



Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality

e-conference paper

Concretising empowerment through school profiles: lessons from Nigeria and Tanzania

Jo Heslop, Institute of Education, University of London;
Ruth Audu, Community Action for Popular Participation (CAPP), Nigeria;
Dunstan Kishekya, Maarifa ni Ufunguo, Tanzania.
Contact: j.heslop@ioe.ac.uk

e4e E-Conference Discussion Paper
Week 2: 19th – 23rd April 2010

Citation format:

Heslop, J, Audu, R, Kishekya, D (2010). Concretising empowerment through school profiles: lessons from Nigeria and Tanzania. In *Engendering Empowerment: Education and Equality e-Conference*. 12 April – 14 May. United Nations Girls' Education Initiative: New York.
Available from URL: <http://www.e4conference.org/e4e>

© The Authors 2010.

Concretising empowerment through school profiles: lessons from Nigeria and Tanzania

Introduction

The paper aims to introduce a way of examining gender and empowerment at the school level using a school profile tool that has been developed by the Transforming Education for Girls in Nigeria and Tanzania (TEGINT) project. The school profile compiles data on gendered school processes, outcomes and actions collected in a baseline study across 129 schools in Northern Nigeria and Tanzania. We will share lessons on how it has been of help in understanding gendered processes, challenges and opportunities at the school, district and state level to guide community intervention and advocacy work with government to make schools better places for girls. We will also focus on two aspects of the school profiles. Firstly, we will look at how school management actions or inactions may or may not be addressing girl's perceptions of obstacles to their schooling. Secondly, we are interested in how well perceptions of girls, teachers, head teachers and school management committee members match data collected through baseline surveys on efforts (school level activism) and outcomes (gender parity in access, retention and achievement) in girls' education and why might there be discrepancies. Although there is some theoretical work on empowerment (e.g. Kabeer, 1999; Veneklasen and Miller, 2002; Gaventa, 2006), applying this knowledge to the field of enhancing girls' rights to and within education is limited. Perceptions of obstacles facing girls and how well the school is addressing them are critical in determining the action that is taken to transform education for girls, and we aim to highlight these connections through the school profiles and consider what it means for girls' education.

Background

The Project

The paper reports on findings from a baseline study undertaken for the TEGINT project (Transforming Education for Girls in Nigeria and Tanzania). The project is being implemented by two NGOs, Community Action for Popular Participation (CAPP) in Nigeria and Maarifa ni Ufunguo in Tanzania, in partnership with ActionAid and a number of

researchers - University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania; the Institute of Development Research and Danfodiyo University in Nigeria; and the Institute of Education in the UK. The project, which runs from 2008 to 2011, aims to achieve a transformation in the education of girls, enabling them to enrol and succeed in school by addressing key challenges and obstacles that hinder their participation in education and increase their vulnerability to HIV and AIDS. The project consists of a combination of three mutually reinforcing strands: community intervention, advocacy and research. A central principle to the partnership element of the project is that bringing different organisations working at different levels and in different contexts together in a systematic and sustained way and in a spirit of open dialogue is key to transforming education for girls. The collaborative nature of the project allows learning to be shared and to feed into different elements of the project. Often research stays with researchers while practitioners get on with the practice. We are finding innovative ways to break those barriers to promote learning within the project and with others.

The baseline study

The data used for the school profiles were gathered in the baseline study for the TEGINT project. The baseline study consisted of quantitative data collection from school administrative records and from interviews and surveys with 2736 school girls, teachers, head teachers, school management committee members and community leaders at 57 primary and secondary schools in six districts of Northern Tanzania and 72 primary and junior secondary schools in eight states of Northern Nigeria. Data was gathered on a multitude of issues of importance to the project, including gendered dimensions of school access, attendance and progression; school management processes; school facilities and financing, violence, teacher training; and views on quality and mobilisation of girls' education.

The first stage of analysis focused on looking at overall patterns emerging in each country study and then considered what contextual factors might help account for variation at state or district level or urban/rural location, for example historical and political differences and access to infrastructure. A paper will be shared at the e4 conference in Senegal sharing some of these broader insights, in particular looking at the baseline findings in relation to women's literacy and poverty (Ingram, Mamedu and Kishekya, forthcoming).

The baseline findings have helped CAPP and Maarifa, the project implementing partners, to plan broad strategies for project implementation and have been especially useful for developing advocacy strategies. However, the central approach of the TEGINT project involves working with key groups within communities (for example, girls' clubs, community circles, school management committees) to build skills and confidence and support them to understand and demand their rights to education and challenge gender discrimination. In order to do this effectively and help meet the specific challenges at a local level we needed to understand what was going on at each school. This led to the development of 129 school profiles and 14 district or state profiles, covering all schools involved in the project in both countries.

School profiles

The school profiles aim to summarise key information in an easy to use format to help comparisons be made between schools and enable targeted interventions. Each two-page profile summarises 38 pieces of key information on gendered processes, actions and outcomes specific to that school. Examples of school profiles accompany this paper, along with a key to define the terms used in the profiles. District or state profiles compiled the data for all schools where the project was working into a district summary, to allow easy comparison with the school profiles.

Because of the large amount of data and to facilitate analysis we developed some composite indicators. The first one we called the "gender profile" score and incorporated gender parity of enrolment, attendance, progression, attainment and completion into one gender parity score. The second composite indicator was the "school management gender profile" score. This included the extent of training for teaching staff, school governance committees and parents on gender and HIV; school committee monitoring of teaching and girls' enrolments and pass rates; extent and nature of school outreach to disadvantaged groups such as girls who are orphaned or involved in hawking; extent of school involvement in education campaigning; and involvement of girls in local activities aimed at improving schooling. These composite scores have proved useful in condensing information in the school profiles to make them easy to use.

There are several limitations to the school profiles. For example, the data gaps, outlined further below, have meant that we have had to compromise on the way we have calculated some of the summary scores. Sometimes specific data that would help answer a question we have simply was not collected in the study and we have had to use the next best thing available. The profiles do not provide all the nuance and depth that qualitative information can provide. They do not provide everything we might want or need to fully evaluate schools in relation to girls' education. They do however provide a useful snapshot of each school and we see them as a starting point that could be developed further.

Some findings from the school profiles

One key observation is that, whilst we have seen key trends across different geographical and political boundaries (i.e. state or district differences) there is also significant variation between schools within states and similar locations. For example, one school in the Federal Capital Territory in Nigeria has a pupil teacher ratio of 65:1 but comes 14th of 72 in terms of school action on gender, whilst another school in the same location's teacher pupil ratio is 30:1 but comes 50th on school action on gender. This illustrates wide variation between schools on teaching staff resources and action taken in ways that may be surprising. Looking at aggregated data alone, whilst useful for some purposes, can mask key important differences at school level. Localised contextual factors could be playing a part for some of these differences (for example, on analysing one school profile in Arusha district, Tanzania, programme officers highlighted that the extremely low rate of retention, completion and attainment in one school compared to others in the district could be affected by the large number of parents who were traders in that village and did not spend much time in their home and community and were less able to monitor their children's attendance). However, it is likely that school-based factors, especially school management, are playing key role in school differences within geographical areas. Looking at these can help identify opportunities at the school level.

The school profiles have also highlighted a lack of quality data available from school administrative records. This is especially the case for the data collected in Nigeria, where only two-thirds of schools in the study had half or more of the data needed to calculate gender parity in enrolment, attendance, retention, completion and performance. There were

minimal records available before the year of data collection and for specific year groups, and many inconsistencies in the records that suggest inaccuracies. There is low capacity in data management and inadequate facilities for storing records, so records have become damaged or gone missing.

Perceptions on obstacles to education and forms of mobilisation

One interesting part of the school profiles looks at girls' perceptions of which obstacles stand in their way of achieving their desired level of education, as well as school management committees' perceptions of obstacles to girls' education. School management (committee members and head teachers) were also asked about a range of activities they were doing both within the school (such as staff training and monitoring, incorporation of gender in curriculum and monitoring girls' access, progression and attainment), outreach in their communities to families of girls not attending or particularly vulnerable groups) and campaigning work with government (for example on school funding or facilities). We matched actions to problems to see what school management was responding to.

This provides a rich source of information to help CAPP and Maarifa identify where there might be gaps and where promoting the right kind of dialogue and analysis could help schools consider strategies to address local challenges. For example, at a school in Katsina state, Nigeria (see school profile attached) the vast majority of girls participating in the study cited pregnancy and ill health as obstacles, as well as poverty, whilst the school board recognised poverty and girls' domestic work, and only took action on poverty. Meanwhile girls suggested that family life education and awareness raising with parents would help them overcome these obstacles. In this school this seems to be barely happening with, for example, only 3 in 10 girls saying they had received any information on HIV/AIDS and even less on girls' rights. The school profiles are helping to uncover taboo issues such as those around girls' sexuality and reproductive health and rights and how they impact on girls' rights to education.

Perceptions of how well the school supports girls' education

Another interesting part of the school profile is that which looks at girls', teachers', head teachers, and committee members' perceptions of quality vis a vis actual actions and outcomes on girls' education (as measured by the composite Gender Profile Score and Gender Management Score mentioned above). As an overall trend, in both countries all groups' ratings were higher than what the "hard data" said about gender parity and actions to make schooling work better for girls. So, whilst school data on enrolment and progression often highlighted big gender gaps and there seemed to be little work to help girls attend and succeed many thought the schools were supporting girls' education very well. When we look at the school level it becomes clear that there are large amounts of variation in perceptions between groups and between schools. In fact there are no clear patterns: in some schools all groups thought the school was doing better than the data says whilst in others there was a lot of variation in responses, with no clear patterns as to who tended to think more positively or critically about school performance.

For example, in one school in Arusha district, Tanzania (see example profile attached, under Obstacles for girls' education and mobilisation section), all groups said the school was supporting girls' education very well, the highest rated of all the schools covered in fact. However, its gender profile score is what we have assessed as below gender parity (mainly because of a low completion rate for girls) and it is doing mid-level activism, so there are evidently improvements to be made towards achieving gender equality in the school. The school is performing reasonably well compared to others in the study so participants may consider this as good performance; in fact it would be difficult for participants to see if and how a school is falling short without the knowledge of what a gender equitable or girl friendly school looks like.

Implications

These findings, and particularly the wide level of variation between schools, suggest a number of uses for the school profiles and implications for policy and practice.

The school profiles are helping to highlight the need for quality data management and monitoring at all levels in the education system. In Tanzania Maarifa ni Unfungo has been sharing the profiles with school authorities to help monitor progress in indicators. Meanwhile CAPP is providing training and ongoing support to school and education authorities in data management and is helping school management to understand the purpose of data management in improving quality and monitoring progress in supporting girls' education. The government supplies registers but no training and CAPP are also advocating for the need for accompanying government training to all involved in keeping and using school based data. Global Action Week this week is being used as a key opportunity to advocate for resources to address training needs in data management as well as increased storage provision for school administrative data, explicitly linking this to making schools more responsive to girls.

The large variability between schools, as well as the poor quality data, also suggest that aggregated data, especially at the national level, such as used in the Global Monitoring Reports, can mask the real picture of what is happening in schools. We have found this to be particularly the case in Nigeria, where our data collected directly from schools suggest a much bleaker picture than those depicted in international datasets. Our findings suggest that these highly aggregated data be used with caution.

We have found the information in the school profiles based on perceptions of key actors at school level as an important addition to complement school based administrative data in the school profiles. A critical understanding amongst school leadership, staff and pupils of the problems relating to gender and education is an important step in making change happen in schools. Paulo Freire's work on raising critical consciousness of unjust structures and how to change them is an important influence in ActionAid's work in education, which focuses on people claiming rights to education. The school profiles highlight that many groups see their school as supporting girls' education very well, whilst in fact there is a large gender gap in retention and performance and little action on girls' education. This suggests a need to focus on creating awareness of rights and supporting groups to critically analyse the gendered school environment and education system before they can demand their rights to an equitable education provision. In Nigeria CAPP have focused on training and supporting school based

management committee members to deepen their understanding of gender inequalities in their schools and communities and work with others to plan action at school level and campaign for better state provision to meet local needs. CAPP have also been training and supporting girls' club facilitators (mostly teachers from the schools the project is working in) so that they can more effectively support girls in understanding their rights, critically examining their school environment and advocating for change. We hope to share the profiles directly with the different groups in schools, including girls in clubs, as a tool to facilitate dialogue, reflection and understanding of what the gendered processes are happening at their school and what actions could be taken to address them.

Where there are differences in opinion, for example in perceptions of how well the school is supporting girls' education, which is the case in many schools, this is where it could be really valuable to bring groups together to share their views and plan strategies together. The school profiles can help identify which groups may be more critical and/or realistic and understand their views more. They may have insights and ideas that others have not thought about and these concerns and ideas can be shared with others to help collective critical thinking about challenges and opportunities to address them. It will be important to be aware of visible and hidden power imbalances in communities when facilitating this kind of community dialogue and create safe spaces for open dialogue and reflection to ensure that the voices of the most powerful do not dominate (Gaventa and Cornwall, 2006).

Conclusion

The school profiles help to illustrate complex and interlocking influences on gender discrimination and quality in education. They help to highlight a need to move beyond the standard demand side interventions that exist to address girls' education, such as more schools, or more teachers, to a more demand driven approach of addressing issues. We are finding school profiles to be a helpful tool to do this, in part because they highlight school-level needs but also because they help provide tangible examples that can be used to highlight issues that need attention with government and media. They are proving helpful in tailoring work with communities to address specific contexts of each school and community and promote critical gender analysis by key groups. By supporting girls to build confidence to speak out and articulate their needs and support required, by working with school

management to help them listen to the voices of girls and involve them in planning appropriate action and by creating safe spaces to bring groups together we hope to address some of the barriers to education highlighted in school profiles.

References

Gaventa, J. (2006) 'Finding the Spaces for Change: A Power Analysis', *IDS Bulletin*, 37(6): 23-33. Brighton: IDS.

Gaventa, J. and Cornwall, A. (2006) 'Challenging the Boundaries of the Possible: Participation, Knowledge and Power', *IDS Bulletin* 37(6): 69-78. Brighton: IDS.

Ingram, Mamedu and Kinyesha, forthcoming paper (soon to be available on e4 website)

Kabeer, N. (1999) 'Resources, agency, achievements: reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment', *Development and Change* 30(3): 435-64.

Veneklasen, L. and Miller, V. (2002) *A New Weave of Power, People and Politics*, Oklahoma: World Neighbours: 39-57.

Questions for e-discussion:

We would like you to contribute to critical debate on if and how school profiles, or some variation of them, can be used to help transform education for girls in different contexts. Have a look at the examples of school profiles attached. Whether in government, multilateral and bilateral organisations, NGOs, CBOs, research organisations or others we would be interested to hear your views on:

- How could you use profiles like these in your work to promote gender equality in education?
- What are the benefits and challenges of using school profile tools like this?
- How could the school profiles be developed further? For example, what else might be needed to provide information to help transform education for girls?

Contact:

For information relating to this article contact Jo Heslop, Research Officer, Institute of Education, University of London, tel: +44 (0)20 7612 6422, email: j.heslop@ioe.ac.uk

For information on the TEGINT project see

<http://www.actionaid.org/main.aspx?PageID=1419> or contact Rebecca Ingram, Project Coordinator r.ingram@actionaid.org

Appendix

Tanzania School Profile

District	Arusha Municipal
School number	7
Is school in an urban or rural area?	urban
School Type	Primary School
Gender parity in enrolment, retention and completion	
GPI Enrolment 2008	0.96
% of girls attending	100%
GPI attendance	1.00
Retention: % of girls enrolled in Grade 1 in 2002 who are enrolled in Grade 7 in 2008	64%
GPI Retention	1.19
Completion: % of girls enrolled in Grade 2 2002 who passed exams in 2007	67%
GPI Completion	0.58
% of girls who sit exams who pass in all subjects (end of Primary Tanzania)	100%
GPI Performance	1.00
School gender profile	0.84
School gender profile rank	11
School management processes	
School management gender profile rank	13
Number of pupils per teacher	22
Teacher sex ratio (number of females for each male teacher)	1.29
Teacher qualification profile rank	28
Facilities	
% of school administrative records available	94%
Separate latrines for girls	Yes
Mean number of students per functioning latrine	58
Class 6&7 both have their own rooms and all girls and boys have desks and chairs (Primary Class 1/JSS1)	Yes
Violence	
Any report in 2008 of violence against girls?	Yes
Actions taken about violence in school	Improve Security

School finance	
What were levies charged for in 2008?	School Fees
Total Levies Charge reported	417,000
Total School Income reported	No data
Levies as a proportion of income reported	
Obstacles for girls' education and mobilisation	
Most important obstacles girls raised	Poverty (50%), Parents withdrew from school (30%), lack of facilities (30%)
Which issues that girls raise do SMBC or head teacher say they have responded to?	Poverty, Parents withdrew from school, lack of facilities
Most important strategies to address them that girls raised	Sponsorship (60%), Abolish fees and Levies (30%), Family life Education (50%)
Obstacles SMC's raise as important	Ill Health
Gender and HIV/AIDS lessons	
% of trained teachers who report that they are actively promoting understanding of gender and HIV/AIDS	60%
% of girls who have received training/information on HIV/AIDS	60%
% of girls who have received training/information on girls' and women's rights	90%
Perceptions on quality	
School rating by girls on how well school supports girls' education	Very Well
School rating by teachers on how well school supports girls' education	Top measure
School rating by head teacher on how well school supports girls' education	Very Well
School rating by SMC on how well school supports girls' education	Very Well
Assessment of gender profile	Below gender parity
Assessment of school management gender profile	Some activities on gender
To what extent do perceptions of girls, teachers, head teachers and SMC members match reality?	All groups think the school is doing better than our data suggests.

Nigeria School Profile

State	Katsina
School number	6
Is school in an urban or rural area?	Rural
School Type	JSS
Gender parity in enrolment, retention and completion	
GPI Enrolment 2008	0.37
% of girls attending	
GPI attendance	
% of girls who sit exams who pass in all subjects - GJSS	87%
GPI Performance - GJSS	0.89
School gender profile	0.69
School gender profile rank	57
School management processes	
School management gender profile rank	8
Pupil Teacher ratio (number of pupils per teacher)	74
Teacher sex ratio (number of females for each male teacher)	0.43
Teacher qualification profile rank	16
Facilities	
% of school administrative records available	25%
Separate latrines for girls	No
Mean number of students per functioning latrine (Primary schools only)	
Class 6&7 both have their own rooms and all girls and boys have desks and chairs (Primary Class 1/JSS1)	No
Violence	
Any report in 2008 of violence against girls?	No
Actions taken about violence in school	None (not applicable)
School finance	
What items were levies charged for?	Not reported
Total Levies Charge	

Obstacles for girls' education and mobilisation	
Most important obstacles girls raised	Poverty (90%), ill health (80%), Pregnancy (80%)
Which issues that girls raise do SMBC or head teacher say they have responded to?	Poverty
Most important strategies to address them that girls raised	Sponsorship (90%), Family life education (90%), Enlightenment of parents (90%)
Obstacles SMC's raise as important	Fees, Working in home, Income earning
HIV/AIDS	
% of trained teachers actively promoting understanding of gender and HIV/AIDS	
% of girls who have received training/information on HIV/AIDS	30%
% of girls who have received training/information on girls' and women's rights	20%
Perceptions on quality	
School rating by girls on how well school supports girls' education	Very Well
School rating by teachers on how well school supports girls' education	Very well
School rating by head teacher on how well school supports girls' education	Very well
School rating: does SMC think school supports girls' education?	Not reported
Assessment of gender profile	Well below gender parity
Assessment of school management gender profile	Few activities on gender
Overall assessment	Very poor
To what extent do perceptions match reality?	There is a very big discrepancy between the positive perceptions of all groups and the very poor assessment of girls' education.

School Profile Key

Indicator	Explanation (where necessary – others we think are self explanatory)
District/State	
School name	
Is school in an urban or rural area?	
School Type	Primary, Secondary, JSS
Gender parity in enrolment, retention and completion	
GPI Enrolment 2008	This compares girls with boys' enrolment. GPI is number of girls enrolled/number of boys enrolled. A GPI of 1 indicates gender parity (equal numbers of girls and boys enrolled). If the number is more than 1 then more girls are enrolled than boys. If the GPI is below 1 then more boys are enrolled than girls, and the lower the number, the lower the gender parity (and a worse situation for girls).
% of girls attending	This is the % of girls enrolled in 2008 who were recorded as attending on the dates specified in the baseline. This data is available for primary schools only in Nigeria.
GPI attendance	This compares the girls attendance rate with the boys attendance rate (see GPI Enrolment above for explanation of GPI – the same applies here). This data is available for primary schools only in Nigeria.
Retention: % of girls enrolled in Grade 1 in 2002 who are enrolled in Grade 7 in 2008	These cannot be calculated for Nigeria because of lack of 2002 data and insufficient data by class.
GPI Retention	This compares the girls' retention rate with the boys' retention rate (see GPI Enrolment above for explanation of GPI – the same applies here). These cannot be calculated for Nigeria because of lack of 2002 data and insufficient data by class.
Completion: % of girls enrolled in Grade 2 2002 who passed exams in 2007	Self explanatory. These cannot be calculated for Nigeria because of lack of 2002 data and insufficient data by class.
GPI Completion	This compares the girls' completion rate with the boys' completion rate (see GPI Enrolment above for explanation of GPI – the same applies here). These cannot be calculated for Nigeria because of lack of 2002 data and insufficient data by class.

% of girls who sit exams who pass in all subjects (end of Primary Tanzania, end of JSS Nigeria)	
GPI Performance	This compares the girls' performance rate with the boys' performance rate (see GPI Enrolment above for explanation of GPI – the same applies here).
School gender profile	<p>The school gender profile combines GPI enrolment, attendance, retention, performance and repetition into a summary score. The school gender profile works the same way as the GPIs above, so a score of more than 1 indicates a favourable school environment for girls and a score of less than 1 indicates a favourable school climate for boys.</p> <p>Nigeria: Because of missing data, the gender school profile scores have to be calculated differently to the Tanzania scores and differently in Nigerian primary and JSS schools.</p> <p>*after school gender profile score means that only one piece of data listed above was available, so these scores should be read with extreme caution.</p> <p>**after school gender profile score means that only two pieces of data listed above were available, so these scores should be read with caution.</p>
School gender profile rank	The school gender profiles were ranked in order. A rank of 1 indicates that it is the school with the highest gender profile score (i.e. most favours girls), going down to 57 for the worst performing school in terms of gender parity (72 Nigeria).
School management processes	
School management gender profile rank	This score indicates the strength of school management in terms of girls' education. It includes staff training, outreach work with disadvantaged groups, campaigning, workshops for teachers, parents and SMBCs and participation of girls in school, development activities. The scores were then ranked in order, with 1 being the best school and 57 being the worst school (72 Nigeria).
Number of pupils per teacher	
GPI teachers	This is the number of women teachers divided by the number of men teachers. So if the score is 3 it means that there are 3 times as many women and men teachers. If the score is 0.5 it means that there half as many women and men teachers. In this way it works the same as GPI more than 1 means more females, less than 1 means more males)
Teacher qualification profile rank	This score indicates the level of qualifications of the teachers. The scores were then ranked in order, with 1 being the best school and 57 being the worst school (72 Nigeria).

Facilities	
% of school administrative records available	A score was developed summing up the different types of key administrative data available (e.g. enrolment, attendance, pass rates), which was then turned into a percentage.
Separate latrines for girls	Yes/no
Mean number of students per functioning latrine	
Class 6&7 both have their own rooms and all girls and boys have desks and chairs (Primary Class 1/JSS1)	Yes/no
Violence	
Any report in 2008 of violence against girls?	Yes/no
Actions taken about violence in school	Any actions that the head teacher said that were taken are listed here
School finance	
What were levies charged for in 2008?	All items are listed
Total Levies Charge reported	
Total School Income reported	Here the amount the head teacher reported for Capitation Grant, Development grant and Other Sources are added together. Note: some data is missing, and it is not clear whether this means that the school received nothing or whether the question was not answered. Data is not available for this in Nigeria.
Levies as a proportion of income reported	This is school income divided by levies charged. Please note that is school income data is not complete this proportion may be inaccurate (for example, if there is no information for "other sources" it is counted as 0, when in fact there may be other income information that was not provided). Data is not available for this in Nigeria.

Obstacles for girls' education and mobilisation	
Most important obstacles girls raised	The 3 obstacles given most by girls for each school are provided here, along with the % of girls who named that obstacle. Please note that only 9 or 10 girls were interviewed per school so 90% only actually means 9 girls out of 10. Sometimes more than 3 obstacles are provided if equal numbers of girls stated them.
Which issues that girls raise do SMBC or head teacher say they have responded to?	We have mapped actions taken by head teachers and SMCs onto the top 3 obstacles raised by girls. For example, if girls say poverty and the SMC reports that it is providing fees/levies support then we would say that they are responding. The full mapping of actions to obstacles can be found in the table below. So here, we have listed whichever of the top 3 obstacles stated by girls that had matching actions to them.
Most important strategies to address them that girls raised	The 3 top responses of girls for how to overcome the obstacles to girls schooling are provided here, along with the % of girls who named that obstacle. Please note the small samples at school level (as explained above).
Obstacles SMC's raise as important	All the responses SMC representatives at each school gave as to why girls don't attend school are listed here.
Gender and HIV/AIDS lessons	
% of trained teachers who report that they are actively promoting understanding of gender and HIV/AIDS	Please note the small samples at school level (as explained above).
% of girls who have received training/information on HIV/AIDS	Please note the small samples at school level (as explained above).
% of girls who have received training/information on girls' and women's rights	Please note the small samples at school level (as explained above).

Perceptions on quality	
School rating by girls on how well school supports girls' education	Girls, head teachers and SMCs were asked to rate how well they thought their school supported girls' education (answer: very well, well, average, poorly, very poorly). For girls the mean response per school was calculated.
School rating by teachers on how well school supports girls' education	Teachers were asked the same question but their responses were split into 4 categories: top measure, average, below average, bottom measure. For teachers the mean response per school was calculated.
School rating by head teacher on how well school supports girls' education	Head teachers responded as girls (see above)
School rating by SMC on how well school supports girls' education	SMCs responded as girls in Tanzania (see above). In Nigeria SMCs were asked whether the school supported girls education; they answered yes/no.
Assessment of gender profile	Here we have categorised the gender profile scores (see first section above) as follows: >0.9 "Gender parity, or girls do better than boys" 0.7-0.9 "Below gender parity" <0.7 "Well below gender parity"
Assessment of school management gender profile	Here we have categorised the school management gender profile scores (see second section above) as follows: 35-50 "Many activities on gender" 20-34 "Some activities on gender" 0-19 "Few activities on gender"
Overall assessment	This combines the assessment of gender profile and school management gender profile into an overall assessment. It is worked out as follows:
To what extent do perceptions match reality?	Here we have compared what girls, teachers, head teachers and SMC members say about how well the school supports girls' education with our assessment of gender parity at the school and efforts to address gender, and written a few words of analysis.