

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Independent Midterm Evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Colombia Project: *Edúcame Primero Colombia*

Partners of the Americas

Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16574-07-75-K



2009

ICF MACRO
an ICF International Company

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**Independent Midterm Evaluation
of the Combating Exploitive
Child Labor Through
Education in Colombia Project:
*Edúcame Primero Colombia***

Partners of the Americas
Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-I6574-07-75-K

2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report describes in detail the midterm evaluation, conducted during May 2008, of *Edúcame Primero Colombia*. The report was prepared by ICF Macro, according to agreements specified in its contract with the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation of *Edúcame Primero* in Colombia was conducted and documented by Michele González Arroyo, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the *Edúcame Primero* project team, and stakeholders in Colombia. ICF Macro would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator, Partners of the Americas and its partners, and U.S. Department of Labor.



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number DOLB089K28215. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
I PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION	1
II EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY	3
2.1 Evaluation Purpose	3
2.2 Methodology	3
III FINDINGS	9
3.1 Relevance	9
3.2 Effectiveness	19
3.3 Efficiency	25
3.4 Impact	28
3.5 Sustainability	33
IV LESSONS LEARNED/BEST PRACTICES	37
V CONCLUSIONS	39
5.1 Relevance	39
5.2 Effectiveness	39
5.3 Efficiency	40
5.4 Impact	41
5.5 Sustainability	41
VI RECOMMENDATIONS	43
6.1 Five Key Recommendations	43
6.2 Other Recommendations	45

ANNEXES

- Annex A: List of Documents Reviewed
- Annex B: TOR/Evaluation Questions
- Annex C: Interview Tools
- Annex D: List of Persons Interviewed
- Annex E: Question Matrix
- Annex F: Stakeholder Meeting Agenda and Participants
- Annex G: Logical Framework
- Annex H: W/P Target Numbers
- Annex I: Sustainability Matrix

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACJ	<i>Asociación Cristiana de Jóvenes</i> (YMCA)
CIETI	<i>Comité Interinstitucional para la Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil</i> (Interinstitutional Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor)
CINDE	<i>Centro Internacional de Educación y Desarrollo Humano</i> (Center for Education and Development)
COETI	<i>Cooperación Internacional por la Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil</i> (International Cooperation for the Eradication of Child Labor)
DANE	<i>Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística</i> (National Department of Statistics)
DevTech	DevTech Systems
ECL	Exploitive Child Labor
EI	Education Initiative
EpC	<i>Espacios para Crecer</i> (Spaces for Growing)
EpE	<i>Espacios para Emprender</i> (Spaces for Entrepreneurship)
ICBF	<i>Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar</i> (Colombian Institute for Family Well-Being)
IDB	Inter-America Development Bank
ILAB	International Labor Affairs Bureau
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
IOM	International Organization for Migration
KAP	Knowledge and Attitudes Perceptions
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEN	<i>Ministerio de Educación Nacional</i> (Ministry of Education)
MPS	<i>Ministerio de Protección Social</i> (Ministry of Social Protection)
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
POA	Partners of the Americas
QL	Quantum Learning
SGA	Solicitation for Grants Application
TBP	Timebound Program
TBW	To Be Withdrawn

TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UNICEF	The United Nations Children’s Fund
UniNorte	<i>Universidad del Norte</i>
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
W/P	Withdrawal/Prevention
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Combating Child Labor through Education in Colombia project, known as *Edúcame Primero Colombia*, targets 10,200 children ages 6–17 for withdrawal or prevention from involvement in exploitive child labor. The project was funded by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) International Labor Affairs Bureau, Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking; it was awarded to Partners of the Americas in association with DevTech Systems, the Center for Education and Development, and Mercy Corps. The project was funded specifically as a Timebound Program (TBP), whose aim is to eliminate the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) in a specific country, in multiple sectors of work, within a defined period of time. It was funded for a three-year period (September 2007–December 2010) for the amount of \$5.1 million.

The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project's primary goal is to progressively reduce the WFCL in Colombia by the end of 2010. To accomplish this goal, the project has implemented an educational intervention known as *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growing, or EpC) specifically targeting working children or children at risk of working. The 184 EpC sites have been established by local implementing partners in the primarily urban areas of Barranquilla, Bogotá, Cali, Cartagena, and Santa Marta, as well as some rural areas in Boyacá and Santander. In addition to implementing the EpC programs, the project has focused on improving the overall quality of education in the regular classroom by training 217 teachers from Barranquilla, Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena in the Quantum Learning (QL) educational methodology.

This midterm evaluation was specifically designed to assess the relevance of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project within the cultural, economic, and political context of Colombia; determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives; provide recommendations for how the project can successfully overcome challenges to meet its objectives and targets; assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies as well as its strengths and weaknesses in its implementation; determine whether project activities are sustainable at the local and national levels and among implementing organizations; and identify the steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives.

Based on the data collected during the evaluation, the evaluator concluded that the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project has supported and complemented the TBP goals, as well as the strategic goals of USDOL Education Initiative projects. The implementation of the EpC educational intervention has successfully withdrawn and prevented children from the WFCL and has improved the participants' self-esteem, regular school conduct, and academic progress. The project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) specialist has successfully designed and implemented a practical and effective system for tracking the work status of children while in the program, as well as collecting and reporting reliable withdrawal and prevention data. At midterm, the project appears to be on target to reach its withdrawal/prevention (W/P) target numbers of 10,200 children by the end of the project in 2010.

The ongoing success of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project and the anticipated attainment of its target number of children by 2010 are due to three important elements of the project design. First, the intervention is educational and is offered during the half day when children are

not in school and are most likely to work. Second, the educational intervention, EpC, is based on the QL teaching methodology that not only engages students in learning and promotes improved academic skills, self-esteem, and conduct, but may also positively affect the educational quality of the regular classroom. Third, the M&E system established by the program is now reliably tracking W/P rates. Almost all of the 155 stakeholders interviewed regard the *Educame Primero Colombia* project as a unique and promising strategy for addressing the problem of child labor in Colombia.

Despite the numerous achievements of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project, however, participants expressed some concerns regarding the sustainability of project efforts and the need to include or enhance activities that would further support the project's goals. The greatest concern centered on the short, 10-month duration of the educational intervention, resulting from the high target numbers established by USDOL's Solicitation for Grants Application (SGA). All interviewees stated that a longer educational intervention would be needed to achieve permanent withdrawal or prevention from exploitive child labor. Project implementers agreed, pointing out that EpC children are likely to return to work following the intervention if there is not ongoing support.

In addition, interviewees suggested the following modifications to the EpC program: (1) a well-structured parental education component to complement the values and skills being learned by the children; (2) nutritious snacks for the children during the educational sessions to enhance their learning experience; (3) uniform training for EpC facilitators on the psychosocial issues the most vulnerable children face; and (4) a rigorous assessment of the QL educational methodology, as well as other facets of the project, to accurately measure their true impact.

Following is a summary of the five key recommendations for successfully meeting the *Educame Primero Colombia* project objectives. A detailed explanation of each appears in Section VI of the report:

1. **Project Sustainability:** Create a Sustainability Committee—under the leadership of the project director—specifically responsible for identifying, leveraging, and planning for the resources necessary to ensure the sustainability of the project as a whole, and the EpC programs in particular.
2. **Parental Intervention:** Create a Parent Education Committee—under the leadership of the project's education specialist—that can develop a comprehensive program for systematically involving and educating parents whose children are enrolled in an EpC.
3. **Special Efforts for Children Who Are Victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation:** Create a separate committee, under the leadership of Mercy Corps, that can develop a clearly articulated and standardized plan for serving the specific needs of child victims of commercial sexual exploitation. As part of this plan, the committee should include additional awareness-level training for EpC facilitators, as well as guidelines for detecting and reporting such cases of extreme exploitation.

4. **Child Nutrition:** Identify one or more individuals within the *Educame Primero Colombia* administration who will be responsible for leveraging the resources necessary to provide a pre-packaged nutritious snack to children attending the EpCs that is cost-effective, hygienic, and easily distributed.

5. **Duration of the Educational Intervention:** Structure the USDOL SGA and budgets in such a way that the direct beneficiaries have a longer educational intervention period in order to achieve permanent withdrawal or prevention from the WFCL. Experts in the field recommend a minimum intervention period of two years to achieve this goal.

I PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

On September 27, 2007, Partners of the Americas (POA), in association with DevTech Systems, *Centro Internacional de Educación y Desarrollo Humano* (International Center for Education and Development, or CINDE), and Mercy Corps, received a three-year cooperative agreement worth \$5.1 million from the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) to implement a Timebound Program (TBP) in Colombia. Timebound Programs aim to eliminate the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) in a specific country, in multiple sectors of work, within a defined period of time. TBPs strengthen the capacity of a country's government and their civil society organizations to address child labor by supporting the strategic goals of USDOL's International Labor Affairs Bureau, Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (ILAB/OCFT) Education Initiative (EI) projects:

1. Withdraw or prevent children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services.
2. Strengthen policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and the formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.
3. Raise awareness on the importance of education for all children and of mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Support research and the collection of reliable data on child labor.
5. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project targets 10,200 children ages 6–17 for withdrawal or prevention from involvement in exploitive child labor. It focuses on victims of WFCL,¹ particularly victims of commercial sexual exploitation and children working in domestic service, street work, construction, recycling, and agriculture. Several urban areas participate in the project: Barranquilla, Bogotá, Cali, Cartagena, and Santa Marta, as well as nearby rural areas in the departments of Boyacá and Santander.

To accomplish its primary goal, the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project implemented an educational intervention known as *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growing, or EpC), specifically for working children or children at risk of working. This direct educational intervention complements the formal school program and takes place during the half-day when children are not in school. Students therefore receive a full day of educational services. The project also focused on improving the overall quality of education provided in the regular classroom by conducting teacher training workshops that introduced an innovative teaching methodology known as Quantum Learning (QL). An additional educational intervention will be introduced in the project's third year, *Espacios para Emprender* (Spaces for Entrepreneurship,

¹ In accordance with ILO Convention 182 on the worst forms of child labor, promulgated in June 1999 and ratified by Colombia (Law 704) in the year 2001. The worst forms of child labor are further defined by Colombian Resolution No. 1677, Ministry of Social Protection, May 2008.

or EpE). This intervention will target adolescents age 15–17 to participate in a program designed to help them develop their self-esteem, life skills, and leadership capacities as well as prepare them for an entry-level job, establish a family microenterprise, and/or continue their education. In addition to the educational interventions provided through the EpC and future EpE programs, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project also coordinated with civil society organizations and government institutions to implement awareness-raising activities that increase public knowledge about child labor issues.

The project goal, purpose, outputs, and major activities of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project are summarized in Table 1:

Table 1: *Educame Primero Colombia*—Project Summary

Goal	Exploitive child labor (ECL) and WFCL in Colombia progressively reduced at the end of 2010 as stated in the National Strategy and its TBP.
Purpose	Targeted children withdrawn or prevented (W/P) from ECL through attendance in EpC or EpE programs, and formal education.
Outputs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Effective educational EpC and EpE models to remove and prevent children from child labor established. 2. Actions against child labor undertaken and monitored by the municipal government. 3. Awareness of parents, educators, and community leaders regarding ECL raised. 4. Increased understanding of ECL problem and possible solutions by policymakers and project stakeholders. 5. Project programs sustained and expanded.
Summary of Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educational interventions to increase enrollment in alternative and transitional educational programming and alleviate barriers to school attendance for working and at-risk children. 2. Strengthening policy, enforcement, and engagement through training for municipal governments and sharing of best practices; teacher training in innovative methodologies; coordination among civil society organizations and government institutions; introduction of a summer school program; and better government monitoring of child labor. 3. Awareness raising to increase public knowledge about the difference between acceptable child work and hazardous exploitive child labor, and changing public attitudes towards child labor.

II EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of the midterm evaluation was to address issues of project design, implementation, and management; identify the lessons learned; determine project replicability; and provide recommendations for the current project as well as for future projects. Within this context, the evaluation aimed to assess the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact on the target population.

Specifically, the midterm evaluation sought to—

- Assess the relevance of the project within the cultural, economic, and political context of Colombia, including the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the Colombian Government.
- Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so.
- Provide recommendations for how the project can successfully overcome the challenges to meet its objectives and targets by the time the project ends.
- Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies as well as its strengths and weaknesses in its implementation, and identify areas in need of improvement.
- Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national levels and among implementing organizations, and identify steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives.

2.2 METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 Evaluator

An external evaluator with a background in education, labor, and public health conducted the evaluation. The evaluator had previous experience conducting evaluations for USDOL projects in Latin America. The external evaluator was responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with ICF Macro, USDOL, and the project staff; conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analyzing the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation at the national stakeholders' meeting; and preparing the evaluation report. Project staff and implementing partners were present at meetings with stakeholders only to provide introductions.

2.2.2 Approach

The evaluation approach was primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used. Quantitative data were drawn from project reports, to the extent that they were available, and were incorporated into the analysis. The following additional principles were applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives were triangulated for many of the evaluation questions in order to increase the credibility and validity of the results.
2. Efforts were made to include the participation of child beneficiaries, using child-sensitive approaches in the interviews.
3. Gender and cultural sensitivity were integrated into the evaluation approach.
4. Interviews incorporated a degree of flexibility, allowing additional questions to be posed while ensuring that key information was obtained.
5. A consistent protocol was followed for each project site, with adjustments made for the different people involved and the specific activities conducted; the implementation progress at each site was also noted.

2.2.3 Data Collection Methodology

Document Review: Prior to arriving in Colombia, the evaluator read a variety of critical project documents and took notes for reference. These documents included the project document and revisions, the cooperative agreement, technical progress and status reports (TPRs), project logical frameworks and monitoring plans, work plans, correspondence related to TPRs, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) reports (including baseline surveys implemented and W/P status reports). During the fieldwork, these documents were verified and additional supporting documents were collected. (See Annex A for a complete list of the documents reviewed.)

Data Collection Tools: USDOL developed a master list of key evaluation questions that served as the basis for the data collection tools. These questions were used to develop guides and protocols in Spanish for the individual and group interviews conducted with project stakeholders. The final list of evaluation questions is incorporated in the Terms of Reference (see Annex B), and a complete set of interview tools can be found in Annex C.

Field Visits: The evaluator visited project sites in Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena. In each city, one school-based and one community-based EpC site was included. During the visits, the evaluator observed the activities and outputs developed by the project. Depending on the circumstances, individual or group interviews were held with a variety of project stakeholders (defined as those who have an interest in the project; for example, implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, government officials).

Stakeholder Interviews: In total, 155 stakeholders were interviewed individually or in small groups; including project staff, project associates, subcontractors, government officials at the national and local levels, international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and multilateral agencies working on child labor issues, other local entities working on child protection projects or committees, teachers, and parents of direct beneficiaries. In addition, two large group discussions/interactions were held with direct beneficiaries in Bogotá (60 EpC students in total) and four small student-group discussions were held in Cali and Cartagena (24 EpC students in total). Table 2 provides a detailed summary of the stakeholder population interviewed, the methods used, the sample size, and the characteristics of the sample. Annex D gives a complete list of the persons interviewed (with the names of the children withheld) by date, site, and method of interview.

Question Matrix: Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator created a question matrix (Annex E) that outlined the source of data from which the evaluator planned to collect information for each terms of reference (TOR) question. This helped the evaluator make decisions regarding time allocation in the field. It also helped the evaluator ensure that she was exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and was consistently documenting the source of each finding.

Stakeholder Meeting: Following the field visits, a meeting was conducted by the evaluator that brought together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. The meeting was used to present major preliminary findings and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders (including those not interviewed earlier). The meeting agenda and list of attendees can be found in Annex F.

Table 2: Interviews—Population, Interview Method, Sample Size, and Sample Characteristics

Population	Method of Interview	Sample Size (Total number of individuals)	Sample Characteristics
Project staff and associate partner representatives	Individual	9	<i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project staff, including the project director, education coordinator, and monitoring team; associate partner representatives from POA, DevTech, and Mercy.
Implementing partners/subcontractors	Individual and small groups	62	Local NGO partner staff, including managers, EpC coordinators, and EpC facilitators from Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena.
Government Ministry officials and local government officials	Individual and small groups	10	Government representatives at the local and national levels, including the Ministry of Social Protection, the Ministry of Education, the Institute of Family Well-Being, and their local counterparts.
International NGOs and multilateral agencies working on child labor issues	Individual and small group	6	Including the International Labour Organization (ILO), International Organization for Migration (IOM), the Telefónica Foundation, Save the Children, and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF).
Other local entities working on child protection projects or committees	Small group	5	Members of local committee working on child labor issues in Cali.
Teachers and administrators whose students attended the EpCs	Small groups	17	Teachers from Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena who had students benefitting from the EpC educational intervention.
Teachers who attended a QL training workshop	Small groups	13	Teachers from Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena who had participated in a 2-day QL training workshop.
Parents of direct project beneficiaries	Small groups	33	Parents of children who participate in the EpC program.
Direct project beneficiaries (EpC students)	Large groups	2 large student group discussions/ interactions (30 EpC students each)	2 EpC sites visited in Bogotá: 1 community-based and 1 school-based. Observation of children engaged in activities, followed by discussion/ interaction with all students in each EpC.
Direct project beneficiaries (EpC students)	Small groups	4 small student groups representing a total of 24 students	4 EpC sites visited in Cali and Cartagena (community-based and school-based); small group interviews were conducted with male and female students between the ages of 9 and 14 (children selected at random).
TOTALS		155 stakeholders interviewed individually or in small groups 2 large student group discussions , representing 60 EpC students 4 small student groups , representing 24 EpC students	

2.2.4 Data Analysis

The document reviews, site visits, stakeholder interviews, and stakeholder meeting generated a substantial amount of raw qualitative data. The evaluator used qualitative data analysis methods, including matrix analysis, to categorize, synthesize, and summarize the raw data captured from the interview notes. The data analysis process was driven by USDOL's key evaluation questions.

2.2.5 Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation lasted nine working days. The evaluator did not have enough time to visit all the project sites. As a result, the evaluator was not able to take all the sites into consideration when formulating her conclusions. All efforts were made, however, to ensure that the evaluator visited a representative sampling of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

Findings for this evaluation are based on information collected from background documents and during interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy and usefulness of the evaluation findings is based on the integrity of the information provided to the evaluator from these sources. Furthermore, the determination of project efficiency did not include a cost-efficiency analysis utilizing financial records. However, the evaluator did include some interview questions to key stakeholders regarding the cost-effectiveness of the educational intervention

III FINDINGS

3.1 RELEVANCE

3.1.1 Project Assumptions

Seven critical assumptions are mentioned in the project's logical framework (see Annex G). Each of the assumptions was discussed in detail with key members of the project staff. Most of the assumptions remain accurate and realistic. However, two assumptions have been impacted by the global economic crisis since the project was conceptualized: (1) Macroeconomic factors do not deteriorate, and (2) EpC will be funded with private and public funds starting from the third year. These assumptions were conceived before the full impact of the global economic crisis was realized. While Colombia has not been hit as hard as other countries, the *Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística* (National Department of Statistics, or DANE) reports a sharp increase in unemployment over the past year among the total working age population.² The most recent figures show that the unemployment rate among the total working population is slightly lower than the January 2009 high of 14.2%. According to the project's M&E specialist, these high unemployment rates may result in an increase in child labor in order to contribute to the total family income. The specialist also assessed that this may impact the project's ability to obtain private and public funding to sustain project efforts.

3.1.2 Obstacles in Addressing Child Labor in Colombia

Colombia's National Strategy for Preventing and Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor and Protecting Working Youth 2008–2015 (National Strategy) offers an in-depth discussion of the root causes of WFCL³ and provides the context from which the strategy was developed. The publication cites the root causes as being economic (poverty), social (including school desertion due to its irrelevance to everyday life), cultural (widespread acceptance of child labor), institutional (weak laws or inadequate enforcement of laws protecting children), and inadequate awareness of the consequences of child labor.

Stakeholders were asked to give their opinions on the root causes and explain how the project strategy addressed these causes. The answers that they provided confirmed the complexity of the root causes of child labor in Colombia. Among the reasons cited by project staff, implementing partners, and ministry officials are the following:

- *Poverty*: Poverty was mentioned as the primary cause of child labor, and education was cited as an important factor in breaking the cycle of poverty. The Colombian national program *Juntos* has developed a multifaceted plan to address the issue of poverty. Education forms one of the key components of this national plan, with a subcomponent that specifically addresses child labor.

² *Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística*. (2009). *Encuesta Continua de Hogares*. Bogotá, Colombia: DANE.

³ Comité Interinstitucional Nacional. (2008). *Estrategia nacional para prevenir y erradicar las peores formas de trabajo infantil y proteger al joven trabajador 2008–2015*, (pp. 20–24), Bogotá, Colombia: Author.

- *Cultural attitudes in Colombian society:* Both parents and some employers have long accepted child labor as simply a normal part of growing up and as helping to contribute to the family. Interviews with educators and parents revealed that parents have grown dependent on their children working, to lighten their own financial responsibilities. The project's education specialist added that receiving an education is often undervalued and is not seen as a tool for breaking the cycle of poverty. The project is providing some parent education workshops to help break these cultural attitudes, but these were not being implemented consistently in all EpCs.
- *Quality of education:* Several of the interviewed stakeholders pointed to the overall quality of education as one of the root causes of child labor. They explained that education may be inaccessible for some children or that the methodology being used in school is not learner-centered. This may lead to higher desertion rates and a greater likelihood of those children joining the workforce. The introduction of innovative teaching methodologies by the *Educame Primero Colombia* project is one strategy that may contribute to a higher quality of education.
- *Dangerous neighborhoods/inadequate childcare/lack of recreational options:* Interviewed parents most frequently cited not wanting to leave their children alone at home because of fear for their safety. They explained that there were no options other than to have their children accompany them to their jobs. The EpC program of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project has helped to alleviate this problem by complementing the half-day of formal school instruction with a half-day of educational activities, thus providing a full day of educational services as well as supervision.
- *Armed conflict and internally displaced families:* Many individuals working with issues of child labor view armed conflict within Colombia as one of the contributing factors to child labor. While the interviewees did not specifically mention children being recruited as soldiers, they did cite armed conflict as a major cause of families being displaced and migrating to major cities such as Bogotá. In these situations, children are frequently called upon to help with their family's increased cost of living. The project is not directly addressing the larger issue of internally displaced families, other than by targeting them for the EpC program and providing them with the integrated services of the implementing partners/NGOs.

3.1.3 Appropriateness of the Project Design

The stated goal of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project is to reduce and progressively eliminate the worst, most exploitive forms of child labor within Colombia. Toward this goal, the project design centers on the implementation of the educational EpC program for children ages 6–14 who are either working or are at risk of working in WFCL. As described previously, the EpC program is offered during the half-day when children are not in school (*contra jornada*) and are most likely to work. An interview with officials at the Secretary of Education in Bogotá confirmed that relevant educational programs offered during an opposing school shift are an effective strategy for reducing child labor. This view was shared by other officials at the Secretary of Education in Cali and Cartagena, as well as specialists in the area of child labor

within the Ministry of Social Protection and the Ministry of Education. These officials agreed that a full day of quality education for children is needed to help eliminate child labor, but they also pointed out that there is not enough funding within the municipal governments to achieve this goal.

While project stakeholders cited an educational strategy as an appropriate focus for the project, they mentioned several key elements that were either weak or missing entirely in the overall design. Implementing partners specifically identified the need for some integrated services, funded by the project, in order for the educational strategy to be effective in combating exploitive child labor. This would include the necessary elements of providing for the child's nutrition during the EpC program, addressing the psychosocial needs of their families through a stronger parent education component, and additional psychosocial awareness-level training for EpC facilitators. These issues are discussed further in Section 3.1.12.

3.1.4 Criteria for Selecting Program Regions and Beneficiaries

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project did not only concentrate its efforts on internally displaced and vulnerable populations in primarily urban areas, but also in some rural areas. These two general populations have a higher incidence of children engaged in WFCL.⁴

According to project staff, some of the regions selected for the project coincided with areas in which POA and Mercy Corps had contacts. However, these areas also have higher concentrations of working children. By focusing project activities primarily in the urban areas of Barranquilla, Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena, the project targeted areas in which nearly 70% of the population ages 5–17 lives.⁵ Program beneficiaries were defined as children who were working or were at risk of working in WFCL (defined by ILO Convention 182 and Colombian Resolution 1677)⁶; particularly commercial sexual exploitation, domestic service, street work, and recycling. Children working in agriculture and carrying out activities related to mining were also targeted in areas not visited during the midterm evaluation fieldwork.

3.1.5 The EpC Methodology

The EpC model applies an active, participatory, and learner-centered approach that includes the following three components: academic skills, personal growth, and recreation. The academic component includes assistance with homework and a special focus on math and language skills. The personal growth component develops the child's self-esteem. The recreational component includes physical education, fine arts, music, theater, and children's literature. The active and participatory methodology that characterizes the EpC program is based on the QL methodology, which will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

⁴ USDOL and Partners of the Americas. (2007, October 1). *Support to the Colombia time bound program on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor: Educame Primero*. [Project Document under USDOL and Partners of the Americas cooperative agreement].

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Secretaría General de la Alcaldía Mayor de Bogotá D.C. (2008, May 20). *Resolución 1677 de 2008 Ministerio de la Protección Social*. Retrieved from <http://www.alcaldiabogota.gov.co/sisjur/normas/Norma1.jsp?i=30364>

The project education specialist described the process of adapting—or “Colombianizing”—the EpC curriculum materials originally created in the Dominican Republic, so that they would be more appropriate for the Colombian culture. She noted that facilitators could further adapt the EpC materials to a local context when planning their lessons. Two representatives from the Secretary of Education in Bogotá shared a slightly contrary point of view. They felt that the materials were too simple for Colombian students, but admitted they had never actually visited an EpC site. Another government education official, who visited an EpC site, felt that the materials were appropriate and effective for Colombian children.

All of the 42 EpC facilitators who were interviewed commented that the EpC materials are appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context of the country. They stated that the training they received on QL methodology gave them more confidence to modify certain EpC program activities for their group of students, without compromising the content. For example, they added more songs and raised the level of critical thinking involved.

Most importantly, the children interviewed gave only positive remarks regarding the content of the EpC program. While they cited the songs and recreational activities as their favorite activities, they most frequently identified the EpC facilitator as what they liked best about the program, “because she/he is fun and loving.”

3.1.6 Quantum Learning and its Contribution to the EpC Programs

Quantum Learning is an active, participatory methodology that promotes effective learning through educational games, positive thinking, physical fitness, and emotional health. QL serves as the foundation for the EpC programs. As part of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project, all EpC facilitators, coordinators, and some regular classroom teachers received training in the QL methodology.

A majority of the EpC coordinators and facilitators who were interviewed had participated in both the EpC and the QL training. All of them strongly expressed that QL forms the foundation of the EpC educational model, and that a facilitator cannot truly plan and execute the EpC class without having base knowledge of the QL methodology. As one facilitator succinctly stated, “Quantum Learning is the ‘why’ behind the EpC model.” Both the project’s education specialist and the education advisor emphatically agreed with this statement.

3.1.7 Project Design within the National Strategy and other Initiatives to Eradicate WFCL

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project is contributing to two significant strategies/initiatives within the national Colombian Government: The National Strategy for Preventing and Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor and Protecting Working Youth 2008–2015, and the program *Juntos*, which is the government’s national initiative for the alleviation of extreme poverty. A description of each strategy and the project’s contribution follows.

One of the immediate goals of the National Strategy is to reduce the number of children and youth ages 5–17 years in the Economic Active Population from 7.2% in 2005, to 5.3% in 2010. To reach this goal, the National Strategy provides general guidelines for departments, districts, and municipalities to consider when developing a specific action plan for withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL.⁷ These guidelines promote the basic concept of engaging children in quality education, while also integrating projects that address the root causes of child labor (for a summary of root causes of WFCL, please see Section 3.1.2). The *Educame Primero Colombia* project directly addresses these guidelines by (1) providing high-quality educational programs to children that complement their half-day of formal school instruction; and (2) introducing innovative and effective teaching strategies into the regular classroom that help alleviate the problem of school desertion.

*Juntos*⁸ is a government program under the Presidential Agency for Social Action and International Cooperation (*Acción Social*) that aims to alleviate extreme poverty. Among the key aspects or dimensions of this strategy are education and training, and the call for programs that result in the withdrawal and prevention of children under 15 years of age from child labor. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project is contributing to this National Strategy by implementing an educational model with a proven record of withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL.

3.1.8 Role of the *Educame Primero Colombia* Project on the National Committee to Eliminate Child Labor

The Interinstitutional Committee to Eliminate Child Labor (National Committee, or CIETI) is made up of key government ministries and institutions, as well as NGOs, labor unions, and the ILO. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project is represented on this committee through its project director. The project director described the unique contribution of *Educame Primero Colombia* on the National Committee, since this committee has the responsibility of implementing the strategies outlined in the National Strategy. The project provides the model of an educational intervention designed to withdraw and prevent children from WFCL, as well as an M&E system to document the impact of its efforts. The M&E system is of particular interest to the National Committee. According to the *Educame Primero Colombia* project evaluation specialist, the project was invited to a meeting with a technical subcommittee of CIETI that took place on June 10, 2009 in order to discuss the development of a single national system for monitoring child labor in Colombia. This national system is tentatively scheduled to be developed by the end of 2009, with funding from the Inter American Development Bank (IDB).

3.1.9 Working Collaboratively in Support of the National Strategy

In Colombia there are numerous governmental agencies and international organizations working on issues related to child labor. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project has made several efforts to coordinate with both government and nongovernment agencies in support of the National Strategy.

⁷ Comité Interinstitucional Nacional. (2008). *Estrategia nacional para prevenir y erradicar las peores formas de trabajo infantil y proteger al joven trabajador 2008–2015*, (pp. 71–77), Bogotá, Colombia: Author.

⁸ *Juntos* is a program under *Acción Social* that specifically addresses issues related to extreme poverty. See www.accionsocial.gov.co for more detailed information on *Acción Social* and the program *Juntos*.

At the national Government level, the institutions directly responsible for carrying out the National Strategy are the Ministry of Social Protection (MPS in Spanish), the National Ministry of Education (MEN in Spanish) and the Colombian Institute for Family Well-Being (ICBF in Spanish). Aside from their interaction with the National Committee, key staff members from *Educame Primero Colombia* have met with each of these entities to discuss the project's activities that support the National Strategy. As a result of this direct approach, the project is carrying out an educational intervention pilot supported by ICBF. Under this intervention, the project will implement 16 EpC programs in the department of Boyacá for one year, ending December 2009. The ICBF and the *Educame Primero Colombia* project are hopeful that there will be future collaborations.

Educame Primero Colombia (represented by Partners of the Americas) has also collaborated with four other key NGOs that are working on projects in support of the National Strategy. They are: Save the Children, World Vision, the *Telefónica Foundation*, and ILO. These four organizations recently formed a group known as the International Cooperation for the Eradication of Child Labor (COETI, in Spanish), convened under the general guidance of the International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC). COETI has two main objectives: (1) To coordinate efforts designed to strengthen governmental institutions in support of the National Strategy, and (2) to design and implement a coordinated national and local communication strategy on issues of child labor. Activities within its work plan focus on inter-institutional strengthening to advance the National Strategy, as well as some broad collaborative awareness-raising activities (such as World Day Against Child Labor, observed on June 12). Promotion or collaboration at the individual project level is not part of COETI's purpose or goal. Interviews with three COETI group members indicated that *Educame Primero Colombia* has contributed significantly with its expertise in M&E. Specifically, the project has provided technical assistance to municipal governments seeking to develop a system to monitor child labor.

3.1.10 *Educame Primero Colombia* Support of TBP Goals

As mentioned in the Project Background and Description (see Section 1.1), this project is specifically designed to meet the goals of a TBP. The general goal of a TBP is to assist a national government in eliminating WFCL in a defined period of time. Table 3 provides a summary of the specific TBP goals and strategies or activities of *Educame Primero Colombia* that support this.

Table 3: *Edúcame Primero Colombia* Strategies/Activities in Support of TBP Goals

TBP Goals	Project Strategies/Activities Supporting TBP Goals
1. Prevent the engagement of children in the WFCL.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The educational intervention being implemented by the project is specifically designed to withdraw or prevent children from engaging in WFCL. • Parental awareness activities regarding child labor and children's right to education are part of the project strategy.
2. Provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the withdrawal of children from WFCL and for their rehabilitation and social integration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The educational intervention provides direct services to children who are participating or are at risk of participating in WFCL. • The project integrates an evaluation component to monitor the child's labor status at the beginning, midterm, and end of the educational intervention, as well as academic progress in math and language arts.
3. Ensure access to free basic education and, wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from WFCL.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the project is not directly involved in advocacy issues related to children's right to education, it is involved in child labor and education committees at the national and municipal levels that focus on these kinds of advocacy issues. • The project actively promotes formal school enrollment for all children involved in the EpC program. The project monitors school attendance at the beginning, midterm, and end of the educational intervention.
4. Identify and reach out to children at special risk.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has made a concerted effort to reach out to internally displaced and vulnerable populations, primarily in urban areas. These populations are shown to have the highest concentration of children engaged in the WFCL.
5. Take account of the special situation of girls.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Girls have been targeted for direct services because they make up a large portion of two of the WFCL targeted: commercial sexual exploitation and domestic service.

As Table 3 indicates, the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project strategy works within the framework established by USDOL TBP projects. Most importantly, by designing a project under the TBP guidelines, the project is providing direct support to the National Strategy's goal of reducing WFCL from 7.2% in 2005 to 5.3% in 2010. Sustaining these efforts poses the greatest challenge to project implementers. (See Section 3.4 for further discussion on sustainability.)

3.1.11 *Edúcame Primero Colombia* Support of the Five USDOL EI Goals

As stated in Project Background and Description (see Section 1.1), USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve the five major goals of its education initiative projects. While this project is technically considered to be a TBP, it also is designed to fit within the goals of USDOL's EI projects. According to USDOL,⁹ "The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitive child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance,

⁹ USDOL. (2009, May). *Independent midterm evaluation of Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Colombia*. [USDOL TOR].

children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work.” EI projects have five strategic goals; Table 4 summarizes how the project design of *Educame Primero Colombia* supports each of these goals.

Table 4: *Educame Primero Colombia* Strategies & Activities in Support of EI Goals

EI Project Goals	Project Strategies/Activities in Support of EI Goals
1. Withdraw or prevent children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through the implementation of the EpC and EpE educational programs, the project is targeting 10,200 children ages 6–17 for W/P from exploitive child labor, focusing on victims of WFCL.
2. Strengthen policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is involved in activities that strengthen child labor programs at the municipal and departmental levels. Specific contributions are in the area of monitoring instruments to track child labor at the local level, providing a model for W/P of children from WFCL, and helping to retain them in school.
3. Raise awareness on the importance of education for all children and mobilize a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct awareness efforts to parents and teachers of child beneficiaries on child labor issues as well as children’s right to education. Broad awareness efforts coordinated through the COETI.
4. Support research for the collection of reliable data on child labor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has developed a reliable M&E system for gathering data on W/P, school attendance, achievement in math and reading, as well as the impact on parental knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding child labor.
5. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At midterm, the project was now preparing to focus its actions on the long-term sustainability of its efforts.

3.1.12 Other Issues Related to the Design or Implementation of the Project

Educame Primero Colombia is not a multidimensional intervention to eliminate child labor; it is an educational intervention and a very important strategy toward withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL. Nonetheless, interviewed stakeholders consistently mentioned several vital components missing from this intervention that could affect the success of the program. Following are four of these major issues.

Duration of the Intervention

Educame Primero Colombia has a timeline of only three years to achieve its goal of withdrawing and preventing 10,200 children from WFCL. With such a compressed timeframe, the project was forced to implement an educational intervention lasting only one school year, or approximately 10 months. The single-most common concern mentioned by project staff and stakeholders was that this was insufficient time to attain the permanent withdrawal, prevention, and retention of

the targeted children. Furthermore, project implementers felt that it was also insufficient time to reinforce the newly formed values, attitudes, and behaviors promoted by the EpC program. Project staff agreed with this assessment, but also felt confined by the target numbers placed on them in the project design (which was predetermined in the Solicitation for Grants Application).

Education intervention experts in the broader field of child labor were also asked for their opinions. Nick Mills, project director for a USDOL EI project from 2004 to 2009, stated in his research on the subject, “Time is a factor in retention and retention is a factor in withdrawal...the longer we can maintain children in quality educational programs, the greater likelihood of saving them from child labor.”¹⁰ Mills suggested an educational intervention period of up to three years, while the project’s education advisor recommended an educational intervention of 18–24 months in order to achieve a greater likelihood of permanent withdrawal or prevention from WFCL.

The three-year timeframe for this project also takes into account the future implementation of the EpE educational intervention in the third year. As briefly described in Section 1.1, this intervention will target adolescents ages 15–17 to participate in a faceted, three-pronged program designed to help them develop their self-esteem, life skills, and leadership capacities, while also preparing them for an entry-level job, establishing a family micro-enterprise, and/or continuing with their education. Interviews with the implementing partners raised concerns regarding the length of time allocated to achieve the objectives of the EpE intervention. According to the project staff, the first EpE programs will begin in October 2009 and end in May 2010, with a one-month break for the holiday season. The implementing staff felt that the intervention timeframe of seven to eight months is far too short to establish and implement a wide-scale project. Implementing partners and project associates made the suggestion to pilot the EpE program and continue with the EpC program. This would allow the project as a whole to strengthen its knowledge of, and broaden its experience with, the EpCs, and thus be better positioned for discussions on sustainable funding.

Parent Intervention

The project has several indirect beneficiaries, including the parents of children enrolled in the EpC programs. All of the implementing partners and teachers felt strongly that it was critical to reach the parents in order for the educational intervention to be successful. The project, however, did not have an organized or systematic educational or outreach/awareness plan for parents. Some of the interviewed NGOs stated that they were able to provide some parent workshops as part of their organizational offerings through their family services programs. There was not consistency, however, among the eight NGOs interviewed. Parents who were interviewed in the three cities visited during the evaluation had varied experiences regarding the parent workshops. Some parents commented that there were no workshops offered after the initial parent interview. Others commented that the program had offered them several workshops/meetings on topics including child labor and child abuse. These parents added that they would be interested in receiving more workshops, but cast some doubt as to whether all parents would attend. They also

¹⁰ Mills, Nick. (2008). *La erradicación del trabajo infantil a través de la educación: Mito o realidad*. [Serie de Investigaciones Aplicadas por el proyecto Primero Aprendo], p.18.

mentioned that it would be helpful for parents outside of the EpCs to be part of awareness-raising activities in order to have a greater effect on the community.

The implementing partners/NGOs that were interviewed felt strongly that an organized intervention for parents was needed. As one EpC coordinator stated, “We need a ‘*Familias para Crecer*’ (Families that Grow) curriculum that complements and reinforces the values emphasized in the EpC curriculum.” Specific suggestions for parental interventions made by project stakeholders included the following:

- Offer workshops to the EpC parents as well as the larger community to discuss child labor within the context of a child’s right to education.
- Offer a series of workshops that discuss psychosocial issues families face.
- Work with families on a longer-term basis to develop personal skills such as literacy and other practical skills that could help them gain profitable work.
- Involve parents in the EpC programs so that they gain a greater appreciation of how their children are benefitting.

Child Nutrition

The implementing partners do not understand why the project does not provide funds for nutritious snacks to be distributed during the EpC session. In their interviews they pointed out the link between proper nutrition and learning, and the fact that it can help with retention in the EpC. Although some NGOs have been able to find ways to provide snacks through community contacts, not all of the EpC sites have guaranteed snacks. “These children are hungry and I simply can’t ask them to think. I have resorted to paying for snacks out of my own pocket when I can,” stated one EpC facilitator who makes a half-day of minimum wage.

Responding to this finding, the project director stated that she had looked for ways in which the government programs could assume the responsibility of providing snacks, primarily through the *Acción Social* program that targets poverty-related issues. To date, however, the project has been unable to secure snacks for all EpCs; this has resulted in a major challenge for the implementing partners.

Additional Training on Psychosocial Issues for EpC Facilitators

The project is targeting the most vulnerable populations for its educational intervention, including children who have been displaced due to the internal armed conflict and victims of commercial sexual exploitation. As one EpC facilitator succinctly noted, “The EpC program enrollment is like putting together the top gang.” Children arrive to the EpC after a lifetime of exposure to daily sexual exploitation, drugs, and violence. Though the EpC facilitator is given no specific training in this area by the project, some of the implementing partners have assumed this responsibility and are providing training on psychosocial issues. The facilitators suggested in their interviews that all implementers (facilitators and coordinators) receive more awareness-level training on the psychosocial issues facing these families. While they recognized that it is

not their role to become a social worker or psychologist, more training in this area would better prepare them for their role as EpC facilitators.

3.2 EFFECTIVENESS

3.2.1 Accurate Identification of the Children Targeted by the Project

According to the implementing partners/NGOs interviewed in Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena, the project's M&E specialist clearly outlined the selection criteria for the EpCs in the M&E Guide.¹¹ As mentioned in Section I on Project Description and Background, the children selected for the program had to be working or at risk of working in WFCL as defined by the criteria established by ILO Convention 182 and Colombian Resolution 1677. This includes victims of commercial sexual exploitation, domestic service, street work (selling items on the street), and recycling, among others.

Working Sectors Represented Among Project Beneficiaries

Implementing partners most frequently mentioned EpC participants to be working or at risk of working in domestic service, street work (selling items in mobile carts), recycling (searching garbage for cans, bottles, or scrap metal), and mining (helping with tasks related to mining in Cali). For the most part, these children are helping their parents carry out their work duties rather than working directly for an employer. In the case of street work, however, children often are hired directly by informal business people to sell goods on the street. In both Bogotá and Cartagena, two NGOs mentioned children who were victims of commercial sexual exploitation or who were at risk of becoming victims. During the interviews with the 33 parents in Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena, the types of work most often mentioned for children include cleaning (domestic and commercial), street vending (selling cell phone minutes and food such as gelatin and fruit), and recycling.

Other Vulnerable Populations

Interviews with the implementing partners and project staff suggested that many of the children enrolled in the EpCs are victims of forcible displacement, but these statistics are not specifically documented. According to the project associate Mercy Corps, Colombia's internal conflict has helped to create the largest population of internally displaced people outside of Sudan—at least 4 million, and growing.¹²

¹¹ *Guía de Monitoreo: Instructivo para la recopilación y análisis de los datos en el campo, versión 2*, Partners of the Americas, DevTech, CINDE, MercyCorps, agosto del 2008.

¹² Mercy Corps, Colombia; available at <http://www.mercycorps.org/countries/colombia>.

3.2.2 The EpC Model and Its Effect on the Beneficiary Community

Increasing Educational Opportunities

The facilitators responsible for implementing the EpCs on a day-to-day basis described the effect that the EpC program has had on giving the participants hope for a better future. They attributed this to the routines and values that the EpC program offers. Participants learn to value education, attend school regularly, try harder, and set goals for what they want to be when they grow up. When the evaluator asked the children what they wanted to be when they grow up, each child had high aspirations of becoming a doctor, nurse, teacher, veterinarian, or any one of a list of occupations. Parents who were interviewed also noted a marked difference in their children's interest in school since participating in the EpC program.

Creating Community Ownership

The design of the EpC program was such that some EpCs were conducted in community space donated through the municipality or the implementing NGO, while others were held at the public school. The evaluator visited both types of EpCs and both had a sense of community ownership. The three school-based EpC programs that were visited had the full support of the school director as well as the involvement of school counselors and/or social workers. The community-based EpC programs had a strong sense of community pride that interviewees attributed to the hard work of the implementing NGOs within that community, rather than to the specific involvement of local community leaders. No local community leaders (political, religious, or other) were interviewed to verify their involvement. Even though a strong commitment was evident in both school-based and community-based EpCs, the implementing NGOs and host school communities agreed that without outside funding, the EpCs would be difficult to sustain.

Increasing the Capacity of Communities

The project design of partnering with local NGOs to implement the EpCs has resulted in an increased capacity for these community organizations. The eight community organizations interviewed during the evaluation fieldwork revealed an average of 28 years of providing services and programs in the targeted communities. However, this was the first time that any of them had implemented a well-structured educational program with the specific objective of reducing child labor in the community. The directors of the NGOs stated that even though future funding of the EpCs is uncertain, their newly developed skills as educators trained in innovative and effective methodologies can be sustained within the organization and can be applied to their other programs. In addition, the EpC materials also may continue to be used, as they were developed in the Dominican Republic and adapted in Colombia with United States Government's funding; therefore, they are in the public domain. The QL training itself, however, is not in the public domain. DevTech recommends that new users receive QL training through the organization ENTRENA in the Dominican Republic in order to implement the EpC model effectively.

Increasing the Understanding of the Dangers of Child Labor

The EpC programs provide an opportunity to communicate the dangers of child labor. Interviews with parents, however, revealed that this message is not being promoted consistently at all EpCs because there is not a systematic and structured parent education component. There was evidence, however, of the local NGOs promoting this message to the wider community. During the fieldwork, one of the implementing partners was featured in the largest newspaper in Colombia, *El Tiempo*, in an article entitled “Education and Patience to Eradicate Child Labor.”¹³ The article specifically featured the contributions of the EpC program in raising parents’ awareness of child labor issues as well as the importance of education. It went on to discuss the methodology of the EpC, stating that a lot of love and patience from the EpC facilitators makes the difference in this successful educational intervention.

3.2.3 Tracking the Work Status of Children

The project uses three primary monitoring instruments to verify the work status of children: (a) an initial baseline survey, (b) a follow-up survey at six months after entering the program, and (c) a final survey at 12 months after entering the program. Besides the verification instruments, the implementing partners commented that the EpC facilitators and coordinators often know the children, their families, and their teachers on a personal basis and can follow up with any questions or concerns regarding the child’s work and educational status.

Interviews with the implementing partners revealed some initial resistance regarding the surveys, but there was general agreement that it was important to obtain reliable and quantitative data that could document the impact of the intervention. The length of the initial survey was the most common complaint (43 detailed questions, taking approximately 40 minutes to administer to each family). There were also concerns about monitoring the “work status” of children who had been victims of commercial sexual exploitation (the questions regarding the number of hours worked were inappropriate and not applicable).

The M&E specialist commented that the overall monitoring system is practical, but staff responsible for gathering and entering the data must be familiar with the Microsoft Access database program. Since not all of the implementing partners initially possessed the necessary skills or computer program, all were provided with the database program and received training in its use. In addition, all implementing partners were provided with ongoing technical assistance during implementation. With this in mind, staff turnover was cited as a major frustration due to the need to repeat the intensive training in data collection and data entering, as well as repeating the technical assistance process. Other challenges to ensuring the accuracy of W/P data are discussed later in this report.

Regarding the monitoring of child work status after school and during holidays, the initial baseline survey has a specific question regarding the time of day and the day of the week that work is conducted. The follow-up survey at 6 months verifies the status of the initial information. According to the M&E specialist, data collected thus far have detected cases in

¹³ “Educación y paciencia para erradicar el trabajo infantil.” *El Tiempo* 7 June 2009: 3–11.

which children enrolled in the EpC has shifted their work hours to weekends or night hours, resulting in an incomplete withdrawal from work. The surveys do not request specific information for work occurring during national holidays.

3.2.4 Collecting and Reporting Withdrawal and Prevention Data

The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project has a well established process for the final assignment of the W/P status, the first of which begins with training the implementing partners/NGOs on W/P definitions. At the start of each new cohort (group of children receiving the educational intervention during the same time period), training is given by the project’s M&E team and is provided to the staff assigned to collect and enter the M&E data (EpC facilitators, coordinators, and data entry staff). This training includes a special emphasis on interpreting key project definitions such as W/P, all of which are contained in the project’s M&E guide provided to training participants as a reference. While the initial assignment of W/P status is given by the implementing partner/NGO staff, all data is analyzed by the project’s M&E specialist, who is the one who assigns the final W/P status reported to USDOL.

Interviews with the implementing partners/NGOs reported some initial problems with the data collection process, but they were confident that the “kinks” in the M&E process had been corrected. The M&E team, however, was more specific. They reported a number of challenges during the first year that were specifically related to the W/P data. Table 5 provides a summary of the problems encountered and the actions taken to correct or overcome these problems.

Table 5: Problems Encountered in Reporting Accurate W/P Data and Corrective Actions Taken

Problems	Actions taken to overcome problems
Errors in the initial and follow-up surveys in Cohorts 1, 2A, and 2B, partly due to a change in EpC coordinators	The M&E team reviewed all raw data collected in the initial and follow-up survey for Cohorts 1, 2A, and 2B, and discussed errors (omissions or incomplete answers) with implementing partners. Surveys were returned to implementing partners so that the errors could be corrected.
Incomplete or erroneous data entered into database	Further corrective action and training were provided to implementing partners. In addition, the M&E database system was adjusted to highlight errors entered so that they could be corrected.
Inconsistent assistance provided by implementing partners to those directly responsible for administering the survey (usually the EpC facilitator)	The M&E team worked through the EpC coordinators, who were responsible for overseeing the work of the facilitators, and visited each implementing partner/NGO’s office to provide direct technical assistance.
Problems determining exact calculation of W/P numbers due to error (incorrect file was included; this error has only occurred once)	Action was taken to correct errors and resubmit corrected data to USDOL. Further efforts are underway to facilitate data collection and database entry process.

3.2.5 Withdrawal and Prevention Target Numbers

The W/P data is collected and reported every six months in the Technical Progress Reports (TPR). By the end of the three-year project, 10,200 children are expected to be withdrawn or prevented from WFCL as a result of their participation in the EpC or EpE educational intervention.

The most recent W/P target numbers achieved and projected over the three-year project were provided to the evaluator during the field interviews (see Annex C). For 2008, a total of 2,281 children were documented as withdrawn or prevented. This fell slightly short of the W/P goal of 2,353 children. The implementing partners and M&E staff explained that the desertion rates and those falling in the “to be withdrawn” (TBW) category were slightly higher than expected, but that this was not necessarily due to ineffectiveness on the part of the EpC program. They cited, rather, the following external factors as likely causes: (a) an increase in the unemployment rate, forcing children to contribute to family income (see Section 3.1.1 for more information), (b) the displacement of families in search of better opportunities, and (c) the inability of certain EpCs to provide snacks and/or transportation from the regular school in order to ensure daily attendance.

Given the inability to fully achieve the 2008 W/P target numbers, the project took specific actions to help meet or exceed target numbers in 2009 and 2010 and therefore comply with the overall project W/P target numbers. Specifically, the project increased total EpC enrollment to offset the expected attrition rate, and then adjusted the enrollment of children to include equal numbers of working children as children at risk of working, in order to meet the established W/P proportion goals.

Implementing partners commented that these new enrollment guidelines have placed a heavier burden on the scarce resources that they are managing. They suggested that the project take action on the root causes of attrition, such as not providing children with nutritious snacks, rather than placing more responsibility on the implementing partners.

3.2.6 Effectiveness of the Awareness-raising Strategy

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project has a specific output related to raising the awareness of parents, educators, and community leaders regarding exploitive child labor. The project director explained that the small budgetary allotment for public awareness-raising activities has forced her to think of strategies for collaborating with other projects that have similar goals. She cited the example of collaborating with the *Telefónica Foundation* to publish a powerful 15-page insert that was circulated in the nation’s leading newspaper, *El Tiempo*, in commemoration of World Day Against Child Labour (June 12, 2008). This year, the project director cited several collaborative awareness-raising efforts, including (a) production of a pamphlet on children’s rights co-produced with the NGO *Fundación Rafael Pombo*, (b) provision of support for a children’s hotline for reporting violations of children’s rights, established by the NGO *Corporatin*, and (c) collaboration with COETI’s larger child labor awareness-raising strategy, under the leadership of the *Telefónica Foundation*.

In addition to these public awareness efforts, the EpCs have conducted awareness workshops for parents on WFCL. As previously mentioned in Table 3, these efforts have not occurred in an organized or systematic way under the direct guidance of the project. Rather, they have depended on the implementing partners to develop and carry out workshops through their own social services programs. This has resulted in parental awareness-raising activities in some, but not all, of the EpCs. As described by two implementing partners, the project's larger awareness-raising strategy has been a series of isolated activities rather than an integral process aimed at social and cultural transformation. For them, an effective awareness-raising strategy needs to be comprehensive and strategic.

Neither the teachers nor the government officials at the national or local (municipal) levels could comment on any specific awareness activities. They did mention, however, that the project has kept a low profile regarding the work of the EpCs and suggested that part of the awareness-raising strategy might include publishing the effect of the EpCs on the direct beneficiaries. This would also help in securing future funding to sustain the EpC programs over the long term.

3.2.7 Project Management Strengths and Areas for Improvement

The evaluator interviewed implementing partners as well as key project staff regarding management strengths and areas that could be improved. In terms of strengths, the implementing partners recognized the expertise of the M&E and education specialists and provided only positive comments regarding the technical assistance provided by each. Both were described as making themselves available when questions arose, and always getting back to the local partners in a timely fashion. Implementing partners especially appreciated the proactive efforts of the M&E and education specialists to bring together EpC coordinators on a monthly basis to discuss any issues or concerns. National government stakeholders and international NGOs (members of COETI) positively described the project director's efforts in working collaboratively toward completing the goals of the National Strategy. Finally, the project management key staff described relatively clear roles for each member and a harmonious working relationship.

Regarding areas for improvement, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project was perceived to have a relatively low profile at the municipal level. Local government officials suggested that the project implementers make a greater effort to get out into the community and build local partnerships. Implementing partners felt that they did not have clear direction from the project management moving forward with meetings with local government officials to discuss the future sustainability of the EpCs; they were not clear on how the meetings fit into the plan. These implementing partners wanted to see a project-led effort, under the leadership of the project director, in creating alliances for sustaining the EpCs.

3.2.8 Coordination Between Project Associates

The evaluator interviewed key project staff representing all four project associates: the project director representing POA, the education specialist representing DevTech, the M&E specialist representing CINDE, and Mercy Corps' coordinator, who works directly with half of the implementing partners, many of whom work with the most vulnerable populations. In addition to the key project staff, the evaluator interviewed project advisors from POA, DevTech, and Mercy

Corps. As previously mentioned, the project staff described a harmonious working relationship, with clear roles and areas of expertise for each project associate. Representatives at the advisory level also recognized each associate's area of expertise and contribution to the project. There were some concerns expressed, however, regarding reaching an agreement on a clear sustainability plan. Two of the associate partner representatives had concrete suggestions for moving forward with plans for obtaining the necessary project support at the local and national levels but stated that a clear plan for creating alliances and building project support had to come from the project director. They expressed concern that a true sustainability plan, with their participation as well as that of the implementing partners, had not yet been initiated.

3.3 EFFICIENCY

3.3.1 Cost-efficiency

Educame Primero Colombia's primary strategy aims for the withdrawal and prevention of 10,200 children from WFCL over three years through the implementation of the EpC programs in the target regions. It is not surprising that the majority of the total budget expenditures (65%) support this output. (The remaining 35% of the total budget supports the other two project outputs.¹⁴) The cost to support one child in the EpC program for one school year, which is estimated to be US\$325, is of particular interest to stakeholders. As a point of comparison, Colombia's regular primary school budget is approximately US\$500 per student per year.¹⁵

Stakeholders representing government officials as well as implementing partners were asked to comment on the cost-efficiency of the EpC program. When comparing EpC costs with current government expenditures for the regular school session, all of the national and municipal government representatives interviewed perceived the EpC costs as high. At the same time, however, they recognized the impact of the EpC program. A more careful analysis by the Secretary of Education in Cartagena indicated that the costs were within reason given the obvious benefits of a quality program that both educates and withdraws and prevents children from WFCL. Nonetheless, the Secretary felt that the costs could not be sustained in the long term without outside funding support.

Of the yearly per student budget, the implementing partners directly receive approximately US\$200 per student per year to implement the EpC program. They recognize that the remaining US\$125 per student per year is needed to cover additional administrative costs for the EpC materials, technical training in both the EpC program and QL methodology, and technical oversight provided by the M&E and education specialists. However, the implementing partners believe that given the time to gain the necessary expertise, they could operate the EpC program with less overhead and technical oversight costs, improving the cost-efficiency of the services provided.

¹⁴ *Project Document under USDOL and Partners of the Americas Cooperative Agreement*, "Support to the Colombia Time Bound Program on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor: *Educame Primero*," October 1, 2007.

¹⁵ Cost provided to the evaluator was based on information presented by the *Ministerio de Educación Nacional, República de Colombia*, February 2009.

3.3.2 Efficiency of the Project Strategy

Educame Primero Colombia identified the establishment and implementation of EpCs through local implementing partners/NGOs as its primary project strategy. These NGOs had a well-established history of working in the targeted communities. Consequently, the project did not have to spend either time or resources to establish contact and gain the trust of the direct beneficiaries. In addition, the NGOs added their institutional support in terms of their expertise in working with vulnerable populations. Some NGOs were able to donate building space and snacks to the EpC programs. In summary, both the *Educame Primero Colombia* project staff and the implementing partners felt that the strategy of working through the local NGOs was far more efficient than the alternative of entering a community and trying to establish the EpC programs without NGO support.

Regarding the awareness-raising strategy, a decision was made by the project director to join forces as often as possible with other organizations that were carrying out child labor awareness-raising activities. This decision was based on the relatively small amount of resources allocated for awareness-raising activities and out of recognition that, by collaborating with other projects with similar goals, more could be accomplished. See Section 3.2.7 for information on specific awareness raising activities.

3.3.3 Efficiency of the Monitoring and Evaluation System

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project greatly emphasizes gathering and reporting reliable project data. The system to collect such data was developed by the M&E specialist under the broader support of the associate partner, CINDE. According to the project document, the total budget allocated for M&E over the three-year project period is US\$264,948, or roughly 5% of the total budget. The M&E specialist stated that this relatively small budgetary allocation forced the project to create an extremely efficient system that has been able to capture and report the statistical data required by USDOL. This system required the full cooperation and support of the implementing partners to collect and enter the data. Challenges in establishing the M&E system are discussed in Section 3.2.4.

3.3.4 Opportunities to Share and Exchange Experiences

The project has established a successful mechanism for coordinating and exchanging experiences among the 13 different implementing partners/NGOs, under the guidance and leadership of the project's education and M&E specialists. EpC coordinators (representing the implementing partners) participate in monthly meetings with the education and M&E specialists in person or via the internet/Skype. The EpC coordinators view these monthly meetings as extremely helpful in staying connected with the larger project as a whole. In addition to the monthly meetings with the specialists, EpC coordinators hold monthly meetings with the EpC facilitators who work under the direct supervision of that coordinator (each EpC coordinator supervises an average of eight facilitators). Still, many of the coordinators and facilitators noted that the project should provide more opportunities for exchanging experiences between the different regions. They also suggested an extensive list of topics for follow-up training, including further training on QL

methodology. More specific information on community-based versus school-based EpCs is provided in the next section.

3.3.5 Community-based EpCs versus School-based EpCs

The evaluator visited three community-based EpCs and three school-based EpCs. The question of which model worked best was posed to EpC facilitators and coordinators. The project's education specialist and education advisor were also asked to give insight. There was general agreement among the interviewees that both types of models have their advantages and disadvantages; no one would identify one model as being better than the other. Table 6 summarizes their comments.

Table 6: Community-Based versus School-Based EpCs: Advantages and Disadvantages

Community-Based EpCs	School-Based EpC
<p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit from the support and infrastructure of the community-based organization, which often provides integrated services to families (counseling, etc.) and/or access to other community programs • Greater opportunity to get to know the students and their families • Community ownership and pride; greater support from parents and community leaders • Students can more easily access other programs administered in the community once the EpC program ends 	<p><i>Advantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit from the support and infrastructure of the school community, including counselors and social workers • School ownership and pride • More opportunities to show the benefits of the EpC educational intervention • More contact/interaction with the regular teaching staff and opportunities to share methodology used in the EpCs • With time, schools are allies, which can open up the door to having a school-wide influence on teaching methodologies
<p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less opportunity to interact with regular school teachers or obtain their support • EpC students come from various schools, which is more difficult to coordinate • Community centers are also multifunctional, so at times EpCs have been displaced for a function that pays for the community space 	<p><i>Disadvantages:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Space in school is often limited and EpCs are often pushed out of their space or have to share it with another class • Some teachers complain that all of the singing and games are distracting to the regular classrooms • School holidays interfere with continuous service (there are more school holidays than community-wide holidays)

3.3.6 Cost-sharing Adjustments

In December 2008, USDOL informed POA that its subcontractors (implementing partners/NGOs) are not allowed to provide matching contributions to projects funded by OCFT. This required an adjustment in all of the subcontracts that the project had signed to remove matching contributions. During the field interviews, project management explained how the cost-sharing adjustments have affected them. At the conceptual phase of the project, the matching funds required by the project design were to come from the implementing partners. These funds

were not necessarily cash resources, but rather a total value of additional resources that the partners would provide to the project. Examples included refreshments, building space, and other in-kind contributions.

According to headquarters staff from POA, the change in policy will not affect the overall success of the project. They are confident that they will find additional donors to raise the US\$600,000 in matching funds and are currently following up on some promising leads.

3.4 IMPACT

3.4.1 Impact on the Project's Direct Beneficiaries: Children Participating in the EpC Program

Children, parents, EpC facilitators, regular classroom teachers, and project staff were interviewed regarding the project's impact on direct beneficiaries. Discussions were held with large and small groups of EpC child participants at six different EpC sites, for a total of 84 children interviewed. All of the children were enthusiastic and sincere about their experiences in the EpC program. The children described how the EpC program made learning fun and interesting. They discussed how they now understood that to achieve their goals, they needed to study, and that work could wait until they were older. Equally important, they discussed how their parents now wanted them to be in school, rather than at work.

Parents spoke of the positive impact of the program and their children's newfound interest in learning. They gave numerous examples of their children's attitude before the EpC program intervention, and after participation in the program. Their children were happier and "always singing." Their children's grades and conduct had improved in school, and for the first time their children had professional goals for what they wanted to be when they grow up.

The facilitators described the transformation they witnessed in the children attending the EpCs, from the first weeks when the children were resistant to routines and structure, to subsequent weeks when they became cooperative and willing participants. The children became more confident as time went on and were able to express their feelings more openly because of improved interpersonal skills. Facilitators also discussed how the program had affected the children's academic progress in their regular classrooms, as shown by improved grades in math and language arts, during their participation in the EpC program. They noted that this improvement could be due, in part, to the children becoming more organized with their homework.

Interviews were conducted with 17 teachers and/or school principals whose students attended an EpC program in Bogotá, Cali, or Cartagena. Of these, 16 remarked that they had noted a difference in the academic progress of these students, as well as positive changes in behavior and attitude. For example, they noted that the children were cooperating more with their classmates, listening to their teachers, were more responsible, and most importantly, had a desire to learn. Only one teacher observed no change in one particular student who participated in the EpC program, and described the numerous psychosocial issues facing this child.

The education specialist discussed her observations of the EpC program and its positive impact on the participants. She described the students during the first weeks of the program, arriving with resistant, distrustful, and at times, violent attitudes. After one month in the EpC program, she saw a change in their entire demeanor and interest in learning. She recognizes, however, that quantitative data are needed to back up her testimony, as well as those of the facilitators, teachers, parents, and students. The education and M&E specialists are working together to measure EpC participants' academic progress in math and language arts. This quantitative assessment began with Cohort 2A¹⁶ (students enrolled in the EpC program from September 2008 to June 2009); results were not available at the time of the midterm evaluation.

3.4.2 Impact on Parents of Children Participating in the EpC Program

A total of 33 parents were interviewed regarding the effect of their children's participation in the EpC program on their own attitude toward child labor. Numerous respondents testified that their attitudes were changing. They shared that they had worked as children and that child labor was a widely acceptable cultural practice. They agreed that their children should focus on their studies and wait to work until after they achieve their academic goals.

The M&E specialist discussed the project's efforts to measure the impact on parents' knowledge and attitudes toward child labor issues. The project conducted the Knowledge and Attitudes Perceptions (KAP) survey among parents to provide quantitative impact data. A baseline KAP survey was administered to Cohort 1; the KAP survey for that group was used as an indicator for focusing parent awareness efforts.

A baseline KAP survey was administered to a sample of parents from Cohorts 2A and 2B, and a follow-up survey will be administered to a randomly selected sample of parents at the end of each cohort period. The same procedure will be followed for the final project cohort (Cohort 3).

3.4.3 Impact of EpCs and QL on Teachers and Facilitators

EpC facilitators are directly responsible for implementing the EpC program. All facilitators received training on the EpC program and most¹⁷ received the QL training it is based on. In addition, approximately 217 teachers from regular classrooms attended a two-day QL training.

Facilitators described the EpC training as essential to implementing the program, and identified the QL training as critical to understanding the teaching methodology. The facilitators described a lifelong impact from having participated in the EpC program and its high standards for quality education. Facilitators described children from the most vulnerable populations that were transformed from disinterested students into highly engaged learners. This was due, in part, to

¹⁶ Each *cohort* is defined as a group of children or project beneficiaries that were withdrawn or prevented from exploitive child labor and provided direct educational services in a particular fiscal and school calendar year. In Colombia there are two academic school calendars: (1) September to June in Cali and Valle Departments—the project refers to this school calendar as Cohort A; (2) February to November in all other geographic areas of Colombia—the project refers to this school calendar as Cohort B.

¹⁷ Some of the facilitators who received the QL training have since moved on to other positions. Their replacements will attend the next available QL training (scheduled for September 2009).

the facilitators' steadfast belief in each child's potential, and that given the right opportunity these children could blossom. The facilitators explained that the QL methodology provided these children with the tools to succeed. They stated that even if they do not continue as EpC facilitators, they most likely will remain in the field of education and will continue using the QL methodology.

Interviews were conducted with 13 teachers who attended the two-day QL workshop. All of the teachers described the training team from the Dominican Republic as outstanding and extremely professional. Two teachers stated that the QL methodology is one of several similar methodologies that use learner-centered teaching approaches. For these teachers, the QL training added some additional ideas to techniques that they already applied in their classrooms. All of the other teachers stated that the QL training "transformed" their teaching methodology. One group of teachers interviewed in Cali was convinced that the QL methodology leads to improved educational quality, which ultimately benefits the student. They strongly suggested that a controlled research study be conducted between a school that fully implements the QL methodology and one that does not, in order to measure the impact on academic achievement as well as behavioral change.

3.4.4 Impact on Implementing Partners/NGOs

As mentioned in Section 3.2.2, the NGOs that are implementing the EpC programs have been providing services to the targeted communities for a combined average of 28 years. For some of these community-based organizations, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project provided the first opportunity to offer services aimed at reducing or eliminating child labor. For others, while they may have previously addressed child labor issues, this was the first time that they implemented a well-structured educational program using innovative teaching methodologies. The eight NGOs that were interviewed described a newfound confidence to discuss and advocate for quality education programs that help to eliminate child labor. They intend to sustain their advocacy efforts on issues regarding child labor and children's rights to quality education. This may also have a "ripple" effect, since many of these NGOs work collaboratively with other local community groups and their programs.

3.4.5 Impact on Government or Policies Affecting Education and Child Labor Issues

At midterm, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project is in a position to discuss and advocate for system-wide change on education and child labor issues with local and national government authorities, based on W/P data retrieved from Cohort 1 (in the March 2009 TPR). Prior to collecting this data, the project kept authorities from the Ministry of Social Protection, the Ministry of Education, and ICBF informed of ongoing activities. The project is better prepared to move forward with advocacy/sustainability work based on quantitative data, but much of the data will not be analyzed and available until the project is near completion. This is another problem raised by the M&E specialist with such a short overall project time period—the project is nearly over just as the data are becoming available.

3.4.6 Impact of Project Activities on Education Quality

The National Strategy has identified the improvement of education quality as one important factor in the effort to eliminate WFCL. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project's quality educational component is the QL methodology described in Section 3.1.6. So far, a total of 217 regular classroom teachers have received QL training.

Educators who received training on the QL methodology spoke passionately about its impact on educational quality. As reported in Section 3.4.3, teachers who received the QL training have become advocates for training additional teachers or even entire schools in the QL methodology to improve the quality of education throughout Colombia. Public school principals who were interviewed in Cartagena and Cali were very interested in receiving QL training based on the feedback given by their teachers trained in this methodology.

The project's education specialist stated that more efforts would be made by the project to introduce QL methodology into teacher training schools, as well as providing more QL workshops for teachers. The eventual goal would be to have a national QL training team that could provide workshops to large numbers of teachers. (The QL methodology is copyrighted; only established franchises can legally offer QL training.)

While the *Educame Primero Colombia* project is planning on expanding the QL training and advocating for its institutionalization on a wider level, there are no current project plans to quantitatively measure its impact on educational quality. However, this may be of interest to the *Universidad del Norte* (UniNorte), one of the implementing partners/NGOs. During the field interviews, UniNorte mentioned the ability to follow up on a number of research questions, including the impact that the QL methodology has had on educational quality in the regular classroom.

3.4.7 Emerging Trends That May Increase Overall Project Impact

Quality education is a priority that is stated in Colombia's general education goals, as well as in its National Strategy to eliminate WFCL. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project is carrying out activities in support of this national priority, but several governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders commented that the project had not openly shared its activities or results. The project responded to this finding by stating that it has made numerous efforts to involve or inform stakeholders, including (a) 24 presentations to local and national government representatives, (b) at least eight special invitations for government officials to attend a project workshop or visit an EpC site, and (c) distribution of EpC materials to government officials at the Ministry of Education, the Secretary of Education in Bogotá, and the ICBF. In addition, the project has informed stakeholders that the EpC materials are published on the Internet.¹⁸

As mentioned in the previous section, the project has, among its implementing partners, the *Universidad del Norte*. UniNorte is interested in using project data to study the long-term impact of the project. In an interview, UniNorte staff discussed their preliminary research ideas,

¹⁸ Available at <http://www.devtechsys.com/services/DOLColombia.cfm>.

including permanence of the child's W/P from WFCL, as well as the impact of the QL methodology on educational quality. As UniNorte is not dependent on project funds to provide this follow-up research, they have the ability to conduct an impact analysis after the formal project has ended.

3.4.8 The Project's Work with Local Government

At the time of this midterm evaluation, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project was beginning more concerted efforts to work with municipal governments on adopting strategies to address child labor issues and to promote support of the EpC programs. Specifically, the M&E team has provided the municipalities of Bogotá and Samacá with technical assistance for creating a system to monitor the progress of child labor elimination within their districts, in support of the larger National Strategy. Additionally, the local NGOs are members of municipal child labor committees that work in support of the National Strategy. Thus far, the local committees have served mostly as an advocacy platform, but more specific strategies in support of the National Strategy are planned. Further discussion of the sustainability of EpC programs appears in Section 3.5–Sustainability.

3.4.9 Overall Response to EpCs

Based on the evaluation field interviews, the following is a summary of the overall response to the EpC program as a valid methodology to combat child labor and improve the quality of education.

Local officials from the Secretary of Education in Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena described the EpC model positively in terms of its success in withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL. The representative from Bogotá stated that the methodology of providing a quality education program during the opposing school shift is key to combating child labor. The other representatives from Cali and Cartagena agreed. However, they all consider cost to be a major obstacle to adopting such a program. They suggested increasing the visibility of the EpC program by openly sharing its methodology and by reporting its measured impact on W/P, as well as educational quality, in order to gain support for future sustainability.

The implementing partners were overwhelmingly positive about the EpC programs during the field interviews. They were convinced, based on the qualitative and quantitative evidence (testimonies as well as W/P data) that the EpC programs were successful at withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL, as well as promoting life skills for students to excel academically. Their biggest concern was the sustainability of these efforts, given the short-term nature of the EpC intervention.

3.4.10 Impact of Project Activities/Strategies on Children Under Extremely Vulnerable Conditions

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project targets children in extremely vulnerable conditions, including child victims of commercial sexual exploitation. The local implementing partners/NGOs have a long history of serving this population; their efforts have been

instrumental in gaining access to these children and enrolling them in the EpCs. Interviews with the NGOs identified three major areas of concern that impact their work with this population: (1) the short length of the intervention, (2) inadequate psychosocial training for EpC facilitators and coordinators, and (3) inconsistencies in W/P data.

Regarding the length of the intervention, virtually all EpC facilitators and coordinators working with this vulnerable population stated that one year was not enough time to permanently withdraw/prevent children from commercial sexual exploitation and provide them with the support they need to succeed academically, socially, and psychologically. While the NGOs can provide some of the necessary integrated services, they mentioned that the *Educame Primero Colombia* project should support the educational intervention for a longer period of time.

The implementing partners/NGOs also expressed concern that the project was not providing uniform training on strategies for working with children who come from extremely vulnerable conditions, including victims of commercial sexual exploitation. While several NGOs have provided additional psychosocial training for EpC facilitators and coordinators, these have not been project-wide efforts. EpC facilitators commented that most of the children in the EpCs come from vulnerable conditions (not just victims of commercial sexual exploitation). They have felt unprepared to handle what one facilitator described as “the best 25-member gang you could put together.”

In addition to concerns regarding uniform training strategies, the NGOs working with victims of commercial sexual exploitation pointed out inconsistencies in the collection of the W/P data. They explained that if a child is identified as a victim of such an activity, the NGO is obligated to take action to protect that child. This results in a total withdrawal from the exploitive situation, including withdrawal from the family and obviously the EpC. The project considers children as “withdrawn” if they have regained their rights and are no longer under the care of their parents.

3.5 SUSTAINABILITY

3.5.1 Project’s Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project created a matrix to outline its plan for sustainability (see Annex H). The matrix mentions the conditions for sustainability, the action needed by the institutions and partners, the process for monitoring the progress of these actions, and the status of the sustainability elements. It does not, however, outline who will be responsible for the specific actions mentioned, or when these actions should be completed. Interviews with associate partner representatives, key project staff, and directors of the local NGOs (implementing partners) revealed that project sustainability was their major concern. They commented that in order to support the project’s sustainability efforts, they need a detailed plan with a clear timeline, specific activities, and the identification of specific subgroups that should carry out these actions.

3.5.2 Progress on Leveraging Resources for Sustainable Funding

At midterm, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project has made a number of efforts to leverage non-project resources in search of sustainable funding. The project director reported that, following meetings with various governmental and non-governmental organizations, unsolicited proposals were sent to a number of these contacts, including the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the Secretary of Education in Bogotá, the Ministry of Education, the Restrepo Barco Foundation, the Mamonal Foundation, the *Compartamos con Colombia* Foundation, and various municipalities of Bogotá and Boyacá. To date, these efforts have not resulted in any specific funding in support of *Educame Primero Colombia* project activities or the EpCs. However, some of these contacts have led to other promising leads that the project director and her assistant are currently pursuing.

According to representatives from DevTech and Mercy Corps, coordinated efforts to leverage resources that also involve their organizations' help and contacts are not being pursued. They expressed concern that too little is being done in the area of sustainability and that they are ready and willing to help.

The project was able to successfully obtain outside funding worth US\$45,656 to implement the EpC program in Boyocá. This funding was not solicited, but rather, was provided by ICBF when it approached the *Educame Primero Colombia* project to become an implementing partner. Even so, it represented the project's first outside funding source in support of project activities. This collaborative effort could serve as a model for obtaining future funding from ICBF or other government entities.

3.5.3 Challenges and Opportunities for Maintaining Coordination with Government Entities

At midterm, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project has been in regular contact with representatives from the key governmental institutions directly responsible for addressing child labor issues in Colombia. Some of this coordination has been through CIETI, while other efforts have been directly through the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Social Protection, and the ICBF (see Section 3.1.9). The governmental institutions interviewed for the midterm evaluation recognize the contribution of *Educame Primero Colombia* toward implementing a quality educational intervention during the opposing school shift, as well as its success at withdrawing and preventing children from WFCL. They also recognize the value of the M&E system that was developed and put into place to provide reliable statistics. The opportunity exists, therefore, to build institutional capacity to carry out this type of educational intervention and to establish a reliable system to monitor its impact.

While the project has included representatives from key governmental institutions at both the national and municipal levels, this involvement has not resulted in concrete action in direct support of its programs. The project's education specialist stated that, so far, the project has only sought informal government support for the EpC programs, but has not sought formal institutional backing (written or financial) for project activities. Representatives from Mercy

Corps stated that formal letters of commitment from key governmental institutions are key to promoting sustainability efforts.

3.5.4 Challenges and Opportunities for Coordinating Efforts with International NGOs

The COETI group described in Section 3.1.9 has provided the opportunity for coordination between the *Educame Primero Colombia* project and other international NGOs. COETI has allowed the organizations to work together on specific efforts in support of the National Strategy. It has also provided the platform to coordinate efforts between organizations that are providing similar direct services, as in the case of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project and Telefónica's Pro-Niño project. Through the efforts of COETI, these two projects agreed to target different areas for intervention.

At the same time that cooperation exists between the international NGOs in support of the National Strategy, there is some also degree of resistance to combining efforts. The *Telefónica Foundation's* representative stated that even though both projects are targeting the same target population for an educational intervention, a joint intervention would be difficult. She reasoned that each project has its own ideas about what works best. She admitted to not being familiar with the EpC program or the QL methodology and suggested that *Educame Primero Colombia* openly share its methodology and results so that others will have a greater understanding of the project's purpose and programs.

3.5.5 Challenges and Opportunities for Coordinating Efforts with Local NGOs

The very cornerstone of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project strategy centers on its work with the local NGOs. At the time of the midterm evaluation, 13 NGOs were serving as implementing partners to carry out the work of 184 EpCs.

As mentioned previously, these NGOs offer a wealth of experience in the provision of social service programs to target communities. Their longstanding relationship with these communities has allowed the project to begin implementing the EpCs immediately. Some of the NGOs have also supported the EpCs by providing integrated services that address some of the psychosocial issues impacting the beneficiary families. Section 3.2.2 describes the impact the project has had on building the capacity of these NGOs to serve as advocates for the elimination of child labor, as well as provide future quality educational interventions that are effective with vulnerable populations.

Coordination with the local NGOs also has brought some challenges. The M&E specialist mentioned that the large number of different organizations administering the survey and entering the data has increased the chances for data error. It has been a challenging process to train NGO staff in both the data collection techniques and the database program. These efforts have been ongoing due to the continual staff turnover experienced by the NGOs.

3.5.6 Concrete Steps to Promote the Sustainability of the Project

The stakeholders' meeting held at the end of the field interviews provided an opportunity to gather specific suggestions for promoting the sustainability of the project. The following is a summary of the suggestions for sustainability made during this meeting:

- Designate one person in the project to coordinate sustainability efforts, preferably the project director.
- Create a permanent advisory group dedicated to project sustainability efforts, under the coordination of the project director.
- Have the project director meet with national as well as local government officials to seek their formal support.
- Have the project director work collaboratively with the local NGOs to meet with local entities suggested by the NGOs.
- Provide further support and direction to the NGOs to begin working on concrete sustainability efforts.
- Provide data/evidence of the project's impact to present to potential donors.
- Involve universities in providing ongoing M&E support.
- Create a webpage to increase the project's visibility and provide a platform to share the project strategy, tools, and results.
- Create a plan for seeking international funding from organizations such as USAID and IDB.
- Collaborate with other international or national agencies that could provide food donations.

Further recommendations to promote sustainability can be found in Section VI, Recommendations.

IV LESSONS LEARNED/BEST PRACTICES

At midterm, it is too early to establish a definitive list of lessons learned and best practices; however, there are some preliminary lessons learned that can be reported and applied to this project, as well as future projects designed to combat exploitive child labor through an educational intervention.

- As a part of larger efforts such as the COETI group or the National Committee to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor, the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project has been able to coordinate and contribute directly to efforts designed to strengthen the overall National Strategy.
- Lasting change regarding something as complex as child labor is not likely to be achieved by an education intervention that only lasts ten months. A longer educational intervention is needed to achieve permanent withdrawal and/or prevention from child labor.
- Implementing a quality educational intervention offered during the opposing school shift is an effective strategy to combating exploitive child labor.
- Educational interventions designed to combat child labor will be more effective if they provide a nutritious snack for children, address the psychosocial needs of families, and integrate a well organized parental education component to reinforce the concepts taught to children.
- Awareness raising as a project component should be seen as a process of social and cultural transformation, and not just as a series of isolated activities. An effective awareness-raising strategy needs to be both comprehensive and strategic.
- Partnering with local NGOs that have a long-established history of working with vulnerable populations is an efficient and effective strategy of integrating the targeted beneficiaries into the EpC program, as well as providing additional services to help meet the psychosocial needs of these vulnerable populations.
- Involving local universities with the project's implementation can create a sustainable research component that can study the long-term impact of the project with regard to the permanence of the child's withdrawal or prevention from exploitive child labor, as well as the impact on education quality.
- An M&E system that depends on numerous data collectors and data entry personnel scattered throughout the targeted communities requires extra diligence on the part of the M&E specialists. Direct and permanent assistance should be provided to implementing partners throughout the project period to ensure the accurate collection and entry of data.
- Poor education quality is considered one of the factors associated with school desertion and child labor. Providing training on innovative educational methodologies for regular classroom teachers, such as QL, may help improve education quality, which may lead to

higher W/P rates as well as retention rates. However, a quantitative assessment must be developed and integrated into the project design to accurately measure the true impact of this methodology.

- A sustainability plan created with input from project stakeholders can help generate commitment and action.
- M&E information that is made available throughout the project forms an integral part of sustainability efforts because it provides evidence of progress and achievement of established goals.

V CONCLUSIONS

5.1 RELEVANCE

1. **Project's Relevance to TBP Goals and EI Goals:** By implementing an educational intervention whose primary goal is to withdraw and prevent children from WFCL, the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project is directly supporting the National Strategy and its TBP goals. The project strategy also supports the five strategic goals of USDOL EI projects by improving access to, quality of, and the relevance of education through the EpC educational model and the QL methodology.
2. **Project's Contribution to the National Strategy:** The project uniquely addresses the guidelines of the National Strategy for Combating WFCL by establishing and implementing a quality educational intervention that withdraws/prevents children from WFCL, and by introducing innovative and effective teaching strategies into the regular classroom. The project is also successfully collaborating in its support of the National Strategy by coordinating efforts with other international NGOs.
3. **Appropriateness of the Educational Intervention, EpC:** The EpC model applies an active, participatory and learner-centered approach based on the QL methodology. The EpC materials have been appropriately adapted for the cultural, economic, and political context of the country.
4. **QL's Contribution to the EpC programs:** QL forms the foundation of the EpC methodology. It would be remiss to implement the EpC program without formal QL training that equips facilitators with the knowledge base needed to effectively carry out the program.
5. **Project Design Issues that Could Affect Its Overall Success:** A quality educational intervention offered during the opposing school shift is an important strategy in combating WFCL. Strengthening or modifying several aspects of the educational intervention, including a longer duration for the educational intervention, a parent education component, a nutritious snack during the EpC session, and psychosocial training for EpC facilitators, could increase the project's overall success,.

5.2 EFFECTIVENESS

1. **Identifying the Target Population:** The project has successfully targeted and integrated children who are working or at risk of working in exploitive child labor, as defined by ILO Convention No. 182 and Colombian Resolution 1677. This includes child victims of commercial sexual exploitation, domestic service, street work, recycling, and mining.
2. **Monitoring and Evaluation System:** The project's M&E system has successfully designed and implemented a practical and effective system for tracking the work status of children as well as collecting and reporting reliable withdrawal and prevention data. The M&E system recognizes the margin for human error and has appropriately addressed

these by providing additional technical assistance as well as adjustments based on the first year's experience. The issue of frequent staff turnover in the NGOs requires ongoing oversight and training to ensure reliable data collection and data entry.

3. **Withdrawal and Prevention Target Numbers:** The project did not achieve its W/P target numbers for 2008, but it appears to be on track in meeting the total W/P target of 10,200 children by the end of the project in December 2010. Even though these numbers are likely to be reached, the permanence of the children's withdrawal or prevention from WFCL is in question given the short duration of the intervention.
4. **Awareness-Raising Strategy:** The project's awareness-raising strategy has not been comprehensive or strategic, partly due to the limited funds available to carry out this component. This has resulted in a series of isolated awareness activities done in collaboration with other projects focusing on child labor issues, rather than an integral process aimed at social and cultural transformation.
5. **Project Management and Coordination with Associate Partners:** The project has successfully brought together an effective project staff representing all four project associates, each offering different areas of expertise. The education and M&E specialists provide consistent and important direct assistance to the implementing partners to carry out the educational intervention and M&E activities. Greater coordination is needed between associate partner organizations (POA, DevTech, Mercy Corps, and CINDE), as well as implementing partners/NGOs, to plan and execute a concrete sustainability plan.

5.3 EFFICIENCY

1. **Cost-efficiency:** The costs associated with implementing the EpC program may be the greatest barrier to its sustainability, even though these costs are reasonable given the expected outcome. Costs could be reduced through the direct implementation of the EpC programs by the implementing partners/NGOs, but technical assistance may still be needed by an outside expert in the areas of M&E and educational methodology.
2. **Efficiency of Project Strategy:** Implementation of project components through the implementing partners/NGOs is an efficient and effective model. These local NGOs have a long-established history of working in the targeted communities, saving the project time and resources to establish the necessary contacts and trust of the target populations. They also add their institutional support in providing integrated services to the most vulnerable populations.
3. **Community-based vs. School-based EpCs:** There is no specific conclusion regarding whether a community-based or school-based EpC model site works better. Both have their advantages and disadvantages. School-based programs offer a greater opportunity to influence the larger school community with innovative teaching methodologies, as well as provide closer follow-up on the child's academic and social progress. Community-based programs have a greater sense of community pride, ownership, and participation. It often depends on the particular circumstances of the implementing partner and the

targeted community in deciding whether to establish a school-based or community-based EpC. A comparative study measuring impact may help determine if one model is more effective or efficient than the other.

5.4 IMPACT

1. **Impact of EpCs on Direct Beneficiaries:** The EpC program has had a definite positive impact on the direct beneficiaries. This impact goes beyond the immediate withdrawal and prevention from WFCL; it has served to improve participants' self-esteem, regular school conduct, and possibly academic progress.
2. **Impact of EpCs on Parents:** The greatest impact on parents has been their acknowledgement of the benefits that the EpC program brings to their children, as well as some level of awareness regarding child labor issues and children's rights to education. The impact on parents could be strengthened with a structured parent education component that parallels the values and skills emphasized in the EpC program.
3. **Impact of QL on Education Quality:** Early qualitative feedback suggests that the QL methodology has been well received and appears to be effective in improving the quality of education in the regular classroom; however, more quantitative assessments need to be carried out to formally determine its impact on educational quality in the classroom.
4. **Impact of Project on Implementing Partners/NGOs:** The EpC program has strengthened the local NGOs capacity to provide services aimed at reducing or eliminating child labor, as well as their ability to implement a well structured quality educational program. They remain sustainable advocates regarding child labor issues and children's rights to education, as well as promoters of quality educational programs.
5. **Impact of Project on Local Government:** The project is just now beginning to work with municipal governments and their efforts in supporting the National Strategy. The project's assistance in establishing M&E systems to monitor child labor is important, but its impact so far is inconclusive.
6. **Impact of Project on Children Under Extremely Vulnerable Conditions:** The project, through its implementing partners, has reached children who have been victims or are at risk of becoming victims of commercial sexual exploitation. In order to serve this extremely vulnerable population more effectively, the project must support integrated services that address the psychosocial issues these children and their families face.

5.5 SUSTAINABILITY

1. **Sustainability Plan and Leveraging of Resources:** The current sustainability matrix/plan provides some general strategies to ensure the project's sustainability, but it lacks the specificity of a true action plan towards this goal. So far, the project has carried out a number of activities to leverage resources, but these appear to be a series of isolated

efforts rather than part of a strategic plan in search of sustainable funding. To date, these efforts have not led to additional funding.

2. **The Local NGOs:** The implementing partners/NGOs are not part of a formal sustainability plan, yet their involvement in *Educame Primero Colombia* may be one of the most sustainable elements of the project. The local NGOs have been an important force in the targeted communities for many years; their ongoing involvement in child labor issues, as well as training received in quality educational interventions, equips them with skills and knowledge that can be applied to future projects. They also remain sustainable advocates regarding child labor issues and children's rights to education.

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 FIVE KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following five key recommendations are critical for successfully meeting the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project objectives:

1. **Project Sustainability:** Create a Sustainability Committee, under the leadership of the project director that is specifically responsible for leveraging the resources necessary to ensure the sustainability of the project as a whole, and the EpC programs in particular. The committee should be made up of representatives from the four project associates (POA, DevTech, Mercy Corps, and CINDE) and the key implementing partners/NGOs. The committee's goal should focus on the creation and execution of a detailed sustainability plan with a clearly articulated timeline, specific actions, and the identification of committee subgroups that will carry out those actions. Project sustainability strategies should involve national actors, such as the Ministry of Social Protection, the Ministry of Education, and the ICBF, as well as local governmental and nongovernmental actors, such as municipal councils, elected officials, departments of social service and education, business organizations, and child labor committees. The involvement of local governments is particularly important for project sustainability, given the decentralized nature of health and education funding within Colombia.

The cost-efficiency of the EpC programs also must be taken into account, as cost appears to be a major barrier to project sustainability. With this in mind, the committee might incorporate specific actions into its timeline that enable local governmental entities or local NGOs to assume more responsibility for the technical aspects of the EpC implementation. For example, NGOs could administer the training for the EpC model, as well as carry out the follow-up M&E of the beneficiaries and program as a whole. Increased NGO involvement may be the most feasible way of sustaining the EpC program over the long term. In addition, the committee should investigate the possibility of establishing a national QL training team in order to further reduce the overall costs of the EpC program.

USDOL can support project efforts to ensure sustainability and leverage resources in the following ways:

- Review USDOL policies to determine what constitutes acceptable matching funds, donations, and contracts in order to maximize the project's opportunities to obtain the necessary funding to sustain project activities. For example, USDOL can facilitate the ability of the project to enter into agreements with government entities and other local funders that will contribute to adopting the project methodologies and promoting the child labor agenda.
- Clear the way for permitting USDOL funding for nutritious, convenient snacks for EpC participants to support the clearly established link between good nutrition and enhanced learning.

- Provide the necessary technical assistance and follow-up to ensure that the recommendations contained in this midterm evaluation report are carried out in a timely and efficient manner.
2. **Parental Intervention:** Create a Parent Education Committee, under the leadership of the project's education specialist, that can develop a comprehensive program for systematically involving and educating parents whose children are enrolled in an EpC. The committee should be made up of a subgroup of the EpC coordinators in addition to the project's education advisor from DevTech. The committee's goal should focus on the immediate development of a parental education component that can administer workshops on child labor issues and children's rights to education, and provide additional support and education on the psychosocial issues facing families with abused children. As part of the parental education component, this committee should take into consideration existing resources that have been developed by ILO-IPEC, UNICEF, and other organizations that have developed parent programs designed to help eradicate child labor and complement the educational intervention for children. An incentive program for rewarding parental involvement and attendance also should be considered.
 3. **Special Efforts for Children who are Victims of Commercial Sexual Exploitation:** Create a separate committee, under the leadership of Mercy Corps, that can develop a clearly articulated and standardized plan for serving the specific needs of child victims of commercial sexual exploitation. As part of this plan, the committee should include additional awareness-level training for EpC facilitators, as well as guidelines for detecting and reporting such cases of extreme exploitation. The plan also should include training on how to create alliances with local NGOs who are experienced in providing educational workshops and support services for victimized children and their families. The committee should consider developing a special proposal for USDOL that would allow the project to lengthen the EpC intervention period for this population, as well as give special consideration when reporting W/P data on this particular subgroup.
 4. **Child Nutrition:** Identify one or more individuals within the *Educame Primero Colombia* administration who will be responsible for leveraging the resources necessary to provide pre-packaged nutritious snacks to children attending the EpCs that are cost-effective, hygienic, and easily distributed. These individuals, under the direct supervision of the project director, should exhaust every avenue for obtaining national or local support for such a provision. USDOL should also consider the ways in which they can support this most basic component of an educational intervention targeting vulnerable children.
 5. **Duration of the Educational Intervention:** To achieve permanent W/P from WFCL, USDOL should structure its SGA and budgets in such a way that the direct beneficiaries have a longer educational intervention period. Experts in the field suggested an educational intervention period ranging from 18 months to 3 years in order to achieve permanent withdrawal and prevention from exploitive child labor. Demanding target numbers in the SGA force an accelerated intervention, compressing it into a timeframe that is too short to achieve permanent withdrawal or prevention from WFCL. USDOL

either should extend the project's total timeline or reduce the overall target numbers to allow for an educational intervention that is sufficient in duration to truly benefit children in the long term.

6.2 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Promotion of Child Labor Awareness:** Create a strategic outreach plan to raise awareness on child labor issues as well as the overall efficacy of the EpC educational intervention, under the leadership of the project director. Awareness-raising strategies for government stakeholders might include the sharing of M&E data that provide evidence of progress and achievement toward established goals, as well as workshops on the educational methodology of the EpCs. Awareness strategies at the community level might include specific community awareness-raising events, workshops, or media campaigns on child labor issues and children's right to education.
2. **Research on the Impact of QL Methodology on Educational Quality:** Support research efforts, under the guidance of the M&E team, that will provide more quantitative data on the effectiveness and cost efficiency of the QL educational methodology, including its impact on the educational quality in the regular classroom. Network with research entities, such as the *Universidad del Norte*, that can design and carry out such studies without the need for additional project resources. Utilize the resultant data, if positive, to secure future funding in support of the QL methodology and the EpC centers that implement it.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Colombia TB cooperative agreement
2. Colombia TB project summary
3. Colombia TB TPR March 08
4. Colombia TB OCFT comments on 08 March TPR
5. Colombia TB TPR Sep 08
6. Colombia TB POA response to OCFT comments on 08 Sep TPR
7. Colombia TB project revision #1
8. Colombia TB agreement with WV, Telefonica, ILO, and Save the Children
9. Colombia TB subcontracts letter
10. Colombia TB POA response to OCFT subcontracts letter
11. Colombia Noticia DOL April 08
12. Colombia TB Noticia DOL Aug 08
13. Colombia TB brochure
14. Project authorization signed by L. Harvey
15. Project document (Colombia FY07 Project) 03.31.09
16. Revised Table III. B (09 March TPR)
17. Colombia TB TPR March 09
18. Comité Interinstitucional Nacional, *Estrategia nacional para prevenir y erradicar las peores formas de trabajo infantil y proteger al joven trabajador 2008-2015*, Bogotá, Colombia, 2008.

ANNEX B: TOR/EVALUATION QUESTIONS

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for the Independent Midterm Evaluation of
Combating Exploitative Child Labor
Through Education in Colombia

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-16574-07-75-K
Financing Agency: Grantee Organization: Dates of Project Implementation:	U.S. Department of Labor Partners of the Americas, in association with DevTech Systems, CINDE, and Mercy Corps September 30, 2007–December 31, 2010
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Midterm Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	May 26–June 8, 2009
Preparation Date of TOR:	May 18, 2009
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US \$5,099,463
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	Macro International, Inc., Headquarters 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

I BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$720 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school;
3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor; and
5. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects—decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

USDOL reports annually to Congress on a number of indicators. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees is accurate and reported according to USDOL definitions.

In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the U.S. Congress directed the majority of the funds to support the two following programs:¹⁹

1. International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)

Since 1995, the US Congress has earmarked some \$410 million to support the International Labor Organization's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO/IPEC), making the U.S. Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO/IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; less comprehensive Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include "direct action" components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitative and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by IPEC projects is to increase children's access to and participation in formal and non-formal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a sustainable base for long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

¹⁹ In 2007, the US Congress did not direct USDOL's appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

2. *Child Labor Education Initiative*

Since 2001, the US Congress has provided some \$249 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being implemented by a wide range of international and non-governmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitive child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work. EI projects may focus on providing educational services to children removed from specific sectors of work and/or a specific region(s) or support a national Timebound Program that aims to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country.

Other Initiatives

Finally, USDOL has supported \$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO/IPEC program or the EI.

Project Context

While child labor has declined substantially in Latin America and the Caribbean in recent years, there are still 5.7 million working girls and boys who are under the minimum age for employment or are engaged in the worst forms of child labor. In Colombia, the problem of child labor is compounded by extreme poverty and ongoing conflict. Large numbers of children are believed to work in mining, domestic labor, commercial sexual exploitation, street work and commercial agriculture.²⁰ It is also estimated that 25,000 youth are victims of commercial sexual exploitation.²¹ Children are recruited, sometimes forcibly, into combat; an estimated 6,000 to 16,000 children are child combatants.²²

Jobs performed by children are often dangerous, illegal, or morally objectionable, placing children at considerable risk. In Colombia, child workers generally make less than 50% of the official minimum wage.²³ Children engaged in exploitive child labor often have low self-esteem, emotional anxiety, and distrust.²⁴ Access to quality education is limited, even though education is

²⁰ Partners of the Americas, Project Summary.

²¹ USDOL's 2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor, Colombia. <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/PDF/2007OCFTreport.pdf>

²² Ibid.

²³ Partners of the Americas, Project Summary.

²⁴ Ibid.

compulsory up to age 15. Many children are behind their grade level, due to late entry into school or dropping out, and family support for school is sometimes limited.²⁵

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in Colombia, having devoted approximately \$9.4 million since 2001 to combat child labor in the country. USDOL has devoted an additional \$17.2 million since 2000 to regional South American initiatives which included Colombia.²⁶ Among these projects is a \$3.5 million, 4-year project implemented by World Vision to combat exploitive child labor by improving basic education. The project ended in 2008, and withdrew and prevented 6,517 children from hazardous agriculture and other forms of labor in the municipalities of Funza and Madrid, Cundinamarca. USDOL also funded a \$7 million, 3-year inter-regional ILO-IPEC project, which ended in 2007, to combat the involvement of children within armed groups. This project withdrew 789 children from child soldiering and prevented an additional 673 children from becoming child soldiers in Colombia. A 4-year regional project funded by USDOL at \$5.5 million, and implemented by ILO-IPEC in Colombia, Chile, Paraguay, and Peru, ended in 2007. This project withdrew and prevented 5,618 children from domestic work and commercial sexual exploitation in Colombia.²⁷ USDOL has also funded a 4-year, \$4.7 million regional ILO-IPEC project to combat domestic work that also included Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay, and Peru. This initiative withdrew and prevented 2,693 children from CDL, and ended in 2004. A 4-year \$800,000 ILO-IPEC project funded by USDOL to combat child labor in informal mining withdrew and prevented 2,187 children from work in clay, gold, emerald, and coal-mining in Colombia. This project ended in 2004.

The Government of Colombia is actively involved in these and other initiatives to combat child labor. The minimum age for employment in the country is 15, and all child workers are prohibited from working at night or performing work where there is a risk of bodily harm or exposure to excessive heat, cold, or noise.²⁸ The country has ratified the relevant international agreements on child protection, including ILO Convention 182.²⁹

The Colombian Institute for Family Welfare (ICBF), Family Commissioners, the Children and Adolescent Police, the Prosecutor General, and the National Ombudsman are responsible for enforcing laws related to children. The country has adopted national strategies, including The Plan for Childhood (2004-2015), which contains provisions related to child labor, and to specific worst forms of child labor, including trafficking, recruitment into armed groups, and commercial sexual exploitation. The National Strategy to Eradicate the Worst Forms of Child Labor 2008-2015, which identifies criteria for guiding future actions has also been adopted, as has the National Plan of Action for the Prevention and Eradication of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls, and Adolescents Less than 18 Years of Age (2006-2011), which aims to introduce

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ USDOL, "Project Status – The Americas." <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/project-americas.htm>

²⁷ USDOL's 2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ ILO-IPEC, "Colombia: Child Labour Data Country Brief." http://www.ilo.org/ipceinfo/product/viewProduct.do;jsessionid=0a038009cebb9bddc54ab204e329c48b7c3d3aabb71.hkzFngTDp6WImQuUaNaKbND3lN4K-xaIah8S-xyIn3uKmAiN-AnwbQbxaNvzaAmI-huKa30xgx95fjWTa3eIpkzFngTDp6WImQuXahuPbx4RbN8Sc2b48OX3b4Dtgj15eMbyknvrkLOIQzNp65In0__?productId=7794

improved legislation, provide services to children, and encourage institutional capacity-building.³⁰

The Government of Colombia is involved in several initiatives funded by donors other than USDOL to combat child labor, many of which are implemented by ILO-IPEC. In addition, international non-governmental organizations and foundations, such as Save the Children and Telefonica Foundation, are carrying out initiatives to combat child labor.

Combating Exploitative Child Labor through Education in Colombia

On October 1, 2007, Partners of the Americas, in association with DevTech Systems, CINDE, and Mercy Corps, received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth \$5.1 million from USDOL to implement a Timebound Program in Colombia, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitative child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the original four goals of the USDOL project as outlined above. Partners of the Americas and its associates were awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As this is a Timebound Program, the project should aim to meet the specific Timebound Program goals:

1. Prevent the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labor;
2. Provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the withdrawal of children from the worst forms of child labor and for their rehabilitation and social integration;
3. Ensure access to free basic education, and, wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from the worst forms of child labor;
4. Identify and reach out to children at special risk; and
5. Take account of the special situation of girls.

As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, this project targets 10,200 children ages 6-17 for withdrawal or prevention from exploitative child labor, focusing on victims of the worst forms of child labor, particularly commercial sexual exploitation of children and recruitment of child soldiers, and the sectors of domestic service, street work, construction, recycling, and agriculture. Targeted urban areas include Bogota, Cali, Yumbo Cartagena, Barranquilla and Santa Marta, as well as nearby rural areas and the departments of Boyacá, Cauca and Santander. The project uses approaches such as introducing alternative and transitional educational programming; strengthening policy, enforcement and engagement of municipal governments; and raising awareness to increase public knowledge about hazardous/exploitative child labor.

The Goal of this project is: The reduction and progressive elimination of exploitative and the worst forms of child labor in Colombia. The project's objectives are:

³⁰ USDOL's 2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor.

- To support policies of the Colombian government, such as the National Strategy for the Elimination of Child Labor, and programs for child soldiers, street children, children involved in commercial sexual exploitation, and children working in other hazardous sectors.
- To provide educational interventions to increase enrollment in alternative and transitional educational programming and alleviate barriers to school attendance for working and at-risk children.
- To strengthen policy, enforcement and engagement through: training for municipal governments and sharing of best practices; teacher training in innovative methodologies; coordination among civil society organizations and government institutions; introduction of a summer school program; and better government monitoring of child labor.
- To raise awareness in order to increase public knowledge about the difference between acceptable child work and hazardous/exploitative child labor, and change public attitudes towards child labor issues.

II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The Combating Exploitative Child Labor through Education in Colombia Timebound program in Colombia went into implementation in October 2007 and is due for midterm evaluation in 2009.

Scope of Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with Partners of the Americas and its associates. All activities that have been implemented during from project launch through time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

The evaluation should address issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, and replicability and provide recommendations for current and future projects. The questions to be addressed in the evaluation (provided below) are organized to provide an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (to the extent possible) impact on the target population.

Midterm Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the midterm evaluation is to:

1. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government;

2. Determine whether the project is on track toward meeting its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;
3. Provide recommendations toward how the project can successfully overcome challenges to meet its objectives and targets by the time of project end;
4. Assess the effectiveness of the project's strategies and the project's strengths and weaknesses in project implementation and identify areas in need of improvement; and
5. Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations, and identify steps that can be taken to enhance the sustainability of project components and objectives.

The evaluation should also identify emerging lessons learned, potential good practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in Colombia and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and Partners of the Americas and its associates and provide direction in making any revisions to workplans, strategies, objectives, partnership arrangements, and resource allocations that may be needed in order for the project to increase its effectiveness and meet its objectives. Recommendations should focus on ways in which the project can move forward in order to reach its objectives and make any necessary preparations or adjustments in order to promote the sustainability of project activities. The evaluation should also assess government involvement and commitment in its recommendations for sustainability.

Intended Users

This midterm evaluation should provide USDOL, Partners of the Americas and its associates, and other project stakeholders an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. USDOL/OCFT and the management of Partners of the Americas and its associates will use the evaluation results as a learning tool regarding the relevance of the approach and strategy being used by the project. The evaluation results should also be used by Partners of the Americas and its associates, the Government of Colombia and other current or potential partners to enhance effectiveness in the implementation. Therefore, the evaluation should provide credible and reliable information in order to suggest how the project could enhance its impact during the remaining time of implementation, ensuring the sustainability of the benefits that have been or will be generated.

The final report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

Evaluation Questions

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below, according to five categories of issues. Evaluators may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL and Macro.

Relevance

The evaluation should consider the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Have the project assumptions been accurate and realistic? How, if applicable, have critical assumptions been changed?
2. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country? (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc) Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?
3. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works?
4. Please assess the relevance of the project's criteria for selecting action program regions and sectors and subsequently project beneficiaries.
5. How successful has the EpC methodology been in the Colombian context? Has the methodology responded to the complex environment where working children or those who are at-risk live? If not, how could it be refined?
6. How has Quantum Learning methodology (Q/L) complemented the EpCs?
7. How has the project design fit within existing initiatives, both by the government and other organizations, to combat child labor?
8. What has the role of the project been within the National Committee to Eliminate Child Labor?
9. How has the project adopted and responded to the challenges posed by the multiple government agencies and international organizations and donors that work on child labor-related issues in Colombia?
10. How has the project fit into the overall design of the broad TBP? Specifically what has been its contribution, if any?
11. What have been the challenges and opportunities for project implementers to work within the framework of a broad government program and Timebound Programs described in the Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 114, June 14, 2007?
12. Does the project design adequately support the five TBP goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?

13. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?
14. What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and DOL?

Effectiveness

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those objectives. Specifically, the evaluation should address:

1. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (commercial sexual exploitation of children, domestic service, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling, and agriculture)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?
2. Assess the effectiveness of the *Espacios para Crecer* and Q/L interventions. Did the provision of these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/commercial sexual exploitation and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?
3. Assess the effectiveness of the *Espacios para Crecer* model on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.
4. Has the project's awareness-raising strategy been effective?
5. Are there any sector-specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?
6. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Is it feasible and effective? Why or why not? How does the project monitor work status after school and during holidays?
7. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial (controls), of this project?
8. What management areas, including technical and financial, need to be improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives?
9. How does the project ensure that the subcontractors understand the definitions of withdrawal and prevention?
10. Has the project had any challenges in accurately reporting the number of withdrawn and prevented children? If so, how could they be addressed?

11. Are the subcontractors meeting their withdrawal and prevention targets? If not, what are the challenges they face in doing so?
12. Have Partners of the Americas and associates been effective at coordinating project activities?
13. How successful has the program's strategy been in terms of coordinating with other organizations working on the issue of child labor?

Efficiency

The evaluation should provide analysis as to whether the strategies employed by the project were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) as compared to its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs). Specifically, the evaluation should address:

1. Is the project cost-efficient in terms of the scale of the interventions, and the expected direct and long-term impact?
2. Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?
3. Were the monitoring and reporting system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?
4. Giving that the project has 130 EpCs run by different subcontractors —community-based and school-based — how successful has it been in coordinating activities and exchange of experiences? Are there differences between the EpCs that are community-based and school-based in different sites?
5. How has the adjustment of OCFT requirements regarding cost-sharing affected the success of the project? How has the project overcome this change?

Impact

The evaluation should assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project – intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country – as reported by respondents. Specifically, it should address:

1. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc)?
2. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc)?
3. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?

4. If applicable, assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and non-formal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?
5. Are there any emerging trends or issues that the project should and/or could respond to in order to increase the impact and relevance of the project? Are there any emerging opportunities to take the work further/have greater impact?
6. At midterm, are there good practices by the project or the implementing partners that might be replicated in other areas, or considered to be innovative solutions to the current situation?
7. Has the project been able to work with local governments to adopt child labor programs? If not, how could the project do so in the cities where there are EpCs?
8. Please assess how local governments, communities, subcontractors, and partner organizations have responded to the EpCs as a valid methodology to combat child labor and improve the quality of education.
9. What has been the impact of the EpCs and Q/L on teachers and facilitators?
10. Please assess the impact of project activities/strategies on children under extremely vulnerable conditions, such as child victims of sexual exploitation, former child soldiers, and child victims of forcible displacement, including Afro-Colombians.

Sustainability

The evaluation should assess whether the project has taken steps to ensure the project's approaches and benefits continue after the completion of the project, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations and/or the government, and identify areas where this may be strengthened. Specifically, it should address:

1. Have an exit strategy and sustainability plan been integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?
2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?
3. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing partnerships in support of the broad TBP?
4. Assess the level of involvement of local/national government in the project and how this involvement has built government capacity and commitment to work on child labor elimination.
5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of initiating and maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the National

Committee for the Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor (NCECL), the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Social Protection, the Colombian Institute for the Family Well-Being (ICBF), as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues?

6. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with the ILO/IPEC, Telefonica Foundation, UNICEF, and Save the Children?
7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?
8. What additional steps need to be taken in order to promote the sustainability of project components?

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation methodology will consist of the following activities and approaches:

A. Approach

The evaluation approach will be primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used as the timeframe does not allow for quantitative surveys to be conducted. Quantitative data will be drawn from project reports to the extent that it is available and incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).
3. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
4. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.

5. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments to the made for the different actors involved and activities conducted and the progress of implementation in each locality.

B. Mid Term Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. The international evaluator
2. One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions.

The international evaluator is Michele González Arroyo. She will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with Macro and the project staff;; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting and preparing the evaluation report.

C. Data Collection Methodology

1. Document Review

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected
- Documents may include:
 - Project document and revisions,
 - Cooperative Agreement,
 - Technical Progress and Status Reports,
 - Project Logical Frameworks and Monitoring Plans,
 - Work plans,
 - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports,
 - Management Procedures and Guidelines,
 - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.), and
 - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Question Matrix

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will create a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the evaluator make decisions as to how they are going to allocate their time in the field. It will also help the evaluator to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation findings are coming from.

3. Interviews with stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews. Technically, stakeholders are all those who have an interest in a project, for example, as implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings will be held with:

- ILAB/OCFT Staff
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents)
- International NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- Labor Reporting Officer at U.S. Embassy and USAID representative

4. Field Visits

The evaluator will visit project sites in Bogotá, Cartagena and Cali. In each city, one school-based and one community-based site will be included. During the visits the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus groups with children and parents will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

D. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

E. Stakeholder Meeting

Following the field visits, a stakeholders' meeting will be conducted by the evaluator that brings together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork.

The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary finding and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders will be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback.

The agenda is expected to include some of the following items:

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners who were not interviewed to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible SWOT exercise on the project's performance
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

F. Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last two weeks, on average, and the evaluator will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating her findings. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator is visiting a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

This is not a formal impact assessment. Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

G. Timetable and Workplan

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise.

Activity	Responsible Party	Proposed Date(s)
Phone interview with DOL and Grantee Staff/Headquarters	Macro, DOL, Grantee, Evaluator	May 4-8
Desk Review	Evaluator	April
Question Matrix and Instruments due to Macro/DOL	Evaluator	April 24
Finalize TOR and submit to Grantee and DOL	DOL/Macro/Evaluator	May 18
International Travel		May 25
Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders	Evaluator	May 26
Field Site Visits	Evaluator	May 27 – June 5
National Stakeholder Meeting		June 8
International Travel		June 9
Draft report to Macro for QC review	Evaluator	June 26
Draft report to DOL for 48 hour review	Macro	July 1
Draft report to grantee for 48 hour review	Macro	July 3
Translation of draft report into Spanish	Evaluator	July 16
Draft report released to stakeholders	Macro	July 17
Comments due to Macro	DOL/Grantee & Stakeholders	July 31
Report revised and sent to Macro	Evaluator	August 12
Revised report sent to DOL	Macro	August 14
Final approval of report	DOL	August 28
Finalization & distribution of report	Macro	September 11

IV EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator's return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to Macro. The report should have the following structure and content:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and three key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description
- VI. Relevance
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VII. Effectiveness
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VIII. Efficiency
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- IX. Impact
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- X. Sustainability
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- XI. Recommendations and Conclusions
 - A. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives
 - B. Other Recommendations – as needed
 1. Relevance
 2. Effectiveness
 3. Efficiency
 4. Impact
 5. Sustainability

- XII. Annexes—including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

The total length of the report should be a minimum of 30 pages and a maximum of 45 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will provide a response to OCFT, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to MACRO on June 26, 2009, as indicated in the above timetable. A final draft is due one week after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT and stakeholders and is anticipated to be due on August 7, 2009, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in English. The first draft report will be translated into Spanish to facilitate review from national stakeholders. The final approved copy of the report will be published in both English and Spanish.

V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

Macro International, Inc. has contracted with Michele González Arroyo to conduct this evaluation. Ms. González Arroyo holds a Master of Public Health degree from the University of California at Berkeley, as well as a high school teaching credential from the state of California. She has twenty years of experience in planning, implementing and evaluating health and education programs. She has previously conducted five process and impact evaluations for USDOL-funded labor, occupational health and safety programs in Central and South America, and has worked on other USDOL Child Labor Education Initiative evaluations. The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, Macro, and relevant staff from Partners of the Americas and its associates to evaluate this project.

Macro International, Inc. will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and sub-contractors, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables. Macro International, Inc. will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

Macro International, Inc. or its subcontractors should contact Anabella Bruch (202- 637-6212 ext. 212 or abruch@partners.net) to initiate contact with field staff. The primary point of contact for the project in Colombia is Clemencia Chiappe Hoyos, project director (571 6349835 or cchiappe@partners.net).

ANNEX C: INTERVIEW TOOLS

Edúcame Primero—Colombia

Evaluación de medio término

Guía de entrevistas #1—Personal clave y asociados del proyecto

Pertinencia

1. ¿Todavía son precisas y realistas las suposiciones iniciales del proyecto? Si no es así, ¿cómo ha modificado algunas suposiciones críticas?
2. ¿Cuáles son los principales obstáculos o barreras que no permite reducir o eliminar las peores formas de trabajo infantil en Colombia (ej. pobreza, falta de una infraestructura educativa, falta de demanda para la educación, etc.)? ¿Qué ha hecho el proyecto para superar estas barreras? ¿Ha tenido algún impacto?
3. ¿Es apropiado el diseño del proyecto para el contexto cultural, económico y político en Colombia? ¿Por qué sí o por qué no?
4. ¿Fue apropiado el criterio que usó el proyecto para seleccionar las regiones/sitos/beneficiarios del proyecto? ¿Por qué sí o por qué no?
5. ¿Cuánto éxito ha tenido la metodología de los EpC dentro del contexto Colombiano? ¿Ha respondido la metodología al ambiente complejo donde los NNA trabajadores o aquellos que están en riesgo viven? Si no es así, ¿cómo se podría modificar?
6. ¿Cómo ha complementado la metodología de “Quantum Learning” a los EpCs?
7. ¿De qué manera está incorporado el diseño del proyecto dentro de otras iniciativas contra el trabajo infantil, que el gobierno Colombiano u otras organizaciones ya están realizando?
8. ¿Cuál ha sido el rol del proyecto dentro del Comité Nacional para la Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil?
9. ¿Cuáles modificaciones ha tenido que hacer el proyecto para responder a los retos que se presentan al trabajar entre una multitud de agencias gubernamentales y organizaciones/donantes internacionales involucrados en asuntos de trabajo infantil en Colombia?
10. ¿De qué manera se ha incorporado el proyecto dentro del diseño amplio del “Programa con límite de tiempo”? Específicamente, ¿cómo ha contribuido a este programa? (Estrategia nacional para el retiro y prevención de las peores formas de trabajo infantil antes del 2015)

11. ¿Cuáles han sido los retos y oportunidades para el proyecto de trabajar dentro del marco de un amplio programa gubernamental y “Programa con límite de tiempo”?
12. ¿De qué manera está apoyando el proyecto las cinco metas del “Programa con límite de tiempo”? Si no es así, ¿cuáles no está apoyando y por qué?
13. ¿De qué manera está apoyando el proyecto las cinco metas de las Intervenciones Educativas del USDOL? Si no es así, ¿cuáles no está apoyando y por qué?
14. ¿Hay otros asuntos sobre el diseño y/o la implementación que están afectando el progreso del proyecto?

Eficacia

1. ¿Ha identificado e incluido el proyecto a aquellos NNA que trabajan o que están en riesgo de trabajar en las peores formas de trabajo infantil (explotación sexual comercial, servicio doméstico, vendedores ambulantes, construcción, niños/as soldados, reciclaje y agricultura)? ¿Hay otros sectores que deberían haber incluido?
2. ¿De qué manera ayudó el modelo *Espacios para Crecer* y estrategias de Quantum Learning para el retiro y prevención de los NNA de las peores formas de trabajo infantil como la explotación sexual comercial y asegurarse de que ellos/ellas estén participando en programas educativos pertinentes?
3. ¿Qué efecto ha tenido el modelo *Espacios para Crecer* para aumentar las oportunidades educativas, fomentar la participación comunitaria, aumentar la capacidad de las comunidades y aumentar el conocimiento sobre los peligros del trabajo infantil?
4. ¿Qué efecto/impacto han tenido los esfuerzos de sensibilización?
5. ¿Hay algunas lecciones aprendidas para algún sector de trabajo infantil específico con respecto a los tipos y la eficacia de los servicios proporcionados?
6. ¿Cuáles sistemas de monitoreo utiliza el proyecto para rastrear/seguir el estatus laboral de los NNA? ¿Es práctico y eficaz? Explique. ¿Cómo monitorea el proyecto el estado laboral después de la escuela y durante los días feriados?
7. ¿De qué manera se aseguran de que los subcontratistas entiendan las definiciones de los términos “retiro” y “prevención”?
8. ¿Ha tenido algún problema el proyecto para indicar precisamente el número de NNA que hayan sido retirados o prevenidos del trabajo infantil? Si así es, ¿cómo se pueden superar estos problemas?
9. ¿Están logrando los subcontratistas sus números metas de retiro y prevención? ¿Si no es así, ¿cuáles son los retos que tienen para lograrlos?

10. ¿Cuáles son las fortalezas administrativas, incluyendo aspectos técnicos y financieros, de este proyecto?
11. ¿Cuáles son las áreas administrativas (técnicas y financieras) que se deben mejorar para lograr los objetivos del proyecto?
12. ¿Han sido eficaces los socios del proyecto—POA, DevTech, CINDE y Mercy Corps—para coordinar las actividades del proyecto?
13. ¿Qué tan exitosa ha sido la estrategia del proyecto para coordinarse con otras organizaciones que trabajan en asuntos de trabajo infantil?

Eficiencia

1. ¿De qué manera es el proyecto costo-eficiente cuando toma en consideración la magnitud de las intervenciones y el impacto directo y a largo plazo que se espera? ¿Cómo se puede mejorar?
2. ¿Son eficientes las estrategias del proyecto con respecto a los recursos financieros y humanos usados, en comparación con sus objetivos? ¿Cuáles alternativas existen?
3. ¿Fue diseñado eficientemente el sistema de monitoreo e información para lograr las necesidades y requisitos del proyecto?
4. Tomando en cuenta que el proyecto tiene 183 EpCs ubicados en la comunidad y las escuelas, manejados por diferentes subcontratistas, ¿de qué manera han coordinado actividades y el intercambio de experiencias? ¿Existen diferencias entre los EpCs ubicados en la comunidad y los que están en las escuelas? ¿Cuáles?
5. ¿Cómo ha afectado el éxito del proyecto las modificaciones financieras de USDOL? ¿Qué ha hecho el proyecto para superar este cambio? Explique.

Impacto

1. ¿Qué tipo de impacto ha tenido el proyecto hasta la fecha en los beneficiarios individuales (NNA, padres de familia, maestros/as, los que han recibido capacitación, otro)?
2. ¿Qué tipo de impacto ha tenido el proyecto hasta la fecha con los socios/subcontratistas del proyecto u otras organizaciones trabajando en el tema del trabajo infantil en el país (ONGs, grupos comunitarios, escuelas, comités nacionales de trabajo infantil, etc.)?
3. ¿Qué tipo de impacto ha tenido el proyecto, hasta la fecha, en las estructuras políticas y gubernamentales—por ejemplo cambios al sistema educativo o sobre asuntos de trabajo infantil?

4. ¿Cuál es el componente de calidad educativa? ¿Qué tipo de impacto han tenido las actividades/estrategias sobre la calidad de educación (tanto las intervenciones formales como las no formales)? ¿Cuál ha sido la reacción del gobierno y la comunidad?
5. ¿Hay algunas tendencias o asuntos que están surgiendo a los cuales el proyecto debe y/o puede responder y así aumentar el impacto y pertinencia del proyecto? ¿Hay algunas oportunidades surgiendo para que el trabajo tenga un mayor impacto?
6. A medio término, ¿cuáles son algunas “buenas prácticas” que han surgido del proyecto o los sub-contratistas que puedan ser replicadas en otras áreas o que son ejemplos de “soluciones innovadoras” a la situación actual del trabajo infantil?
7. ¿Ha colaborado el proyecto con gobiernos locales para adoptar programas contra el trabajo infantil? Si no, ¿cómo podría el proyecto lograr esta colaboración en los lugares donde existen los EpCs?
8. ¿Cómo han respondido los socios, subcontratistas, comunidades y gobiernos locales a los EpCs como un método válido para combatir el trabajo infantil y mejorar la calidad de educación?
9. ¿Cuál ha sido el impacto de los modelos EpC y la metodología Quantum Learning en los maestros/as y facilitadores?
10. ¿Cuál ha sido el impacto de las actividades/estrategias en los NNA que son sumamente vulnerables, como las víctimas de la explotación sexual, niños/as soldados y víctimas del desplazamiento forzado, incluyendo Afro-Colombianos?

Sostenibilidad—¿Cuáles acciones ha hecho o debe hacer el proyecto para asegurarse de que los métodos y beneficios del proyecto continúen después de terminar el proyecto (ej. nuevas fuentes de financiamiento y alianzas con otras organizaciones y/o el gobierno)?

1. Se ha integrado al diseño del proyecto una estrategia de salida y un plan de sostenibilidad? ¿Va a ser eficaz?
2. ¿Cuánto éxito ha tenido el proyecto para lograr una palanca financiera de otras fuentes? ¿Existe la posibilidad de un financiamiento sostenible?
3. ¿Cuáles han sido los mayores retos y oportunidades de implementar alianzas que apoyan el “Programa con límite de tiempo”?
4. ¿Cuál ha sido la participación del gobierno local/nacional en el proyecto? ¿Cómo ha aumentado la capacidad del gobierno local/nacional y su compromiso para trabajar hacia la erradicación del trabajo infantil
5. ¿Cuáles han sido los mayores retos y oportunidades, si existen, de iniciar y mantener coordinación con el gobierno Colombiano, en particular la Comisión Nacional para la Erradicación de las Peores Formas de Trabajo Infantil, Ministerio de Educación,

Ministerio de Protección Social, y el Instituto Colombiano para el Bienestar Familiar, así como otras agencias gubernamentales que se dedican a asuntos de la niñez?

6. ¿Cuáles han sido los mayores retos y oportunidades, si existen, de coordinar con OIT/IPEC, Telefónica, UNICEF y Save the Children?
7. ¿Cuáles han sido algunos de los retos y oportunidades de trabajar con otras ONGs nacionales y/o organizaciones comunitarias presentes en el país?
8. ¿Cuáles acciones adicionales se deben tomar para promover la sostenibilidad de los componentes del proyecto?

Educame Primero—Colombia

Evaluación de medio término

Guía de entrevistas #6—Padres/Madres de familia

1. ¿Por qué creen que sus niños fueron seleccionados para participar en este programa? ¿Querían participar? ¿Creen que la selección de participantes fue justo o hay niños que no deben o deben estar en el programa?
2. ¿Contribuye su hijo/a al hogar trabajando? ¿Qué oficios hace para usted? ¿Para otros? ¿Dónde? ¿Cuándo? ¿Cuántas horas por semana?
3. ¿A qué edad empezaron a ayudarles? ¿Todavía están trabajando o ayudándoles?
4. ¿Cómo ayudó el programa *Espacios para Crecer* para que sus hijos/as dejaran de trabajar? ¿Está ayudando el programa para que se dediquen a sus estudios? ¿Cómo?
5. ¿Ha ayudado el programa para dar a sus hijos más oportunidades de estudiar? ¿Cómo?
6. ¿Participaron en algunos talleres sobre el tema de trabajo infantil? ¿Cuáles? ¿De qué manera cambió su actitud después de participar en estos talleres? ¿Cuáles otros talleres ofreció el programa?
7. ¿Cuáles actividades han sido de mayor beneficio? ¿Por qué?
8. ¿Qué tipo de impacto ha tenido EpC en sus hijos/as? O sea, ¿cuál es la diferencia en las vidas de sus hijos/as ahora que están participando en el proyecto?
9. ¿Tienen más ganas/interés en los estudios? ¿Cuáles son las metas educativas que tienen? ¿Cómo ayudó EpC fomentar estas metas?
10. ¿Qué opinión tienen sobre la calidad de la educación que están recibiendo sus hijos/as en EpC? ¿En sus ¿Cómo?
11. ¿Tienen alguna sugerencia para que el proyecto tenga mayor impacto en las vidas de sus hijos/as?

Educame Primero—Colombia

Evaluación de medio término

Guía de entrevistas #7—Estudiantes

1. ¿Qué hace en las clases de *Espacios para Crecer*? ¿Le gusta las actividades y tareas? ¿Cuáles le gusta más/menos? ¿Por qué?
2. ¿Por qué cree que fue seleccionados para participar en este programa? ¿Quería participar? ¿Cree que la selección de participantes fue justo o hay niños que no deben o deben estar en el programa?
3. ¿Qué oficios/trabajo hace para su mamá/papá? ¿Para otros? ¿Dónde? ¿Cuándo? ¿Cuántas horas por semana?
4. ¿A qué edad empezó a trabajar/ayudar? ¿Todavía está trabajando/ayudando?
5. ¿Trabaja más horas, menos horas, o dejó de trabajar después de su participación en el EpC?
6. ¿Cómo ha cambiado su actitud hacia el trabajo y la escuela ahora que está participando en EpC?
7. ¿Cuál es la diferencia en su vida ahora que está participando en EpC?
8. ¿Qué quiere ser cuando sea grande? ¿Cómo va a lograr esa meta? ¿Cómo puede ayudar EpC para que logre esta meta?
9. ¿Tiene alguna sugerencia para mejorar el programa EpC?

ANNEX D: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Midterm Evaluation of Combating Exploitative Child Labor Through Education in Colombia

May 27-June 8, 2009

26/05/09

1. Andres Montaña, Especialista, Monitoreo y Evaluación, Edúcame Primero
2. Edgar Malagón, Asistente, Monitoreo y Evaluación, Edúcame Primero
3. Clemencia Chiappe, Directora de Proyecto, Edúcame Primero
4. Piedad Rivero, Education Specialist, Edúcame Primero

27/05/09

5. Patricia Fajardo, Directora General, ACJ, Bogotá
6. Rosa Peña, Directora del centro ACJ
7. Jenny Mendieta, Coordinadora de EpC, ACJ
8. Carolina Molano, Facilitadora de EpC, ACJ
9. Andrés Duarte, Facilitadora de EpC, ACJ
10. William Sánchez, Facilitadora de EpC, ACJ

11. Maricela Holguín, Madre de familia, ACJ
12. Osiris Iglesias, Madre de familia, ACJ
13. Tania Barreto, Madre de familia, ACJ
14. Olga Niño, Madre de familia, ACJ

15. Leticia Moreno, Docente, Colegio República de Venezuela

16. Maria Fernanda Cruz, Coordinadora de Programas, Mercy Corps
17. Luz Stella Cárdenas, Directora General, Renacer
18. Viviana Blanco, Facilitadora de EpC, Renacer
19. Zared Garzón, Coordinadora de EpC, Renacer

20. Clemencia Isaza, Facilitadora de EpC, Renacer
21. Yustin Salazar, Facilitadora de EpC, Renacer
22. Jenny Santos, Facilitadora de EpC, Renacer
23. Luz Nelly Martínez, Facilitadora de EpC, Renacer
24. Nelly Ruiz, Facilitadora de EpC, Renacer

25. Asdrubal Arias, Rector, Atalayas School
26. Claudia Cadena, Docente, Atalayas School
27. Monica Martinez, Docente, Atalayas School

28. Zuleima Arias, Orientadora que recibió cap. Q/L, Santa Ines School
29. Mercedes Trujillo, Orientadora que recibió cap. Q/L, Agustín Nieto Caballero School

30. Rosmery Rodriguez, Orientadora que recibió cap. Q/L, Colombia Viva School
31. Ana Francisca Colmenares, Madre de familia, Atalayas
32. Jenny Constanza Bautista, Madre de familia, Atalayas
33. Felsa Cristiana, Madre de familia, Atalayas
34. Claudia Huerfano, Madre de familia, Atalayas
35. Yulieth Rodriguez, Madre de familia, Atalayas
36. Carolina Tuzon, Madre de familia, Atalayas
37. Luz Moreno, Madre de familia, Atalayas
38. Sandra Santos, Madre de familia, Atalayas

28/05/09

39. Ingrid Rusinke, Subdirectora de Intervenciones Directas, Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar
40. Tanya Lopesierra, Responsable de Trabajo Infantil, ICBF
41. Soraya Mesa, Experta en Generación de Ingresos, Programa Niñas y Niños Desvinculados, OIM
42. Sandra Ruiz, Gerente, Programa Atención a Niños y Niñas, OIM
43. Liliana Obregón Espinel, Coordinadora, ILO/IPEC Colombia
44. Patricia Velandía, Especialista del Área de Trabajo Infantil, Ministerio de Educación Nacional
45. Claudia Aparicio Yañez, Directora Gestión Social y Fundación, Telefónica

29/05/09

46. Ruth Yaneth Guaidia, Coordinadora, Grupo de Protección a Poblaciones Trabajadoras Vulnerables, MinPS
47. Carmen Elisa Gómez, Profesional del Área, Inclusión e Integración de Poblaciones, Sec. de Educación, Bogotá
48. María Esperanza López, Profesional del Área, Inclusión e Integración de Poblaciones, Sec. de Educación, Bogotá

01/06/09

49. Ileana Mijia Florz, Coordinadora general, Fundación Mamonal
50. Astrid Aristizábal Vizcaíno, Coordinadora de Educación, Fundación Mamonal
51. Yomaira Botet, Coordinadora entre Fundación Mamonal y *Universidad del Norte*
52. Betty Gomez, Coordinadora de los EPC, Fundación Mamonal
53. Luz Marina Agamez, Docente de colegio regular donde asisten los NNA de los EpC
54. Humberto Rosales, Docente de colegio regular donde asisten los NNA de los EpC
55. Loira Camaño, Docente de colegio regular donde asisten los NNA de los EpC

56. Dubis Torrez, Docente de colegio regular donde asisten los NNA de los EpC
57. Alicia Gonzalez, Docente de colegio regular donde asisten los NNA de los EpC
58. Gilma Vargas de Avila, Docente de colegio regular donde asisten los NNA de los EpC

59. Onaris Mejia, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal
60. Angela Julion, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal
61. Ines Maria Marrugo, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal
62. Martha Arnedo Castro, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal
63. Daira Cecilia Blom, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal
64. Daniela de Avila Ricardo, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal
65. Claudia Reyes Ramirez, Madre de familia, Fundación Mamonal

66. Ana Maria Ahumada, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal
67. Sofia López, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal
68. Daveiva Machado, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal
69. Mariela Pardo, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal
70. Carmen Alcalá, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal
71. Sidia Anaya, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal
72. Lilibet Luna, Facilitadora, Fundación Mamonal

73. Ubaldo Elles Quintana, Rector, Instituto Educativo Fernando de la Vega, Cartagena
74. María Mercedes Ariza, Trabajadora Social, Instituto Educativo Fernando de la Vega, Cartagena
75. Ana Parra, Docente, Instituto Educativo Fernando de la Vega, Cartagena
76. Miliam Castro, Docente, Instituto Educativo Fernando de la Vega, Cartagena
77. Felicita Reyes, Docente, Instituto Educativo Fernando de la Vega, Cartagena
78. Doris Babilonia, Docente, Instituto Educativo Fernando de la Vega, Cartagena

79. Irina Mercado, Docente y recipiente de capacitación Q/L
80. Mónica Ruiz, Docente y recipiente de capacitación Q/L
81. Carmen Gazabán, Docente y recipiente de capacitación Q/L

82. Fabian Cardenas, Director Regional, Renacer, Cartagena
83. Carlos Salcedo, Coordinador de los EpC, Renacer, Cartagena

84. Juleisy del Carmen Contreras, Facilitadora, Renacer, Cartagena
85. Alba Inés Restrepo Alcazar, Facilitadora, Renacer, Cartagena
86. Deyanira Torres Rocha, Facilitadora, Renacer, Cartagena
87. Inés María Herrera Céspedes, Facilitadora, Renacer, Cartagena

88. Gladys Olier, Madre de Familia, Renacer, Cartagena
89. Ludys Ballestas, Madre de Familia, Renacer, Cartagena
90. Osiris Mendoza, Madre de Familia, Renacer, Cartagena
91. Milson Torres, Padre de Familia, Renacer, Cartagena

92. Luis Javier Cano Pautt, Facilitador, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena

93. Lilibeth Agresot Narvaez, Facilitadora, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
94. Sandra Barrio Palomino, Facilitadora, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
95. Francisco Miranda Sanchez, Facilitador, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
96. Kelly Martinez Otero, Facilitadora, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
97. Nebris Puello Julio, Facilitador, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
98. Hansel Arrieta Arenas, Facilitador, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
99. Martha Lara Escobar, Facilitadora, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena

100. Ibeth Rodriguez Ruiz, Coordinadora, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena
101. Jennifer Villafañe Gómez, Volver a la Gente, Cartagena

02/06/09

102. Julio Alandete, Secretario de Educación Distrital, Cartagena
103. Harol Lora, Director de Planeamiento Educativo Distrital, Cartagena
104. Jorge Palacio, Coordinador General, UniNorte, Barranquilla
105. Eloisa Sierra, Coordinadora de los EpC, UniNorte, Barranquilla
106. Lola Turise, Facilitadora, UniNorte, Barranquilla
107. Liliana Quintero, Coordinadora de los EpC, Fundación Desarrollo del Niño, Familia y Comunidad, Santa Marta
108. Kelly Rodriguez Pérez, Facilitadora, Fundación Desarrollo del Niño, Familia y Comunidad, Santa Marta

03/06/09

109. Gloria Astudio, Madre de Familia, CEDECUR, Cali
110. Miriam Gomez, Madre de Familia, CEDECUR, Cali
111. Consuelo Cutiva, Madre de Familia, CEDECUR, Cali

112. Luz Helena Arango Angel, Directora General, CEDECUR, Cali
113. María del Carmen Mosquera, Coordinadora de EpC, CEDECUR, Cali

114. Isabela Castillo, Facilitadora, CEDECUR
115. Sandra Montoya, Facilitadora, CEDECUR
116. Carolina Caicedo, Facilitadora, CEDECUR
117. Carmen Idalba, Facilitadora, CEDECUR

118. Alexandra Rebellón, Docente, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Cali
119. Ilse Montaña, Docente, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Cali

120. Hermana Margarita Puello, Rectora, Institución Pedregosa, Cali
121. Ferny Palta, Director, Fe y Alegría, Cali
122. Yadira Lorena Zuñiga, Coordinadora EpC, Fe y Alegría, Cali

123. Rosa Elena Ramos, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali
124. Janeth Lopez, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali
125. Jaeth Bravo, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali

126. Alba Lydia Gaviria, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali
127. Emma Serón, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali
128. Gloria Isabel Meneses, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali
129. Marisa Marmolejo, Madre de Familia, Fe y Alegría, Cali

130. Paula Villa, Docente, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Fe y Alegría, Cali
131. Ricardo García, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Fe y Alegría, Cali
132. Eileen Olaya, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Fe y Alegría, Cali
133. Ofir Cuero, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Fe y Alegría, Cali
134. Jennifer Gómez, Recipiente de capacitación Q/L, Fe y Alegría, Cali

135. Claudia Galvis, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
136. Jimena Aguirre, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
137. Gina Moreno, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
138. Carlos Chicaiza, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
139. Jorge Palta, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
140. Katherine Obando, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
141. Yuliana Melo, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali
142. Yolanda Largacha, Facilitadora y Docente, Fe y Alegría, Cali

143. Monica Victoria, Asistente, Proyectos Adversales, Secretaría de Educación, Cali
144. Mariela Rodriguez, Coordinadora, Fortalecimiento a la Calidad de Educación, Secretaria de Educación, Cali

145. Gloria Amparo Hernandez, Miembro, Comité de Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil, Cali
146. Jenny Banguero, Miembro, Comité de Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil, Cali
147. Claudia García, Miembro, Comité de Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil, Cali
148. Esperanza Alegría, Comité de Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil, Cali
149. María Elena Tenorio, Comité de Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil, Cali

150. John Helwig, Especialista en Educación, DevTech, EE.UU.

05/06/09

151. Roberto Moncada Roa, Coordinador Proyecto Erradicación de Trabajo Infantil, Save the Children, Bogotá
152. Rocio Mojica, Oficial de Protección Infantil, UNICEF, Bogotá

153. Andrea Burniske, Gerente de Programas, MercyCorps
154. Gary Burniske, Director de País, Mercy Corps

06/06/09

155. Anabella Bruch, Vice President, Resource Development and Field Operations, Partners of the Americas, EEUU

Niños/Niñas/Adolescentes de los EpC

1. 27/05/09: Observación/interacción - 28 estudiantes en un EpC comunitario – ACJ, Bogotá
2. 27/05/09: Observación/Interacción - 30 estudiantes en EpC escolar – Colegio Atalayas – Renacer, Bogotá
3. 01/06/09: Entrevista en grupo – 8 niños/as del EpC comunitario – Fundación Mamonal, Cartagena
4. 01/06/09: Entrevista en grupo – 7 niños/as del EpC escolar – Renacer, Cartagena
5. 03/06/09: Entrevista en grupo – 4 niños/as del EpC comunitario – CEDECUR, Cali
6. 03/06/09: Entrevista en grupo – 9 niños/as del EpC escolar – Fe y Alegría, Cali

ANNEX E: QUESTION MATRIX

Questions Matrix Methodology—“*Edúcame Primero*”—Colombia

1. Relevance

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
1.1 Have the project assumptions been accurate and realistic? How, if applicable, have critical assumptions been changed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates (DevTech, CINDE, Mercy Corps) • Project document and Technical Progress Reports (TPR) 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1)
1.2 What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country? (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc) Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations’ directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov’t reps (Ministerio de Educación, Min. de Protección Social, Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar) • TPRs 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov’t (Guide 4)
1.3 Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations’ directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov’t reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov’t (Guide 4)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
1.4 Please assess the relevance of the project's criteria for selecting action program regions and sectors and subsequently project beneficiaries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO, etc) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)
1.5 How successful has the EpC methodology been in the Colombian context? Has the methodology responded to the complex environment where working children or those who are at-risk live? If not, how could it be refined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
1.6 How has Quantum Learning methodology (Q/L) complemented the EpCs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3)
1.7 How has the project design fit within existing initiatives, both by the government and other organizations, to combat child labor?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO, etc.) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
1.8 What has the role of the project been within the National Committee to Eliminate Child Labor?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
1.9 How has the project adopted and responded to the challenges posed by the multiple government agencies and international organizations and donors that work on child labor-related issues in Colombia?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5) •
1.10 How has the project fit into the overall design of the broad TBP? Specifically, what has been its contribution, if any?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)
1.11 What have been the challenges and opportunities for project implementers to work within the framework of a broad government program and Timebound Programs described in the Federal Register, Vol. 72, No. 114, June 14, 2007?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)
1.12 Does the project design adequately support the five TBP goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Other donor or international agencies (ILO/IPEC, etc) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)
1.13 Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Project document and Technical Progress Reports (TPR) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
1.14 What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and DOL?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO, etc) • Stakeholders 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5) • Stakeholders' meeting

2. Effectiveness

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
2.1 Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (commercial sexual exploitation of children, domestic service, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling and agriculture)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO, etc) • Project document and Technical Progress Reports (TPR) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
2.2 Assess the effectiveness of the <i>Espacios para Crecer</i> and Q/L interventions. Did the provision of these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/commercial sexual exploitation and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Parents of beneficiaries • Direct beneficiaries (children and adolescent) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Parents of EpC students (Guide 6) • EpC students
2.3 Assess the effectiveness of the <i>Espacios para Crecer</i> model on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Parents of beneficiaries • Direct beneficiaries (children and adolescents) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Parents of EpC students (Guide 6) • EpC students (Guide 7)
2.4 Has the project's awareness-raising strategy been effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Parents of beneficiaries 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Parents of EpC students (Guide 6)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
2.5 Are there any sector-specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Parents of beneficiaries • Direct beneficiaries (children and adolescents) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Parents of EpC students (Guide 6) • EpC students (Guide 7)
2.6 What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Is it feasible and effective? Why or why not? How does the project monitor work status after school and during holidays?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2).
2.7 How does the project ensure that the subcontractors understand the definitions of withdrawal and prevention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
2.8 Has the project had any challenges in accurately reporting the number of withdrawn and prevented children? If so, how could they be addressed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
2.9 Are the subcontractors meeting their withdrawal and prevention targets? If not, what are the challenges they face in doing so?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
2.10 What are the management strengths, including technical and financial (controls), of this project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. (director, ed. coord., M&E specialist, financial officer); project associates (Dev Tech, CINDE, Mercy Corps); POA HQ staff • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
2.11 What management areas, including technical and financial, need to be improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. (director, ed. coord., M&E specialist, financial officer); project associates (Dev Tech, CINDE, Mercy Corps); POA HQ staff • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
2.12 Have Partners of the Americas and associates been effective at coordinating project activities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
2.13 How successful has the program's strategy been in terms of coordinating with other organizations working on the issue of child labor?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO, etc) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)

3. Efficiency

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
3.1 Is the project cost-efficient in terms of the scale of the interventions, and the expected direct and long-term impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • TPRs, financial documents 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
3.2 Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
3.3 Were the monitoring and reporting system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
3.4 Given that the project has 130 EpCs run by different subcontractors — community-based and school-based — how successful has it been in coordinating activities and exchange of experiences? Are there differences between the EpCs that are community-based and school-based in different sites?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
3.5 How has the adjustment of OCFT requirements regarding cost-sharing affected the success of the project? How has the project overcome this change?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1)

4. Impact

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
4.1 What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO/IPEC, etc) • Parents of beneficiaries • Direct beneficiaries (children and adolescents) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donors/international agencies (Guide 5) • Parents of EpC students (Guide 6) • EpC students (Guide 7)
4.2 What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO/IPEC, etc) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donors/international agencies (Guide 5)
4.3 What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO/IPEC, etc) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donors/international agencies (Guide 5)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
4.4 If applicable, assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and non-formal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
4.5 Are there any emerging trends or issues that the project should and/or could respond to in order to increase the impact and relevance of the project? Are there any emerging opportunities to take the work further/have greater impact?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor/international agencies (ILO, etc.) • Stakeholders 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5) • Stakeholders' meeting
4.6 At midterm, are there good practices by the project or the implementing partners/sub-contractors that might be replicated in other areas, or considered to be innovative solutions to the current situation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor/international agencies (ILO, etc.) • Stakeholders 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5) • Stakeholders' meeting

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
4.7 Has the project been able to work with local governments to adopt child labor programs? If not, how could the project do so in the cities where there are EpCs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
4.8 Please assess how local governments, communities, subcontractors, and partner organizations have responded to the EpCs as a valid methodology to combat child labor and improve the quality of education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
4.9 What has been the impact of the EpCs and Q/L on teachers and facilitators?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3)
4.10 Please assess the impact of project activities/strategies on children under extremely vulnerable conditions, such as child victims of sexual exploitation, former child soldiers, and child victims of forcible displacement, including Afro-Colombians.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders (school teachers, school directors, community leaders) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor or international agencies (ILO/IPEC, etc) • Parents of beneficiaries • Direct beneficiaries (children and adolescents) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/ comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5) • Parents of EpC students (Guide 6) • EpC students (Guide 7)

5. Sustainability

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
5.1 Have an exit strategy and sustainability plan been integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
5.2 How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
5.3 What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing partnerships in support of the broad TBP?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
5.4 Assess the level of involvement of local/national government in the project and how this involvement has built government capacity and commitment to work on child labor elimination.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)
5.5 What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of initiating and maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the National Committee for the Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor (NCECL), the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Social Protection, the Colombian Institute for the family Well-Being (ICBF), as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Edúcame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4)

Topics/questions	Key Informants	Geographical area	Instrument of measurement
5.6 What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with the ILO/IPEC, <i>Telefónica Foundation</i> , UNICEF, and Save the Children?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Other donor/international agencies (ILO, <i>Telefónica</i>, Save the Children, etc.) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5)
5.7 What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2)
5.8 What additional steps need to be taken in order to promote the sustainability of project components?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin. staff and project associates • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (organizations' directors, EpC coordinators, EpC facilitators) • Local educators and/or community leaders • Colombian gov't reps (MinEd, MPS, ICBF) • Other donor/international agencies (ILO, etc.) • Stakeholders 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educame Primero</i> project admin.; project associates and POA HQ staff (Guide 1) • Implementing partners/sub-contractors (Guide 2) • Local educators/comm. leaders (Guide 3) • Colombian gov't (Guide 4) • Other donor/international agencies (Guide 5) • Stakeholders' meeting

ANNEX F: STAKEHOLDER MEETING AGENDA AND PARTICIPANTS

STAKEHOLDER MEETING AGENDA

June 8, 2009—Bogotá, Colombia

- 2:00-2:30 Bienvenida y presentaciones
- 2:30-2:45 Objetivos y proceso
- 2:45-3:45 Hallazgos preliminares; aclaraciones
- 3:45-4:00 Descanso
- 4:00-4:45 Actividad en grupos pequeños:
- Discusión sobre los hallazgos
 - Conclusiones (2–3) con base en los hallazgos
 - Recomendaciones (2–3) con base en sus conclusiones
- 4:45-5:45 Presentaciones de los grupos (10 min. por grupo)
- 5:45-6:00 Comentarios finales (abierto)

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Present preliminary findings
- Obtain clarifications from stakeholders
- Facilitate a participatory process to arrive at conclusions and recommendations based on preliminary findings
- Document conclusions and recommendations to include in final report

**Stakeholder Meeting Participants—Midterm Evaluation of *Edúcame Primero Colombia*
Bogotá, Colombia—June 8, 2009**

No.	NOMBRES COMPLETOS EN ORDEN ALFABETICO	CARGO	EMPRESA
1	Jorge Ivan Bula	Investigador Senior	CINDE
2	Andrea Burniske	Coordinadora de Programas	Mercy Corps
3	Andrés Martínez	Analista de Proyectos	Proyecto <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i>
4	Andrés Montaña	Especialista M&E	Proyecto <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i>
5	Astrid Aristizabal	Coordinadora de Educación	Fundación Mamonal
6	Carlos Reverón	Investigador	CINDE
7	Carmen Elisa Gomez	Profesional de la Subdirección de Inclusión e Integración de Poblaciones	Secretaría de Educación de Bogotá
8	Clemencia Chiappe	Directora	Proyecto <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i>
9	Edgar Malagon	Asistente M&E	Proyecto <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i>
10	Eileen Muirragui	Division Chief Latin America and Caribbean	US Department of Labor
11	Eloisa Sierra	Coordinadora	UNINORTE
12	Elsa Prada	Profesional Subdirección de Permanencia	Fundación El Camino
13	Franz Guzman	Asistente de la Dirección	Proyecto <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i>
14	Gary Burniske	Country Director	Mercy Corps
15	Gloria Hidalgo	Directora	ACJ
16	Gloria Patricia Velandia	Profesional Subdirección de Permanencia	Ministerio de Educación Nacional
17	Graciela Salazar	Coordinadora	Fundación el Camino
18	Jenny Mendieta	Coordinadora	ACJ
19	John Helwig	Especialista Senior en Educación	Dev Tech
20	Jorge Palacio	Director	UNINORTE
21	Luz Estella Cardenas	Directora	Fundación Renacer
22	María del Carmen Mosquera	Coordinadora	CEDECUR
23	María Fernanda Cruz	Coordinadora Sección Derechos Humanos	Mercy Corps

No.	NOMBRES COMPLETOS EN ORDEN ALFABETICO	CARGO	EMPRESA
24	Maria Ines Torres	Contadora	Proyecto <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i>
25	Michele Gonzalez	Evaluadora	Macro International
26	Patricia Fajardo	Coordinadora de Proyectos	ACJ
27	Piedad Rivero	Especialista en Educación	Proyecto <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i>
28	Pilar Velasquez	Latin America and Caribbean	US Department of Labor
29	Thomas Hilleary	Labor Post	US Embassy
30	Yadira Lorena Zuñiga	Coordinadora	Fe y Alegría
31	Yomaira Botet	Coordinadora	Fundación Mamonal
32	Zared Garzon	Coordinadora Renacer - Bogotá	Fundación Renacer

ANNEX G: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Logical Framework Matrix - Combating Child Labor Through Education in Colombia

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions																		
<p>Goal: Exploitative and worst forms of child labor (ECL) in Colombia progressively reduced at the end of 2010 as stated in the National Strategy and its Time Bound Program.</p>	<p>Number of children from 6 to 17 years old identified as working in the worst forms of child labor (by gender, age, region and type of work). Number of children identified as working who attend formal education.</p>	<p>Colombian Ministry of Protection Child Labor Registration System. Departamento Nacional de Estadística National Survey of Child Labor DANE 2007. Research studies or related documents.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>																		
<p>Purpose: Targeted children withdrawn or prevented (W/P) from ECL through attendance in Espacios para Crecer (EpC) or Espacios para Emprender (EpE) programs, and formal education.</p>	<p>QL/EpC - EpE Programs for children W/P from ECL. 1. Number of W/P children enrolled in EpC-EpE. Programs:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="600 678 1203 878"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>EpC</th> <th>EpE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Targets: Cohort 1:</td> <td>2,500</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cohort 2:</td> <td>4,293</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cohort 3:</td> <td>1,050</td> <td>2,357</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sub-total:</td> <td>7, 843</td> <td>2,357</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td>10, 200</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2. % of W/P children retained in EpC - EpE programs Target: 80%</p> <p>3. % of W/P children completing EpC - EpE programs Target: 80%</p> <p>4. % of W/P EpC - EpE children, by gender, from 6 to 17 enrolled in formal schooling: Target:</p> <p>6-14 years 90% formal school enrollment 15-17 years 70 % formal school enrollment</p> <p>5. % of W/P EpC - EpE children retained in formal education Target: 80%</p> <p>6. % of W/P EpC children who complete the formal education grade in which they were enrolled Target: 90%</p>		EpC	EpE	Targets: Cohort 1:	2,500		Cohort 2:	4,293		Cohort 3:	1,050	2,357	Sub-total:	7, 843	2,357	Total:	10, 200		<p>Baseline survey inquiring the educational status, work status, the amount of time and activity in which the child works, the conditions of work, and gender, in accordance with the ILO 182 convention. Two census surveys per cohort inquiring work and educational status. The mid-cohort/mid-school year census survey will reveal retention rates. The end of cohort/school year census survey will reveal completion rates.</p>	<p>Violence and displacement issues in Colombia does not increase in the targeted areas.</p>
	EpC	EpE																			
Targets: Cohort 1:	2,500																				
Cohort 2:	4,293																				
Cohort 3:	1,050	2,357																			
Sub-total:	7, 843	2,357																			
Total:	10, 200																				

Outputs

Output 1. Effective educational EpC and EpE model to remove and prevent children from child labor established.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
1.1 Effective Educational EpC-EpE programs established in target areas.	1.1.1 % of ECL W/P children enrolled in EpC and EpE attending at least 80% of the time. Target: 80% 1.1.2 ECL W/P children show improved school performance. Target: 60%	Baseline Survey Update Surveys Attendance records Sample survey of 5% enrolled in Cohort 2.	Macroeconomic factors do not deteriorate. Social barriers do not increase beyond those already identified.
1.2 Barriers to formal school for targeted working or at risk children reduced.	1.2.1 % of W/P children enrolled in EpC or EpE but not enrolled in school at baseline, subsequently enroll in formal education by a result of project action. Target: 60%	Enrollment records. Records of enrollment provided by schools. Services to reduce barriers	EpC funded with private and public funds starting the third year.

Output 2. Actions against child labor undertaken and monitored by the municipal government.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
2.1 Increased effectiveness of monitoring the implementation of the National Strategy at the local level	2.1.1 Number of municipalities implementing monitoring actions in support of National Strategy Target: 3	Organizational plans, budgets and reports.	.
2.2 Municipal policies to Eradicate Child Labor implemented in support of the National Strategy.	2.2.1 Number of municipalities implementing actions in accordance with the National Strategy, with project assistance. Target: 3	Technical documents and project reports Policy Documents.	

Output 3. Awareness of parents, educators and community leaders regarding ECL raised.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
3.1 Improved knowledge, and attitudes among parents regarding the importance of educating children, child labor laws and the costs and dangers of child labor.	3.1.1 Index of level of awareness and knowledge among targeted parents about the benefits of reaching, with educational services, child laborers or children at risk of working. Target: 75	Randomized sample survey of parents and caregivers in participating children's households.	
3.2 Child labor issues raised in targeted communities through innovative use of media and communications technologies.	3.2.1 Number of media announcements about child labor issues and project educational interventions. Target: 12 3.2.2 Expanded use of communication technologies through web sites, Face Book and U-Tube to deliver anti-child labor messages.	Recordings Project monitoring/ verification. Photographs and report on movement at project booth Video & Sound recordings. List of web sites where messages appear. Feedback from users	

Output 4. Increased understanding of ECL problem and possible solutions by policy makers and project stakeholders.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
4.1 Increased understanding of project related child labor issues and possible solutions through studies.	4.1.1 Number of collaborative studies that measure impact of methodologies for reducing child labor. Target: 2 4.1.2 Number of policy decisions influenced by project actions or studies. 4.1.3 EpC program validated for Colombia.	Final reports Official reports on policy and programs and interviews Final report to MOE, Secretariats of Education in target regions, teacher's unions, and other relevant stakeholders.	The project will select research studies to support Colombia's government efforts and will consult with DOL, IPEC, OMI, and UNICEF.

Output 5. Project programs sustained and expanded.

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Critical Assumptions
5.1 EpC and EpE models and/or QL effectively supported and implemented by national, or local entities	5.1.1 Number of entities financing the expansion or utilizing QL methodology. Target 5	Number of EpC or EpE financed by contracts or agreements.	EpCs and EpEs funded with private and public funds starting the third year.

ANNEX H: W/P TARGET NUMBERS 2008–2010

Área Geográfica	Socio Regional	Operador	Meta 2008-2010			Ejecución 2008			Meta 2008*	Retirados y Prevenidos Projectados 2009			Retirados y Prevenidos Projectados 2010			Total Cumplido a 12/2010
			Total	Retirados 1/	Prevenidos 2/	Total	Retirados	Prevenidos		Total	Retirados	Prevenidos	Total	Retirados	Prevenidos	
BOGOTA	ACJ	ACJ Bogotá	1.225	440	785	201	75	126	181	419	210	209	608	158	450	1.228
	TOTAL ACJ		1.225	440	785	201	75	126	181	419	210	209	608	158	450	1.228
BOGOTA	CORPOEDUCACION	Corpoeducación	146	52	94	139	6	133	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
	TOTAL CORPOEDUCACION		146	52	94	139	6	133	146	0	0	0	0	0	0	139
BOGOTA	MERCY CORPS	Fundación Renacer Btá.	1.600	574	1.026	356	149	207	400	612	306	306	432	19	413	1.400
CARTAGENA		Fundación Renacer Ctga.	1.100	395	705	294	51	243	300	339	170	169	367	74	293	1.000
		Fundación Volver a la gente	800	287	513	223	14	209	400	406	203	203	171	70	101	800
SANTANDER		Fundación El Camino	1.500	539	961	295	108	187	300	651	326	325	530	105	425	1.476
	TOTAL MERCY CORPS		5.000	1.795	3.205	1.168	322	846	1.400	2.008	1.005	1.003	1.500	268	1.232	4.676
CARTAGENA	UNINORTE	Fundación Mamonal	751	270	481	227	207	20	159	337	169	168	377	100	277	941
B/QUILLA		Fundación Universidad del Norte	1.013	364	649	307	100	207	261	427	214	213	332	50	282	1.066
SANTA MARTA		Fundación para el Desarrollo del Niño la Familia y la Comunidad	458	165	293	239	21	218	206	246	123	123	21	21	0	506
	TOTAL UNINORTE		2.222	799	1.423	773	328	445	626	1.010	506	504	730	171	559	2.513
CALI-VALLE	FE Y ALEGRIA	Fe y Alegría	457	164	293	0	0	0		188	94	94	269	70	199	457
	TOTAL FE Y ALEGRIA		457	164	293	0	0	0	0	188	94	94	269	70	199	457
CALI-VALLE	CEDECUR	CEDECUR	950	341	609	0	0	0		710	355	355	255	1	254	965
	TOTAL CEDECUR		950	341	609	0	0	0	0	710	355	355	255	1	254	965
BOYACA	TBD	Boyacá (Samacá)	200	72	128	0	0	0		187	94	93	35	0	35	222
	TOTAL TBD		200	72	128	0	0	0	0	187	94	93	35	0	35	222
TOTAL			10.200	3.663	6.537	2.281	731	1.550	2.353	4.522	2.264	2.258	3.397	668	2.729	10.200

1/ NNA que fueron identificados en la Línea de Base (LB) como trabajadores y que recibiendo los servicios educativos del DOL han dejado de trabajar definitivamente o han reducido sustancialmente su actividad laboral.

2/ NNA que fueron identificados en la Línea de Base como en riesgo de trabajar y que en la actualización continúan fuera del trabajo .

* Meta en concordancia, aunque no señalada en el PRODOC Table of Beneficiaries.

ANNEX I: SUSTAINABILITY MATRIX

Sustainability Plan/Matrix

Sustainability Matrix for Project: Support to the Colombia Time Bound Program on the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor—
Edúcame Primero Colombia

Date initially prepared: 30/09/2008

Date of this version: 22/01/2009

Project Component	Conditions for Sustainability	Further action by institutions and partners involved	Process for monitoring progress on the sustainability elements	Status on the sustainability elements
<p>Output 1. Effective educational EpC and EpE model to remove and prevent children from child labor established.</p> <p>Effective Educational EpC-EpE programs established in target areas. Barriers to formal school for targeted working or at risk children reduced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Strategy for Preventing Child Labor and Protecting the Young Workers 2008-2015 (NS) issued. Relevant actors convinced of the benefits of the EpE and EpC interventions. Economic resources coming from government and private agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action is necessary because the National Strategy for Preventing Child Labor and Protecting the Young Workers 2008-2015 NS has already been issued on February 7 / 2008. The project showing statistics related to changes in the working status of children and changes in the retention at school. The project actively seeking for economic support for the EpC's & EpE's. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A Follow up and assess of both the data produced by the project and the socialization the project makes with relevant actors. Follow up and assess the fundraising strategy for the expansion of the EpC's and EpE's. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In place. The results of the first year have been presented to: the National Committee, USAID, and the Secretary of Education of Bogotá, The Ministry of Social Protection. We are conducting conversations with Fundación Telefónica to convince them of sponsoring the EpC. We will present our results and ask for sponsors in the Sixth Inter-American Conference in Corporate Social Responsibility and in the Partners Binational Convention Colombia-USA. The project presented unsolicited proposals to to USAID, Secretary of Education of Bogotá, Partners volunteers and the municipalities of Zipaquirá, Funza, Factativá and Chiquinquirá.

Project Component	Conditions for Sustainability	Further action by institutions and partners involved	Process for monitoring progress on the sustainability elements	Status on the sustainability elements
<p>Output 2. Actions against child labor undertaken and monitored by the municipal government.</p> <p>Increased effectiveness of monitoring the National Strategy implementation at the local level</p> <p>Municipal policies to Eradicate Child Labor implemented in support of the National Strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Committee requesting biannual reports and stakeholders requesting monitoring results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide technical assistance to the National Committee for them to establish as a regular practice the request of monitoring reports. Mobilize NGOs with projects seeking the eliminations of child labor to ask for monitoring reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodically review the technical assistance interventions undertaken by the project. Reviewing the municipal development plans and national development plans to see if actions on child labor are included. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has committed to support the actions lead by the Ministry of Social Protection and IPEC: they are giving directions to the Departments and Municipalities to include child labor in their development plans. We will place in our local subcontractors the responsibilities of actively encourage the inclusion of child labor programs and economic resources in the development plan.
<p>Output 3 - Awareness of parents, educators and community leaders regarding ECL raised.</p> <p>Improved knowledge, and attitudes among parents regarding the importance of educating children, child labor laws and the costs and dangers of child labor.</p> <p>Child labor issues raised in targeted communities through innovative use of media and communications technologies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parents convinced that their children should not be working before the legal age. Critical mass of Media people informed about child labor issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educate parents within the project about withdrawing the children from work and having them attending educational services. Address selected Media people and Schools of Journalism and inform them periodically about child labor issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administer a Baseline Survey and a second survey (Knowledge and Attitude Perception survey KAP Survey) to a sample of parents or caretakers in the project to assess the degree of change of attitudes and knowledge. Monitor information submitted by the project and information presented by the Media on child labor issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline survey on parent knowledge and attitudes already design and sent to the NGO's to be administered on the last three months of the year 2008. One media announcement issued by the project. Process of compiling selected Media people addresses and selected Schools of Journalism addresses in progress.

Project Component	Conditions for Sustainability	Further action by institutions and partners involved	Process for monitoring progress on the sustainability elements	Status on the sustainability elements
<p>Output 4 – Increased understanding of ECL problem and possible solutions by policy makers and project stakeholders.</p> <p>Increased understanding of project related child labor issues and possible solutions through studies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the research studies impact policy programs or projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the selection of research studies that key policy makers considered necessary to formulate policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The indicator in the PMP requires that the research projects impact policy programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Committee for the Eradication of child Labor (NCECL) has been selected as the policy making entity to be consulted. The consulting will take place through a workshop with the NCECL.
<p>Output 5 – Project programs sustained and expanded.</p> <p>EpC and EpE models and/or QL effectively supported and implemented by national or local entities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the project guarantees the sustainability actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the actions done, after the end of the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow up and assess the sustainability actions by local actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A network has been created between IPEC-OIT, Telefónica, World Visison, Save the Children, and Educame Primero Colombia in order to work in a coordinated manner.