result of DAF / Mini Grants funding (taking into account the changing climate of UK knowledge and perceptions of global issues)? What evidence do we have that DAF funding has resulted in increased awareness of development issues and, beyond this, of increased awareness resulting in changes in behaviour e.g. more involvement in development issues? Particular activities which have led to positive achievements should be highlighted as good practice examples. Shortfalls and any unforeseen achievements or unexpected outcomes should be noted.
- **the changing context for DFID's work**. Have key changes taken place within British society since 1999 that should impact on how DFID seeks to build support for development activity through the DAF and Mini Grants schemes? What pointers / evidence do we have about this?
- **knowledge and understanding of aid institutions and the UK Government's role**: to what extent have DFID funded initiatives through the DAF / Mini grants schemes attempted to generate understanding of aid policy architecture and specifically of the UK Government's and DFID's own roles and how successful have any such efforts been? How realistic is it to attempt to generate such understanding? How could this best be achieved within what DFID is funding now and could fund in future?

Broader Strategic Questions

- Do the 4 objectives of the DAF make sense? Could an overall logic model and evaluation framework be designed?
- Is the demand led Challenge Fund instrument the best way to achieve awareness of and support for development? Or would some interventions supported through the DAF, in particular the development education centres (DECs), be better supported by other aid modalities?

- What is the capacity of the various CSOs (Faith, BME, Union etc) to deliver development awareness objectives? Are they the right vehicles for reaching the target audiences?
- Do we need to define the target audience and development awareness objectives more narrowly?

Current operations of DAF

- What would appear to be the best way of achieving each DAF objective through which type of organisation?
- What is/ should be the purpose/ role of the administration of the DAF? Should it be mainly administrative or should it be more to support the programme (i.e. support the grantees in order to design and implement good projects? Should there be more culling at concept note stage and more attention given to the proposals and grantees?).
- How should performance assessment be conducted and learning achieved? How should learning be used and disseminated?
- If there is a need for CSO capacity building or support – how could this be provided?
- Given DFID's rules on competitive funding schemes, could the entire operation of the DAF be contracted out? (Therefore the consultants are required to investigate the rules regarding competitive funding schemes.)

Method

8. The review will include:

- analysis of key documents and interviews with stakeholders. Initial lists are provided below;
- visits to at least 10 DAF grant recipients, covering the different organisational types (eg small NGO, DEC, Faith), target groups (formal education, young people, communities etc.), and regions funded by the DAF; and
- visits to at least one Mini Grant project in each of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

9. The DEA will also organise on behalf of DFID three regional consultation workshops, to give any stakeholders who wish the opportunity to feed-in their views. A consultation questionnaire will also be included in the DEA's e-bulletin and posted on DFID's website. The consultant is expected to contribute to the agenda for the regional consultations and attend them, and develop the questionnaire and analyse responses to it.

Deliverables

10. A draft report no more than 50 pages long covering the issues and questions listed under Scope above with an Executive Summary of no more than 10 pages. This should be submitted to DFID electronically. It must be clearly laid out and easy to read.

11. A final report taking into account comments from DFID. DFID will provide comments on the draft report within four weeks. A final report taking into account DFID's comments should then be submitted within one week of the consultants receiving the comments. Three hard copies of the final report as well as an electronic version should be provided to DFID.

12. A presentation of the draft report findings to DFID and a final presentation.

Inputs and Timing

13. Up to 40 days of work by a consultant/s with:

- a good knowledge of methods for increasing awareness among the UK public of international development issues; and
- a proven ability to grapple with ideas, strategies and activities that aim to create change in 'external' institutions and amongst individuals;

- knowledge and experience of the operation of civil society funding mechanisms.

DFID Co-ordination

14. The consultant/s will report to Jenny Yates, Head Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team. Cathy Welch, Programme Manager, Communities and Faith, Outreach and Stakeholder Relations Team, will provide guidance and support and will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the consultancy.

Stakeholders for Interview and Documents for Review

15. The following are initial lists only and the consultant is expected to take a proactive approach to identifying additional documents and stakeholders for review / interview

Stakeholders for Interview

Name	Position & Organisation
David Smith	DAF Project Director, Triple Line Consulting
Martin Wright	DAF Project Manager, Triple Line Consulting
Elaine Peacock	Grant Administrator (administrative and financial management work)
Bob Hirst	Strategic Advisor – DAF (formal sector)
Cathy Midwinter	DAF Assessor- Formal Sector
Ali Brownlie Bojang	DAF Assessor- Formal Sector
Nikki van der Gaag	DAF Assessor/Specialist- Media
Ali Lochhead	DAF Assessor/Specialist- NGO
Steven Grinter	DAF Specialist- Unions
Shoa Asfaha	DAF Specialist- BME Sector
Rev. Giles Goddard	DAF Specialist- Faith
Angela Higgins	Mini Grants (Scotland) Managing Agent
Dominic Miles	Mini Grants (Wales) Managing Agent
Stephen McCloskey	Mini Grants (N. Ireland) Managing Agent
Hetan Shah and	Chief Executive DEA, which is the Mini Grants (England) Managing Agent
Sejal Patel	Education Projects Manager, Responsible for the Mini Grants at the DEA
	Mini Grants Evaluators: Managing Agents to advise on who and contacts.
Harm-Jan Fricke	Consultant to EES
Diana Dalton	Head of BSD Team 2005-2008 (now in Evaluation Dept.)
Shirley Addies	Building Support for Development Team 2004-2008 (now Research Manager, Human Development Group, Central Research Dept.)
Sandy Docherty	Previous member of Building Support for Development Team responsible for the Mini Grants
Lone Sorensen	Civil Society Department, DFID – re. operation of civil society challenge funds

Key Documents for Review

DFID White Papers 1997, 2000 and 2006

DFID Building Support for Development Strategy Paper 1999

<http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/buildingsupportdevelopment.pdf>

DFID Communications Strategy

DFID Gender Action Plan

General Evaluation of Actions to Raise Awareness of Development Issues in Europe, by Paul Sfez and Karen Sherlock – see http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/worldwide/civil-society/index_en.htm

The DAF and mini grant guidelines to applicants, and reporting requirements

DAF and mini grant assessment criteria used by grant assessors

DAF project documentation on selected projects: application, progress or final reports, external evaluations (where available)

DFID Information Notes to DFID ministers at the close of each funding round (to be supplied by Cathy Welch)

Jenny Yates DFID March 2009

People Interviewed

Name	Position	Organisation
DFID		
Jenny Yates	Head of ORST	DFID, ORST
Diana Dalton	Former Head of BSD	DFID, EvD
Shirley Addies	Research Manger	DFID, CRD
Sandy Docherty	Not spoken to yet	
Lone Sorensen	Stakeholder Manager	CSD
Cathy Welch	Programme Manager, Communities and Faith	OSRT
Steve Nally	Stakeholder Team Leader	
Colette O'Neill	Stakeholder Manager	DFID, CSD
Lorraine Healy	Stakeholder Manager	DFID, CSD
Colin McGinty	Stakeholder Manager	DFID, CSD
Christine Edwards	Deputy Programme Manager	DFID, CSD
James Medhurst	Former BSD manager	DFID, EvD
DAF Management Agent		
David Smith	Director	TLC
Martin Wright	DAF Manager	TLC
Elaine Peacock	Grant Officer	TLC
Bob Hirst	Independent Strategic Advisor (formal sector)	TLC
Cathy Midwinter	Independent DAF Assessor (formal sector)	TLC
Ali Lochhead	Independent DAF Assessor (NGO sector)	TLC
Steven Grinter	Independent DAF Assessor (Unions)	TLC
Shoa Asfaha	Independent DAF Assessor (BME Sector)	TLC
Rev. Giles Goddard	Independent DAF Assessor (Faith)	TLC
Mini Grant Management Agents		
Angela Higgins	MG administrator	IDEAS
Dominic Miles	Coordinator	Cyfanfyd
Annette Boyle	Administrator, Mini Grants	Cyfanfyd
Stephen McCloskey	Centre Director	CGE
Hetan Shah	Chief Executive	DEA
Sejal Patel	Administrative Officer	DEA
Amanda Thomson	Finance and Ops Director	DEA
Others		
Harm-Jan Fricke	Independent consultant	
Gillian Temple	Head of Education	Oxfam
Peter Davis	GB Education and Youth - International Coordinator	Oxfam
Richard Baker	Head of Educational Practice	Oxfam
Anne Keen	Education Coordinator	Oxfam (Scotland)
Wendy Young	Education Coordinator	Christian Aid
Collette Pitts	EES Coordinator Wales	
Celia Mather	Independent Consultant	
Eleanor Knowles	Coordinator	Cumbria DEC

DAF/Minigrant recipients visited/interviewed

No.	Organisation	Dates	Name of DAF	Budget	People met	Type	Location	Key work
1	RISC	2005-08	Measuring Attitudinal Change in Schools	£60,102	Martin Mikhail Liz Allum	DEC	South East	Formal - schools
2	War Child UK	2007-10	Social networking in schools	£119,849	Caroline Armitage	International NGO	London	Formal - schools
3	The Mediae Company Ltd.	2007-10	Makutano Junction: Kenyan TV soap opera as a vehicle for development awareness	£199,151	Kate Lloyd Morgan Helen Garforth	Limited company	South	Formal – schools Media
4	Workers Education Association	2007-10	Out of Africa	£114,291	Howard Croft	National NGO	West Midlands	Adult Ed Unions
5	Tzedek	2007-10	Development Education in Jewish Schools, Youth Movements and Synagogues	£156,300	Dan Berelowitz Victoria Lawrence	Small NGO	London	Faith Education Youth
6	IDEAS		Taking a Global Approach to Initial Teacher Education	£299,956	Angela Higgins, Tanya Whely	DEC	Scotland	Formal – ITE
7	Mercy Corps	2008-11	Global Citizen Leadership Programme	£293,482	Sarah Brown, Gary McClelland	International NGO	Scotland	Youth
8	International Centre for Reconciliation, Coventry Cathedral	2008-11	Youth for Fair Trade	£295,290	David Williams	Church	West Midlands	Faith Youth
9	Brighton Peace and Environment Centre	2009-12	Climate Connections	£183,375	Linda Austin	DEC	South-East England	Community, BME/Diaspora
10	Asian Foundation for Philanthropy	2009-12	Naitika – Choices for Change	£201,511	Bala Thakrer	NGO	London and Midlands	Diaspora youth
11	Trade Union Congress	2009-12	Raising the bar on workers rights: 2012 sportswear supply chain awareness	£297,810	Gemma Freedman, Anne Watson	Trade Union	UK	Adults
12	Inside Out	2009-12	Network Earth: Global Citizen for the 21 st Century	£154,523	Fergal Barr	Voluntary Organisation	Northern Ireland	Formal primary
13	Centre for Global Education	2008-11	Building DE Capacity in BME sector in Northern Ireland	£209,264	Charo-Lanno Madden	NGO	Northern Ireland	BME

Mini grants

	Organisation	Dates	Name of Mini Grant	Budget	People met	Type	Location	Key work
England								
1	African Women's Welfare Group	2005-08	Raising our voices for Security and Development	£29,000	Hadija Hamoud Said	NGO	London	Informal - women
2	Cheshire DEC	2005-08	Get Global at the University of Chester		Carol	DEC	Chester	Formal ITE
3	Muslim Aid	2008-11	Education Really Matters	£30,000	Zahra Kasmani	Faith Org	London	Muslim Schools
4	WEA	2007-09	Development Education in Adult Learning	£17,000	Howard Croft	National NGO	W Midlands	Adult learning Diaspora
5	Manchester DEP	2006-08	Fairer Enterprise and Schools	£17,378	Claire Cowell	DEC	Manchester	
Wales								
6	Dolen Cymru	2008-09	Engaging people with learning disabilities in the MDGs	£10,000	Cathrin Daniel Betsan Ifan Sue Phillips	NGO	S Wales	Adults with learning disabilities
7	UNA Exchange	2008-09	Sharing experiences of development	£10,000	Sam Powell	NGO	S Wales	Volunteering - youth
8	Down to Earth	2008-09	Developing Formal and innovative approaches to ESDGC	£10,000	Mark McKenna	NGO	S Wales	Hard to reach youth
Scotland								
9	WOSDEC	2009-12	Developing a World View	£30,000	Lynne Baxendale	DEC	Scotland	Formal
10	Working Together For Change	2008-10	MDGs: connecting local experience in Scotland with global injustice	£12,500	Maureen Brough, Margaret Anne Gachagan	Voluntary Org	Scotland	Community
11	Stop Climate Chaos	2008-9	Cool it: Machinima Project	£9,000	Wendy Young	Voluntary Org	Scotland	Formal
12	Scottish Youth Parliament	2008-10	Vision 2015: Keeping the Promise	£17,000	Sarah Davies	National Youth Org	Scotland	Formal & Community
Northern Ireland								
14	War on Want	2007-8	Building Capacity to Deliver Development Education	£10,000	Linda McClelland	NGO	N Ireland	Community
15	Latinoamerica Unida	2007-8	Global Awareness Training for Rural Women	£7,900	Alexandra de la torre	NGO	N Ireland	Community
16	Beyond Skin	2008-9	Global issues through music	£10,000	Charo Lanao-Madden	NGO	N Ireland	Community
17	NIPSA	2009-10	Global solidarity champions	£9,760	Geraldine Alexander	Trade Union	N Ireland	Trade Union

Mini Grants Applications and Awards 2003/04 to 2009/10

Year	Total Applications	Formal Education	Youth	Business and TUs	Faith Groups	Media	BME/Diaspora	Other	Total MG Awards	Formal Education	Youth	Business and TUs	Faith Groups	Media	BME/Diaspora	Other
England																
2003/04									12	5	2		1		2	2
2004/05									19	12	3					4
2005/06									9	6					2	1
2006/07									13	10	2				1	
2007/08									16	10	2	1			1	2
2008/09									9	5					3	1
2009/10	75								24	13	5				3	3
Northern Ireland																
2003/04	14	5	2				5	2	2	2						
2004/05	11	5	3				2	1	2	2						
2005/06	12	4	3				3	2	2	1				1		
2006/07	10	5	3				0	2	2	2						
2007/08	9	5	2				1	1	3	2				1		
2008/09	14	6	2	1			1	4	4	2				1	1	
2009/10	16	6	2	1			1	6	6	4		1		1		
Scotland																
2003/04	14	4					3	7	4							
2004/05	12	5					1	6	7	4						3
2005/06	11	5	2			1		3	6	3						2
2006/07	17								6	4						2
2007/08									7	4	1					2
2008/09	18								7	2	2					3
2009/10	21	7	2		1	1	2	8	7	4	2				1	
Wales																
2003/04	13								5	1	2	1				1
2004/05	19								9	4	2					3
2005/06	22								6	4	1			1		
2006/07	25								7	4	1		1			1
2007/08	14								5	3	2					
2008/09	25								10	5	3	1				1
2009/10	20								6	1	3	1			1	

Development Education Centres Survey

The Development Education Centres (DECs) have been a key player throughout the life of the DAF. There are about 43 DECs currently operating and many have been engaged in development education since the 1980s. Run by a mixture of paid employees and volunteers, the staff of DECs are committed to Building Support for Development and have built up considerable expertise in developing materials, running courses for teachers, working with children and teachers in schools and promoting development awareness within the community.

A key issue emerging from the review was the role of DAF Grants and Mini Grants in the financing of the DECs. A survey of DECs undertaken in 2006 by DEA with support from Oxfam covered all aspects of DECs including types of work undertaken and their financial situation. The questionnaire developed for this review focused on capturing the situation of DECs three years on with particular reference to relationships with DFID.

DEC Questionnaire Returns

There were 18 responses received to the DEC questionnaire out of the total number of DECs consulted which is approximately 43 (about 42% return). This compares to the 45 DECs active at the time of the 2006 survey. Since then Global Connections in Wales has closed and TIDE no longer refers to itself as a DEC.

No.	DEC
1	Pestalozzi International Development Education Centre
2	Cheshire Development Education Centre
3	WEDG, Canterbury
4	Leicester Masaya Link Group
5	Lancashire Global Education Centre
6	Highland One World Group
7	Powys Environment and Development Education Centre
8	Cumbria Development Education Centre
9	Reading International Solidarity Centre
10	Teesside One World Centre
11	Development Education in Dorset
12	Brighton Peace and Environment Centre
13	Global Education Milton Keynes
14	Beacons: the Development Education Centre for Herefordshire and Worcestershire
15	Development Education Centre, Hull
16	The One World Centre, Isle of Man
17	Craven Development Education Centre
18	Global Education, Derby

Analysis of Results

Section A – organisational profile

DECs vary considerably from no paid staff to 20. The majority have 3 to 4 staff but there is no indication of whether they are part time or not. All but one have volunteers working for them, generally more than the number of paid staff.

Section B – Strategy and work of the organisation

The founding purposes varied across the DECs but a significant number mentioned the promotion of public education related to hunger, disease and poverty. Some focused on more specific issues, particularly those like Masaya link which focused on the fostering of links between Leicester and Masaya. Others focused the provision of development education in schools from the outset. Present strategies indicated change according to the direction in which the organisation had moved since its inception. Whilst a number of DECs

indicated that their initial founding purpose had remained the same, a majority presented a more focused purpose/strategy which had been influenced by the way in which the work of the organisation had developed and by funding opportunities presented. 11 out of the 18 returns indicated a present purpose/strategy which related specifically to formal education.

Section C – Balance of Work

The majority of the work of all DEC's is with formal education including work with schools, higher education institutes, teachers training, both pre and in-service and local authorities. On average this accounts for 73% of the work ranging from 44% to 95% between DEC's. Work with young people outside of school is significant in 2 DEC's, including Wales and a number of DEC's are working in early years. There is very little work with Trade Unions, Faith Groups or churches though a limited number of DEC's carry out work with community groups. Other areas of work include programmes outdoor education and the environment.

For most DEC's the balance of work has not changed significantly but some indicated that they have moved away from community work or moved into other areas of work such as outdoor education or business. There was an indication by most groups that changes in who they worked with were influenced by where they could access funds from.

Section D – Funding

Funding patterns have changed for most of the DEC's but there is quite a bit of variation. Out of the 14 DEC's who gave the break down of funding, all but one (the Isle of Man which is not eligible for DFID funds) had funding from DFID either for DAFs and Mini Grants or for EES. However, DFID funds for Hull DEC were insignificant and have not been considered in the following discussion. The average per DEC over the years was 30% with the lowest being 9% and the highest 51%. Trends for most DEC's over the years, however, indicate an increase in dependence on DFID funding with the figures for the last financial year recorded indicating an average of 48% per DEC with the lowest being 5% and the highest 80%. Key players that used to fund DEC's but are now hardly giving any funding at all are Oxfam, Christian Aid and the National Lottery. Some DEC's are accessing funds through local councils and other locally available funding sources.

DEC's are concerned about stability of funding with only 2 DEC rating their position at 4 out of 6 on a rating scale of 1 to 6 where 1 is least stable. Just under half rated their position as 3 whilst 4 gave a rating of 1 indicating that their position was strongly unstable.

All DEC's are generating some of their own income, though some is minimal in the form of membership fees. Overall this varies from 1-2% in 2 DEC's to 30% at the highest in 1 DEC only. For one DEC where accommodation is provided gratis, they are not eligible to charge for services which is a cause for concern.

All DEC's felt that generating their own funds was vital but were finding it difficult to do so. Suggestions for funding included the view that DCSF should be proactive in supporting work in the Global Dimension since it was now in the secondary curriculum. Mention was also made of the importance of quality materials being published and suggested publishers as a possible source of fund generation.

Section E – relationships

Relationships with regional bodies were generally thought to be positive and most rated them between 4 and 6 though there were some that gave a rating of 1 or 2 only indicating some dissatisfaction with the relationship. The view was expressed that DEA were helpful at providing information and that they were useful for advertising courses.

The picture with regard to EES was mixed. For organisations who were coordinating EES it was generally positive and the view was expressed that they had good relations across the region. For other DEC's they could generally see the value of EES but the views were expressed that it was not necessarily the best way of networking across the regions and that whilst networking regionally may be a good networking was best at the local level.

The importance of DEC's working together and the opportunities for mutual learning came through strongly. A number of DEC's were involved in joint working on DAFs and mini grants.

Others expressed the view that there was minimal interaction on DAFs and mini grants despite good relationships across the region between DECs.

On relationship with DFID views were mixed. Some expressed that the relationship was good as they had a DAF or had had a ministerial visit whilst others did not feel they had a relationship with DFID. There were some complaints about DFID not responding to invitations and an indication by one recipient that the relationship had deteriorated since the DAF was contracted out.