

**FINAL REPORT**  
(FINAL DRAFT)

**Independent Midterm Evaluation of**

**Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education  
in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Ethiopia Together  
Project:  
Rwanda Country Report**

**World Vision**

**USDOL Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-4-0057**

**Prepared by: Karen Tietjen**

**Under Contract #: DOLU059K22577**



**11785 Beltsville Drive  
Calverton, MD 20705**

**[www.orcmacro.com](http://www.orcmacro.com)**

**MARCH 2007**

## CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A. Problem Statement, Background, and KURET Project Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. Purpose and Summary Evaluation Questions</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>C. Approach and Methodology</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>D. Organization of Report</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CHAPTER II: FINDINGS ON IMPACT, OUTPUTS, AND IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>A. Orientation and Summary Description of the KURET/Rwanda Project</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>B. KURET/Rwanda Impact</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>C. Output Results, Effectiveness, and Implementation</b>	<b>6</b>
1. Output 1: Access to education for target children increased.	6
2. Output 2: Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of and to those who have been removed from, the worst forms of child labor.	13
3. Output 3: Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education.	19
4. Output 4: Support for the education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased.	20
<b>CHAPTER III: OPERATIONS—MANAGEMENT, BUDGET, M&amp;E, AND PARTNERSHIPS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>A. Management</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>B. Budget</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>C. M&amp;E</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>D. Partnership</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>CHAPTER IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>ANNEX 1</b>	
<b>ANNEX 2</b>	

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Methods Matrix and Description for KURET/Rwanda

Table 2: KURET/Rwanda Beneficiaries Withdrawn or Prevented from Child Labor

Table 3: KURET-Supported Student Participation by Learning Site

Table 4: Learning Site Support

Table 5: Teachers and TOTs trained by KURET by Subject Area

Table 6: Committees or Groups by Level

## ACRONYMS

ADP	Area Development Plan
AED	Academy for Educational Development
ALP	Accelerated Learning Program
CL	Child Labor
EFA	Education For All
EI	Child Labor Education Initiative
HIV-AIDS	Human Immuno-deficiency virus-Acquired immuno-deficiency syndrome
IGA	Income Generating Activity
ILO	International Labor Organization
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KURET	Combating Exploitive Child labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIFOTRA	Ministry of Public Service, Labor, and Skills Development
MOE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
TOT	Trainers of Teachers
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USDOL	U.S. Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor
WV	World Vision
GTZ	Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit

## **Acknowledgements**

THE AUTHOR WOULD LIKE TO THANK THE FOLLOWING PEOPLE AND THEIR STAFF FOR THEIR TIME AND SUPPORT DURING THE RWANDA COUNTRY VISIT:

KURET/RWANDA STAFF—

JOY GATERA, PROJECT MANAGER

JULIAN NYETZIMA, M&E COORDINATOR

UWAMOHO DIANE, DATA AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATOR

NGENDAHIMANA EDOUARD, DRIVER

WORLD VISION/RWANDA—

KOFI HAGAN, DIRECTOR

## Executive Summary

This report is one of four country reports prepared as part of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project (KURET) midterm evaluation. It presents findings from Rwanda with a focus on country-level outputs and management issues. The purpose of the evaluation is to review project progress to date to determine: (a) whether and the extent to which KURET has achieved its stated objectives<sup>1</sup> and outputs and explain why or why not; (b) assess the impact of the project in terms of sustained improvements achieved, and (c) identify lessons learned and good practices. The evaluation was carried out by a two-person team from October to November 2006, with the participation of KURET country and regional staff. Preliminary findings were presented at a stakeholder workshop.

### FINDINGS ON IMPACT, OUTPUTS, AND IMPLEMENTATION

**Orientation and Summary Description.** In Rwanda, nearly 400,000 children aged 6 to 17 (13% of the age group) are engaged in child labor, with 50 percent working under conditions associated with the worst forms of child labor. While poverty is the overarching factor for child labor, the underlying causes are the legacy of the 1994 Genocide and the current HIV/AIDS pandemic. The KURET/Rwanda project is managed and implemented by World Vision/Rwanda. Its life-of-project target is to withdraw (5,250) and prevent (1,750) children in HIV/AIDS-affected communities from exploitative work through the provision of educational services. The project operates in 25 administrative sectors spread across 10 districts with a 4-person central staff, 8 district facilitators, and a variable number of temporary education counselors.

**Impact.** KURET/Rwanda reports that 4,765 children have been withdrawn (2,005), prevented (917), and withdrawn/prevented (1,843) from engaging in child labor, achieving 68 percent of the life-of-project target. Unfortunately, it appears that many of the KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries continue to engage in a variety of child labor activities in order to contribute to both their own and their families' survival, although at a reduced level of effort because of attending school. KURET/Rwanda has limited child labor for these children, but not eliminated it.

**Output 1 (Access to education for target children increased):** KURET/Rwanda supports the enrollment of 4,765 children who have been removed from or were at risk of child labor at 235 different learning sites. Beneficiary persistence in the education programs is high (92%). Absenteeism is significant because of hunger and illness. Beneficiaries are universally happy to be in school. They are satisfied with their academic programs, although in some cases the fit appears questionable. The project struggles to find available programs. The pilot Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) or Catch Up program offered by the Ministry of Education (MOE) provides a viable and popular alternative for many of the older children. KURET/Rwanda is challenged by its students' academic success: many of its primary school students have already entered or will enter secondary school, which is expensive. The project has created 450 slots by constructing 10 classrooms (450 slots) and 24 latrines at a few primary schools and ALPs.

The student support package, tailored to the school or training program requirements, is largely sufficient to meet students' educational needs, but it is not sufficient to ensure students' full participation in education. The lack of food and health care causes absenteeism and inability to concentrate. Parents suggest that KURET/Rwanda support income-generating activities. KURET/Rwanda has created livelihood linkages for 128 of its children, achieving only about 3 percent of its target. These linkages are almost exclusively (75%) with World Vision, because programs available to address these needs are few and located in different target areas, with their own target beneficiaries and mandates. The psychological impact of KURET support is underappreciated. Perhaps for the first time in their lives, KURET

---

<sup>1</sup> Withdrawing and preventing children from the worst forms of child labor, and enrollment, retention, and completion of educational programs.

beneficiaries feel “stable and supported” by the individualized attention they receive from the Local Child Labor Committees.

KURET faces particular challenges in dealing with the students it supports in vocational education programs. The supply of formal and non-formal vocational training programs is limited, many beneficiaries lack the P6 certificate required by formal vocational schools, and formal and non-formal programs are expensive. The plans that KURET/Rwanda has made for their future follow-up and support raise several questions and require additional thought. Many of the students will still be underage (under 18) when they graduate. KURET must ask itself whether its plans for creating cooperatives, providing a starter kit, and perhaps ensuring project-related commissions are sufficient to ensure the safety and well-being of the vocational training program graduates.

**Output 2 (Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of and to those who have been removed from the worst forms of child labor):** Project data do not allow for assessment of educational attainment, but school staff judge KURET-supported student performance to be equal to or better than non-KURET-supported students, saying that they are more motivated to study and “disciplined.” There were clear indications that teachers exposed to some form of KURET training had made some positive behavioral changes. They are more patient and willing to deal with student problems. There is no overt negative gender bias toward girls, but teachers did not exhibit any particular knowledge about their learning needs or instructional approaches.

Extracurricular activities are the primary means of teaching students about child labor and the impact of HIV/AIDS on child labor. With the exception of science and moral/ethics classes, lessons about child labor/child rights and HIV/AIDS are not integrated into classroom teaching. KURET students appear determined to succeed in school, but say they need additional help. Counseling is a pressing need and a key factor in persistence. More teachers in each school should be trained. The modest school support package is not sufficient to serve the school needs or have a significant effect, but it is appreciated.

KURET/Rwanda’s teacher training program is difficult to understand. It was unable to articulate clearly or present in written form its overall teacher training plan. Approximately 239 teachers selected from most of the learning sites have received a basic orientation package of training on child labor/child rights and HIV/AIDS; 11 teachers were trained in psychosocial/counseling; and 30 trainers of teachers (TOT) received an expanded package that includes learner-centered methods, and gender and peace education. An additional 1,154 education-related persons were trained.<sup>2</sup> Teacher participants interviewed express appreciation for the training, saying it deepened their knowledge about child labor, but they need more training to learn how to put concepts into practice. There is no special training for School Directors. The TOT system is not functional at this point. Most TOT have not systematically trained teachers in structured training sessions, because they do not have a workable training plan and they lack materials and resources. KURET teacher training is not integrated into the official MOE system of pre- and in-service training, but is conducted separately, although KURET has conducted its training with the approval of MOE and the participation of district education officers.

**Output 3 (Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education):** KURET/Rwanda has been successful in raising the awareness about child labor in stakeholders at the household, school, community, district/sector, and national levels. KURET has been active in implementing its awareness-raising program and has attempted to reach every segment of the population through a variety of methods geared toward their interests. KURET’s awareness-raising program has used several creative means of raising awareness: nationally broadcast television segments and radio call-in shows, an Art and Essay Competition, performances by children at public events, and a photo essay project for KURET beneficiaries. As awareness grows, different forms of awareness raising will be required to deepen understanding and direct awareness toward action.

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, school inspectors, non-KURET learning site teachers, or administrators.

KURET has provided orientation to child labor to select personnel at the district, sector, and even sub-sector (i.e., cellule) levels, but because many staff have changed in the recent and on-going government decentralization, such training may need to be repeated (and more than once.) It does not appear that a plan has been put in place for the self-directed community- or local-level awareness raising (apart from the informal follow-on performed by local committees). KURET should help build the Ministry of Public Service, Labor, and Skills Development's (MIFOTRA's) awareness-raising capacity through the development of a comprehensive awareness-raising plan.

**Output 4 (Support for the education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased):** Support for target children by households, communities, schools, and government institutions has generally taken the form of monitoring and oversight, rather than any material contribution, but there is evidence that some key building blocks for increased support are being established. KURET has activated the National Child Labor Advisory Committee and convinced MIFOTRA that a Child Labor Policy should be developed. KURET/Rwanda has not yet worked specifically or directly with the central MOE on child labor issues, but it has coordinated its activities and inputs at the decentralized levels.

With project support, two target districts have established bylaws penalizing child labor. Other districts have not yet followed suit, as the recent administrative reorganization and decentralization has complicated the environment. KURET has activated support of target children at the local level by mobilizing School Child Labor Committees, Parent-Teacher Associations, and Local Child Labor Committees' participation in identifying and monitoring children. However, local-level support is not always systematic.

Some committees report that their activities are stymied by a lack of transport. KURET/Rwanda works with 151 committees, having created 149 of them. Most have received training. Capacity building undertaken by KURET has mainly consisted of raising awareness and understanding of child labor. Community-level Child Labor Committees have been trained in the criteria and identification of children engaged in or at risk of child labor, which is appropriate for the role they play. A clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of district, sectors, and cellules is required by KURET/Rwanda to develop a sensible training program that does not have all levels doing the same thing.

The lack of national-level personnel at MIFOTRA has stymied capacity development. However, KURET/Rwanda has reached district-level labor inspectors, having presented a session on child labor issues at a MIFOTRA workshop. MIFOTRA has requested more comprehensive training.

#### **FINDINGS ON OPERATIONS—MANAGEMENT, BUDGET, M&E, AND PARTNERSHIPS**

**Management.** The management of the KURET/Rwanda project is strong and effective. The Project Manager has created a well-functioning team. Staff relations at headquarters and with field offices are cordial and collaborative. There is regular contact between the headquarter staff and field staff. The project is understaffed, and there should be at least one facilitator per district. Field operations run smoothly, but are challenged by the volume of work, particularly reporting on beneficiaries. The informal system for monitoring KURET beneficiaries appears to be working well.

KURET/Rwanda relations with the KURET Regional Office are excellent. The KURET/Rwanda Project Manager says that the Regional Office is supportive and responsive. KURET/Rwanda has benefited from the World Vision association. KURET/Rwanda relies on World Vision for logistical support. There is notable synergy between the KURET/Rwanda and World Vision Area Development Program activities.

**Budget.** There are no immediate budget issues that seriously impede project operations, although resources are scarce and not all needs can be met.

**Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).** KURET/Rwanda has been able to fulfill its data collection and reporting obligations. The M&E requirements, particularly the semi-annual formal child follow-up, place a heavy demand on staff time and resources. The field facilitators estimate that formal follow-up commands about 50 percent of their time. Currently, approximately 89 person-weeks are required every 6 months to complete the required forms.

**Partnerships.** KURET/Rwanda has established productive relations with its partners at all levels. The key partners interviewed expressed satisfaction with their working relationship. KURET/Rwanda has not yet developed close ties with the U.S. Embassy or the U.S. Agency for International Development, but these groups have expressed strong interest in KURET's work. The relations that KURET/Rwanda has forged with the communities where it works appear strong. The school and local committees are active on behalf of the project in monitoring and supporting KURET beneficiaries

## **CONCLUSIONS**

KURET/Rwanda has made notable progress in implementing its program, with activities in all four output areas. It is well-managed, and has established good relations with its partners. However, in some areas, KURET/Rwanda has been unable to meet its targets, does not appear to have developed effective programs, or has not yet focused sufficient attention to ensure sustainable results at the end of the project.

### **KURET/Rwanda Strengths and Accomplishments**

- KURET/Rwanda project is up and running. All outputs are being addressed.
- 4,765 children, who would otherwise be working in or at risk of child labor, are in school or in training programs.
- Project training has had positive effects on teacher understanding of and behavior toward students.
- KURET/Rwanda enjoys excellent relations with MIFOTRA and other key partners.
- KURET/Rwanda has been the driving force behind the acceptance of the need for and development of a Child Labor Policy.
- KURET/Rwanda support has resulted in the promulgation of bylaws penalizing child labor in two districts.
- KURET/Rwanda has shown how practical and concrete action can be taken to address child labor. The beneficiaries are pleased with the services and support KURET provides: “May God bless KURET!”

### **KURET/Rwanda Innovations and Notable Practices**

- Student Art and Essay Competition.
- Student Photo-Essay Project “Carrying Heavy Loads.”
- Television and radio call-in shows.
- Child-headed Households Mentoring Scheme.
- Teacher Peer Counseling Scheme.

### **KURET/Rwanda Challenges**

- Keeping KURET beneficiaries from engaging in child labor outside of school hours.
- The progression of those who complete P6 to higher cost high schools strains the budget.
- Dealing with livelihood needs of children and families (particularly in areas affected by drought, resulting in increased hunger, illness, and instability).
- High demand and need for counseling services (because of genocide).
- Transition of vocational training graduates into gainful and safe employment.
- Immediate and significant scale-up of teacher training and TOT activities.
- Human and financial resources to work with an increased number of districts and sectors.
- Procurement.

# Chapter I: Introduction

This report is one of four country reports prepared as part of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project (KURET) midterm evaluation. It presents findings from Rwanda with a focus on country-level outputs and management issues. Supplementing this report are similar country reports for Ethiopia, Uganda, and Kenya. A regional synthesis report examines overall project impact, design, and sustainability issues, as well as regional-specific outputs and management issues.

## A. Problem Statement, Background, and KURET Project Overview

In Sub-Saharan Africa, an estimated 40 percent of children—48 million—are engaged in child labor. Education is recognized by the global community as a powerful intervention for combating child labor, as well as an essential ingredient of national social and economic development. The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Child Labor Education Initiative (EI) projects are designed to withdraw or prevent these children from child labor by providing them with quality and relevant education opportunities, and ensuring that they persist in their schooling once enrolled.

In September 2004, World Vision (WV), with its partners the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Academy for Educational Development (AED), was awarded a 4-year cooperative agreement for \$14.5 million to implement the KURET project. By improving access to quality education, KURET aims to sustainably reduce the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) in targeted areas in each of the four countries, specifically those with both a high incidence of child labor and HIV/AIDS prevalence. Its purpose is to educate 30,600 children aged 5 to 17 in HIV/AIDS-affected communities who have been withdrawn or prevented from WFCL.<sup>3</sup> In addition to the International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 182 working definition<sup>4</sup>, KURET considers “productive, exploitative, and household work that prohibits children from attaining a primary-level education though formal, vocational, or alternative learning programs to be a WFCL.” KURET defines children “at risk” as those affected by HIV/AIDS, conflict, or other extreme circumstances that may push them into child labor, as defined by the local community or those already engaged in WFCL<sup>5</sup>.

The KURET project operates at both the country and regional levels. It maintains offices in each country, as well as a Regional Office in Kampala. The KURET country strategy, executed by KURET national offices, comprises four output objectives that define activities: 1) access to education of target children increased; 2) quality and relevance of basic education services available to target children improved; 3) awareness of key stakeholders about the negative effects of child labor, importance of education, and relationship between HIV/AIDS and education increased; and 4) support for education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased. While there is some variation for country context, all four national projects follow the same parameters.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 1 for precise definitions.

<sup>4</sup> As defined by ILO Convention 182, the WFCL are: “(a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery (b) the use, procuring or offering a child for prostitution, ...pornography or pornographic performances; (c) the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, ... (d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.”

<sup>5</sup> Criteria used to identify such children include, among others, having siblings already engaged in child labor, living with parents/guardians who are chronically ill, and being a child mother.

<sup>6</sup> As described in the Project Document (2005).

## **B. Purpose and Summary Evaluation Questions**

KURET is now entering its third year of operation. The scope of this midterm evaluation includes an assessment of both the country and regional activities carried out under WV's Cooperative Agreement with USDOL. Its purpose is to review project progress to date to determine: "(a) whether and the extent to which KURET has achieved its stated objectives and outputs and explain why or why not; (b) assess the impact of the project in terms of sustained improvements achieved; and (c) identify lessons learned and good practices to inform future USDOL projects."<sup>7</sup> The evaluation addresses 49 research questions, subsumed under the following seven key questions:

1. Is the project achieving expected impact (objective) and results (outputs) and associated targets?
2. Are the current implementation approaches and activities effective, and if not, why not?
3. Are monitoring and evaluation tools and systems in place and providing accurate and timely information?
4. Have the project principals established productive relationships with each other, government and local partners, international agencies and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and USDOL?
5. Is the project management effective at both country and regional levels, and budget resources sufficient to achieve results and targets?
6. Is the design of the project logical and coherent, relevant to its goals, appropriate to its context, and realistic in its scope and targets?
7. Is the project's strategy for and approach to sustainability adequate and appropriate to promote sustainability of project services and interests?

## **C. Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation was carried out by a two-person team from October to November 2006, with the participation of KURET country and regional staff. Roughly 10 days were spent in each country.<sup>8</sup> The evaluation team met initially in Uganda to plan and prepare for the national program evaluations. Evaluation visits were conducted separately in Rwanda and Kenya and jointly in Ethiopia and Uganda (with each evaluator collecting data on a different implementing partner, either WV or IRC. In each country, the evaluator was accompanied by national and local project staff, who made introductions, oriented the evaluator, facilitated appointments, and participated in interviews, as appropriate. The evaluators were assisted by interpreters and note-takers as necessary, depending on local language requirements.

Data collection methods employed included document review; comparative data tables for the different countries; individual and group interviews with implementing partner staff at the regional and national levels, with stakeholders at the national and district (or sector) levels, and with direct and indirect beneficiaries at the local (e.g., learning site) level, including school principal and teachers, parents, students, school management and/or Local Child Labor Committee, and when possible both parents of and children still engaged in child labor; and observations of class interactions, project environment, and general status of beneficiaries.

The same methodology and instruments (11 interview guides and 2 checklists) were used in each country.<sup>9</sup> District and learning site visits were selected purposively to obtain a range of contexts and environments. Efforts were made to visit at least one type of learning site in each country, including

---

<sup>7</sup> See page 4 of TOR.

<sup>8</sup> See Regional Report Annex 1 for work plan and more detailed description of methodology.

<sup>9</sup> The instruments were developed to obtain information required to answer the TOR questions. They are included in Annex 4 of the Regional Synthesis Report.

formal primary and secondary schools, Accelerated Learning Programs (ALPs), and formal and non-formal vocational training.<sup>10</sup> At the end of each national data collection exercise, a stakeholder meeting brought together the national implementing partners and other stakeholders to vet and validate the preliminary finding and emerging issues presented by the evaluators, solicit recommendations, and obtain additional information. The evaluation field work concluded with a day-long regional debriefing meeting in Kampala for regional and country staff.

During the Rwanda visit (October 17 to 28), the evaluator visited three districts.<sup>11</sup> A total of 146 individuals were interviewed, including officials at the Ministry of Public Service, Labor, and, Skills Development (MIFOTRA), Ministry of Education (MOE), ILO, and district and sector government officials. The national stakeholders’ meeting, held October 27, was attended by more than 40 persons, in addition to KURET regional and country staff.

**Table 1: Methods Matrix Description for KURET/Rwanda**

		Total	Total persons
1	# of districts visited	3	NA
2	# of learning sites visited	6	NA
	• Primary School (formal)	1	NA
	• Secondary School (formal)	0	NA
	• Vocational School (formal)	1	NA
	• Alternative Learning Programs	3	NA
	• Vocational Skill Training (non formal)	1	NA
3	# school directors interviewed	NA	6
4	# of teacher group interviews	6	23
5	# of parent group interviews	4	36
6	# of student group interviews	5	49
7	# of school-level committee interviews	2	3
8	# of local-level committees interviewed	2	5
9	# of sector-level offices interviewed	3	9
10	# of district-level offices interviewed	1	1
11	# of government ministries & institutions	2	3
12	# of international agencies and NGOs	3	3
13	# of KURET staff interviewed	NA	6
14	# of implementing partners interviewed	1	2
	Total	NA	146

## D. Organization of Report

This report presents the findings from the Rwanda KURET Country Project. Rather than addressing the full range of evaluation questions presented above, it focuses specifically on country-specific impact, implementation, and management progress and issues to date. The regional report synthesizes country findings and examines major design, implementation, management/budget and partnership, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and sustainability issues from an overall project perspective.

This report is organized into four chapters. Chapter I (above) introduces the evaluation, including background, purpose and methods. Chapter II provides an orientation to the Rwanda project and presents finding on impact, output results, and activities. Chapter III presents finding on management and operational issues. Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations specific to the Rwanda project. The country visit itinerary report and definition of the criteria for withdrawal/prevention from child labor are included as annexes. Other annexes are attached to the Regional Report.

<sup>10</sup>See Regional Synthesis report for total number of sites and respondents.

<sup>11</sup> See Annex 1, attached to this report, for evaluation schedule and program.

## Chapter II: Findings on Impact, Outputs, and Implementation

### A. Orientation and Summary Description of the KURET/Rwanda Project

In 2002, nearly 400,000 children aged 6 to 17 years (13 percent of the age group) were engaged in child labor in Rwanda, with a slightly greater percentage of girls (53 percent). The majority (83 percent) of these children work in the agriculture, forestry, livestock, and fishing sectors, followed by domestic work (12 percent). An estimated 50 percent of these children were working under conditions associated with WFCL, with many deployed as soldiers, working on tea plantations, or trafficked as prostitutes. While poverty is the overarching factor for child labor, the underlying causes are the legacy of the 1994 Genocide and the current HIV/AIDS pandemic. The genocide created high numbers of orphans (17 percent) and child-headed households (60,000). Female-headed households are common, a result of both the large numbers of widows and men who are currently incarcerated for genocide-related crimes. The growing prevalence of HIV/AIDS (13 percent infection rate) continues to disrupt and impoverish households and adds to the orphan population. Of the 65 percent of children who have attended primary school, few (28 percent) complete, primarily because of poor living conditions and poverty. Not only do many of these children suffer the deleterious physical consequences of hard labor, inadequate nutrition, and non-existent health care, but they also exhibit the psychological scars caused by violence and instability.<sup>12</sup>

KURET/Rwanda is managed and implemented by WV/Rwanda. Its life-of-project target is to withdraw (5,250) and prevent (1,750) children in HIV/AIDS-affected communities from exploitative work through the provision of educational services. The project operates in 25 administrative sectors spread across 10 districts.<sup>13</sup> By design, the project works in areas that are part of WV's Area Development Plan (ADP)<sup>14</sup> catchment area. The project supports targeted children's access to formal public and private primary and secondary schools, the government-run ALP for primary education (i.e., Catch Up), and formal and non-formal vocational skills training, including apprenticeship programs. In addition to direct beneficiaries (i.e., targeted children), their families, staff at the schools they attend, and their immediate communities, the project's primary partners include, at the national level, MIFOTRA, the Ministry of Gender and Social Affairs, and MOE; at the district level, the district executive committee, the established child labor committee, and district representatives of the ministries; and at the local level, the sector social affairs committee, including the social affairs officer, and the volunteer sub-sector (i.e., cellule) committees.<sup>15</sup> The KURET/Rwanda office in Kigali, located in the WV country headquarters, is staffed by a Project Manager, an Education Coordinator (vacant), an M&E Coordinator, and a Data Clerk/Administrative Assistant. (It uses a part-time WV accountant.) In each district, the project has stationed one district facilitator/coordinator (housed at the WV ADP office).<sup>16</sup> Beneficiary placement, counseling, and formal monitoring (i.e., follow-up) are conducted by part-time, temporary education counselors hired specifically for these tasks in each district twice a year.

---

<sup>12</sup> Sources: KURET, "Project Document under USDOL and World Vision Cooperative Agreement," July 18, 2005; KURET, "Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labor and Education in HIV/AIDS affected Communities in Rwanda," November 2005.

<sup>13</sup> The administrative re-organization has increased the number of districts. They are as follows: Bugesera, Gasabo, Gatsibo, Gicumbi, Kicukiro, Nyagatare, Nyamagabe, Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, and Rulindo.

<sup>14</sup> The World Vision ADP is an integrated development program that addresses multiple sectors—livelihood/income generation, health, schooling—in a targeted geographic area. World Vision maintains a long-term presence (10+ years) and helps put in place/supports local and community structures to develop and implement self-help interventions and services.

<sup>15</sup> The sub-sector ("cellule") committees are part of the government administrative structure. They are not the same as the Local Child Labor Committees.

<sup>16</sup> The recent administrative reorganization by the government has complicated personnel assignments, causing one facilitator to cover two ADP areas.

## B. KURET/Rwanda Impact

As of September 2006, KURET/Rwanda reports that 4,765 children have been withdrawn or prevented from engaging in child labor, achieving 68 percent of the life-of-project target. Approximately 54 percent of these are female, in keeping with KURET's policy of favoring girls but falling short (at this point in the project) of the 60 to 40 percent desired female-male distribution KURET has set for itself overall.<sup>17</sup> The initial beneficiary intake cohort was not disaggregated according to whether the child was withdrawn or prevented from child labor, but later cohort figures show that 2,005 (69%) of the children have been withdrawn and 917 (31%) prevented. KURET does not report on the type of labor a child was withdrawn from, which could be helpful given the expanded definition of WFCL KURET uses, so that the impact on truly egregious cases is known and reports against KURET's own ranking of child labor.<sup>18</sup>

KURET's ultimate objective (i.e., impact) is to reduce the number of children in WFCL, including those precluded from attending school because of work. For the most part, KURET uses enrollment or participation in school or a training program as a proxy for this, working on the assumption that if the child is in school, he or she has left child labor.<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, despite KURET efforts, it appears that many of the KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries continue to work in child labor activities in order to contribute to both their own and their families' survival, although at a reduced level of effort because of attending school. KURET/Rwanda has limited child labor for these children, but not eliminated it.

**Table 2: KURET/Rwanda Beneficiaries Withdrawn or Prevented from Child Labor**

	Female	Male	Total
Withdrawn	1,136	869	2,005 (42%/69%)
Prevented	541	376	917 (19%/31%)
Withdrawn or Prevented <sup>20</sup>	871	972	1,843 (39%)
Total	2,548 (54%)	2,217 (46%)	4,765 (100%)

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006) and KURET, September 2006 TPR

Several beneficiaries interviewed said that they engage in child labor (distinct from age-appropriate work) on the weekends and holidays to earn money for food, clothing and even shelter. This appears to be especially true in urban areas, where it is possible that the opportunities to earn cash on a one-off or occasional basis are greater. (For example, two parentless teenage boys said that when they needed food, they stayed up all night to fabricate wire clothes hangers.) At the same urban primary school where a group of mothers declared they would never let their children go back to child labor, half of the children interviewed said that they continue to labor by collecting old metal, burning charcoal, fetching large jerry cans of water, and porting heavy loads. Nearby, girls in a vocational skills training program, who are still living in households where they worked as domestics, indicate that they continue to serve after school hours and weekends doing family laundry, cooking, and cleaning. (In a corresponding interview, some of their employers expressed dismay that they needed to hire additional household help because the girls were spending part of the day in training.) In contrast, the children interviewed in rural areas said that they had "escaped" child labor, although both they and their parents say they continue to do chores around the house. A few teenage boys in a Catch Up program said that they are "tempted" to return to

<sup>17</sup> The Rwanda Child Labor baseline survey shows boys to be more often involved in child labor than girls, but the higher percentage of girls is not the result of KURET policy, but rather the choice of the Local Child Labor Committees and the government's active promotion of girls' education.

<sup>18</sup> This includes WFCL, hazardous work, long hours, and work that prevents school attendance. Such breakdowns seem to be recorded in the KURET monthly reports, but do not appear in aggregated form in accessible KURET reports (e.g., TPR).

<sup>19</sup> Note that the number of beneficiaries appears to equal the number withdrawn/prevented, although not all students have been completely withdrawn from child labor.

<sup>20</sup> These figures were reported by KURET before disaggregating withdrawn and prevented children.

child labor when they need money, but that they have resisted because it would cause them to miss school.

Many parents—most often mothers—are passionate about their intention to never let their child return to the type of labor he or she was doing previously when and if KURET support ends, indicating progress in sensitizing parents. However, a significant number—most often fathers—note with regret that there is “a great risk” and high probability of their child reverting to child labor, as the “situation will not have improved at home.”

KURET/Rwanda has taken steps to determine whether a child continues to labor. In addition to education counselors hired by KURET to conduct semi-annual beneficiary follow-up, Local Child Labor Committee members voluntarily assign themselves children living in their neighborhood to monitor informally on a near daily basis, although no formal reporting responsibilities have been developed. However, every six months, KURET/Rwanda will administer the new KURET-wide form, validating that the child is no longer working. Once in use, spot checks should be done to see if this form accurately reflects the child non-involvement in child labor and that appropriate actions have been taken.

## **C. Output Results, Effectiveness, and Implementation**

### **1. Output 1: Access to education for target children increased.**

This section examines the major results, elements, and activities aimed at increasing access that comprise the KURET/Rwanda Program.

#### ***Student Participation and Perceptions***

The intended result of this output is to ensure the educational participation of targeted beneficiaries in an education or training program. KURET/Rwanda supports the enrollment of 4,765 children who have been removed from or were at risk of child labor at 235 different learning sites in the 10 districts where it works. The majority of beneficiaries (85 percent) are enrolled in a formal education program. Although KURET/Rwanda does not distinguish among levels, most are at the primary level. Non-formal education programs include the government-run ALP, which offers a primary school curriculum, condensed from 6 to 3 years, to over-aged children, and short (one year or less) vocational skills training programs.

The beneficiary persistence in the education programs is high (92 percent). KURET/Rwanda has experienced an 8 percent dropout rate from its program, with a 5 percent incidence among formal school students, 14 percent among ALP students, and 32 percent among non-formal skills training students. The 4th TPR (September 2006) shows that dropout rates have improved significantly among the latter two groups, and KURET/Rwanda reports that many of those who dropped out in earlier years have returned to the program. For example, at one ALP school, all but three of the 23 first-year dropouts returned to the program. Beneficiaries in ALP reportedly had a difficult time adjusting to the school environment and resented teacher discipline, but were enticed to return by fellow students. Beneficiaries in vocational classes were placed by the project in courses that suited them better. Female students are more likely to persist in formal school and in vocational training programs, but they drop out of ALP courses at a much higher rate (20 and 13 percent, respectively).

**Table 3: KURET-Supported Student Participation by Learning Site**

		Formal Education			Alternative & Non-Formal		Total
		Primary School	Secondary School	Vocational School	Accelerated Learning Program	Vocational Skills Training	
1	# of learning sites	143	69	8	7	8	235
2	# of KURET students	4,074			320	371	4,765
3	# of male KURET students	1,913			136	168	2,217
4	# of female KURET	2,161			184	203	2,548
5	# of KURET dropouts	207			46	120	373
6	# of male KURET	131			31	68	214
7	# of female KURET	76			15	52	159
8	# of KURET transfers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9	# of male KURET	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
10	# of female KURET	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11	# of KURET completers	0	0	171 <sup>21</sup>	0	0	0
12	# of male KURET	0	0	70	0	0	0
13	# of female KURET	0	0	101	0	0	0

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006) and KURET, September 2006 TPR

Absenteeism among KURET-supported students, although not considered high by school staff, is reported by students and teachers to be significant. One school levies fines for unexcused absenteeism (e.g., attending market), but says KURET-supported students are rarely fined. While KURET monitors individual student attendance, it does not calculate an overall attendance rate. Students said and teachers confirmed the primary reason they miss school is because of hunger, followed by illness of their own or family members. They do not indicate that they miss school because of the need to work, but rather as a result of the consequences of not having money to purchase food, medicine, or health care. While these beneficiaries may attend school regularly, it is likely that exhaustion from arduous work, late nights, and hunger impinges on their ability to fully participate in school (e.g., concentrate in class, prepare homework). Participants at the stakeholder workshop noted that hunger is endemic in Rwanda, as several regions are suffering prolonged drought, and that not only KURET-supported students suffer. While true, KURET beneficiaries may be more vulnerable and likely to experience extreme forms of hunger. Most students interviewed said that they receive only one small meal a day, which is corroborated by parents. Many had to rely on school feeding programs as their source of food, and weekends and break periods find them without the assurance of meals.

KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries were universally happy, even thrilled, to be in school, and expressed gratitude to KURET, World Vision, and the U.S. government (and on occasion USDOL). Many are pleased to be at school because their peers are. They want to be like “normal” children: “Everybody wants to be in school.” Children who had been forced to leave school said that KURET gave them a “second chance.” Others enjoyed school and its activities, citing school clubs, sports, and even studying. Nearly all believe that the education they are receiving will make their and their families’ futures better. Older students, in particular, expressed a determination to make the most of the opportunity. “I want to be number one in my class,” said a girl in an ALP school. All students interviewed in formal schools and ALP aspire to go to the next level of formal education, rather than pursuing vocational training (see the text box below).

***“Now that I am a student...”***

- “I will learn to read and write, and make my future.”—Boy
- “I have hope now. I had lost hope. I thought I would die in child labor.”—Girl
- “We are treated better and with respect.”—Boy
- “We are trusted. Before, we slept in the street and were rounded up by the police as thieves and put in jail.”—Boy
- “Our parents treat us better. Before they abused us, but now they know that we will be able to help them in the future.”—Girl
- “Our parents are waiting patiently. They know we will earn money for them.”—Boy
- “I like to wear my uniform all the time, so everyone can see. It shows we are students!”—Boy

### ***Education Program Selection***

As a final step in the intake process, students are matched with the educational program considered appropriate to their needs, interests, and attributes (e.g., age, level of education). Students are generally happy with the programs in which they are enrolled, although in some cases the fit appears questionable. For example, a Grade 2 graduate in a non-formal training program expressed the desire to improve her reading skills, which was echoed by peers who had not completed primary school. In another case, a 17 year old was inappropriately placed in a regular primary school because, as was later explained, “there were no other educational opportunities within reasonable distance for that child.”<sup>22</sup> KURET/Rwanda frequently struggles with supply constraints (i.e., appropriate programs are not available in the beneficiaries’ locale). In some instances, KURET-supported students are enrolled in programs as boarding students (e.g., Centre de Formation de Jeunesse Mayange) at significant expense or KURET must start a program on its own (e.g., vocational training), whose post-project sustainability is questionable.

The pilot ALP or Catch Up program offered by MOE appears to provide a viable alternative for many of the older children, particularly as a precursor to vocational training. KURET-supported students enrolled in the Catch Up program were clearly satisfied, noting that they are both too old to consider a 6-year primary school program and disinclined to “sit with young-young children.” They were confident that they are receiving the same education (“we sit for the same exam as primary students”). It was popular with parents as well. One group of fathers felt that the Catch Up program “is really a university, the children are learning so much.” Another group said that unlike vocational education, “it is not a dead end; children can go to secondary school.” However, the Catch Up program is not nationally available, despite the high demand noted by both students and local government and school officials. KURET/Rwanda has not yet pursued or systematically advocated for its expansion with MOE.<sup>23</sup>

KURET/Rwanda is also challenged by its students’ academic success. Many of its primary school students have already entered into or will enter secondary school during the life of the project, which is expensive and strains the resource envelop. Current KURET/Rwanda policy is to continue to support project children in the program of their choice for which they qualify until the age of 18 (or beyond if they are mid-cycle). KURET/Rwanda (and the other countries) may need to consider other options for dealing with this situation, such as reducing the support package at higher grades, getting government matching funds, and financing less expensive options (limited vocational training).

### ***School Supply/Slot Creation***

The KURET strategy recognizes that the availability of school places is a key element of “increased access.” The enrollment of its beneficiaries in local schools or training programs may be stymied by the lack of school places, and may exceed or strain existing capacity. Indeed, the lack of spaces available in vocational training schools and ALPs accounts for the slight shortfall between KURET/Rwanda’s Period 4 targeted and actual enrollment. Consequently, it provides for “slot creation” by providing for modest infrastructure expansion through the construction or rehabilitation of classrooms, including furniture (e.g., desks, chairs) and equipment (e.g., blackboards). To date, KURET/Rwanda has initiated construction of 10 classrooms (450 slots) and 24 latrines at a few (number not specified) primary schools and ALPs (often sited at primary schools).<sup>24</sup> Construction is not reported to present any major problem. It is supervised by the school management committee or Parent-Teacher Association (PTA). Community contributions are not required by KURET/Rwanda, but arranged for by the PTA. Communities have

---

<sup>22</sup> This school was in Kigali. KURET/Rwanda will continue to support his education as he progresses although he will soon be over the 18 year cut-off point.

<sup>23</sup> In its comments on the draft evaluation report, KURET indicates it participated in a meeting in which MOE would plan for 50 Catch-Up centers progressively during a 2-year period. This was not brought up in earlier discussions and it is unclear to what extent KURET may have influenced that decision.

<sup>24</sup> Several schools have received infrastructure support through the World Vision ADP.

contributed by clearing land, bringing stones, and even building a latrine block.

However, demand continues to outpace supply and school directors are loathe to turn any students away: “We will somehow squeeze them in.” Extraordinarily high teacher-student and classroom-student ratios, often approaching 1:80, are common in formal primary schools and Catch Up programs. Most school directors expressed confidence that if new classrooms are built to accommodate more students, they can find the teachers to staff them. However, they are likely to confront the constraints imposed by the 3 percent annual hiring rate ceiling imposed by the government. Should KURET/Rwanda continue to build classrooms, it must make sure that a sufficient number of teachers is available. This has been left up to the school directors to negotiate with the MOE. It is not apparent that the number of available teachers had been systematically ascertained previously.

**Table 4: Learning Site Support**

		Formal Education			Alternative & Non-Formal		Total
		Primary School	Secondary School	Vocational	Accelerated Learning	Vocational Skills Training	
1	# of learning sites	143	69	8	7	8	235
2	# of learning sites receiving infrastructure improvement	ND*	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
3	# of classrooms	7	0	0	3	0	10
4	# of classrooms	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	# of latrines constructed <sup>26</sup>	12	0	0	12	0	24
6	# of latrines rehabilitated	0	0	0	0	0	
7	# of OTHER constructed	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	# of OTHER rehabilitated	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	# of learning sites receiving furniture	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	# of learning sites receiving learning materials &	15	0		3	0	18
11	# of learning sites receiving equipment	0	0	0	0	0	0

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006)

\*ND = no data

### ***Student Support Package***

The cost of schooling (or training) presents a significant demand-side constraint to the educational participation of children withdrawn or at risk of child labor. KURET/Rwanda provides each beneficiary with a student support package, tailored to the school or training program requirements, that includes payment of tuition or dues<sup>27</sup>, student learning materials and supplies, and uniforms.<sup>28</sup>

Students, parents, and teachers believe that the KURET student support package is largely sufficient to meet their educational needs, but it is not sufficient to ensure their full participation in education. All point to the need for dealing with food and medical needs. Most students receive only one meal per day, many through school lunch programs, subsidized by school dues paid for by KURET/Rwanda. However, school lunch programs are not available at all schools, and many students both come to and leave school

<sup>25</sup> Construction underway.

<sup>26</sup> Construction underway.

<sup>27</sup> The government has eliminated primary school tuition fees as part of Education For All.

<sup>28</sup> Vocational students are said to be provided with protective gear as warranted, but the author was unable to ascertain this with the group of carpentry students interviewed, some of whom had goggles but did not know their source.

hungry.<sup>29</sup> Some students said that they engage in child labor on the weekends and holidays to earn food money: “If I am hungry, I do child labor.”<sup>30</sup> Some students said they lack shelter and have no place to live. (One school allowed a student to sleep in a storeroom.) Others said they have no clothes other than the school uniform. Some girls said that the desire for pretty things is what makes girls vulnerable to having sex. Adolescent girls complained that they lack sanitary products. (One girl said her teacher helped her.)

While not all of the above will impede a child’s full participation in school or training, many will. The lack of food and health care causes absenteeism and inability to concentrate. The lack of sanitary supplies is known to contribute to absenteeism among girls. (The Rwanda baseline survey indicates that girls are “ill” more often than boys, which research on girls’ education generally shows to be associated with menstruation.)

No parent has ever refused to let a child participate, but parents suggested that they would be better able to help their children and ensure that they remain in school if KURET/Rwanda could support their participation in an income-generating project. “We can’t ask for anything more, but we need food for our families,” said one father. Nonetheless, they say that they are able to deal with the hardship caused by the loss of the child’s labor by “working harder” and are sustained by the prospect of a better future for their child. “It helped me psychologically and emotionally; I no longer worry about my child. May God bless KURET!” said one mother. “I am hungry, but happy!” said another, referring to loss of income. Other parents and guardians, loathe to admit it perhaps, clearly continue to let their children labor, as attested to by beneficiaries, and orphans, often on their own or heading households, lead an especially precarious economic existence. For most, the student support package makes educational participation possible, but not optimal. The bottom line is stark: no support package, no schooling.<sup>31</sup>

The psychological effect of KURET support should not go unappreciated, although it is unmeasured. Perhaps for the first time in their lives, KURET beneficiaries feel “stable and supported.” Students point to the individualized attention they receive from Local Child Labor Committees, KURET/Rwanda education counselors and facilitators, and school staff. Many students recounted stories about how just talking to one of these adults helps them deal with problems (e.g., homelessness, mental illness and HIV/AIDS suffered by family members). Both students and teachers said that KURET has “really become a parent.” Clearly, the personalized approach promulgated by KURET has caused students to believe that they are cared about and valued, and is noted as a cause for motivation and “not wanting to disappoint.” Students and parents have formed the high expectation that KURET will help them solve and confront problems and ensure that the child remains in school. While some dismiss this as unwarranted “psychological dependence,” it is real. This dependence is to be expected, when throwing a lifeline to children—many orphans—who are desperate for adult attention and support. KURET/Rwanda is jointly piloting a mentor program with WV with 10 child-headed households, in which the child head selects a local community member as a mentor to provide adult counsel, guidance, and support in order to reduce dependency on teachers and the project.<sup>32</sup> If viable, this should be expanded before the end of KURET to reduce emotional trauma associated with the end of the project in 2008. WV is also developing a program for teachers in peer counseling to help them deal with the demands of these children, which will provide on-going advice and backstopping. It is important to expand psychosocial training for teachers,

---

<sup>29</sup> Some schools said they do not have the capacity to create a school feeding program for the entire school, noting that they cannot only serve KURET-supported students.

<sup>30</sup> The examples the respondents provided demonstrate that they are referring to child labor, not work.

<sup>31</sup> Parents agree that payment of tuition or dues is an essential element of the package, but they are divided about the importance of uniforms or school materials. Uniforms give children entrée to school, said one parent, which is most important. Another said that school materials are “the foundation of learning” and school is useless without them.

<sup>32</sup> World Vision developed the program with Tulane University and the University of Rwanda. Mentor “parents” receive training and meet monthly with other mentors to compare experiences and solve problems.

and to institutionalize this training.

### ***Linkages***

Recognizing that its student support package would not meet all the livelihood needs of beneficiaries and their families, the KURET strategy calls for linking children to other organizations/programs. KURET/Rwanda has created these linkages for 128 of its children, achieving only about 3 percent of its target. These linkages are almost exclusively (75 percent) with WV through its ADP or other programs, including the previously mentioned mentor program, a health care and food provision program for families affected by HIV/AIDS, and a recently restarted food-for-work Development Action Program (aimed at adults) funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Some KURET beneficiaries are linked to a Caritas program, which provides food and clothing to vulnerable children. The challenges to creating linkages fall into two categories. First, the needs of the exceptionally vulnerable KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries are so vast that they are impossible to fully address (e.g., food, shelter, health care, clothing, parenting, school-related needs). Second, the programs available to address these needs are few, located in different target areas, and have their own target beneficiaries and mandates. Government orphans and vulnerable children programs are barely operational and participation criteria are highly specific, limiting applicability to KURET beneficiaries. Sometimes the support they provide duplicates KURET's and is less reliable (e.g., the Genocide Survivor Fund pays school fees). Even the WV child sponsorship program has different age criteria than most KURET beneficiaries, as its age of entry is below school age. KURET/Rwanda is hopeful that new government programs will fill some gaps, such as the Medical Insurance Program and the Genocide Survivor Fund.

Overall, the linkage strategy appears unrealistic as a means of meeting the needs of vulnerable KURET beneficiaries, given, as KURET points out, "the limited number of options existing within the project catchment area." In the future, KURET and similar programs should conduct a thorough assessment of child livelihood needs and linkage options available (brokering specific agreements with other NGOs and programs), before committing to this as the major strategy.

### ***Vocational Education***

KURET faces particular challenges in dealing with the students it supports in vocational education programs. The supply of formal and non-formal vocational training programs is limited, particularly in rural areas. KURET/Rwanda notes that it does not create non-formal programs, but it does work with local private sector concerns to bolster their training capacity. Many of the KURET beneficiaries are not eligible to participate in available formal vocational schools because they do not have the requisite P6 certificate. Both formal and non-formal programs are expensive, in terms of tuition, materials and student starter kits, apprenticeship assistance, and cooperative formation. The high dropout rate experienced in non-formal vocational programs further elevates costs, although this appears to have improved somewhat in the last reporting period. Reasons for the high dropout rate vary (e.g., dissatisfaction with the program, relocation because of the famine, illness, and aimlessness).

Only two field sites were visited—a formal government-run boarding vocational school and a non-formal private tailoring center. Both sites seemed relatively well-organized and equipped, with many of the materials and tools provided by KURET. However, the formal school complained that KURET/Rwanda had not yet supplied the carpentry students with tools/materials for their internships. (Tailoring students also suffered from the lack of materials, even though it is the school responsibility to provide them.) Students thought the environment was safe, but the evaluators observed that the carpentry students wear flimsy sandals in the workshop, exposing them to injury.

Students who complete the programs are assumed to have mastered marketable skills, although this is not always clear. KURET has not conducted a formal market survey to determine which skills training to support. At the one non-formal tailoring center visited, some of the displayed clothing made by KURET-

supported students showed that more practice was required. The center director said that 5 of the 7 KURET-supported students were very strong, although all would receive certificates. Formal school trainers said the majority of students are mastering skills, especially those with apprenticeship components. Since the first cohort of project trainees is about to graduate their respective programs, it is impossible at this point to know how they will fair in the job market. Nonetheless, the students themselves were pleased and optimistic about the skills they had acquired.

The plans that KURET/Rwanda has made for their future follow-up and support raise several questions and require additional thought. The project will provide students with starter kits, but for some professions the students are expected to share. For example, relatively expensive sewing machines will be assigned to a group of student graduates. Plans call for students to continue to work together through the formation of cooperatives, so—in theory—sharing of equipment would not be problem, but some students are not as enthusiastic as others about staying together. Moreover, it has to be asked whether the market in a single locale could support work for multiple tradespersons. Business start-up is also likely to require more than a starter kit of tools and equipment. Funds will be needed for such costs as purchasing materials and supplies and renting a shop. Many students will need financial assistance in finding a place to live.<sup>33</sup>

More importantly, do these young people (most under 17 years old) have the skills and maturity required to run a successful business? Many of those in non-formal programs have only rudimentary literacy and numeracy skills, and have not received or mastered training in business-related skills, such as accounting and client relations. KURET/Rwanda plans to assist the transition of these youngsters by matching their cooperative with an experienced tradesperson who can help them develop their skills and business. So far, five apprenticeship programs are in the process of being established, but finding the right persons has proved a challenge and may make this approach infeasible. Another challenge is ensuring that a proper balance is struck between the competing needs of the established entrepreneur and his young protégées. An entrepreneur may not be enthusiastic about helping future competitors hone their skills. Furthermore, special expertise is required to establish and operate cooperatives, which these experienced tradespersons are unlikely to have. Even the instructors at a formal vocational school said that they need training on how to form and run cooperatives, explaining that they are not experienced in this area (and suggesting a Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit [GTZ] cooperative formation training program). KURET/Rwanda also hopes to direct project-related commissions to these cooperatives, which might work for school uniform fabrication but is less feasible for masonry and some of the other skill areas.

Many of the students will still be under-age (less than 18 years old) when they graduate. KURET must ask it itself whether its plans for creating cooperatives, providing a starter kit, and perhaps ensuring project-related commissions are sufficient to ensure the safety and well-being of the vocational training program graduates. The KURET-supported students expressed confidence that KURET will help them, and they desire follow-up, but the safety-nets noted so far—the hope for assistance by local authorities and micro-credit programs<sup>34</sup>—are not convincing. KURET/Rwanda must determine how far KURET responsibility goes toward helping these young people and preventing them from falling back into child labor. Rwanda's Project Manager states, "We cannot ensure the children have all skills to run a business...." If this is true, then it is logical to ask why KURET is investing in vocational training and promoting an approach (cooperatives) that requires business skills. A clear policy is needed to better plan

---

<sup>33</sup> Some girls in the tailoring program face eviction from the homes of their former employers. Some boys from the carpentry program plan to move to the "big city."

<sup>34</sup> WV has recently started looking into how to deal with vocational training in its ADPs. It plans to strengthen the vocational training schools themselves to provide better training, as well as strengthen the ability of artisans in the community to help trainees. It also plans to retain production and marketing advisors to help the trainees form associations. It has a micro-finance/credit program that could help young people. KURET will benefit from these plans.

the program, as is a more thoughtful analysis of the costs associated with setting up cooperatives. These efforts are urgent because students are graduating. KURET/Rwanda needs to re-examine its entire vocational training program to make sure that the training it provides is relevant, good quality, and sufficient to qualify beneficiaries for employment. It also needs to develop a more thorough plan for transitioning beneficiaries from training to work. It should closely examine its experience with its first cohort of trainees.

It is fortuitous that WV/Rwanda (not KURET) is planning to strengthen vocational education in its ADPs by building the capacity of training schools to provide better training and strengthening the ability of local artisans to help apprentices. WV has also engaged a production and marketing advisor to help cooperative development. It also is operating a micro-credit/finance program that will help young people with their ADPs. It is not yet clear to what extent the KURET beneficiaries will be targeted (if at all), but KURET should work closely with WV to benefit from its research and programs.

## **2. Output 2: Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of and to those who have been removed from, the worst forms of child labor.**

### ***Student Performance***

The definition that USDOL uses for its common indicator “completion” is different than that conventionally used in education programs to indicate a measure of internal efficiency (i.e., the percentage of an enrollment cohort having successfully completed all grades in a schooling cycle or level such as primary education). Instead, the USDOL common indicator “completion” is defined as the percentage of children in a cohort reported as withdrawn or prevented from exploitive labor and enrolled in an educational program who complete the KURET-planned education program, rather than a cycle or level of education. Consequently, the data do not allow for assessment of the educational attainment of KURET beneficiaries or comparing them with non-KURET counterparts. Repetition has little relevancy because of the automatic promotion policy, and although formal schools and ALPs administer exams and prepare report cards on a trimestrial basis, they have not disaggregated the data according to KURET and non-KURET-supported students, nor has KURET/Rwanda attempted to do so. (School staff reported that KURET/Rwanda facilitators have collected the grade registers.) Nevertheless, the school staff interviewed (school directors and teachers) judged KURET student performance as equal to or better than non-KURET-supported students, saying they are more motivated to study and “disciplined.” Teachers reported that now students listen attentively in class, do their lessons, and are clean and punctual, although initially some students—particularly the older ones—had trouble adapting. They were arrogant, rough, rude, quick to fight, and not friendly with other students. “But once they saw we treated them well and cared about them, they changed,” said one teacher at a school where 15 primary students out of 40 are heads of households. The principal cited a case where a once-obstreperous sixth grader now intervenes to stop fights and “counsel” children.

### ***School and Instructional Quality***

There are no quantitative student data collected by the project or readily accessible to the evaluators<sup>35</sup> that show whether student performance has improved or weakened. Anecdotal evidence indicates that KURET-supported student performance is equal to non-KURET-supported students. Other objective indicators present a mixed picture about improved quality.

The shortage of school places in Rwanda’s schools means large class sizes. In some cases, the KURET

---

<sup>35</sup> KURET does not collect persistence data on non-KURET-supported students. Schools were unable to produce synthetic statistics—persistence, promotion, completion, achievement—on demand, and the government could not readily produce individual school data.

project may be exacerbating the problem. At one school, the director noted that enrollment grew not just because of enrollment of KURET-supported students, but also because other students were attracted by the new classrooms and latrines it had subsidized and the (somewhat illogical) hope that they might be selected for KURET support. At another school, enrollment in the ALP Level 1 class was 120 students (per one teacher.) However, another school director said that the construction of KURET-funded classrooms caused the ratio to drop from 80:1 to 55:1. It appears, however, that he was referring to classrooms built by WV (not KURET/Rwanda). A significant omission from the KURET teacher training program is large class size management (and adaptation of learner-centered methods to large class sizes). KURET/Rwanda reports that the 30 teachers trained in learner-centered methods were observed using these methods in class.<sup>36</sup> In contrast, the evaluator found little indication that child-centered methods are being used in teaching, although this could be because of the limited number of teachers trained so far and teacher observations were not conducted.<sup>37</sup> The formal school and ALP classrooms visited were rudimentarily furnished with the typical tables and benches (i.e., table-bancs). There was no sign in furniture arrangement that any active learning activities (e.g., group work) were taking place. There were no student materials displayed in the classrooms visited. Most teachers correctly indicated that learner-centered methods focus on the child, but few were able to provide examples of actual techniques (e.g., group learning, project-based learning, games), and many schools still use corporal punishment.

There were clear indications that formal school and ALP teachers exposed to some form of KURET training—be it direct teacher training, through trainers of teachers (TOT) or as part of a Local Child Labor Committee—had made some positive behavioral changes that were child-friendly. Most notably, enhanced teacher understanding of the difference between child work and child labor, the effects of child labor on children, and the trauma they have suffered has resulted in teachers who are more patient with and willing to deal with student problems. School directors noted that teachers are now less authoritative. Teachers said that they now listen to students, appreciate their explanations, and counsel them, rather than beating them for being late, not doing homework, or not listening in class. (Some teachers and most students said that corporal punishment is still used, but it is “light, not like for criminals or animals.”) Students confirmed that their teachers are friendlier, and that they often confide their problems to them. Students said many of their teachers provide both substantive and psychological support: “they help us” with informal tutoring, “encourage and advise us,” and a few open their purses to provide money for food and sanitary products. In one case, a vocational training instructor found a new home for a young girl who had been thrown out by her former employer.

Not only were parents pleased that their children are in school, but most thought that their children are receiving a good education. Equal treatment of children was frequently noted with satisfaction. Parents thought that the school support package means that their children are as well provided for as, indistinguishable from, and as academically competitive as “children of rich men.” “Teachers do not discriminate—all children receive the same punishment,” said one parent. Parents noted the changed behavior in their children: “They are more disciplined and do their studies.” Parents also felt encouraged to visit the school and ask teachers questions: “They are willing to sit with us and discuss.”

According to students, there is no overt negative gender bias toward girls. Although no classes were observed, students reported that if anything, girls receive more attention and counseling from teachers because “they are more vulnerable” and “may fall into prostitution and bad practices.” (Clearly, child labor training for students has also had an effect on their awareness.) Teachers, on the other hand, did not

---

<sup>36</sup> The veracity of these findings is open to question given the instrument used and lack of controls (baseline, attribution to KURET, control schools).

<sup>37</sup> Observations of teachers were not conducted because 1) the time available at school was insufficient, 2) the time was better spent interviewing several teachers, rather than observing one, and 3) teacher observations should not be casually done. To be valid, an observations instrument needs to be designed based on the training received by teachers from KURET. Teachers had received variable training, so a different scoring system would have had to have been devised.

exhibit any particular knowledge about the learning needs or instructional approaches for girls, although they were aware of government interest in girls' education and general issues (such as the need for equal treatment and separate latrines). Nonetheless, KURET/Rwanda reports that observed teachers exhibited gender-sensitive approaches in class.

### ***Educational Services***

To make educational services more relevant to the needs of children who have suffered from or are at risk of child labor, KURET has supported the development and introduction of new services that assist children to adapt to the school environment and equip them to better deal with the problems that confront them outside of school.

Extracurricular activities are the primary means of teaching students about child labor and the impact of HIV/AIDS on child labor. KURET/Rwanda has helped to create 35 Child Labor Clubs. In each of the 35 schools, three teachers work with the clubs and have introduced week-long units on HIV/AIDS and child labor. However, teachers at other schools with pre-existing HIV/AIDS Clubs said they have received no KURET guidance and would appreciate a handbook on developing activities for clubs. At each school visited though, students energetically performed songs and plays they had composed about the evils of child labor. One has to ask what other activities, both educative and entertaining, they might pursue over the coming years. The Phase 2 awareness-raising strategy should address this.

With the exception of science and moral/ethics classes, lessons about child labor/child rights and HIV/AIDS are not integrated into classroom teaching in other subjects (such as reading or math). Per MOE policy (pre-dating KURET), HIV/AIDS is taught in science class and moral/ethics class, and is addressed in other venues (e.g., assemblies). Moral/ethics classes offer the opportunity for instruction on child labor, but the official curriculum does not yet provide for its inclusion. (This could be an area for KURET intervention, although stakeholders point out that this could be a lengthy process.) None of the KURET teachers reported having delivered child labor modules. Teacher information sharing on child labor with students is largely opportunistic, in some cases creatively taking advantage of in-school situations to discuss child labor. For example, one teacher described how at roll-call in the morning she would ask about reasons for student absence and discuss the effects of child labor. KURET/Rwanda implies that this is an established practice it has introduced, although only one teacher interviewed cited this as an example. KURET could take advantage of some of its own work to help teachers integrate child labor into classroom instruction. For example, it could provide them with guidance on how to use *Carrying Heavy Loads* in reading class. Teachers indicated that they need additional guidance.

KURET-supported students appeared determined to succeed in school, but many said they need additional help. KURET Catch Up students suggested that their teachers be given incentives to provide structured tutoring and holiday revision sessions. Teachers suggested that this service would keep students out of child labor during school breaks. KURET school teachers are quick to point out that Compassion International supports such a program and pays its teachers.

By all accounts, counseling is a pressing need in schools and a key factor for ensuring a high persistence rate. Many children, traumatized by genocide and the loss of their parents, suffer from depression, particularly those enrolled in the Catch Up programs. KURET/Rwanda has started training a few (11) Catch Up teachers in trauma and counseling (i.e., psychosocial services). Teachers who participated in the training said that they found the 3-day course helpful, but not sufficient, and that more teachers in each school should be trained because the needs are so great. For example, two trained counselors felt that they were unable to meet the needs of the 197 Catch Up students at their school.

Literacy training is not part of the non-formal training programs. Because many students' literacy skills need strengthening, KURET/Rwanda will subsidize their participation in district literacy classes.

However, a few students indicated that they were unaware of this option and others indicated that it did not take place in an accessible location. KURET/Rwanda hopes to develop a Vocational Functional Literacy program but has not yet started. KURET is also working to introduce government-developed life skills training into formal and non-formal literacy programs, by linking vocational training instructors with other training programs. It is unclear how this strategy is working so far. Students at KURET-supported vocational programs received training on HIV/AIDS, but did not mention other life skills that KURET/Rwanda had mentioned (e.g. accounting).

### ***School Support Package***

KURET/Rwanda provides a modest school support package consisting of textbooks, teacher guides, teaching-learning materials, and basic office supplies to schools and training programs, tailored to the particular program and grade levels of the KURET-supported students. The school support package is intended to be used to improve and support instruction for all students, not just KURET-supported students. For example, books will be distributed in class for students to share. Given the under-resourced schools, it is not surprising that the schools visited stated that the school support packages are not sufficient to serve the needs of the school. Although they are appreciated, they are not likely to have a significant effect on student learning. At most, KURET reports that it provides 100 books, which is obviously inadequate to serve multiple classes, subjects, and students. While not a trivial item in the KURET budget, it cannot begin to fill the deficit.

Sometimes the school support package is based on a school's specific requests, but not all schools receive items they deem helpful or appropriate. For example, one French-language school received English-language math texts. At the stakeholder workshop, it was noted that there are three official languages in Rwanda (i.e., French, English, and Kinyarwanda), and all schools are requested to use them, although it was not clear (and probably unlikely) that multi-language instruction policy applied to all subjects. One participant, a headmaster, said that all languages should be taught and "We are happy to have text books in different languages." Nevertheless, the headmistress at the school visited said that the math books they received presented a problem and were not useful. KURET should be sure that the materials provided are not only in line with MOE policy, but are also consistent with school needs and practice.

### ***Model Schools***

A more robust package, including sports attire for students, has been provided to 18 model schools. These schools are expected to demonstrate a variety of best practices, and it appears that they may receive more inputs from KURET/Rwanda (e.g., more teachers trained, construction). The 18 model schools were the subject of an Art and Essay Competition. It is not apparent, however, how these model schools are assisting or inspiring quality improvement at other schools or that any comprehensive plan has been made for them to do so.

### ***Teacher Training***

Improving teacher skills is a major means of improving the quality of education. KURET/Rwanda has supported the training of teachers (including school directors), teacher trainers, and other education personnel in a variety of areas: child labor/child rights, learner-centered methods, gender, HIV/AIDS, peace education, and psychosocial/counseling.

The teacher training program is not yet fully rolled out. So far, 245 teachers have been trained: 208 primary school, 20 formal vocational school, 11 Catch Up, and 8 non-formal vocational skills training. Trainee candidates are selected by district education officers, inspector of schools, and head teachers. Approximately 239 teachers from most of the learning sites have received a basic orientation package of training on child labor/child rights and HIV/AIDS;<sup>38</sup> 11 teachers were trained in psychosocial/counseling;

---

<sup>38</sup> The 239 figure may not mean that the same 239 teachers were trained in all subjects.

and 30 TOT (school-based teacher trainers) received an expanded package that includes learner-centered methods, gender, and peace education. An additional 1,154 education-related people were trained, such as education officers and school inspectors. Teachers also receive training and orientation through their membership in School and Local Child Labor Committees, specifically in the identification of children engaged in or at risk of child labor.

**Table 5: Teachers and TOT trained by KURET by Subject Area**

		Child Labor	Child Rights	Learner-centered Methods	Gender	HIV/AIDS	Peace Ed.	Psychosocial/Counseling
	<b>RWANDA</b>							
1	# of teachers trained	239	239	0	0	239	0	11
2	# of male teachers trained	110	110	0	0	110	0	4
3	# of female teachers	129	129	0	0	129	0	7
4	# of TOT trained (total)	30	30	30	30	30	30	0
5	# of male TOT trained	12	12	12	12	12	12	0
6	# of female TOT trained	18	18	18	18	18	18	0
7	# of OTHERS trained <sup>39</sup>	1,154	1,154	0	0	1154	0	0
8	# of male OTHERS	701	701	0	0	701	0	0
9	# of female OTHERS	453	453	0	0	453	0	0

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006)

The evaluator found the KURET/Rwanda teacher training program difficult to understand. KURET/Rwanda was unable to articulate or present in written form its teacher training plan (e.g., what different training packages would include, who would receive them, their scope and sequence).<sup>40</sup> Instead, it explained the process of how the program was developed (through a national-level stock-taking workshop), how it used MOE materials, who would develop supplementary materials (e.g., ASC Umulimo, ADPA, and FACT), and who delivered the training. This is, in part, the result of the departure of the KURET/Rwanda Education Specialist, who would have been best placed to address the questions. A clear understanding of a plan is also obscured by the messy reality of implementing teacher training: at times, teachers were trained by TOT, training sessions had to be divided to accommodate the academic schedules, and not all teachers could attend all of the time. Moreover, school and administrator attempts to spread the training among teachers may mean that different teachers receive the various training modules and that some schools which had already received training in a certain area may have been excluded from participation in a particular training. Nevertheless, it is imperative that KURET/Rwanda understand and implement a coherent teacher training strategy and plan, so that it ensures and can show that a core number of teachers at each learning site have received the full package of the requisite training.

Teacher participants interviewed expressed appreciation for the training they received, saying it deepened their knowledge and understanding about child labor. Teachers were able to distinguish child work from child labor. At more than one school, teachers said that they stopped employing under-18 domestics or other children in their homes. The training appears to have had a positive effect on teacher behavior toward students. Major critiques of the training included that the training was not long or extensive enough; they had been previously exposed to some of the content (e.g., HIV/AIDS); and they need more training to learn how to put concepts into practice, not only for child labor but also in the areas that had been briefly touched upon in training, such as learner-centered methods and gender. Vocational school teachers said that they needed training in job creation and cooperative development.

There is no special training for school directors, although some have participated in their role as teachers

<sup>39</sup> "Others" refers to persons who have been trained other than KURET learning site teachers, TOT, and committee members (see Table 3). These might include school inspectors, non-KURET learning site teachers, or administrators among others.

<sup>40</sup> This was found to be the case in other countries as well.

in either the teacher or TOT training. Some indicated that they had received training through other programs, and they believed they were conversant with the topics. Others said that they would rely on the designated TOT to train them, and that they themselves cannot provide pedagogical leadership in specific KURET-taught techniques. Because research has found principals to be a key variable in school quality and because many services to support vulnerable children must be done at a school rather than at a classroom level, KURET should consider specialized modules for principals.

The KURET/Rwanda strategy calls for a cascade approach to reach all the teachers at its learning sites with a full range of training. In principle, every school should appoint two TOT who will receive direct and more extensive training that they in turn will share with their professional colleagues. TOT are selected by school inspectors and school directors on the basis of their qualifications, talents, and willingness to serve. Not every school visited had assigned TOT, although in some cases it appeared that up to four teachers may have participated in the TOT training. (KURET/Rwanda explains that in some cases, teachers were included in some of the training modules intended for TOT to optimize training resources.) Only 30 TOT have received initial training, which means that if only one TOT was assigned to a school, less than 13 percent of the KURET/Rwanda learning sites have been covered. This leaves relatively little time for the TOT system to become effective and bear fruit for the project as a whole. KURET/Rwanda should review its timelines to determine to what extent the TOT training can be expedited and whether this approach remains viable for the project.

TOT review of the training they had received was generally positive, especially in terms of their exposure to learner-centered methods. Some said it was the first time they had learned about this approach, while others said that it is a regular part of MOE pre- and in-service teacher training. TOT mastery of learner-centered techniques appears limited. They said that they need more practical training in this area, and they were enthusiastic about the idea of attending a practicum. TOT training in gender-sensitivity techniques also appears limited. Several TOTs said they received no gender training, and only one TOT indicated that it was mentioned, but only “in passing.” At the stakeholder meeting, a school director clarified that the KURET training he participated in addressed gender, but in very general ways and not in terms of teaching methods.

Despite KURET/Rwanda expectations, the TOT system is not functional at this point. Most TOT have not systematically trained teachers in structured training sessions. They have shared information about their training and its content through routine staff meetings or during informal conversations. (At the stakeholder meeting, one TOT said she arranged a meeting with teachers, during which she showed them the methods.) The reasons for this are many. Some TOT said that they were waiting to complete the entire training before they ventured to train teachers at their school; others said they did not yet feel competent to train teachers on the topic and modules in which they were trained. All said that they do not have a workable training plan and that they lack materials to give the teachers. They also noted that there is no time for training during the school day, that the monthly “*journees pedagogiques*” exist only in theory, and that there are no resources at the school to pay for transport or lunch if trainings were held on weekends or on holidays. (The teachers trained in psychosocial counseling made the same complaints.) KURET/Rwanda should ensure that TOT training includes a realistic training plan, that teacher materials are available, and that schools agree to set a specified amount of time and funds aside to support the training.

KURET teacher training is not integrated into the MOE system of pre- and in-service training, but is conducted separately, though KURET/Rwanda uses some of the MOE handbooks and training materials and government trainers. Some teachers who had received training on learner-centered methods from the government said the content was somewhat different, but this may be the result of KURET’s need to present abridged versions because of time/budget constraints.

### **3. Output 3: Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education.**

#### *Awareness levels*

KURET has not yet developed a project-wide methodology to measure increases in awareness levels, so evaluator conclusions are impressionistic and based solely on anecdotal data. Nonetheless, it appears that KURET/Rwanda has been successful in raising awareness of child labor and surrounding issues in stakeholders at the household, school, community, district/sector, and national levels.

- KURET beneficiaries demonstrated that they are well aware of the problem of child labor. They were able to explain why it is harmful and differentiate it from child work. They are active messengers in their own right, by staging plays and skits about child labor for the community and talking to other children. The children follow-up with other children in peer monitoring.
- Parental awareness has increased, notably among the parents/guardians of KURET beneficiaries. Some indicated that they did not realize how harmful child labor was before KURET. Others said that KURET provided the means for them to act on pre-existing knowledge. However, many said that they would not be able to guarantee that they could prevent their child from reverting to child labor when KURET ends, although those interviewed said they would try.
- Community awareness in the KURET catchment areas has also increased, although the KURET baseline study shows that it was already significant in the World Vision ADPs. Members of the Local Child Labor Committees have been active in “spreading the word” about child labor, and some KURET parents reported that other parents (non-KURET) are withdrawing their children from child labor and putting them in school. “Now we can’t find a maid anymore!”
- The Minister of State for Labor in MIFOTRA has made child labor a priority issue, based in part on her participation in KURET-arranged awareness-raising activities (National Child Labor Day) and other KURET activities.
- Parliament members, in response to the KURET-supported media efforts, have taken on the cause of child labor.

One advantage KURET/Rwanda has had is that child labor is a relatively new issue and captures public attention, unlike other topics (possibly HIV/AIDS) where message-fatigue has set in. It is not apparent that awareness about education needs to be raised because there is a high latent demand for education that can be released given the proper financing. Parents do not turn down KURET/Rwanda assistance, and in a few cases where they pulled their child from school or the child dropped out, it does not appear to be because of an antipathy toward education, especially formal schooling.

#### *Awareness Raising Program*

KURET has been active in implementing its awareness-raising program and has attempted to reach every segment of the population through a variety of methods geared toward their interests, such as the following:

- For government officials and development organizations, it made presentations on the empirical baseline study KURET prepared on child labor.
- For teachers, community leaders and groups, district/sector and local government officials, and other existing structures (e.g., ADP committee), it has held structured workshops on child labor and the project.
- For students, it has used school-based Anti-AIDS and Child Labor Clubs to interest and inform them, their parents, and other teachers and students about child labor.
- For the local populace, it has held mass rallies at each of the 10 district centers that brought together disparate groups using entertainment, speeches, and appearances by local and national dignitaries.

- It has been active in helping MIFOTRA orchestrate the national celebration/observance of Child Labor Day and HIV/AIDS Day.

KURET's awareness-raising program has used several creative means of raising awareness: nationally broadcast television segments and radio call-in shows, an Art and Essay Competition involving more than 500 children at the 18 model schools, performances by children at public events, and a photo essay project for 100 KURET beneficiaries resulting in the poignant and informative publication *Carrying Heavy Loads*. Expanding awareness and keeping the issue of child labor in the forefront will require that these efforts continue, especially among influential groups that might not have been fully sensitized (e.g., religious leaders were suggested at a stakeholder workshop). As awareness grows, different forms of awareness raising will be required to deepen understanding and direct awareness toward action. KURET's project-wide Phase 2 awareness-raising strategy will inform KURET/Rwanda's next steps.

KURET has provided orientation to child labor to select personnel at the district, sector, and even sub-sector ("cellule") levels, but because many staff have changed in the recent and on-going government decentralization, such training may have to be repeated (and more than once.) Most awareness-raising activities at the lower administrative levels continue to be organized by KURET. It does not appear that a plan has been put in place for the self-directed community- or local-level awareness raising (apart from the informal follow-on performed by local committees). This plan should be part of its Phase 2 program.

MIFOTRA indicated that one of its roles is to raise awareness and sensitize the public to child labor. KURET and MIFOTRA's awareness-raising efforts have been complementary, but it is not clear if KURET has built the Ministry's awareness raising capacity through the development of a comprehensive awareness-raising plan. Such a plan should be part of KURET/Rwanda's Phase 2 plan for awareness raising (and capacity building). Implementation of many Phase 2 activities should be done by MIFOTRA. Awareness raising/orientation to child labor has been provided for MIFOTRA's district labor inspectors, who will then be able to help incorporate it into District Action Plans. Similar awareness raising has not yet been done with other key ministries, such as MOE and the Ministry of Health, particularly at the higher levels (some school inspectors and district official have been included in training programs).

Although HIV/AIDS has been included in all training programs, it is not clear how HIV/AIDS has been incorporated into KURET's awareness raising efforts. Although its association with child labor is compelling, the operational objective is not immediately apparent. Is it to alert authorities to the increased risks of certain children engaging in child labor or is it prevention? Does the HIV/AIDS aspect confuse or clarify the child labor message? Is the population already receiving enough public messages (not necessarily training) about HIV/AIDS from other sources? These and similar questions should be answered and addressed by not only the awareness-raising strategy, but other components as well.

#### **4. Output 4: Support for the education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased.**

Support for target children by households, communities, schools, and government institutions has generally taken the form of monitoring and oversight, rather than any material contribution, but there is evidence that some key building blocks for increased support are being laid.

##### ***National Policy and Strategy***

KURET has directed most of its policy support work at MIFOTRA. MIFOTRA's role is to define policy, create an enabling environment, and sensitize leaders and the public to the problem of child labor. KURET has several notable achievements in this area:

- It has activated the National Child Labor Advisory Committee, chaired by MIFOTRA and including MOE, Ministry of Youth, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Justice, the police, trade unions, the United Nations Children’s Fund, ILO, and KURET/Rwanda as members. The committee is responsible for creating an overall child labor strategy, and its various members will work with their respective institutions to develop their own strategies to integrate child labor issues into their portfolio. The committee will soon develop Development Action Plans that will launch this work.
- KURET supported the conduct of a policy analysis study, which resulted in the recommendation that a National Child Labor Policy be developed (with KURET assistance).
- MIFOTRA, which initially resisted formulating a separate policy for child labor, is now convinced of its necessity and has launched the process. It will also host a regional child labor conference.
- MIFOTRA is also hiring a child labor specialist (supervised by the Departement de Travail).

Several partners at the national level (e.g., MIFOTRA, MOE, and ILO) noted that KURET has served as a “driving force” in child labor. MIFOTRA credits it with restarting its support of child labor issues with technical assistance and serving as a “de facto secretariat” for the personnel-poor Child Labor Unit.

MIFOTRA does not maintain a case worker network at the local level that can follow individual children (as KURET/Rwanda does). In each district, there is a Labor Inspector, who is in touch with the District Education Authorities to ensure that policies are being followed or implemented. It is MOE teachers, however, who have the most regular and frequent interaction with children. They are the de facto social workers in the community. KURET/Rwanda interaction with MOE has primarily been at the school and district level, where it has focused on coordinating and implementing its activities (e.g., teacher training, classroom construction) with head teachers and district education offices. KURET/Rwanda has not yet worked as closely or systematically (i.e., following a detailed, written plan of action) with MOE at the national level on child labor issues. KURET states that primary contact with MOE at the national level has primarily been through the Child Labor Advisory Committee, whose current member has recently been promoted to Secretary General. KURET reports in the March 2006 TPR that MOE will plan for 50 Catch Up centers progressively in a period of 2 years, and KURET will work to train teachers and enrich the ALP curriculum, but the Project Manager says that central MOE activities have been “placed on the back burner.” KURET uses official materials and MOE staff (whom KURET pays) to deliver training to teachers. The KURET training is done with the knowledge and approbation of MOE. However, the modules and materials KURET has adapted or created—specifically on child labor—are not yet offered as part of the official pre- and in-service teacher training program conducted by MOE. KURET has aligned its training with MOE, but it has not integrated it to the extent that its components are being or will be replicated by MOE.

Given the launching of the Development Action Plan exercise and the relationship KURET has built with the Secretary General, now is an opportune time to provide assistance to develop a comprehensive plan for the integration of child labor issues into its policy framework or operations, such as an official teacher training curriculum or Education for All scholarship funds. KURET should consider pursuing opportunities with key education institutions, such as the Kigali Institute of Education. KURET has not completely ignored the education sector from a policy standpoint: it is poised to involve itself in the Education Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy, having prepared a rationale for the inclusion of child labor as an issue. The Project Manager sits on the education sector committee, the MIFOTRA Child Labor Representative is on the labor sector committee, and other members of the Advisory Committee sit on several different sector committees.

KURET has not engaged the Ministry of Health in its community of partners, although health workers also have regular contact with children. It is not sufficient to assume that “Information exchange in the

Advisory Committee ensures integration,” as stated by KURET staff at the stakeholder workshop.

### ***District, Sectors, and Sub-Sectors***

With KURET/Rwanda support, 2 of 10 target districts have established bylaws penalizing child labor. In Gicumba District, employers and others who involve children in child labor will be punished. In Nyugururu District, penalties will be imposed if children are found working on tea plantations. These districts have put in place enforcement systems by creating communities at different levels who monitor the employers and plantations and notify the police if necessary, which demonstrates the role that district authorities can play in creating a supportive environment.

Other districts have not yet followed suit. The recent administrative reorganization and decentralization has complicated the environment in which KURET/Rwanda operates. The roles of the administrative units and their personnel have changed. KURET now must deal with 10 districts and 25 sectors, which strain its capacity to be effective (contrast this with four districts in Uganda). It has determined to work closely with sectors (sub-districts), but it is unclear whether this is the strategic pressure point. The districts now serve a coordinating role, with the sectors charged with decisionmaking and implementation. KURET must now deal not only with a new set of counterparts, but also with those who know virtually nothing about child labor or KURET. Further complicating this matter is that the ADP structure no longer corresponds exactly to this reorganization, with the ADP communes no longer entirely included in the sectors.

Discussions with district, sector, and sub-sector level personnel reveal that there is no clear delineation (or understanding) of roles and responsibilities at each level for the treatment of child labor, nor a codified work program. Although charged with general oversight, both district- and sector-level personnel say that they identify and monitor children, but it appears that this is done solely on an ad hoc basis, as they do not have sufficient personnel to do so.<sup>41</sup>

### ***Communities***

KURET has activated support at the local level by mobilizing School Child Labor Committee, PTA, and Local Child Labor Committee participation in the identification and monitoring of target children.<sup>42</sup> (The committees do not participate in formal follow-up of beneficiaries. This data is collected by KURET/Rwanda education counselors.) However, local-level support is not always systematic. Many of these groups react on an as-needed basis or are constrained by time and transport. While it is apparent that community monitoring is probably the most effective and sustainable means of support, it has not been fully developed or formalized so that it plays a viable and reliable role in the national monitoring system for child labor. Some committees reported that their activities are stymied by a lack of transport.

### ***Capacity Building***

KURET/Rwanda works with 151 committees, having created 149 of them. Most have received training. Capacity building undertaken by KURET has mainly consisted of raising awareness and understanding of child labor. Community-level Child Labor Committees have been trained in the criteria and identification of children engaged in or at risk of child labor, which is appropriate to the role they play. While higher administrative levels also need this knowledge as a foundation, such knowledge does not directly increase their capacity to fulfill their role in child labor. A clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of district, sectors, and cellules is required by KURET/Rwanda to develop a sensible training program that does not have all levels doing the same thing.

---

<sup>41</sup> Monitoring done by these committees should not be confused with the formal monitoring and follow-up conducted by KURET/Rwanda through its education counselors.

<sup>42</sup> The committees do not participate in formal follow-up of beneficiaries. This data is collected by KURET/Rwanda education counselors.

The lack of national-level personnel at MIFOTRA has stymied capacity development at this level. KURET has undertaken policy review and document development by itself, although with the approval of its partners on the Child Labor Advisory Committee. It does not appear that these studies are used as a way of building institutional expertise or capacity by involving ministry staff (other than feedback). Instead, they are prepared in-house and presented. However, KURET/Rwanda has reached district-level Labor Inspectors, having presented a session on child labor issues at a MIFOTRA workshop. MIFOTRA has requested more comprehensive training to help it integrate child labor issues into district action plans. Higher levels of MOE have been neglected or ‘put on the back burner.’ Future capacity building should be aimed at these and other relevant ministry personnel, at national and district levels.

**Table 6: Committees or Groups by Level**

	National	Regional	District	Sector	Local <sup>43</sup>	School/Center	Total
1 # of Committees or Groups supported	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
• o/w # of Committees or Groups	1	0	2	9	33	104	149
2 # of Committee or Groups receiving	0	0	0	9	33	104	148
3 # of Committee or Group members	0	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006)

\* ND = no data

## Chapter III: Operations—Management, Budget, M&E, and Partnerships

### A. Management

The management of the KURET/Rwanda project is strong and effective, yet even though activities are progressing under each output, not all targets have been met. Most notably, it appears that the withdrawn/prevented indicator target has not been met, nor has the target for linkages. The September 2005 TPR also reports that the project has not met sub-targets for enrollment in vocational and Catch Up classes. Project staff members were able to readily answer detailed questions and provide information, documentation, and explanations in their area of responsibility. (It is unfortunate that the Education Coordinator recently left and could not be questioned.) The Project Manager is knowledgeable about most aspects of the project, and aware of field-level details. The evaluation revealed few surprises. Moreover, all the project staff interviewed displayed an overall understanding of the project.

#### *Personnel Management and Staffing*

The Project Manager has created a well-functioning team. Staff relations at headquarters and among field offices are cordial and collaborative. There is regular contact between the headquarter staff and field staff. However, the KURET/Rwanda project is understaffed. The government’s administrative restructuring has increased the number of districts in which the project operates to 10, but KURET/Rwanda operates with only 8 facilitators. The project management and facilitators say there should be at least one facilitator per district to deal with the myriad responsibilities: orchestrating beneficiary intake, counseling, and follow-up; ensuring accurate data collection; arranging awareness raising; and organizing training and capacity building for local committees, sector, and district personnel. Decentralization has also devolved responsibility to the sector level, so the number of administrative units with which the facilitator must work has increased. KURET/Rwanda facilitators suggested that one (or two) full-time assistants would be helpful.

<sup>43</sup> Local may include sub-sector or community-level committees or groups.

The Education Coordinator position is currently vacant, and KURET/Rwanda is now recruiting a replacement, the third in less than two years. The Project Manager reports that it is difficult to find qualified staff. Frequent turnover means that experience and momentum are lost.

### ***Field Operations***

Field operations run smoothly, but are challenging given the volume of work, particularly reporting on beneficiaries. KURET/Rwanda relies on a temporary, part-time cadre of local university graduates whom it trains as education counselors to deal with beneficiary intake and formal follow-up. Facilitators report that this group has remained stable, but changes in the data forms results in the need for frequent retraining.

The informal system for monitoring KURET beneficiaries appears to be working well. Teachers on the School Child Labor Committees maintain registers and monitor KURET student absences, follow-up with the student, and inform the Local Child Labor Committee and the Project Facilitator of problems. The Local Child Labor Committees (often the ADP committee) have assigned students to members for regular monitoring. Members reported that they visit the learning sites once or twice a week and frequently talk to students. The facilitators also frequently visit the learning sites.

Procurement of student and school materials is done through the WV ADP or district procurement committee, and facilitators distribute the materials to schools. Field staff members said that procurement is “a nightmare” because of the volume and the highly individualized packages that must be distributed. KURET/Rwanda field offices are not equipped with computers, and staff must use ADP office computers, which are not always available. This makes the preparation of monthly and other reports challenging, and precludes the option of localized data entry for student follow-up and file management. Computers were not included in the budget. At least one laptop per field office would be helpful.

### ***Relations with Regional Office***

KURET/Rwanda relations with the KURET Regional Office are excellent. The KURET/Rwanda Project Manager says that the Regional Office is very supportive and responsive. The two offices are in constant communication, and a Regional Office staff member visits on average every two months. The Regional Director ensures that they get the technical support the project requires, and intervenes with USDOL. The regional technical specialists are helpful, and KURET/Rwanda would like to have more time from the Education Specialist, whose input is appreciated, as this area has been somewhat of a challenge. It also appreciates the input of the Policy/M&E Specialist.

### ***Relations with World Vision Country Office***

KURET/Rwanda is considered by project staff and World Vision to be a World Vision/Rwanda project. The World Vision country director is knowledgeable about the project (and attended the stakeholder workshop), and would like to see more integration of the KURET/Rwanda and ADP Projects.

It is clear that KURET/Rwanda has benefited from the World Vision association. KURET/Rwanda relies on World Vision for administrative (e.g., accounting) and logistical support (e.g., motor pool, office space). Its field operations are facilitated by ADP and the structures and capacity it has created. For example, local ADP sub-committees have readily assumed child labor roles. KURET/Rwanda facilitators are housed in ADP field offices and use ADP office equipment (e.g., computers). It appears that these are not counted as part of the counterpart contribution.

There is notable synergy between the KURET/Rwanda and World Vision ADP activities. Vulnerable children that KURET/Rwanda cannot take on are referred to World Vision for support. Most of the linkages that KURET/Rwanda has established to deal with the livelihood needs of its beneficiaries have been with the World Vision program. The World Vision program contributes additional funds to KURET

when needed. For example, ADP funds have purchased cows for child-headed households to supplement income. World Vision attention to the challenges of vocational education will benefit the KURET/Rwanda project.

Support is not just uni-directional. World Vision indicates that it has gained a greater understanding of child labor from KURET and is incorporating the issue into ADP design and activities. It also appreciates the KURET child follow-up and reporting system, and is bringing in a data specialist to adapt a streamlined version to its needs.

### ***USDOL-Related Issues***

KURET/Rwanda relies on the KURET Regional Office to communicate with USDOL, following KURET protocol. Few project-specific issues have needed USDOL attention, but in two cases USDOL response has been dilatory. KURET/Rwanda says it is still waiting for approval of a budget line item change for stationery, submitted in January 2006 and a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) amendment request, submitted in May 2006. However, USDOL indicates that the budget and PMP revisions submitted by KURET last spring were returned to World Vision to revise, and that it is now waiting for the submission of a second draft.

### ***Faith-Based Issues***

World Vision, which is the lead grantee of the KURET project and the sole implementing organization in Rwanda, is a faith-based organization. KURET/Rwanda participates in the 30-minute opening prayer and administrative update session with the rest of the World Vision staff. KURET/Rwanda working hours are long, observed to regularly exceed eight hours, so the 8 a.m. opening session does not reduce work hours devoted to the project. The Project Manager says that preference is given to hiring Christians at the World Vision/Rwanda headquarters in Kigali. There was no evidence of discrimination against the intake of non-Christian children, though Christians predominate in Rwanda, and the project does not keep records on beneficiary religious background. The project includes both non-denominational and religious school and learning sites, but schools verify that no religious materials are purchased with KURET funds. KURET/Rwanda does not directly support teacher salaries. The evaluator did not observe any religious activities in the schools supported by KURET/Rwanda, although religious school will obviously include both prayer and religious instruction in their curricula. Government schools also included instruction about religion.

## **B. Budget**

There are no immediate budget issues that seriously impede project operations, although resources are scarce and not all needs can be met. The unit costs for supporting children in vocational and secondary education are higher than planned and place a strain on the budget. Problems and delays with financial reports are attributed to the resignation of the accountant earlier in the project.

## **C. M&E**

KURET/Rwanda has been able to fulfill its data collection and reporting obligations. Random spot checks conducted by the evaluator comparing student file data with actual student responses show that the file data is accurate. The M&E requirements, particularly semi-annual formal child follow-up, place a heavy demand on staff time and resources. The district facilitators estimate that formal follow-up commands about 50 percent of their time. Similar estimates are given by the centrally-based national staff. District facilitators must check 800 to 900 student forms every 6 months to ensure accuracy, and they have to correct mistakes (which often means tracking down children themselves). Errors revealed during the Kigali-based data entry are sent back to the field for correction.

Significant resources go into hiring education counselors and data entry assistance. Education counselors spend about 45 minutes per child for the semi-annual follow-up. This means that for the present 4,765 beneficiaries, nearly 3,574 person-hours, 447 person-days, or 89 person-weeks are required every 6 months to complete the required forms. Frequent changes in intake forms mean re-entering information on new forms. Staff suggests that the forms be streamlined and made more user-friendly. They also say that a formal field guide would be helpful. Intake management and reporting is further complicated by the divergence between the academic calendar (beginning in September) and the scheduled intake period (February).

KURET/Rwanda does not delineate student data for formal primary and secondary schools, but it should.

#### **D. Partnership**

KURET/Rwanda has established good and productive relations with its partners at all levels. The key partners interviewed expressed satisfaction with their working relationship with KURET (as well as with KURET's work).

“KURET advises, pushes, and provokes!” said MIFOTRA Minister Muganza, who credits KURET assistance and persistence with convincing her that a Child Labor Policy was needed. Emblematic of the close working relationship that KURET/Rwanda (particularly the Project Manager) has established with MIFOTRA is the willingness of the Minister to meet with the evaluator after hours, the interview requested by the Departement de Travail head, and active participation in the stakeholder workshop. The new Secrétaire General of MOE, a former National Advisory Committee member, also expresses appreciation for KURET's work on child labor and credits it with bringing multiple sectors together in the National Advisory Committee. (The other key national partner—Ministry of Gender and Social Affairs—did not respond to a request for an interview.)

The ILO representative in charge of the Children in Armed Conflict Project says that it works in close partnership with KURET/Rwanda, as they share the same goal and challenges. They have collaborated on several activities (e.g., organizing the World Day against Child Labor celebrations), and have joined forces to influence the government. They also share experiences. For example, ILO used the baseline report data, while KURET asked for advice on the vocational training apprenticeship development. The ILO representative considers himself “an honorary KURET staff member” and says that KURET/Rwanda “is accessible, transparent, and generous with information. There are no impediments to working with KURET.”

KURET/Rwanda has not yet developed close ties with the U.S. Embassy or USAID, but these groups have expressed a strong interest in KURET's work. The U.S. Embassy Political Officer and USAID Education Officer attended the stakeholder workshop (at the evaluator's invitation), and the U.S. Ambassador invited the evaluator, KURET, and World Vision for a briefing meeting. Such opportunities should be pursued.

The relations that KURET/Rwanda has forged with the communities where it works appear strong. The school and local committees are active on behalf of the project in monitoring and supporting KURET beneficiaries. KURET/Rwanda is faced with re-establishing relations with new district and sector personnel, but those interviewed expressed satisfaction with their interactions with KURET/Rwanda and appreciation for training and the work in child labor. One sector officer joked, “Because of KURET, I won't have any work to do!”

The major challenge in working with other organizations at the field level is the paucity of partners (besides World Vision) in the geographic area and their own project demands.

## Chapter IV: Conclusions and Recommendations

Midway through the project, KURET/Rwanda has made notable progress in implementing its program. It has launched activities in all four output areas, and has put in place systems to implement, manage, and report on project activities. KURET/Rwanda appears to be well-managed. It has established good relations with its partners at all levels. It has enjoyed some significant successes, such as persuading MIFOTRA to develop a Child Labor Policy and using innovative means of raising awareness about child labor. (See the text box on page vii for a summary of strengths, innovations, and challenges.) However, in some areas, KURET/Rwanda has been unable to meet its targets, does not appear to have developed effective programs, or has not yet focused sufficient attention to ensure sustainable results at the end of the project.

KURET/Rwanda has achieved the enrollment of 4,745 beneficiaries in education and training programs, but it is questionable whether all<sup>44</sup> these children have been fully withdrawn or prevented from engaging in child labor, as is reported in the KURET TPR (September 2006). USDOL reporting requirements for EI grantees under the Government Performance and Results Act necessitate that KURET track beneficiary work status as well as school status, and be able to confirm that project beneficiaries are not continuing to engage in exploitive work. In some instances, it appears that beneficiaries still are engaging in exploitive work, despite participation in school or training. KURET follow-up should verify this, and it should reach agreement with USDOL about what constitutes acceptable work per each age group (the KURET expanded definition of child labor may be too encompassing), so that no doubt remains about the number of children withdrawn from child labor. The project should also:

- Report on the type of labor a child is withdrawn from, the reduction in the number of hours worked, and the more acceptable forms of work/less severe labor he or she is currently involved in (if applicable), so that the project's impact on beneficiary engagement in exploitive work, including WFCL, is known.
- The Confirmation of Removal Certification Form may need to be modified to reflect degrees of child labor. Once in use, random spot checks should be performed to ascertain that the form accurately reflects beneficiaries' non-involvement in exploitive work or WFCL.

KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries are happy to be in school/training, with relatively few leaving the program. However, KURET/Rwanda has not yet dealt with several issues that affect the extent to which its beneficiaries can take full advantage of their schooling and the probability that they will not revert to child labor at the end of the program. The needs of some KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries exceed the project student support package, which compromises their full participation (e.g., regular attendance and in-class concentration) in education. KURET's linkage strategy for addressing critical livelihood needs has proven inadequate to meet its targets, as well deal with the ever-growing needs of its beneficiaries as the severe drought continues. Despite these shortfalls in support, both KURET/Rwanda beneficiaries and their families have formed a financial and psychological dependence on KURET that is likely to result in reversion to child labor and possibly some emotional trauma at the end of the project. KURET/Rwanda has not yet developed alternative approaches to deal with livelihood issues, and it is working with World Vision to deal with providing continued emotional support. KURET/Rwanda has also not yet put in place a fully developed approach to ensuring the successful transition of vocational education students to non-exploitative employment. In terms of Output 1, the project should:

---

<sup>44</sup> The qualitative methods used to obtain this information are not appropriate to provide a statistically accurate picture of the extent to which KURET beneficiaries continue to engage in child labor or the sector in which they are engaged.

- Collect and report beneficiary absenteeism data and calculate an overall attendance rate for KURET-supported students.
- Verify that any new classroom construction it undertakes fits within the MOE policy and investment framework, specifically so that qualified teachers will be made available to accommodate new slots created (without increasing existing student-teacher ratios beyond prevailing acceptable standards or those in effect at the targeted school).
- Continue to advocate for and support the expansion of the Catch Up program.
- Conduct an assessment of beneficiary support requirements to allow full participation in schooling, and determine how to increase support, such as negotiating a reduction in the number of beneficiaries, reducing the support package at higher grades, securing government matching funds, and financing less expensive options (limited vocational training).
- Determine linkage options available and broker specific agreements with other NGOs or programs before taking on a beneficiary.
- Develop other strategies for meeting beneficiary livelihood and welfare needs. Review other KURET projects and local experience with income-generating activities and establish pilot activities.
- Develop and put in place a child mentoring and teacher counseling program to reduce “separation trauma” that is likely to affect beneficiaries, particularly orphans and children heading households, when the project ends in 2008.
- Expand psychosocial training for more teachers at KURET schools and institutionalize the program within MOE.
- Conduct an assessment of vocational training programs for quality and relevancy of programs, success of training-to-employment schemes, beneficiary satisfaction, and success in finding employment (beneficiary tracer study). Conduct an analysis of the feasibility and costs associated with setting up cooperatives. Develop a more detailed and costed plan for transitioning beneficiaries from training to work. Work with a World Vision consultant to improve the vocational education approach.

There is some indication that KURET/Rwanda training has had a positive impact on teacher behavior in terms of more understanding and supportive treatment of beneficiaries. However, this is not sufficient to conclude that the quality and relevance of education has significantly improved. In terms of material support, the school support package provided is not sufficient to fill the enormous needs of under-resourced schools, so that the entire student body benefits. More importantly, it appears that KURET’s major programs to improve school quality—model schools and teacher training—are not fully functional. The model school program, as currently implemented, appears to have little relation to school quality improvements. The teacher training program appears to lack an overall strategy that articulates the training package or what overall end competencies should be, and the TOT program faces several barriers to roll-out. KURET’s aim to significantly improve quality and relevance of education at the school level may exceed its ability. In terms of Output 2, KURET should:

- Collect and report available student performance data (e.g., attainment, grades).
- Encourage and support schools to provide structured tutoring and revision classes.
- Develop a more effective use of model schools to improve quality or drop the intervention.
- Start serious long-term work with MOE on integrating child labor into its curricula.
- Provide teachers with guidance on how to integrate child labor into classroom instruction.
- Explore instructional uses for Carrying Heavy Loads.
- Develop a clear teacher training plan (e.g., what different training packages would include, who would receive them, their scope and sequence) against which KURET/Rwanda can implement and report.
- Fully develop and immediately roll-out a TOT program. Develop a realistic plan and resource TOT

roll-out at schools.

- Increase and support training in pedagogy, especially gender-sensitive methods.
- Include large class size management and adaptation of learner-centered methods training for large class sizes in teacher training.
- Develop specialized modules for school directors on such subjects as management, teacher support, and gender.
- Work with MOE pre- and in-service teacher training to include child labor in its standard training programs.
- Provide vocational education students with more life skills (in addition to HIV/AIDS).

KURET has succeeded in raising awareness of many targeted stakeholders and has even changed some behaviors (e.g., among teachers). It has used several creative means of raising awareness, but it has not yet built the capacity of its partners (e.g., MIFOTRA or district-level structures) to develop and undertake awareness-raising campaigns on their own. Moreover, it has not yet developed concrete guidance for households on how to deal with or compensate for the lack of a child's labor. In terms of Output 3, the project should:

- Assist MIFOTRA with developing its own long-term, comprehensive awareness-raising strategy.
- Develop the capacity of local structures to plan and undertake their own awareness-raising activities.
- Develop Phase 2 awareness-raising activities that move awareness to action (e.g., additional how-to guidance for parents and communities).
- Participate in a KURET-wide deliberation about its role, its objective, and the messages it should send about HIV/AIDS. KURET/Rwanda should then conduct an assessment of HIV/AIDS awareness needs in its target areas, according to KURET-wide parameters, and design its strategy based on the results.

KURET/Rwanda has made significant inroads in furthering the Child Labor Policy agenda by jump-starting the Child Labor Policy development process and supporting the development of district-level by-laws penalizing child labor. It has not worked as closely with other sectors to integrate child labor into their policy frameworks and portfolios, despite some interactions with MOE. So far, sustainability of child labor issues has been addressed through child labor policies, not institutionalized services or practice. In terms of Output 4, KURET should:

- Work directly with MOE to determine how it can institutionalize child labor issues and training. For example, it should work to introduce child labor into pre- and in-service teacher training, guidance, and counseling/psychosocial training curricula.
- Develop district, sector, cellule, and local training based on a clear delineation (or understanding) of roles and responsibilities at each level for the treatment of child labor.
- Work with local committees to determine their resource needs for carrying out child labor activities (e.g., transport) and develop plan for obtaining or providing resources.
- Build MIFOTRA capacity by helping them plan training programs for lower levels (e.g., Labor Inspectors).
- Develop a plan for working with districts together (e.g., joint district training).

In terms of operations, KURET/Rwanda is functioning well, and it should:

- Hire one facilitator per district.
- Include data on beneficiary religious background on the intake form.
- Provide dedicated computers to field facilitators.

- Pursue opportunities for funding and collaboration with the U.S. Embassy and USAID to determine what program linkages might be developed or built on, especially in education.

# ANNEX 1

## DEFINITIONS

### Definition of withdrawal and prevention (*mutually exclusive categories*)

#### 1.1. Children withdrawn from exploitive work:

This refers to those children that were found to be working and no longer work as a result of a project intervention. This category also includes those children that were engaged in exploitive/hazardous (see definition 1.3 below) work and as a result of a project intervention now work shorter hours under safer conditions. In both cases, in order to be considered as beneficiaries of the project/program under this category, children working in exploitive child labor must no longer be working and be benefiting or have benefited from educational or training opportunities, as defined above, provided by the project.

*NOTE: Enrollment in school is not the sole consideration that defines a child as removed from or withdrawn from exploitive child labor. For example, a child who attends a USDOL supported non-formal education program in the morning and works under hazardous conditions in mining during the afternoon and evening should not be counted as withdrawn/prevented. That is, if before program intervention, a child is not going to school and is working in a worst form of child labor and after program intervention the child is now enrolled in school but continues to work in a worst form of child labor that child is not, by definition, withdrawn from child labor and should not be counted in the withdrawn/prevented indicator. The process of withdrawing a child from exploitive child labor may take some time. Children should only be counted as withdrawn/prevented at the point at which the child is no longer working in exploitive child labor and is benefiting from the education program(s) provided by the USDOL-funded project.*

#### 1.2. Children prevented from enter exploitive work:

This refers to children that are either siblings of (ex-) working children or those children not yet working but considered to be at high-risk of engaging in exploitive work. In order to be considered as “prevented” these children must benefit (or have benefited) from educational or training opportunities, as defined above, provided by the project.

#### 1.3 Exploitive/hazardous work:

This refers to the conditions under which the child works and the safety, health, and environmental hazards to which the child is exposed as well as the duration of work. The worst forms of child labor outlined in ILO Convention 182 and all types of work that prevent a child from obtaining an education (attending school regularly) should be considered exploitive work (see R.190 accompanying C.182 for additional guidance on identifying hazardous work). Children intercepted or rescued from being trafficked may also be considered as withdrawn from an exploitive situation since the moment they become victims of trafficking (even though still in transit to the “place of work”) they have already entered an unacceptable situation bound to lead to exploitive/hazardous work.

## ANNEX 2

### REVISED ITINERARY FOR KURET RWANDA EVALUATION

<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsible person</b>
Oct, 17 <sup>th</sup> 2006		Arrival, check in at Hotel.	Joy Gatera
Oct, 18 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Wednesday	8:00am - 9:30am	Debrief with National Project Manager (Joy)	Joy
	9:30 am- 12:00 am	Debrief with KURET Project office staff (Joy, Julian, Diane)	Joy
	<b>12:00 pm- 1:00pm</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
	1:00 pm- 2:00 pm	<del>MIFOTRA</del> rescheduled	Joy
	2:00 pm - 3:00 pm	<del>MIGEPROFE</del> cancelled	Joy
	3:00 pm - 4:00 pm	MINEDUC (Mr. Musabeyezu Narcisse, Secretary General)	Joy
	4:00 pm – 5:00 pm	ILO (Mr. Lamech Nambajimana)	
Oct, 19 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Thursday	8.00 am-9.00am	<b>Kimihurura Sector</b> (Ms. Odette, Social Affairs Officer)	Olive /Joy
	9:00 am – 12.45 noon	<b>Formal Basic ( Kimihurura P/S )</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parents of KURET students (1 hr)</li> <li>• Director and Focal Point ( 1hr)</li> <li>• Teachers ( 1hr)</li> <li>• KURET Students ( 1hr)</li> </ul>	Olive /Joy
	<i>12:45pm- 1:pm</i>	<i>Travel</i>	
	1: 00pm - 5:00 pm	<b>Non formal vocational (HOPE)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director and Teachers (1 hr)</li> <li>• KURET Students (1 hr)</li> <li>• Parents of KURET Students (1 hr)</li> </ul>	Olive/Joy
	5:00 pm – 6:00pm	Sector leaders and Community committees	Olive/Joy
	6.30 pm – 8.00pm	MIFOTRA (Minister of State, Angelina Muganza)	Joy
Oct, 20 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Friday	<i>7:00am – 8:00am</i>	<i>Travel to Nyamata</i>	Leontine/Joy
	8.00 – 9.00 am	KURET Site facilitators (Leontine and Felix)	
	9.00 -10.00 am	ADP Sponsorship Committee	
	10.00-11 am	District Labor Inspector, Sector Social Affairs Officer, Cellule Chairman	
	11:00 am – 15: 00 noon	<b>Visit Murama Catch Up</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director and PTA Head ( 1hr)</li> <li>• Teachers ( 1hr)</li> <li>• KURET Students ( 1hr)</li> <li>• Parents of KURET students (1 hr)</li> </ul>	Leontine/Joy
	<i>15:00 pm – 16:00 pm</i>	<i>Travel</i>	

	2:00 pm- 5:00pm	<b>Visit CFJ Mayange</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Director and Focal Point ( 0.5 hr)</li> <li>• PTA/KURET CL Committee (1hr)</li> <li>• Teachers ( 1hr)</li> <li>• KURET Students ( 0.5hr)</li> </ul>	Leotine/Felix
Oct, 21 <sup>st</sup> 2006 Saturday			
Oct, 22 <sup>nd</sup> 2006 Sunday			
Oct 23 <sup>rd</sup> 2006 Monday		Meet with facilitators (Leontine, Felix, Dennis, Olive)	
		World Vision Country Office (Kofi Hagan-Director, James Mathenge-Finance)	
Oct 24 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Tuesday	6:00 am – 8:30	Travel to Mudasomwa area	
	8:30am- 1:30pm	<b>Accelerated ( Uwikomo)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Director (1hr)</li> <li>• Teachers Child Labor committee (1hr)</li> <li>• KURET Students (1 hr)</li> <li>• Parents of KURET students (1 hr)</li> <li>• Akagali committee &amp; LCLC (1 hr)</li> </ul>	Aaron/ Joy
	1:30 pm – 2:00 pm	Travel	
	2:00pm – 5: 30 pm	Formal Basic ( Nkumbure p/s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School Director &amp; Focal Point (45 m)</li> <li>• Teachers ( 45 m)</li> <li>• KURET Students (45 m)</li> </ul>	Aaron/Joy
	5:30 pm – 8:00pm	Travel back to Kigali	
Oct 25 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Wednesday	7.30 – 8.30 am	George Learned, U.S Embassy Political Officer & Francis Musinguzi ,USAID Ed.	
		Prepare preliminary findings	
Oct 26 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Thursday	8:30am – 3:30 pm	Stakeholders meeting	Joy/ Evaluator
	4.00 – 5.00pm	Hon. Michael Arietti (U.S.Ambassador), G. Learned, and F. Musinguzi	
Oct 27 <sup>th</sup> 2006 Friday	8 am -10 am	Meet Project Manager Gatera	
	10 am -11 am	Meet Mme Fatina, Head of MIFOTRA Departement de travail	
	12 noon	Depart for Kenya	