



# Final evaluation of KIYO's Empowering youth together globally program Belgium

*Final report | 1 June 2026*

*Impact House, Rue Joseph II 20 | 1000 Brussels, Belgium  
[www.odsupport.eu](http://www.odsupport.eu) | [info@odsupport.eu](mailto:info@odsupport.eu)*

---

## Executive summary

This document summarises the findings of the final evaluation of KIYO's five-year DGD-funded programme (2022–2026), Empowering Youth Together Globally, implemented in Belgium in partnership with Djapo. The programme aimed to create quality learning environments enabling young people to discover their rights, develop their potential, and become active citizens. It operated across three strands: School 4 Rights (S4R), Action 4 Rights / Youth 2 Youth (Y2Y), and Lift Up (organisational capacity development).

The evaluation was conducted between April and June 2026 by Veronika Horvath and Andres Narros (ODS) and drew on document review, 14 key informant interviews, and participant observation. Given that KIYO took the decision to close operations in 2026, the evaluation was designed to distil learning for the broader sector rather than inform KIYO's future work.

### Relevance

The programme demonstrated strong relevance. Schools engaged primarily due to pre-existing interest in global citizenship, a desire for external expertise, and a need to address practical challenges such as student disengagement and behavioural issues. KIYO's tailored, universal content and expertise aligned closely with its Theory of Change, which targeted both student experience and educator awareness.

Key factors supporting relevance included the breadth of content (allowing each school to find applicable topics), individually tailored trajectories, and KIYO's credibility as a specialist organisation. Relevance was constrained in some cases by structural factors, notably teachers' time burdens beyond the trajectory, and the emergence of new institutional priorities (e.g. decolonisation frameworks, gender) that the programme could not accommodate within the funding period.

### Effectiveness

KIYO met or surpassed all measured targets between 2022 and 2025. Concrete results included:

- Changes to school-wide policies, including student council governance and anti-bullying protocols;
- Shifts in informal practices, such as rights-based decision-making and inclusive participatory methods;
- Improved teacher knowledge of children's rights and global citizenship;
- Enhanced self-image and confidence among participating young people;
- New programme activities introduced by Lift Up partner organisations.

Key enablers of effectiveness included the provision of concrete tools and structured in-person events, a focus on localised and tangible actions, supportive school leadership, and the interpersonal skills of KIYO staff.

Effectiveness was hindered by the significant time demands placed on teachers, the operational stress of fundraising uncertainty and staff departures, and limited spontaneous demand for Lift Up accompaniment.

### Sustainability

Financial sustainability of the programme has been severely constrained. None of the programme's components achieved standalone financial viability, and most tools and approaches (including Youth 2 Youth and Lift Up) will cease with KIYO's closure. Social and technical sustainability is most likely where changes have been embedded into the policies and everyday practices of partner schools and organisations.

A significant limiting factor is the limited effectiveness of train-the-trainer approaches: coaching a small group of teachers did not lead to school-wide multiplication of impact as anticipated. Future programmes would benefit from planning for direct engagement with target groups rather than relying on cascading models. Positive sustainability outcomes were most evident where new written policies (e.g. anti-bullying frameworks) were introduced, as these persist independently of continued KIYO involvement.

### Impact

The evaluation identified "seeds of change" at the school and organisational level. School shared their experience with a lasting shift in institutional identity, fully embedding student participation and a rights-based approach into its culture beyond the programme period. Changes to internal policies in several schools and organisations represent potential mid-term effects.

No clear evidence of broader societal impact was found at the community, sector or national level. This reflects the programme's scale (not broad enough for wider impact) and its focus on individual partnerships rather than a systemic change or advocacy focused strategy. Future programmes are advised to connect their work more explicitly to broader social and policy debates to enhance systemic relevance. However, the connection between systemic change and individual collaborations is also likely to need additional investment.

### Key recommendations for the sector

The evaluation distils the following recommendations for organisations working in children's rights and global citizenship education:

- Adopt an iterative design approach – starting from needs analysis with target groups, piloting, and regular adaptation – rather than designing programmes solely from organisational expertise and adapting on a case-by case basis.
- Build flexibility into programme design to accommodate shifting priorities (e.g. gender, decolonisation) and evolving partner contexts.
- Invest in MEAL systems that are participatory, decision-relevant, and capture change at the level of young people's experience and behaviour.
- Pursue more strategic consortium collaboration, with shared design, implementation, and learning processes.
- Develop a clear partnership strategy that articulates different forms of collaboration and their expected contributions.

- Strengthen narrative coherence – connecting programme work to broader social and policy debates – to improve sustainability and funding prospects.
- Invest in staff recruitment, development, and wellbeing, recognising that programme quality depends heavily on the quality of human relationships.

### Conclusion

KIYO's Belgian programme delivered meaningful results within a challenging operational context, demonstrating the value of tailored, rights-based education for schools and youth organisations. Its closure underscores the systemic vulnerabilities facing mission-driven organisations in a constrained funding environment. The central learning for the sector is the need to combine refined programme design with adaptive, participatory MEAL systems and strong narrative coherence to achieve and sustain impact.

## About the programme

This document is the final evaluation of the KIYO's five-year DGD programme (2022–2026), Empowering Youth Together Globally. KIYO is an organisation working to empower youth in Belgium and internationally. The Belgian programme aims to create quality learning environments that enable young people to discover and develop their talents and potential, to become aware of their rights and claim them, and to actively shape their future while contributing to a more just and sustainable world.

In Belgium, KIYO implemented the programme in partnership with Djapo. The two organisations worked directly with secondary schools and organisations that work for, with and through young people.

KIYO has worked with a total budget of 949844,48 EUR over the course of the programme in Belgium (only KIYO). The original target group of the Belgian programme (KIYO-Djapo combined) was planned as an annual coverage of 2092 teachers (317m/1775f) in 389 schools, 20 organizations and 60 mentors of youth organizations (30m/30f).

The work with schools seeks to strengthen the culture of schools. School 4 Rights, in a broader partnership with a total of five partners (originally started with six partners), aims to support teachers and school communities in integrating children's rights and global citizenship into the school culture. The programme does this by engaging directly with classes as well as with teachers.<sup>1</sup>

Action 4 Rights / Youth 2 Youth is KIYO's own youth empowerment approach. It seeks to inspire and support students towards active engagement through a global citizenship pathway and connection with their peers in different countries.

These two strands have integrated moments of connection between the programmes of KIYO outside of Belgium and the Belgian programme.

In a separate strand of work, Lift Up, KIYO supports organisations that work with, for and by young people. This support takes the form of capacity building and coaching for mentors. Lift Up focused on the civil society organisations of the 'fourth pillar, youth organisations and other nonprofit organisations.'

### Methodology of the final evaluation

The evaluation was conducted between April and June 2026, by Veronika Horvath from Organisation Development Support (ODS).

The evaluation collected information through:

- A thorough review of documentation from the work of KIYO, including quantitative and qualitative data, reporting and internal reflection documents;

---

<sup>1</sup> The full partnership included Djapo, KIYO, Plan International België, RCN Justice&Démocratie, UNICEF België and VIA Don Bosco

- Interviews with KIYO staff, Board, school partners, organisational partners and one student (a total of 12 interviews).
- Participant observation at the School 4 Rights Inspiration Day on 12 March 2026 in Mechelen.

### Limitations

- Overall context: In 2025, KIYO took the difficult decision to close operations in 2026. The evaluation took place in the final two months of KIYO's operations. At the time of the review, most staff had already departed, and the organisation was focusing on wrapping up reporting and administrative obligations. This particular moment meant that analysis and learning were not relevant for KIYO as such. Therefore, the evaluators and KIYO took the decision to distil learning for the broader sector instead of KIYO.
- Sample size: Given the limited time available; and the organisational context in which the evaluation took place, the evaluation did not have a bearing on the future work of KIYO. Therefore; the evaluators and KIYO agreed to keep the burden on key informants light. Therefore, a sample of schools and a sample of organisational development partners were interviewed. The evaluation did not collect data from students participating in the programme, as the trajectories were already finished and the management of parental consent and data protection were too challenging for large student numbers within the timeframe of the evaluation. These limitations affect the depth of insight that the evaluation could provide.
- Availability of informants to share detailed information: school staff often had limited time to discuss the programme. This meant that the evaluation did not gather granular enough information for detailed case studies.
- Limited time: the evaluation took place over two months between March and May 2026. This is a period in which schools have several holidays; which meant that the availability of interviewees was limited.
- Selection and positivity bias: Those partners who have accepted to be interviewed were likely those who had a closer relationship with KIYO. This might have meant that those who have benefitted less from the collaboration might not have contributed. Finally, KIYO's network had a lot of sympathy for the organisation and the team as it is going through closure. This might have affected the willingness of participants to share critical points.

### Research questions

Research questions were designed in a way that the reflections gathered would lead to insights and recommendations for the sector, as opposed to past exercises where evaluations were conducted with a view towards informing the work of the organisation.

- Relevance:
  - Why did schools and partners engage in the programme?
- Effectiveness:
  - To what extent have implemented strategies contributed to achieving expected results and outcomes?

- How satisfactory is the quality of the achieved results?
- Has the programme effectively empowered youth by strengthening learning environments?
- What factors have facilitated or hindered the achievement of results?
- Was the way in which the trajectories were set up the best way to reach our results - to contribute to the quality learning environment?
- Sustainability:
  - Financial: Were the strategies, approaches, and materials financially sustainable and likely to continue beyond the programme's end?
  - Social: Have participation and ownership among target groups and intermediaries ensured continued social relevance?
  - Technical: Has the programme strengthened the capacities of target groups and partners to maintain and build upon results?
- Impact:
  - What are the medium- and long-term effects of the intervention (positive or negative, intended or unintended)?
  - Have benefits for target groups generated broader changes or multiplier effects at community, sector, or national levels?

## Analysis of the programme

The below section summarises insights from the document review and key informant interviews.

### Relevance

Main research question: Why did schools and partners engage in the programme?

#### Reasons for engaging in the programme

The evaluation team interviewed schools who took part in the School 4 Rights partnership to zoom in on what expectations they had on taking part in the programme. They shared a range of reasons:

- **Pre-existent interest.** Some school partners shared that the leadership was already interested in the topics covered by KIYO's work on global citizenship and were actively looking for an organisation to bring external expertise to take their work further on this topic. In some cases, schools shared that they were already working on themes around children's rights, and KIYO brought the global citizenship angle to the work.
- **School 4 Rights as a way to increase quality or to address everyday challenges.** The interviews looked at the reason for which schools were already interested in children's rights. The starting point for some schools was an ethical ambition, wanting to integrate children's rights in the school to reach higher standards. Others shared that they saw the collaboration with KIYO as a way to address long-standing behavioural challenges within the school. For example, schools shared struggles with a disengagement of students, or the growing diversity of the student population, which had led to

aggressive or inappropriate behaviour among students. Some schools ascribed these tensions to a lack of shared understanding of rights and responsibilities of students. KIYO's own assessment was that the focus on talents in the trajectory, also helped increase the interest of teachers and schools in participating.

- **Credibility of external partners.** KIYO's own assessment of the reasons for which schools joined; also included the higher legitimacy of doing this work through an external partner and the possibility to obtain a label.
- **Specific expertise and ability to connect.** KIYO also indicated that they felt that schools opted to participate because KIYO brought expertise in areas where teachers were less experienced. KIYO also brought a focus on connecting with others; nationally and internationally.

In conclusion, the way in which school partners experienced the School 4 Rights partnership aligned well with the TOC of the programme. Interviewees echoed the focus on both the experience and change in students as well as the awareness and skills of educators. In addition, all interviewees mentioned that they were also looking for ways to make students more aware of their obligations in addition to their rights. This interpretation aligns with the vision of the TOC, which focuses on empowerment that is inclusive of rights as well as obligations.

Youth 2 Youth partners were not interviewed for the evaluation. Based on the desk review, it can be concluded that the concept of the work was aligned with the TOC, especially in bringing an international perspective to the work around children's rights and engagement.

KIYO also worked with organisational partners, some of whom were interviewed for the evaluation. One institutional partner shared that the collaboration was especially relevant for them as a way of accessing expertise on communicating children's rights to the students they work with in higher education. This was an area of expertise that they otherwise felt that they could not provide. Therefore; the collaboration was relevant in providing expertise that they would not otherwise be able to access. Another organisational partner confirmed the complementarity of KIYO's expertise to their own. In that case, although both organisation shared a focus on youth and empowerment, the partner valued that KIYO brought the frameworks and networks to reach young people from a broad range of backgrounds, and experience with project-based work, learning and evaluation.

### Factors supporting relevance

The approach of School 4 Rights was relevant through the universal topics that the trajectories focused on. Due to the breadth of the content; each school could find topics that met their interest. In addition, KIYO made efforts to design each trajectory in a way that would meet the challenges; questions and restraints of each partner school in a tailored way. This helped make the trajectories relevant to the specifics of each school. In the feedback from schools collected for the mid-term evaluation as well as interviews for the end-term evaluation, teachers highlighted that the coaching sessions were designed to give them practical, directly applicable approaches. This also helped promote the relevance. Finally; the School 4 Rights trajectories were aiming to qualify schools for a label. Therefore, the trajectories had to be relatively standardised to ensure

coherence, thus adaptations had to balance the needs of schools with the framework of the label. KIYO did take steps to meet the needs of the schools within these boundaries. For instance, as schools expressed their challenges in participating in long trajectories, KIYO piloted a shorter version of the trajectory, focusing on specific themes.

In the case of Youth to Youth, the relevance of the collaboration was supported by the interest and motivation of the participating organisations and schools, and the openness of the participants. The openness of the Youth to Youth framework also contributed to creating a tool that could be used in different international pairings, for example in an exchange between Brazil and DRC-based groups. Interviewees also felt that bringing youth groups together aligned well with global topics, such as climate change.

The connections that KIYO had with youth in the countries where the global programme worked, also made it a more relevant connection.

In the case of organisational development, the relevance of each collaboration was enhanced by individually assessing the needs of participating organisations and developing an individual offering aligned with their needs, for example learning about self-evaluation in principles of children's rights or the integrations of APPS in their work.

### Factors limiting relevance

In the case of Youth to Youth, a factor limiting both relevance and effectiveness stemmed from the different level of engagement - the Global South group being youth who participate in the KIYO programme in the partner countries, not in a school context and often on a voluntary basis. These participants were motivated by their own interest, while attendance for the Belgian students was compulsory.

At the strategic level, one of the partners shared that the focus of their organisation is shifting from a children's rights framework towards a decolonisation framework, making the angle of the partnership less aligned with the strategy. Similarly, in the school context; questions around gender (especially masculinities) emerged as a more urgent priority, where the programming of KIYO could not expand in the short term. KIYO shared that had the programme continued; this would have been one of the topics to which they would have dedicated more research and attention.

### Analysis and Recommendations for the sector

**Moving beyond the school-based learning environment.** The Theory of Change (TOC) of the programme, defined in collaboration between Djapo and KIYO, emphasises the focus on approaching the empowerment of youth through a focus on creating an inclusive and high-quality learning environment. The TOC also highlights that this approach looks at empowering both the rights holder (the children and youth) in strengthening their ability to make choices and participate actively in society; and the duty bearers (adults) who are supported in being more conscious of their obligations to respect and mobilise for the rights of children.<sup>2</sup> Working with schools to pursue this goal has helped KIYO's work. In addition, KIYO shared that in

---

<sup>2</sup> Theory of Change narrative, Bijlage 2 - Veranderingstheorie voor de outcome 'Empowering kinderen en jongeren in België'

recent years, the organisation has also began reaching out to non-school youth structures. These structures were expected to be progressively instrumental in reaching young people in different networks, as well as being able to work with young people in environments where they participated voluntarily, as opposed to schools where the choice to join the KIYO trajectories was made at school level. KIYO reported seeing limited uptake of collaboration among these non-school youth organisations, with no clear insight into the reason for this. KIYO shared the analysis that perhaps the added value of international connections would need to be shared more explicitly, and that offers for new collaborations with youth organisations also need to take the context into account, especially as the youth sector already has several sources of support.

**Supporting teachers and mentors, but also working directly with young people.** KIYO's APPS approach is structured around four key elements - awareness, protection, participation and skills. These aspects have covered both the change in teachers and the change in young people. The way in which the programme was structured originally assumed that change would happen through the changes in the awareness; skills and practices of teachers. In practice; KIYO team members also worked directly with students, thus adding a separate layer of relationships, working towards the same goals. In the case of School 4 Rights, this happened organically; but in other programmes the streams of working directly with youth as well as coaching teachers, could be built in on purpose.

**Designing programmes that respond to the pressures that schools, teachers and nonprofit partners experience.** In five years, organisations have experienced significant changes in their internal and external context. KIYO has adapted the design of School 4 Rights to some extent; shortening trajectories. The organisation also became aware of new angles and topics that have become more relevant in the discourse about empowerment in S4R, Y2Y and Lift Up, such as gender, anti-discrimination, intercultural communication and decolonial approaches, but it did not have time and resources to restructure the offering around these. In future programming; the design phase could already account for shifting circumstances and build flexibility into the offering. While implementing programmes, exploring the shift in strategies and priorities of different partners and planning for changes in the content can help keep the offering relevant. In the case of education, this might mean working with and around staff constraints, changing frameworks (e.g. national objectives and indicators on which schools report) within which educators deliver content, and topics that take centre stage. KIYO has implemented this shift in the revised School 4 Rights trajectories, where the trajectory was condensed into Masterclasses.

**Designing from the ground up.** KIYO, Djapo and partners developed the offering of School 4 Rights; Youth 2 Youth and Lift Up, starting from their own strategies and expertise. The evaluation found that the most pressing needs of organisations were not always completely aligned with the offering of these instruments. For example, while some schools joined hoping to work more with an international angle; other schools have shared that they took up the trajectory primarily because they struggled with student behaviour and enforcing respect for the rules. Organisational partners also arrived with different needs, only some of which were aligned with the expertise of KIYO. As a result, KIYO shared that recruiting partners for the different pathways was often challenging; despite the participation being offered for free. In addition, the motivation of participants was uneven, often showing only slow progress or limited uptake of the lessons. In future

programmes, taking an iterative **service design approach** could be relevant for organisations. Such an approach could start from a definition of the target group, an analysis of needs with the planned target group, and arriving at a first version of the service; that then could be piloted and learned from, before developing further, and iterating on a yearly or biannual basis. This way, organisations could offer their expertise to the groups that are the best fit; and adjust the offering to keep it relevant. KIYO's approach focused on adapting the support in Lift Up to each organisation on a case-by-case basis, which offered added value, but also required a high investment or resources, as opposed to designing one resource that is used across the group. The need for adaptation and the need for efficiency for all programmes will have to be balanced - for implementing organisations it will be important to make these trade-offs in an intentional and strategic way.

**Working towards a label.** The original assumption of the programme implied that the structured framework of a label would encourage more schools to participate and support relevance and effectiveness. None of the interviewees mentioned that a label was a deciding factor in their participation in the trajectory. At the end of the current funding period, the partners have decided to not continue work under the label, even where they continue to offer trajectories with schools. It remains to be seen, under what conditions and for which partnerships a label is an attractive and effective form of organising longer collaborations.

**Coherence and strategic relevance for the organisation.** In the internal organisational context of KIYO, the work of the Belgian programme was very different from the work of country programmes. At the same time, in the last strategic cycle of KIYO, the organisation structured the Belgian programme as an equal programme comparable to the other country programmes in strategy and implementation. The Belgian programme had closer contact with youth and the education system compared to the country programmes, which was seen by an internal interviewee as an opportunity to pilot approaches (for example working on gender or Youth 2 Youth) and learn about new topics that could then be taken up across the country programmes.

For Lift Up, the connections to the work in the schools or the global programme were not clear nor articulated. This might have been a missed opportunity - KIYO shared that the organisation was considering deepening connections with non-school youth organisations to build a bridge between the two practices, but it saw limited uptake of the offer to collaborate.

**Limited relevance of international aspects.** Based on feedback from school partners and reflections from KIYO, the global experience of KIYO was relevant as a door-opener and in thinking more broadly about the world. At the same time, the most relevant aspects of the work around participation and school environments, did not have a strong connection to international work. As discussed in the Effectiveness sector below, and as highlighted by partner interviews, the most successful partnerships were those that worked with small, immediate actions that were local to the school. These findings were echoed in the mid-term evaluation, which found mixed experiences among young people taking part in Youth 2 Youth. This insight offers a promising avenue for future planning. In future programmes in the sector, it would be useful to articulate the extent to which the local and international levels are expected to be connected.

In the assessment of the evaluators, the Belgian programme created value and relevance by itself through KIYO's talent-based approach<sup>3</sup> and expertise on children's rights and organisational development. In hindsight, two threads of topics emerged - **connection**, which included learning about and engaging with international partners and youth; and **action**, which included negotiating and implementing concrete activities, and was most successful at the local level. In future programming, these two modalities could be kept separate and planned for separately.

## Effectiveness

To what extent have implemented strategies contributed to achieving expected results and outcomes? • How satisfactory is the quality of the achieved results? • Has the programme effectively empowered youth by strengthening learning environments? • What factors have facilitated or hindered the achievement of results? • Was the way in which the trajectories were set up the best way to reach our results - to contribute to the quality learning environment?

KIYO has met all of its targets up to where data was available for the evaluation (the 2026 reporting was being finalised at the time of the final evaluation). The table below shows the progress towards targets. The table shows the Dutch indicator phrasing as used by KIYO and an English translation.

Indicator	Target	Total result over the course of the programme 2022-2025
SD	Scholen en organisaties die werken met, voor en door jongeren creëren een kwaliteitsvolle leeromgeving die aansluit bij de leefwereld, de context en de identiteit van alle kinderen en jongeren waarmee zij werken, zodat deze zichzelf maximaal kunnen ontwikkelen als actieve wereldburgers.	
	Schools and organisations working with, for, and by young people create a high-quality learning environment that aligns with the life world, context, and identity of all children and young people they work with, so that they can develop themselves to their fullest potential as active world citizens.	
SD1.1	Aantal scholen dat initiatieven neemt voor het creëren van een EDO/WBE-kwaliteitsvolle leeromgeving - waarvan kleuterscholen of scholen in het basis- en secundair onderwijs met een gemiddeld hoog % leerlingen in een kwetsbare context (d.i. SES, TSO/BSO, buitengewoon onderwijs) (bereik/kwantitatief) - waarvan KRS/S4R	4
		4

<sup>3</sup> KIYO's talent- centered approach is based on the work on talents of Luk Dewulf.

	<p>Number of schools taking initiatives to create an EDO/WBE quality learning environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• of which nursery schools or primary and secondary schools with an average high % of pupils in a vulnerable context (i.e. SES, TSO/BSO, special education) (reach/quantitative)</li> <li>• of which KRS/S4R</li> </ul>		
SD1.2	Gemiddelde score bij scholen op vlak van het creëren van een EDO/WBE-kwaliteitsvolle leeromgeving volgens de principes van een Whole School Approach en genderdiversiteit (kwalitatief)	2,5	2,55
	Average score at schools regarding the creation of a GCE/ESD-quality learning environment according to the principles of a Whole School Approach and gender diversity (qualitative)		
SD1.3	Aantal organisaties die werken met, voor en door jongeren dat een empowerment leertraject start (kwantitatief)	20 (2026 target)	20
	Number of organisations working with, for and by young people that start an empowerment learning trajectory (quantitative)		
SD1.4	Gemiddelde score bij organisaties die werken met, voor en door jongeren op vlak van het creëren van een EDO/WBE-kwaliteitsvolle leeromgeving volgens de principes van genderdiversiteit (kwalitatief)	3 (2026 target)	3,46
	Average score at organisations working with, for and by young people regarding the creation of a GCE/ESD-quality learning environment according to the principles of gender diversity (qualitative)		
1	<p>Resultaat 1: Leerkrachten en toekomstige leerkrachten uit het basis- en secundair onderwijs zijn gemotiveerd, competent en passen elementen in hun praktijk aan om een inclusieve EDO/WBE-kwaliteitsvolle leeromgeving te creëren waarin alle leerlingen zichzelf ontwikkelen, leren van en experimenteren met maatschappelijke vraagstukken.</p>		
	Result 1: Teachers and future teachers in primary and secondary education are motivated, competent, and adjust elements in their practice to create an inclusive GCE/ESD-quality learning environment in which all students develop themselves, learn from, and experiment with social issues.		
Ind1.1	2590 individual teachers taking advantage of the offer of KIYO/ Djapo per year - reach, quantitative <sup>4</sup> m: 388/v: 2202)	2590	5413
Ind1.2	Individual teachers who directly start implementing activities with students on setting up social actions m: 5/v: 7	18	29

<sup>4</sup> Cumulative goal for Djapo and KIYO

Ind1.3	Gemiddelde score bij leerkrachten (in opleiding) op vlak van EDO/ WBE competenties & gendersensitiviteit van 1,5 op een 4-puntenschaal (onderbouwde inschatting)	89% behaalt 2 op 4. 70% behaalt 3 op 4 in j3	Min. 70% van de bevroagde leerkrachten behaalt 2 op 4 - > In 2025 behaalt 100% deze doelwaarde Min. 10% van de bevroagde leerkrachten behaalt 3 op 4 - > In 2025 behaalt 85% deze doelwaarde
	Average scores of teachers (in training) based on EDO/ WBE competences and gender sensitivity Average score of 1.5 on a 4-point scale (substantiated estimate)		In 2025, 100% of teachers reached minimum 2 out of 4 and 85% reached 3 out of 4
5	<p>Resultaat 5: Organisaties die met, voor en door jongeren werken en hun mentoren zijn gemotiveerd, competent en passen elementen in hun praktijk en beleid aan om een kwaliteitsvolle, inclusieve leeromgeving te creëren waarin alle jongeren bewust zijn van hun rechten en hun potentieel, zich veilig voelen, zich kunnen uitdrukken en nieuwe vaardigheden ontwikkelen om sterker te staan in het leven.</p> <p>Result 5: Organisations working with, for and by young people and their mentors are motivated, competent, and adjust elements in their practice and policy to create a quality, inclusive learning environment in which all young people are aware of their rights and potential, feel safe, can express themselves, and develop new skills to be stronger in life.</p>		
Ind5.1	Aantal mentoren (m/v/x) dat door een traject bereikt is (bereik/kwantitatief)	60 (2026 target)	56
	Number of mentors (m/f/x) reached through a trajectory (reach/quantitative)		
Ind5.2	Gemiddelde score bij organisaties rond 1 of 2 elementen belangrijk voor het creëren van een kwaliteitsvolle EDO/WBE-leeromgeving (kwalitatief)	3 (2026 target)	2,76
	Average score among organizations around 1 or 2 elements important for creating a high-quality GPE/WEA learning environment (qualitative)		

The organisations interviewed for the evaluation, both schools and fourth pillar organisations and other partners, all shared having made concrete changes to the ways in which they work as a result of their engagement with KIYO. This also resonated with the data gathered by the mid-term evaluators. Interviewees and reporting from KIYO shared concrete changes at the level of:

- **School-wide policies (governance of the student council, anti-bullying policies)** - in some interviews the schools saw a qualitative change in the way in which the student council works. For example, one school shared that the student council became 'cooler' and more connected, less isolated from the rest of the students and actively creating opportunities for dialogue. They also saw the student council work more actively on diversity.
- **Informal practices.** The informal practices mentioned by schools included a yearly themed celebration about global citizenship, ways of decision-making with the students, and a collaborative practice around environmental topics. One school shared that they shifted towards more inclusive work with students and a more visual way of working to encourage participation. A school also highlighted that a positive experience of the partnership with KIYO itself has made the school more enthusiastic to build further partnerships with other organisations.
- Changes to **knowledge and awareness** about children's rights; One school shared that they see a long-term change in the awareness of teachers about global citizenship and diversity.
- Changes to the **self-image** of participating young people (increased confidence; leadership, creativity)
- Personal growth of the teachers and other adults who participated in the trajectories.
- **Educational offering of Lift Up partners to their volunteers and youth target groups.** Organisations who took part in the Lift Up trajectories have shared designing and implementing new activities to educate and engage young people, for example introducing reflections on (global) citizenship in accompaniment of volunteers and including rights awareness.

In the reflection documents with partners; the organisations identified the following factors that influenced the trajectory of the programme towards the goals. These observations came to the fore on the first batch of indicators (up to SD 1.4).

#### Indicator SD1

- The programming with schools was affected by the after-effects of COVID, resulting in a slower start. However the numbers in the end reached the target.

Schools interviewed for the evaluation shared that their interest in participating came from a growing diversity in the student body and challenges resulting from cultural diversity. At the same time, having a strong vision from the leadership of the school and at least one or more teachers who would champion the collaboration, were also key to keeping the involvement in the trajectories.

- Factors that have represented challenges in recruiting schools to the programme:
  - **Involvement required** from teachers. Teachers and consortium partners shared the analysis that teachers had little room in their schedule to invest in a trajectory. The result of this challenge was that activities sometimes took longer than expected to implement concrete steps.
  - Interviewees mentioned that the **logistics** of finding suitable moments for a group of teachers to discuss, were very challenging. One interviewee explained more in detail. In the school day, it was not possible to find sufficient time, as 45 minutes to an hour of discussion time

was experienced as too short for the themes of the trajectory. However, some teachers were also reluctant to dedicate their free time to this 'extra' activity.

- **Buy in required from leadership.** One interviewee shared that the relatively small scale of the trajectory meant that it was difficult to advocate with leadership to make it into an **organisational priority**.

### Indicator SD 1.2

This indicator looked at the quality of the education and the school's involvement in the process. The indicators looked at scores related to the content of work in the classroom (how teachers work in the classroom with their students), as well as the school-wide approach to participating in the trajectory, for example the extent to which the school team displays ownership of the trajectory. KIYO and partners remarked on the difficulty of knowing how a teacher actually applies tools in their classrooms, as observation and self-reporting both present some biases.

A reflection note from the partners indicated that the outcomes met expectations. Interviews with school partners also shared that teachers felt that they benefitted from the coaching in terms of personal skills. One interviewee also appreciated the support through the trajectory to translate their vision around relationships and wellbeing into concrete policies; starting with an anti-bullying policy.

### Indicator 1.3

KIYO built a total of 20 partnerships through the programme. These were not limited to work funded under the DGD programme but grew according to the interest and strategies of both KIYO and partners. Collaboration took different forms, from coaching and organisational support to collaboration on specific projects (for instance with Amoukanama on implementing circus-based creative activities). KIYO's approach to building partnerships was broad and open, with the organisation exploring partnering for additional projects supported by Erasmus + and other funding streams.

### Indicator SD 1.4

Over the (years of the programme, all organisations improved their assessment scores between the start and wrap-up of accompaniment trajectories. Looking back through the trajectories, KIYO reflected that the scores were affected by the baseline values, with stronger organisations scoring higher, and less strong organisations also booking less progress in the trajectories. The scores were based on a self-assessment and the assessment of the coach, and were not used for decisionmaking about the content or continuation of partnerships.

### Unintended effects

**Creative collaborations and new connections.** Through implementing the Belgian programme, KIYO has created a network of relationships with schools and fourth pillar organisations. In some cases, this collaboration was taken further; and KIYO facilitated collaborations between partners from its network, within and beyond Belgium, within and beyond the DGD programme. The creative collaborations with young people from Burundi, and between international circus or theatre companies and Belgian students, or one of the supported organisations and a Brazilian circus school, were examples of connections that would not have been possible without the unique network and expertise of KIYO.

Examples of changes at the organisational levels that drew on the international expertise of KIYO also included for example a rewriting of the volunteer policy of an organisation to include new insights around participation and active citizenship.

**Strengthening the reach and sustainability of partners.** One partner shared that because of the collaboration with KIYO, their organisation strengthened their reach among young people in Belgium. The same partner shared that peer learning from KIYO helped them review and strengthen their own ways of working.

**Limited insight into effects at the level of student experience and behaviour.** The mid-term evaluation looked more in depth at the experience of Belgian youth participants of Action 4 Rights / Youth 2 Youth. The evaluation showed a mixed picture; with students being most appreciative about the modules around rights and empowerment. However, the effectiveness of the programme was not measured in practical terms. A minority (approximately a quarter) of the students who were part of the mid-term evaluation, shared having told others about their experiences. No students shared taking concrete action. The student interviewed for the final evaluation also shared that their group has stopped working on their action plan once the direct involvement of KIYO came to an end.

At the same time, one student interviewed for the final evaluation shared that participating in the programme has created a new way to connect and **new friendships** among the group of students.

#### Factors limiting effectiveness

KIYO and partners highlighted that the trajectory required significant **time investment** from schools, which might have represented a barrier to uptake. At the same time, they shared that teachers felt that the children's right approach took a long time to embed into classroom work, yet it also created lasting change.

#### Factors supporting effectiveness

The evaluation identified a few factors that supported effectiveness and could be useful for organisations considering similar trajectories in the future.

**Concrete tools and in-person events for strengthening collaboration.** The TOC mentioned that the partnership would work in an evidence and practice- informed manner. This was reflected in the development of toolkits, structured approaches and gatherings where partners came together to share and reflect on their journeys. The Inspiration days were a good example of this, bringing in external expertise as well as connecting schools and partners on specific topics. In the 2026 Inspiration Day, the evaluator observed high levels of enthusiasm among educators for working with the creative tools for exploring identity and rights; including the use of talent cards.<sup>5</sup> KIYO and partners also used other opportunities; such as visits from international partners, or programme events under other funding streams, to invite their network and weave new relationships.

**Focusing on concrete tools, actions and early, localised results,** as opposed to high standards for the quality of actions, helped schools stay on track. Interviewees shared that organising school-wide events or working

---

<sup>5</sup> Developed by Luk Dewulf

on internal policies and structures helped make the collaboration more concrete. The same was true for working in small, immediate ways to enact change. In the experience of KIYO, talking about global action can feel too abstract for school partners. They emphasised that tangible, local changes (such as implementing an action to make the school greener or involving children about making decisions about the schoolyard design) were more successful in keeping partners motivated. The mid-term evaluation highlighted the **usefulness of concrete tools and resources** in promoting effectiveness. KIYO had indeed produced a toolkit under a separate funding stream, which was shared with partners of the DGD activities.

**A supportive school culture and engagement of school leadership.** KIYO found that school culture was a key factor in making collaborations successful. This meant that the programme worked best where they were working with at least a director and at least one teacher, together with at least some enthusiastic students who would take ownership of the trajectory. In some cases, the school already had a working group whose focus was a good fit for the trajectory; which helped participation further.

**More concentrated collaboration, instead of long-term projects.** The design of trajectories shifted to accommodate the insight that a more focused approach helped keep the collaboration active. Instead of a multi-year design, KIYO experimented with delivering a masterclass in 5-6 sessions within a year, to help ease the burden of time on teachers. KIYO and partners felt that this was a promising avenue for future design.

**Importance of personal connections and highly skilled coaches.** All interviewees stressed the importance of the personal and professional qualities of KIYO staff that supported them. They appreciated the knowledge but especially recognised the value of the ability to listen, connect and follow up with different partners. Partners also highlighted the openness, spontaneity and curiosity of KIYO team members. The combination of subject matter expertise, personal strengths and organisational project management capacities helped partners to bring shared plans to fruition; even where the collaborating partners were less experienced. Making teachers, volunteers and other staff feel safe and comfortable while learning new skills was an important factor in the outcomes.

**Tailoring organisational development support.** KIYO reflected that tailoring the support to organisations according to their needs (within the limits of KIYO's expertise) was a key factor in supporting the effectiveness of the programme. This was implemented by starting each trajectory with a self-assessment. At the same time, tailoring the approach to each organisation meant that this was a very resource intensive approach.

### Factors limiting effectiveness

**Ensuring that resources are available.** In School 4 Rights, one of the factors limiting effectiveness was the need for **time, resources and institutional support** to implement actions at the schools. This point resonated in the mid-term evaluation as well as in the interviews conducted for the end-term evaluation. In a context of growing time pressure and competing priorities, some teachers found it challenging to keep up the focus on rights-based education.

**Understanding the results of the work.** One higher education partner shared that the content provided by KIYO was taken up in an online course. The effectiveness of this course was however not monitored; therefore, it was not possible to understand how the students learned or applied insights from it.

**Aligning smaller actions with the central programme.** In addition to School 4 Rights; Youth 2 Youth and Lift Up, KIYO also implemented a plethora of smaller actions funded by non-DGD sources, for example creative collaboration with circus professionals to provide circus training and on one occasion, hosting a group of young people from Burundi to co-create a climate change-themed circus show. In this work Connect for Global Change; KIYO's own insight was that the method (creative work, circus training) was effective in attracting and engaging youth participants but also led to the original content (climate consciousness) being lost.

Creative, embodied methods, specifically circus arts, have proven successful in engaging participants. However, there was a trade off in terms of integrating the original intended content of the project - KIYO shared that enthusiasm for the physical activity sometimes took over the focus. In the future, organisations could examine this trade off further and adjust their strategy accordingly, either by reframing the intention of the work or by adjusting the content.

**Fundraising stress limited the reach of the work.** The organisational context of KIYO itself has limited the effectiveness of the programme. Given that the organisation was struggling to find sufficient funds to secure co-funding for the next iteration of the programme, fundraising became a priority goal for all staff. Fundraising for continuing the work took up a lot of the resources that could have otherwise been dedicated to design, adaptation and delivery. Job insecurity and the winding down of staff also made it difficult for team members to work effectively, often stepping in to take the workload of departing colleagues.

**Limited demand for some types of coaching.** In the case of the organisational development work of KIYO, the effectiveness of the programme was limited by the limited uptake of the offering. KIYO shared that they used significant time to search for and market the offering to organisations, as there was little spontaneous demand for this type of accompaniment. KIYO also shared that organisations had different levels of engagement, numbers of staff who attended and resources to build further on what was covered in coaching sessions. The work with organisations in Lift Up also saw a challenge due to motivation and energy to prioritise the work. Participants from fourth pillar organisations were usually volunteers with limited time and resources. Thus, even where they reported enjoying the training itself, KIYO often saw limited follow-up. Those organisations who were more motivated and who did follow up, often saw meaningful change in their ways of working and policies.

**Challenging funding environment for nonprofit organisations.** Organisations who received Lift Up support from KIYO are also facing their own challenges in a difficult funding environment, which limited the long-term outcomes of the work. At least one of the recently supported organisations has had to make important cuts to programming and staff and had to significantly downsize operations at the time of writing of this report. In cases where the organisation sees leadership changes or has to cut back on work, implementing the changes suggested in the Lift Up accompaniment is not always possible.

## Analysis and Recommendations for the sector

KIYO's programme had a unique structure combining work streams around connection and action, schools, youth and organisational development. The review of the programme highlighted some takeaways for organisations working in the sector.

**Grounding programme design in research and in-depth; collaborative assessment.** One of the strong points of KIYO's work in Lift Up and School 4 Rights was the **attention and individual dialogue** with partners in the planning phase. Interviewees shared that a structured exploration of the reality of each partner was a key enabler of the work. In these conversations, KIYO staff could understand the culture and challenges of the partners. In addition to the one-on-one conversations at the beginning of the work, direct, in-person engagement was an important part of creating and implementing the work. We have also seen that the remote data collection for MEAL (online surveys) often created data that was difficult to interpret or translate into decisions. **Structured in-person conversations** instead of surveys could have been a useful tool in collecting insights on the contribution and effects of the work.

**Designing for structural collaboration among consortium members.** KIYO and Djapo, the two main partners in the DGD programme, and the other partners in School 4 Rights, shared the overall framework of the label, and came together for some moment of collaboration and reflection. They also organised meetings among coaches and developed the School 4 Rights action plan together. However, following the design phase they mostly implemented the programme separately, developing their own approaches; tools and connections. This is also illustrated by the monitoring and evaluation framework, where several indicators are only relevant for one of the organisations, and the way in which outcomes are counted for some of them differs significantly between KIYO and Djapo. In future programmes, actively seeking for meaningful synergies in design, implementation and learning could increase the effectiveness of the work and potentially avoid duplications in the development of tools.

**Building a rich network with multiple types of relationships.** KIYO built 20 partnerships in the 5 years of the programme. These partnerships spanned from capacity strengthening and coaching, to shared implementation of programmes led by KIYO, to KIYO supporting the work of the partner, to shared fundraising for new initiatives. Some organisations partnered in more than one way (e.g. both being coached and implementing a programme together). Allowing for this complexity was useful in reflecting the complexity of relationships and gave KIYO the possibility of being responsive to opportunities as questions and requests emerged. . At the same time, a more strategic vision of partnership would have allowed KIYO to understand where closer partnering was needed; for instance, to fill gaps in expertise that the organisation did not have, to discontinue collaborations where these were felt to not bring fruit, and to assess KIYO's own contribution. Therefore; the evaluators recommend a partnership strategy for other programmes in the sector. The partnership strategy should reflect on the different forms of collaboration and create a narrative around assumptions and expectations.

**A logical framework and MEAL system that helps decision making and telling the story of the programme.**

The mid-term and end-term evaluations brought to light that the logical framework and MEAL systems were

not well aligned with the reality of the programme. For instance; some of the indicators measured at mid-term and end-term included different schools, therefore not capturing progress within the same target group, but not being able to distinguish between trajectories with different start and end times. Data collection was focused on self-assessment surveys and observation-based scoring; both of which are challenging to implement meaningfully. For example, surveys were affected by non-response and positive bias, and observations of an entire learning environment were challenging to implement with the resources at hand. In addition, the core ambitions of the programmes were around changes in the experience, attitudes and behaviours of youth; while objectives and indicators were all defined at the level of the schools or teachers. These shortcomings have meant that the MEAL system was used for accountability towards the donor but was not very useful for making decisions about the programme itself. Some elements of the programme, like Youth 2 Youth; are almost entirely absent from the MEAL framework due to the way they are built (focus on students vs focus on teachers or schools). In future programmes, the evaluators recommend additional focus on MEAL systems that are participatory (also sharing information back to the target audiences) and meaningful for decisionmaking.

**Leaving no one behind versus working with those who are most motivated to participate** In Youth 2 Youth, the programme showed that students separated into those that were most interested in participating and those who were only there because of obligations. This affected the experience of students; partners and the outcomes of the programme, as also highlighted in the mid-term evaluation. The experience highlights a tension that is relevant for all organisations working in an educational context and with less advantaged groups. On the one hand, the programme had an explicit aim to leave no one behind. On the other hand, those most motivated to actively participate, were disadvantaged by the presence of their unmotivated peers. In future programmes, the work with sub-groups according to level of motivation could be designed into the programme.

**Investing in staff development, motivation and skills.** Finally, the skills, emotional intelligence and ability to connect that characterises KIYO staff was highlighted across the evaluation interviews. This underlines the insight that ultimately it is people who make up a programme, and the quality of collaboration with partners and youth ultimately depends on the quality of relationships that programme staff is able to build. Therefore; it is key for all organisations to recruit individuals who are a good fit for the programme and invest in retaining and developing them over time.

## Sustainability

Financial: Were the strategies, approaches, and materials financially sustainable and likely to continue beyond the programme's end? • Social: Have participation and ownership among target groups and intermediaries ensured continued social relevance? • Technical: Has the programme strengthened the capacities of target groups and partners to maintain and build upon results?

### Financial sustainability

**Financial sustainability depends on the resources of partners.** Based on the interviews with school partners, financial sustainability, especially in terms of schools being able to dedicate staff time to projects beyond immediate priorities, is likely to remain a challenge for continuing the work of School 4 Rights. However, where the attitudes; skills or tools have been built into the everyday functioning of the school or staff, these can be implemented in the future at no additional cost to the school.

**None of the components of the KIYO programme have created financially sustainable standalone elements.** As a result; most of these will cease to exist with the closure of KIYO, unless partners or funders decide to continue offering or hosting the tools developed by KIYO. None of the partners have shared taking the Youth 2 Youth pilot forward. None of the partners shared planning to build forward on the tools and expertise built up in Lift Up, although one partner shared that they were planning to keep the platform with information, produced with KIYO, accessible to their students, even as it is not being updated anymore. The alliance of School 4 Rights as such is also discontinuing its operations, with each partner taking the content forward to the extent to which it fits within their future strategies.

### Social and technical sustainability

**Partners may continue to implement and build on the content of the programme in their own practice.** Interviewees shared having acquired skills and insight that they can further build on. Schools and some partners have also reported introducing new policies and practices; which are likely to continue informing their work.

Interviewees and the monitoring of progress indicators showed **seeds of change** in terms of increased knowledge and attitudes around children's rights and stronger practices of integrating these in the work of teachers and organisational partners. The mid-term evaluation and anecdotal evidence from interviews also shared some early signs of change in the experience; interest and knowledge of some of the young people participating in the programme. The evaluators have hypothesized that in cases where the teachers and organisations working with young people keep engaging on rights and empowerment, the benefits of the programme may continue in the longer term. One of the partners also shared that they are planning on carrying on their own creative-social work with youth, continuing the approach that they had developed and piloted together with KIYO. They credited the close work with the target groups and the peer learning from KIYO with now being able to continue their own path in working with schools in Belgium.

### Factors supporting sustainability

The single most important factor supporting sustainability that emerged from the review was the **creation of policies** in schools and nonprofit organisations. Interviewees shared that once insights from the work with KIYO have been translated into organisation-wide documents, they were confident that the schools and organisations would continue working with them.

### Factors limiting sustainability

**Limited resources and a restrictive policy environment.** In a reflection note from school partners, programme participant schools emphasised the relevance of the overall education policy context for being able to continue

this work. They expected further cuts to budgets and having to work with different structures in planning and evaluating the content of lessons. In addition, they expected having to work with smaller teams to deliver the same work as before. These conditions will likely affect the availability of resources and staff to implement rights-based programming. The same is true for nonprofit organisations who have worked with KIYO. In an overall challenging funding environment, these organisations, often running on volunteer time, might find it difficult to focus on strengthening their rights-based working.

**Limited effectiveness of train-the trainer approaches.** Interviews with KIYO and school staff have shared that the trickle-down effects of coaching a group of teachers for school-wide impact has not materialised as hoped. One interviewee also shared that translating the coaching of teachers into tangible changes in the classroom was already a challenge. At the Inspiration Day and in interviews, partners agreed that training their fellow teachers was not a feasible avenue for multiplying impact. This insight means that future programmes would likely benefit from focusing on directly engaging teachers rather than assuming that train-the-trainer approaches would lead to scaling.

**Translating insights and effects beyond school.** As highlighted by the mid-term evaluation, the focus of Youth 2 Youth has been within the school environment. The mid-term evaluation and the management response from KIYO agreed on the relevance of exploring how youth can use the skills they developed within their own lives, outside of the school context. This approach would have been a promising avenue for embedding the outcomes of the work with schools and youth but did not come to fruition due to the closure of the programmes.

### Analysis and recommendations for the sector

As a result of context changes in education, it is likely that future programmes need to work with a design approach that explores and responds to the needs of school partners for sustainable outcomes. This could look like:

- Beginning from an analysis of the frameworks and instructions that guide the work of teachers, and design tools and trajectories that align directly with the goals to which teachers are working.
- Decreased focus on train-the-trainer approaches - instead, planning for implementation through the groups that the programme engages directly.
- As mentioned above in the Effectiveness section, increase focus on developing policies and long-term practices that do not depend on continued intense engagement to remain visible.

## Impact

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What are the medium- and long-term effects of the intervention (positive or negative, intended or unintended)?</li><li>• Have benefits for target groups generated broader changes or multiplier effects at community, sector, or national levels?</li></ul> |
|--|

The review found signs of change and seeds of change in the work of partners.

**Changes in the learning environment.** One interviewed school shared that collaborating with KIYO on global citizenship contributed to a longer lasting change in the way the school approaches children's rights and participation. After the end of the three-year trajectory with KIYO, they continued working with some of the structures that were created in the trajectory (e.g. a student council). The school also continued partnerships with other organisations around topics related to global citizenship. Finally, the school representative shared that the collaboration with KIYO was instrumental in changing the perception of teachers around student participation. The shift in attitudes towards more inclusive school processes has lasted beyond the trajectory with KIYO and became a fixed element in the identity of the school.

**Changes in internal policies.** The evaluation found some examples of indications for potential mid-term effects in schools and organisations where working with KIYO has led to changes in internal policies. In the case of schools for example defining an anti-bullying policy would have a longer-term effect that lives beyond the trajectories. However, these examples are case by case and depend on future strategies, resources and implementation by the partners.

**No indications of broader impact.** The evaluation did not find clear indications of societal impact at community, sector or national levels. The reason for this might be that the scale of the programme was not such that it could reach a critical mass of partners and participants. The programme also focused on individual collaborations with schools and organisations, based on a responsiveness to demand rather than a system change strategy. Therefore, it looks more likely that system-level context changes, such as education policy or funding trends for nonprofit work, affect the programme rather than the other way around. However; some of the organisations acted as multipliers, potentially planting **seeds of change- introducing topics of conversation that might lead to further changes later on**. One diaspora organisation has shared that they have felt a shift in the attitudes of their members towards cultural norms regarding children's rights; including the right of children to be heard.

### [Analysis and recommendations for the sector](#)

KIYO's programme sought to enact change within existing systems. The programmes sought to support shifts in the way teachers did their work, create new experiences for students, or support organisations in enriching their existing strategies with youth empowerment aspects. KIYO did not seek to advocate for changes in international cooperation; development of education policy. The mid-term evaluation highlighted the ways in which broader systemic issues such as gender and discrimination experienced by young people; intersected with the goals of the programme. The experiences of participants, as well as their ability and motivation to engage in the programmes, were likely affected by gender and cultural/ ethnic discrimination.

- In the future; organisations working on rights and within the education sector in Belgium and globally might benefit from connecting the narrative about their programme with broader social issues and policy debates.

## In conclusion

The evaluation has looked at the relevance; effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the programme. It has shown that the approach that KIYO developed for global citizenship education, had promising and useful elements to catalyse action and introduce new topics in the work of schools. The experience of KIYO also illustrated the conditions that are necessary for a similar global citizenship education programme to thrive: strong commitment from partners, sufficient resources from schools, teacher time, targeted support, individualised planning and capable trainers.

The present evaluation looked back at the past four years of work of KIYO. It took place in a particular context; as KIYO has taken the decision to close operations in 2026. Therefore, the evaluation served as a closure moment, as well as a point of reflection with the partners that worked with KIYO over the years. The evaluation also brought to the fore the impact of the period preceding the closure on the work. Staff shared that the internal challenges and the departure of most team members affected the climate within the team. It also affected the ability and energy of the team to recruit new partners and to develop additional tools.

The evaluation distilled a set of learning points for organisations who are continuing to work around children's rights or global citizenship education. In a challenging global and national environment for development and education work, organisations will likely benefit from refining the design of programmes, as well as implementing MEAL systems that allow for learning and rapid adaptation. Stronger storytelling and narrative coherence of the programmes can help organisations strengthen their funding mix and ultimately become more sustainable.

Given the challenges faced by organisations in development and social justice; the experience of KIYO is not unique and can offer a learning point even beyond the specifics of the evaluation of the Belgian programme. One learning is therefore aimed at organisations in the sector who have to take the decision to close. It is important to dedicate resources and staff time to **sunset planning in the last 12-18 months of operations**, including accompanying staff, supporting partners in finding a path forward with other organisations, and taking decisions about the legacy of intellectual products.

The evaluation team has hoped that the evaluation has captured both the experience of KIYO and partners; and created learning for the sector that can carry the legacy of KIYO's work further. As such; we express our thanks for KIYO staff members and the informants who have contributed their insights to this review.

## Annex I - List of documents

- Programme proposal
- Theory of Change
- Consortium reflection notes
- Toolkits used with schools - start Up kit children's rights and Toolbox active citizenship
- Mid-term Evaluation of the Belgian programme
- Lift Up training materials, 3 organisations
- Coaching materials S4R; 3 schools
- Session materials Youth 2 Youth; 2 schools
- MEAL framework (indicators tracking)

## Annex II - List of interviewees

KIYO staff and Board	
Michiel de Baere	Programme coordinator Belgium
Sandra Bootsma	Senior facilitator
Charlotte Vroemans	KIYO Board
Coalition partners	
Kristien Defrenne	Djapo
School and organisational partners	
Elynn Asselberghs	Busleyden Atheneum stassart Mechelen
Lieve de Bast	BuSo Don Bosco
Kurt Knuts	Wico Hamont - Achel
Veerle van Leeuwen	Sint-Michielscollege Brasschaat
Anonymous	Student, trajectory in 2024
Evelyn Botchway	Nyemimei Akpee Belgium
Nathalie Vandenabeele	Amoukanama
Fien Portier	UCOS

## Annex III - TOR