

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

# Independent Midterm Evaluation of the Combating Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic Project

DevTech Systems, Inc.

Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16573-07-75



2009

**ICF** MACRO  
an ICF International Company

This page left intentionally blank.

**FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

# **Independent Midterm Evaluation of the Combating Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic Project**

DevTech Systems, Inc.

Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16573-07-75

# 2009

This page left intentionally blank.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

This report describes in detail the midterm evaluation, conducted during April to May 2009, of Combating Child Labor Through Education II in the Dominican Republic. 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 Combating Child Labor Through Education II in the Dominican Republic was conducted and documented by Julia Hasbún, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the Combating Child Labor Through Education II Project team, and stakeholders in the Dominican Republic. ICF Macro would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator; DevTech Systems, Inc., EDUCA, and INTEC, and their 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.*

### Thanks

The person in charge of the assessment wishes to express her recognition to the following individuals:

- Lisa Slifer-Mbacke, Mary Anne Anderson, and Jamie Timmons of ICF Macro for the pertinent and permanent support in the course of this evaluation.
- All the personnel at DevTech System Inc, Acción para la Educación Básica (EDUCA), ENTRENA, and other institutions—including Fernando O gando, Aída Consuelo Hernández, Saschia Seibel, Altagracia Díaz, Adalgisa Mercedes, Clara, Liliana Degorgis, and Alfredo Imbert—for the excellent coordination and teamwork involved in carrying out this evaluation.
- Mr. John Helwig for sharing his broad experience and insight.

- The members of the consortium or agents for lending their time and personnel to guide, explain, and answer all questions arising in the evaluation.
- All government officials interviewed for the valuable information and documents furnished.
- All persons interviewed who, with their warm welcome and shared perceptions, made this midterm evaluation possible.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>I EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Evaluation Objectives .....	1
1.2 Evaluation Methodology.....	1
<b>II PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>III RESULTS: RELEVANCE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Findings.....	5
3.2 Best Practices .....	8
<b>IV RESULTS: EFFICACY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Findings.....	9
4.2 Lessons Learned.....	17
4.3 Best Practices .....	17
<b>V RESULTS: EFFICIENCY .....</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Findings.....	19
5.2 Best Practices .....	19
<b>VI IMPACT .....</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 Findings.....	21
6.2 Best Practices .....	24
<b>VII SUSTAINABILITY .....</b>	<b>25</b>
7.1 Findings.....	25
7.2 Lessons Learned.....	27
7.3 Best Practices .....	28
<b>VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
8.1 Key Conclusions and Recommendations.....	29
8.2 Other Recommendations.....	31

## ANNEXES

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Annex B: Guides Used During Fieldwork

This page left intentionally blank.

## LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

---

AECID	<i>Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo</i> (Spanish International Cooperation Agency for Development)
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DevTech	Development Technology Systems, Inc.
DR	Dominican Republic
EDUCA	<i>Acción para la Educación Básica</i> (Action for Basic Education)
EFT	<i>Encuesta de Fuerza de Trabajo del Banco Central</i> (Central Bank Workforce Survey)
EI	Education Initiative
ENTI	<i>Encuesta Nacional de Trabajo Infantil</i> (National Child Labor Survey)
EpC	<i>Espacios para Crecer</i> (Spaces for Growth)
EpE	<i>Espacios para Emprender</i> (Spaces for Entrepreneurship)
FUDECO	<i>Fundación para el Desarrollo Comunitario</i> (Foundation for Community Development)
IDDI	<i>Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral</i> (Dominican Institute for Comprehensive Development)
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
INAFOCAM	<i>Instituto Nacional de Formación y Capacitación del Magisterio</i> (National Institute of Education and Training for Teachers)
INDOTEL	<i>Instituto Dominicano de Telecomunicaciones</i> (Dominican Telecommunications Institute)
INTEC	<i>Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo</i> (Technological Institute of Santo Domingo)
ISFODOSU	<i>Instituto Superior de Formación Docente Salomé Ureña</i> (Salomé Ureña Higher Educational Institute for Teachers)
INFOTEP	<i>Instituto Nacional de Formación Técnico Profesional</i> (National Vocational Training Institute)
MIS	Management Informational System
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOL	Ministry of Labor
NGO	Nongovernmental Organizations
NNA	<i>Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes</i> (Children and Adolescents)

QL	Quantum Learning
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## Background and Objectives

The United States Department of Labor (USDOL) has, on multiple occasions, supported the struggle to eradicate child labor in the Dominican Republic (DR). Through a competitive bid process sponsored by USDOL, DevTech Systems Inc. was awarded a cooperative agreement together with a consortium of nongovernmental organizations for a three and a half year implementation of an Education Initiative program aimed at removing and preventing the involvement of *niños, niñas y adolescentes* (children and adolescents or NNA) in child labor, meaning any kind of activity—paid or not—that may interfere with school attendance and with the children's physical, mental, emotional, or social development. This gave rise to the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education Project to which this midterm evaluation refers. The timeframe set forth in the agreement for this project is from September 2007 to February 2011.

The project objectives will be reached through educational strategies. To this effect, the project developed two types of spaces to receive NNAs in need of strengthening their academic skills (and at high risk of abandoning their studies) or NNAs who would be removed from child labor.

The first type of space developed was *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growth or EpC). These spaces operate in premises with a maximum capacity of 30 NNAs between age 6 and 13. The approximate duration is 18 months. The second space developed was *Espacios para Emprender* (Spaces for Entrepreneurship or EpE) aimed at adolescents of both sexes from age 14 to 17. The project consists of 450 hours of programming, dedicating—among other things—150 hours to technical-vocational learning.

The primary objective of the midterm evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic Project was to review and analyze the actions implemented for the project, as provided for by the cooperative agreement entered into with USDOL. It should identify aspects concerning the relevance, efficacy, efficiency, sustainability, and apparent impact indicators. Furthermore, it should determine if the project will be able to achieve its final goals and provide the recommendations necessary toward attaining such goals. The project objectives are the following:

- Remove NNAs from, or prevent them from becoming involved in, child labor through the provision of direct education and training activities.
- Strengthen child labor policies, national institutions, and educational systems toward reducing child labor involvement and increasing school attendance of NNAs who are in child labor.
- Raise awareness among NNAs about the importance of education and encourage key actors to improve and expand educational infrastructure.
- Support research and the provision of child labor data.

- Ensure the sustainability of efforts in the long term.
- Foster relations between public and private sectors.
- Promote social responsibility and codes of conduct that may certify child labor eradication.

## **Methodology**

Eight focus group sessions were conducted: four with beneficiaries' parents, one with project personnel, one with school personnel, one with community leaders, and one with beneficiaries of an EpE. Five group interviews were conducted: one with beneficiaries' parents, one with school personnel, one with project facilitators, one with project personnel, and one with government officials. A total of 99 individual interviews were conducted with NNAs and other actors.

## **Results**

The premises on which the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic Project was initially based are still currently relevant, as child labor continues to represent a challenge that DR must face. The existing data regarding the magnitude of the problem date back to 2000, when the *Encuesta Nacional de Trabajo Infantil* (National Child Labor Survey or ENTI) took place. While there are other quantitative sources about child labor, they lack the characteristics necessary to compare with the 2000 ENTI. However, while the general perception of the persons interviewed in the target communities is that the number of NNAs enrolled in child labor has diminished, they are unable to predict in what magnitude.

The design of the project and the application of its educational strategies fit properly for the removal and prevention of child labor. The project contributes a model that approaches the full school program (i.e., most schooldays); the beneficiaries are inserted into a traditional school program (attending school) and in an extracurricular program given by the project spaces. In the visits and interviews, it was observed that the project receives NNAs who were previously employed as apprentices or assistants in a carpentry shop, as clerks in a grocery store, as home cleaners, in the harvest workforce, and more.

Most direct beneficiaries of the project are NNAs whose age is above that of the public educational system—that is, their age exceeds by far the average age of those in the grade they are currently in. This average is precisely one of the lines of action prioritized by the Ministry of Education to be worked on in DR. The project contributes to provide answers to level the grades of its beneficiaries and focuses on the search for solutions and the attainment of the national educational system goals.

The project assumes and contributes to the goals established by the Ministry of Labor in its mandate to eradicate child labor in the country and, through its educational strategy, it favors the fulfillment of world commitments assumed by the country such as the Millennium Development Goals that set forth, among other aspects, the need to universalize education up to and including eighth grade.

The direct project beneficiaries are mostly selected in the following two ways: (1) community school personnel (teachers, principals, and counselors) identify beneficiaries to be prevented, and (2) community leaders identify beneficiaries to be withdrawn. This selection method constitutes a best practice, as the decision of whom to work with falls entirely on the community, which is the entity that can best recognize its needs.

Another best practice is that the project does not require its direct beneficiaries to have a birth certificate for them to gain access to the spaces. According to data provided by the project, 12% of the beneficiaries do not have that document. Although the Project does not require beneficiaries to have a birth certificate, Project members have facilitated the ability of beneficiaries to obtain birth certificates as one initiative.

One of the obstacles identified in the project was finding proper premises for the spaces. The project does not have premises of its own; premises are provided through cooperation from schools and community centers (these are the most numerous). Another challenge is that some spaces are located in premises shared with another space at the same time; in a place divided by some object separating them, a temporary divider two spaces may be found working at the same time. According to the characteristics of the Quantum Learning (QL) methodology, this results in mutual interference.

A lesson learned arises from the problem with the premises. The project has understood the need for the premises to be close or inside the school. This makes access easier for the beneficiaries as they live close to the schools, avoiding the need for parents to incur in any transportation expenses to reach the spaces.

It was found that parental knowledge of the legal framework regarding labor and the rights of the NNAs could be improved. So far, the project has been unable to overcome this important barrier successfully. The project seems to focus more on educating NNAs—the attempts to raise awareness of the parents and the community in general have been few or not as effective. From reports of the project facilitators, it may be observed that they communicate with the parents, especially when they have cases where beneficiaries fail to attend the space because of responsibilities at home (house chores or street vending of food products).

From a midterm point of view, it seems that most of the project's objectives will be achieved. It is currently very likely that the intended number of children to be withdrawn or prevented will be reached and probably surpassed.

The creation and implementation of spaces has been successful; there are presently 242 EpCs and 48 EpEs. While the project has not yet conducted the annual survey to monitor the school grades of its beneficiaries, the reports submitted by the teachers interviewed in the schools indicate that there is a substantial improvement in academic performance, which must be reflected in the school grades. The services offered by the project are considered by almost all key actors interviewed to be effective in removing and preventing NNAs from engaging in child labor.

The vocational education offered by the project at the EpEs is perceived as beneficial, and the response of the beneficiaries is very enthusiastic. However, there are important challenges that need to be overcome: coordination of the vocational component with *Instituto Nacional de*

*Formación Técnico Profesional* (INFOTEP), the national vocational training institute must be improved in order to avoid delays and problems in offering the courses described in the recommendations.

The project includes a finalization and sustainability plan that could be effective. There are three aspects that the project must analyze carefully in the plan. The first one concerns the training of the Department of Education teaching staff in the QL methodology and other components with funding from *Instituto Nacional de Formación y Capacitación del Magisterio* (National Institute of Education and Training for Teachers or INAFOCAM) and training through *Instituto Superior de Formación Docente Salomé Ureña* (Salomé Ureña Higher Educational Institute for Teachers). The purpose is to disseminate the QL methodology not only to basic education teachers, but to those of higher grades. To that effect, INAFOCAM must include these training courses in its annual budget. This has not occurred to date and there are no signs that this will happen.

Incorporating resources from outside the project has been an initiative of the project staff more than that of the consortium. Some actions, however, have taken place as a consortium. An example is the inclusion in the consortium of the *Sur Futuro* organization, which will fund its own spaces following the project model.

Several aspects can qualify as emergent. These aspects were not contemplated by the project and most of the agents have not been trained for them: (1) the need to teach NNAs to read and write; (2) aggressive behaviors denoted by many beneficiaries when entering the spaces; and (3) the multiple situations of abuse (at least verbal) to which such beneficiaries have been subjected, undermining their self-esteem and self-confidence. In many spaces, it was reported that agents were working with NNAs whose parents were drug dealers or were in prison because of drug-related violations. NNA victims of incest or rape were identified in other spaces. Children with special needs (such as those with mental retardation) were also identified.

## **Recommendations**

Training project facilitators in skills for teaching reading and writing to beneficiaries is necessary and relevant. Other agencies and donors have projects to train teaching staff to teach reading and writing. That is the case with the U.S. Agency for International Development, which has been working in a similar project since 2002. This agency is in the best position to contribute this aspect to the project. They have already developed the experience and educational materials, providing a good opportunity to cover one of the project needs.

Another opportunity the project can take hold of is the experience of the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour in raising the awareness of community members. They have also developed materials to this effect. Moreover, the Dominican office has produced (and continues producing or sponsoring) videos that explain the subject matter issue simply and clearly, which may be ideal to raise the awareness of parents and community members. As it was previously mentioned, during the interviews with the parents of project beneficiaries, they had already been exposed to some activity aimed at raising awareness of the risks of child labor; however, they had no recollection of that. This could indicate that it is necessary to find instruments that may be more attractive to them, such as videos. It might also be better to stay

away from lectures with broader content that tend to disperse attention and do not achieve the ultimate goal of the intervention.

The existing situation of delays in vocational training at the EPs between the project and INFOTEP has a simple solution, especially given the importance of this learning for the beneficiaries. The first thing to do is review the agreement. This requires clearly establishing the final purpose of the training provided by INFOTEP: not to offer professional education to the beneficiaries at the spaces, which is only 150 hours, but rather to build the foundations of vocational learning skills. Agents could also be motivated to identify trainers beforehand, who are already registered and certified by INFOTEP in different vocational areas in their work communities. Another option is for agents to encourage the trained personnel of the community to obtain INFOTEP certification.

The project has to coordinate with the United Nations Children's Fund and their associates in the important task of eradicating commercial sexual exploitation of children. This is one of the worst forms of child labor, one that the project works on less; therefore, with good coordination, the project could acquire the necessary experience to address it. The project could also take advantage from that association, of the marked elements of the NNA rights that agency has, and apply them within the project.

The project management information system must be finished so that it can offer updated data at any moment without great trouble. Monitoring and follow-up actions depend on it.

It is recommended that ENTRENA and the consortium revise their daily routine dynamics and their contents. Of course, the dynamics are routine when they take place on a daily basis, and lose that interactive element that is required for when they are needed and cause somewhat loss of interest.

The consortium must strive to improve its capacity to capture funds, considering the funding opportunities existing in the country. To this effect, it must seek information about all the initiatives that can be helpful for its program tasks and negotiate with the agents its possible use or exchanges.

This page left intentionally blank.

# I EVALUATION

---

## 1.1 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the midterm evaluation is to review and analyze the actions implemented by the project, in line with the provisions under the cooperative agreement with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL). It should identify aspects concerning the relevance, efficacy, efficiency, sustainability, and apparent impact indicators. It should also determine if the project will be able to achieve its final goals and provide the recommendations necessary toward attaining such goals.

The advantage of this kind of assessment is that it enables follow-up of the project and identification of areas that require improvement or that need to be transformed without having to wait for the final assessment. In this way, the project is further enriched.

The midterm evaluation, like all assessments, is based on the objectives of the project, which are as follows:

- Remove or prevent *niños, niñas y adolescentes* (children and adolescents or NNAs) from involvement in child labor through the provision of direct education and training activities.
- Strengthen child labor policies, national institutions, and educational systems toward reducing child labor enrollment and increasing school attendance of NNAs that are in child labor.
- Raise awareness about the importance of education among NNAs and encourage key actors to improve and expand educational infrastructure.
- Support research and the provision of child labor data.
- Ensure the sustainability of efforts in the long term.
- Foster relations between public and private sectors.
- Promote social responsibility and codes of conduct that may certify child labor eradication.

## 1.2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The first stage in the methodology was the identification and preparation of key questions to be answered in the evaluation. This task was performed by ICF Macro, an institution engaged by USDOL to conduct and subcontract the personnel required to perform the evaluation of the project.

Once the services of the assessment entity were hired, a specific and clear description of tasks to be performed was provided. Based on these tasks, a master questionnaire was created,

identifying the ideal respondent for each question. The methodology attached hereto were created in that way.

With the supervision of ICF Macro, project management prepared a schedule of field visits and interviews of the different actors and spaces. DevTech submitted a list of possible informants to ICF Macro, from which a selection was made by the evaluator. In addition to this selection, the evaluator interviewed or contacted other types of informants based on the information requirements.

Once all the documents required were gathered, the evaluator studied them and prepared a summary of the most relevant aspects. Among the documents requested were statistics pertinent to the project and reports, as well as materials produced by the project. This stage lasted until the moment when the report was prepared.

Based on the schedule prepared and accurately coordinated by DevTech, all qualitative techniques concerning fieldwork were applied within a two-week period.

The qualitative techniques used were the following:

- Focus group sessions were conducted with groups of six people or more. Eight focus group sessions were conducted: four with beneficiaries' parents, one with project personnel, one with school personnel, one with community leaders, and one with beneficiaries from an *Espacios para Emprender* (Spaces for Entrepreneurship or EpE).
- Group interviews were held involving more than one person and less than six. Five such interviews were conducted: one with beneficiaries' parents, one with school personnel, one with project facilitators, one with project personnel, and one with government officials.
- Individual interviews with children and other actors were also held. A total of 99 interviews were performed as follows: 31% of these interviews were with NNAs of *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growth or EpC), 25% with beneficiaries of an EpE, and the rest (44%) with other key actors who might offer valuable information for the assessment.
- Thirteen spaces were visited (nine EpCs and four EpEs) in seven provinces of the country.

Interviews were recorded using a digital recorder, with prior authorization of the interviewed persons. The recording of all interviews was verbally approved after the evaluator promised to preserve the confidentiality of the information and the identity of the informants. For this reason, this report does not include the names of the persons interviewed; if the names had been included, in some cases it would be very easy to match the content to the identity of the informant. What is relevant for this assessment is the content of the information provided and not disclosing the identity of the respondents.

Once all the necessary information was obtained, it was qualitatively analyzed using the triangulation technique in order to answer the assessment questions.

## II PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

USDOL has on multiple occasions supported the struggle to eradicate child labor in the Dominican Republic (DR). Through a competitive bid process sponsored by USDOL, DevTech was awarded a cooperative agreement together with a consortium of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), for a three and a half year implementation of an Educational Initiative (EI) program aimed at removing and preventing NNAs from child labor, meaning any kind of activity—paid or not—that may interfere with school attendance and with the children's physical, mental, emotional, or social development. This gave rise to the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic Project to which this midterm evaluation refers. The time period set forth in the agreement for this project is from September 2007 to February 2011. This agreement included conducting a midterm evaluation in 2009.

The project aims to fight the following areas: human and drug trafficking, hazardous agriculture, commercial sexual exploitation, and hazardous urban work. The project is administrated by an association led by DevTech, the Consortium Spaces to Grow, and the *Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo* (Technological Institute of Santo Domingo or INTEC) aided by ENTRENA. It covers most of the geographical area of DR because of the participation of eight NGOs and numerous organizations with community grassroots.

These organization *Acción para la Educación Básica* (EDUCA) heads the consortium, which consists of *Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral* (Dominican Institute for Comprehensive Development or IDDI), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), *Plan Internacional*, World Vision, Save the Children/Fudeco, *Universidad Católica Nordestana*, *Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes*, and the Pringamosa Foundation.

The project objectives described would be reached through educational strategies. To this effect, the project developed two types of spaces to receive (1) NNAs that require strengthening their academic skills and are at high risk of abandoning their studies, or (2) NNAs involved in child labor who need to be removed.

The first type of space developed was the EpC. These spaces operate in premises with a maximum capacity for 30 NNAs between age 6 and 13. They last approximately 18 months, of which the first nine months run parallel to the school year. This is followed by a two-week vacation before the start of the summer course (like a summer camp). Another two weeks of vacation follow, and the program starts again at the same time as the school year, with a new program called Tomorrow's Leaders—the final stage of the EpC. This part of the program lasts approximately six months and does not necessarily conclude with the school year.

EpCs have three kinds of components: an academic component (where school work is reviewed and overage NNAs are leveled with the grades they are taking currently); a personal growth component (where self-esteem is strengthened and concepts and dynamics are offered for the development of skills and abilities); and a recreational component (where playful elements predominate). This last component is the one most worked with during the summer/camp courses. All these services are free for the beneficiaries. They are headed by facilitators who conduct and supervise all the activities.

There are EpEs aimed at adolescents of both sexes from age 14 to 17. The spaces have 450 hours of programming, distributed as follows: 150 hours in technical-vocational learning, 150 hours in leadership development, 90 hours in micro-business learning, and 60 supplementary hours defined by each agent according to the needs of the group. These may be for sports, art, culture, or some other activity, or they may be invested in solving some academic deficiency, such as reading and writing, logic mathematics, and others. Services are free and classes have a maximum capacity of 30 adolescents.

## III RESULTS: RELEVANCE

---

### 3.1 FINDINGS

#### 3.1.1 Analysis of project assumptions and strategies

As a baseline, the project used the results from the 2000 *Encuesta Nacional de Trabajo Infantil* (National Child Labor Survey or ENTI). This survey estimated that about 436,000 NNAs were working in DR, with 80% working in conditions that threatened their overall development. Based on this finding, the project has counted on realistic assumptions from the onset. During this year, the Secretary of Labor declared publicly that this number had reduced to about 195,000 NNAs. The source of these data comes from the 2008 *Encuesta de Fuerza de Trabajo del Banco Central* (Central Bank Workforce Survey or EFT), which the Central Bank conducts from time to time. The EFT data are not comparable to those of the 2000 ENTI, as the surveyed population is not the same. The ENTI surveyed NNAs between age 5 and 17, but the EFT targeted individuals age 10 and older. Despite other methodological aspects, this differentiation in the age groups invalidates any possibility to compare results, so it can not be accurately concluded that the situation actually changed. A new ENTI will be conducted shortly, which may contribute something in this respect.

The general perception of the persons interviewed in the participating communities is that the number of NNAs enrolled in child labor has decreased; however, they cannot confirm to what magnitude.

Education is the primary strategy used by the project. Strengthening NNAs education helps to prevent them from abandoning their studies because of problems with school learning or because they engage in work, favoring school desertion.

In most cases, the project works with NNAs who are over the average age for their current grades, for example, one of the beneficiaries might be a 17-year-old who is in seventh grade. Attending a school grade with an age way above the average of the other students (two or more grades) represents a risk in itself for that student to abandon school. Feelings of frustration and failure may accompany an overage student. One of the interviewed beneficiaries (age 13, grade 5) stated when interviewed, “I have to attend every day a grade that is full of children much younger than I. They look at me as if I were a freak. That is why I’m doing all I can to prepare myself at the EpC, so that I can attend a higher grade and be with children my age.” Another child (age 14, grade 5) added, “I was about to quit school and start working because I was so far behind. I thought I was not able to study, that I was too dumb for that.”

In the visits and interviews, it was observed that the project receives NNAs who were previously employed as apprentices or assistants in a carpentry shop, as a clerk in a grocery store, as home cleaners, in the harvest workforce, and other areas. A boy (age 14) who was a clerk in a grocery store (and overage for his grade) shared the following: “I used to work in the morning at the grocery store and then at 2:00 in the afternoon I would go to school. I was not able to study or do my homework at the store, as there are always people coming in to buy. I like the work and I earned my money; my schoolwork was not important to me anymore.”

The project offers these beneficiaries the opportunity to level themselves and move forward to a grade in line with their age. According to the teachers and principals of the school system, the project is achieving its objective.

### **3.1.2 Identification of the main obstacles or barriers the project has identified as important in the struggle against child labor in the country**

Poverty is one of the factors most identified by those interviewed as the main obstacle in the struggle against child labor. A community leader elaborated, “Poverty here is tight and, when it gets too tight, one tries to seek the solution, no matter what. NNAs working here don’t do it without a reason. It is because their families are in great need. Here there are many women on their own, who are pulling their families out and, in those cases, the children find themselves forced to work in order to eat.”

This factor, while it seriously affects attainment of the project’s final goal, is not something that the project may work with directly. However, the education offer is, in the long run, a way out of poverty, so the project is contributing in that respect.

Another factor identified is the lack of education of the parents, both academic and regarding labor laws. Many interviewed actors stated that education is not valued enough and falls second behind everyday survival. One teacher said, “My greatest concern is how to obtain our daily food. Educating the children is not seen by many of them as something essential.” During the interviews, it was possible to observe that very few parents were aware of the prohibition and restrictions of labor laws for persons under age 14. “When one is poor, everyone at home works. That’s the law I know,” said one interviewed mother.

And with respect to parents’ unawareness of the legal labor framework and the rights to which NNAs are entitled, the project has been unable so far to successfully address this important barrier. The project seems to focus more on educating NNAs, and the actions aimed at raising awareness of the parents and the community in general are too few or not as effective. From the reports of the project facilitators, it is apparent that they communicate with the parents, especially when they have cases where beneficiaries fail to attend the space due to responsibilities at home (house chores or street vending of food products). Generally, the project “sells” the idea of better education to the community, and very few in the community are aware of the real nature of the project: preventing the prioritization of child labor and contributing to the eradication of the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).

An area coordinator of one of the project agents explained the situation: “At the beginning, one tries to persuade parents to let their children go to the spaces. The education offer is essential at this stage. It’s the carrot. If one tells them that the project seeks to prevent child labor, they will feel they are being judged that they put them to work. So it is necessary to go easy and not alarm them.”

In many of the places visited, some parents admitted having attended meetings where they had talked with project agents, but very few of these parents recalled what was discussed. “I attended the meeting, but I cannot remember what they talked to me about.” Furthermore, most of the

interviewed parents are not aware that there is a law that prohibits child work up to age 14. Their perception is that the NNAs can work at an early age if required and it is the parents' decision. This may indicate that, while in some cases information is given to them, the content concerning child labor prevention is easily forgotten; therefore, raising awareness of the risks of child labor goes mostly unnoticed by the parents. This jeopardizes the efforts of the project itself. Although the project is achieving its objective to remove and prevent NNAs from child labor, it does not seem to raise the necessary awareness of the parents. When this happens, the possibility that the family situation will add to the poverty and limitations (leading the project beneficiaries to enroll again in child labor once they complete their studies in the spaces) increases.

The school personnel interviewed also seemed to be unaware of the final goal of the project. To them, the project essentially aims to address the educational problems of the average school population. The eradication of child labor, the ultimate goal of the project, seems to become a "hidden agenda."

Those who were familiar with this goal were the community leaders interviewed. This is natural since, as it will be seen later, they are the ones in charge of selecting potential beneficiaries among the working NNAs.

### **3.1.3 Cultural, political, and economic context of the project and its relation with other initiatives**

The project is designed to adapt to the different contexts in which it operates—in fact, there is evidence that it does. For example, in the tourist areas visited, it was observed that the vocational education offered at the EpEs is more focused on the production of craftwork and provision of tourist services. In other words, the project develops their learning toward activities pertaining to the economic context of the communities. The inclusion of cultural elements was also observed in the EpCs; traditional games specific to each area were included, strengthening the cultural identities of the communities.

In DR, there are other initiatives to fight child labor in all sectors. In the public sector, through the Ministry of Labor (MOL), the government has ratified agreements since 1997, developing a legal framework that prevents and controls child labor. In its role as general coordinator of the efforts engaged throughout the country, MOL directs government organizations and NGOs working on these efforts.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) and its International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC)—in addition to being key advisors in the ratification of agreements by the Government of the Dominican Republic—implement determined action programs, merging policies and lines of action toward eradicating child labor. One type of program implemented is very similar to those of the project, with some methodological and strategic differences. Mostly, these programs are not carried out in the provinces and cities where the project operates; however, there is no evidence that one project interferes with the other negatively, and there does not seem to be coordination between their actions.

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), working with other agencies such as Italian Cooperation and the Government of DR, has recently started a bilateral project that fights abuse

and the commercial sexual exploitation of children, especially in tourist areas of the country. This articulation of efforts is too new to observe the kind of coordination that will be carried out between actors pursuing that goal; however, it is worth pointing out that the main action of this society persecutes one of the WFCL. Efforts to combat WFCL are included in this project, making it essential for both structures to coordinate their actions.

Specifically in the district of Dajabón, it was observed that some NGOs of a religious nature were making efforts toward implementing work rooms for NNAs. These organizations were identified as Mission of Mercy and another organization of the Baptist Church of the United States. There is no coordination between these institutions and the project, which has resulted in negative interference. Several project facilitators reported that the beneficiaries of some EPCs missed their spaces twice a week (the days that these institutions had the work rooms) with the approval of their parents. These work rooms provided them with attractive snacks, such as rice pudding. In other words, they missed their usual space in order to eat the snack offered by another institution.

### **3.1.4 Analysis of the selection criterion of the geographical areas where the project operates**

The criterion used by the project (as well as by other projects, such as ILO-IPEC) to identify the work areas for intervention is based on the results of the 2000 ENTI. The survey points out the geographical areas that show the greatest risks for WFCL among NNAs. This selection criterion is valid and appropriate, observing in the visits made to the project that the work areas were located in areas or belts of extreme poverty in the country, which increases the risk of proliferation of child labor exploitation.

## **3.2 BEST PRACTICES**

The range of action of the agents is an aspect that deserves highlighting. When the consortium was formed, one of the selection parameters was to be able to attract agents that already had a physical presence and experience working with the communities to be intervened. This selection parameter has helped the project a great deal, as the community has been able to perceive continuity and fidelity of the agents in the efforts engaged. The fact that many agents carry other projects simultaneously in different areas is yet more beneficial. Agents contribute to a more comprehensive development and that is how the communities perceive it.

## **IV RESULTS: EFFICACY**

---

### **4.1 FINDINGS**

#### **4.1.1 Adaptation of the design of the project to achieve the five EI goals**

The design of the project fits properly in working toward removing and preventing access to child labor through educational strategies. The project contributes a model that approaches the full school program; during most school days, the beneficiaries are in a traditional school program (attending regular school) and in an extracurricular program given by the project spaces. That means that beneficiaries attending school in the morning invest some three to four hours in school during that time. They return home for lunch and at 2:00 p.m they go to the project space which takes a minimum of three hours. The same happens when beneficiaries are enrolled in the afternoon school shift. This implies that during most time when they would usually have been at work, project NNAs are busy in an educational environ.

The educational methods used, such as the Quantum Learning (QL) methodology, simplify the recovery of learning abilities and skills that help beneficiaries to easily transition into the traditional educational model. It is necessary not to forget that most project beneficiaries have learning problems in school and that they are, as a result, overage because of their repeated or abandoned studies. An official of the Ministry of Education (MOE) mentioned the following about the QL methodology: “It is a more active, fun, human education that manages to recover the confidence of students in their ability to learn. The project also helps us to reduce the overage gap, which is a problem we have and a priority MOE line of action.” When the project achieves significant changes in learning through the QL methodology, it also pushes away the possibility of abandoning studies because of perceived impediments. An interviewed father stated, “I was about to pull my daughter out of school and forget about her studying, putting her to work instead. She seemed to be unable to learn anything. They recommended that I get her into an EpE, which I did as a last resort. I know now that she can complete high school and that there is no reason why she should quit studying.”

By implementing these educational strategies, the project reinforces the national policies against child labor, while strengthening the DR educational system and intervening with school students who have problems, keeping them in the system. These educational strategies have also had an impact in the communities as an example of beneficial initiatives that receive great support from the community itself.

The project must provide reliable information through research and information systems that help clarify the child labor situation in DR. In October this year, INTEC will conduct a survey to identify the intervened communities’ perception of child labor. Filing data cards of the beneficiaries also contributes to identifying magnitudes and qualities of the different community situations.

As it will be seen later in the identification of best practices, the project has achieved work in close contact with the government’s educational sector, especially in the attainment of a full education day, which is a national goal of MOE. A school principal said this of the project: “It

completes our school day.” The project also has the support of a group of companies such as the Vicini Group, the Rica Group, *Implementos y Maquinarias*, and *Generadora Felipe*, among others, which work to promote and increase the project’s sustainability.

#### **4.1.2 Midterm perspective regarding scope of project objectives**

From a midterm point of view, it seems that most project objectives will be achieved. It is very likely that the goal number of children to be removed from work and the number of children to be prevented from beginning a job will be reached and probably surpassed. The current retention rate, according to the management information system (MIS) is 85%, when the annual goal set was 80%.

While the project has removed NNAs from child labor, in some places like Dajabón it was observed that there are NNAs who miss attending their spaces twice a week. These days coincide with the market days in the district, which is the main source of income for the community. As explained by the facilitators, these absent children sell food, such as boiled eggs, in the market to the public. The facilitators negotiated with the parents of these NNAs to let them attend the spaces at least three days per week. In one case, a facilitator persuaded the beneficiary’s mother to sell the eggs herself from her house and let the child attend the space every day. This is very positive, but not everyone has the advantage of living close to the marketplace.

The creation and implementation of spaces has been successful; presently, there are 242 EpCs and 48 EpEs. While the project has not yet conducted the annual survey to monitor the school grades of its beneficiaries, the reports submitted by the teachers interviewed in the schools indicate that there is substantial improvement in academic performance, which must reflect in the school grades. The schools visited and parents interviewed report that the leveling of the average students to higher school grades, in line with their ages, has been successful.

An aspect in which the project seems to be falling behind is in the interventions aimed at the parents and the community regarding the delivery of effective information to raise awareness concerning child labor risks.

The project must also speed up once certain problems with vocational training at the EpEs have been resolved through INFOTEP. In most of the EpEs visited, they had delays of more than one month. This is addressed in more depth later.

Another aspect to be examined and which must be programmed if found feasible, is the one related to the training of school teachers through *Instituto Superior de Formación Docente Salomé Ureña* (Salomé Ureña Higher Educational Institute for Teachers or ISFODOSU) and which must be annually budgeted by *Instituto Nacional de Formación y Capacitación del Magisterio* (National Institute of Education and Training for Teachers or INAFOCAM). Until now, the project has provided QL methodology training to teachers of the communities where it operates; however, the finalization plan envisages the training of teachers in general, the cost of which must be assumed by MOE. This has not yet happened.

### **4.1.3 Efficacy of the strategies and actions of the project**

All indicators previously analyzed point out that the project interventions are effective in the prevention/removal of NNAs from exploitive work. An example of this is displayed by I DDI, which currently works with 60 children in neighborhoods of Santo Domingo who were used as mules for the transportation of illegal drugs before project intervention. Today, these children are EpC beneficiaries.

The services offered by the project are considered by almost all key actors interviewed as effective in removing and preventing NNAs from engaging in child labor.

According to the statements of different persons interviewed, the creation of the spaces for growth and for entrepreneurship as basic structures of the project has contributed to improving and increasing the educational opportunities of its beneficiaries. The project has been pinpointed as essentially educational. As analyzed before, the perception that this is a project that fights child labor is limited.

### **4.1.4 Identification of target audience of the project**

The system used by the project to identify its potential beneficiaries is as follows:

1. NNAs that are overage, have quit school, or have learning problems and are at risk of abandoning their studies because they are lagging behind, are identified through school staff members such as teachers, counselors, and principals. These staff members also assist in talking parents into authorizing the participation of their children in the spaces. One of the teachers shared the following: "I talk to the parents so that they let their children attend the spaces. And I insist that it is one way that their children can level into the corresponding grades and can receive a more personal attention than they would in school, with classrooms with over 60 students."
2. Potential beneficiaries who are employed or working without pay in their parents' labor activities are identified through community leaders. "We know who put their children to work in the community. Some of them get a job, but others spend almost half a day's work helping their fathers in farming or livestock work. Those children always stay behind in school. That is for sure, as they have no time to study and school here has a short shift. I go and tell the parents to enroll them in the space because it is free and they will learn things. I can vouch for that myself. Most say yes. But there are others who would hide their children if they could. They have them carrying water all day and taking care of animals. These are few, but these parents refuse because they see their children as work horses."

Enrollment cards are filled out for the beneficiaries without restrictions, such as for those lacking a birth certificate. This card is sent to INTEC, which then verifies the data and sorts them by age to assign them to the right spaces.

In Dajabón there is a case of a young Haitian boy who crosses the border every day and attends an EpE in the morning and school in the afternoon. Haitian children also attend the EpC.

In the Eastern part of the country, there are Dominican and Haitian beneficiaries in the spaces located in the bateyes (sugar workers' locales) without distinction.

Something that was observed during the visits to the spaces is that, above all, most of the beneficiaries in the EpEs are firstborns. And if they are not, they are second-born children in homes where firstborns are currently away. It is important to analyze this fact as it might outline a more accurate profile for NNAs at risk. While in most cases, beneficiaries are overage students or students with learning problems—in beneficiary groups of 24 to 30, usually 6 or less were removed from work—the causes that have led students to repeat grades and be overage for their grades must be analyzed. One factor could be that they need more personalized education, which is not possible to find in the schools today. But it could also be that they are the firstborn children, which many studies and psychologists refer to as “substitute parents”; these children face responsibilities at home that exceed their capacities. They are not paid employees; however, they are engaged in what may be considered dangerous work.

During the visits it was observed that the unpaid domestic work sometimes goes unnoticed in the project as dangerous work. This kind of work usually falls on the female gender. For example, a mother was proudly saying at a focus group session that she had taught her eldest daughter how to cook at age 6 and that the daughter was the one who cooked every day since then. The reason she gave was “she cooks better than I.” This mother was not aware that cooking was dangerous for a six-year-old, and the facilitator had never mentioned this to her. Another example was given in an EpC, where the facilitator admitted that many of its beneficiaries had to do the chores at home in their spare time between space and school, and they had to take care of their younger siblings. “This was normal,” said the facilitator, “not an actual job.” That is, the responsibility given to children—sometimes children younger than age 9—to watch over their younger siblings is not perceived as an excessive responsibility.

One of the usual visitors (not a beneficiary) of an EpC was a 10-year-old girl who in the mornings cleaned her entire house and was responsible for the house chores. Her mother just cooked. The mother said, “She loves to do house chores.”

A father said that his daughter helped with the chores at home while “the boys played.” Both fathers and male children acknowledged doing house chores in the interviews. However, the chores assigned to boys were activities such as making their beds, folding their clothes, doing the dishes occasionally, sweeping the patio, or running errands. The girls' chores were much more numerous, including acting as nannies for their younger siblings. Two mothers admitted in a focus group session that, when they had to go out, their eldest daughters missed school to stay home and watch younger siblings or do chores. If the project does not work on this, the perspective of helping the community to encourage equality of gender fades away. Tradition still allocates house chores to women, unpaid and unrecognized; in the case of female NNAs, it forces them to do dangerous tasks, such as cooking, minding other, younger children even while be young themselves, or carrying water.

In the project, beneficiaries have been adequately selected, but not everyone is there who should be there.

#### **4.1.5 Type of monitoring used and efficacy**

A monitoring plan has been developed and is under the responsibility of INTEC. That plan foresees periodical visits that intend to validate beneficiary registration and attendance statistics. Furthermore, visits are made to solve problems with filling out registration cards (although INTEC developed a thorough and very detailed guide about filling out formats) and the submission of mandatory monthly data in the project.

In turn, the teaching staff monitors the quality of the QL methodology from time to time, and ENTRENA collects the information required about personnel training in that methodology. As observed during the evaluation field visits, the project personnel keeps very good communication with the area coordinators of the agents, who are the ones that supervise the actions carried out in the communities.

Meanwhile, project management is in charge of programming and monitoring activities; there are continuous meetings regarding the sustainability of the project and the finalization plan.

Monitoring and follow-up of project actions is essential for achieving goals. However, it was observed that, with the exception of the INTEC personnel, the others seem to have little or no command in some cases of the logical framework of the project. This must be addressed as a weakness, as the logical framework is a tool to monitor and follow up actions and is not intended for the sole use and management of INTEC personnel.

At the beginning of the cohort, a card is filled out by the local personnel of each agent. This card carries the pertinent labor data, but it must be specified that the project does not have a formal follow-up system for when its beneficiaries abandon the spaces on completion of the cycle or due to desertion. The project can register the retention rate in the case of desertions, but does not actually follow up on its former beneficiaries or graduates.

During summer vacations, the project conducts a camp that is about one month long, when monitoring is permanent and uninterrupted throughout the vacations. The camp is mostly intended to prevent beneficiaries from using their vacations to work. It leaves a few vacation weeks before and after camp. It is worth mentioning that harvest dates are typically in the fall and spring rather than in the summer. During Christmas vacations there are really no formal project activities; however, during that time it is less likely that children will engage in work, as Christmas is traditionally perceived as a holiday season.

Both DevTech and the donor reported being satisfied with the biannual reports submitted by the project to USDOL. Although agents also get together from time to time to discuss and analyze the situations found and possible solutions, it is still necessary to provide biannual reports (the same that are sent to USDOL) to the consortium agents. This way, the consortium could appreciate the general status of achievement of project goals and objectives established within the logical framework and not only with respect to each one of them. Some agents seemed to be unaware of the general status of the project, which may also be explained by the fact that the persons attending the meetings are not always the same and, therefore, they have gaps, as they did not attend the previous ones.

The monitoring system of the project is also satisfactory for the agents in general, although some were of the opinion that it should be monitored more frequently and not only when there is some problem to solve.

#### **4.1.6 Identification of financial strengths**

One of the strengths observed in the project is its financial control. Such financial control covers the payments and expenses of the entire consortium. The financial area keeps the data in good order and at hand at all times. It is also worth mentioning that, given the nature of the information system in this area (described further below as a best practice), the financial staff has good command and understanding of all project activities, an aspect not frequently in other projects, where the financial area is not acquainted with the scopes and motivations of the technical area.

#### **4.1.7 Identification of managerial areas that require improvement for the successful achievement of objectives and goals**

1. According to what the project facilitators, parents, and beneficiaries reported, many of the NNAs attending the spaces don't know how to read and write. This seems to be due to the public school's automatic promotion system, which does not evaluate skills until a certain grade; children in first, second, and third grade pass automatically to the next grade without being assessed. This illiteracy situation, while generalized, was not considered as such in the project. However, the project is facing it without having the necessary tools at hand, such as the proper training in teaching reading and writing and the respective educational material.
2. Most of the managerial personnel has no command or is not acquainted with the logical framework of the project.
3. The self-funded agents' activities report (that is, in the cases where the consortium is not buying their services) is not adequate. It is untimely and delayed, which may cause under-registration in the activities and goals to be reached.
4. While all the project facilitators have been trained in the QL methodology, micro-businesses, and all the other project components, there is still concern for times when personnel faces situations they are not necessarily trained for, such as the literacy teaching they must engage in with some beneficiaries and the solution of conflicts that are beyond their capacities.
5. The agreement between the consortium and INFOTEP is not as clear as it should. When it was signed, it was not sufficiently examined and there are some points that are ambiguous or unclear, which have led to confusion. The recommendations include suggestions in this respect.
6. Some agents have not negotiated locally with MOE the provision of school snacks for all their spaces, although there is a general agreement to that effect. For some of them, this is already being provided; however, as observed, it is informal and irregular. The provision

of snacks to everyone must be formalized. One of the reasons found for deserting the spaces in a rural community in San Juan de la Maguana, for example, was that some parents withdrew their children from the spaces at the beginning because they were not receiving the school snack. Later, it was provided after negotiating with the school. However, until the negotiation took place, some parents expected their children to receive snacks and were disappointed when this did not happen, and they withdrew their children from the spaces. We must not forget that the project works in areas of extreme poverty, where a snack may be the only food NNAs receive in the mornings if they attend the space in the morning shift. It is also worth recalling that an attractive snack, such as rice pudding, is what seems to attract children (and to persuade their parents to let them attend) to other projects' work rooms in Dajabón.

7. The location of the facilities for the spaces is problematic for the consortium agents in many of the communities. For example, during the visits it was observed that there was one facility that was shared (separated by what might have been a blackboard) by two simultaneous spaces. This set-up makes it impossible to work with the QL methodology, as the dynamics require independence of spaces for activities such as sing-alongs and clapping. Other spaces are located in facilities owned by topolitical parties, churches, and even a funeral parlor. While nothing negative has occurred to date, it could happen, for instance, in the facilities of a political party, that during election campaign times the party might need its facilities on a full-time basis or that the spaces might be "sold" by the parties lending the facilities.
8. Shortage of educational materials, such as cardboard paper and crayons, was also observed during the visits (whether due to the supplies being exhausted or not supplied at all). This was confirmed by both the facilitators of the spaces and the NNAs themselves. In the QL methodology, shortage of these materials is questionable. Some NNAs interviewed reported that what they like the least about the spaces is that if they need to use a color, they sometimes need to wait until another child has finished using it. One of them reported that what he liked least about the spaces was "that I have to fight over colors with others." It was also observed that in one of the spaces there were drawings of the Dominican flag with yellow substituting red; it was not a product of the imagination of whoever drew it, but of the lack of the color red. It was noted as well, that the space facilitators sometimes did not clearly know which materials to use for some of the products included in the program. For example, one facilitator was overheard asking another about what would be used to make some puppets, which they needed to use in the next days. When she was told it was with flour, she asked again if the project would supply it or if she had to bring it from her home. It seems it is not unusual that facilitators, and sometimes even the NNAs themselves, have to contribute materials. We need to mention again that the poverty conditions of the project beneficiaries do not allow them contribute educational materials. Another aspect was that in one of the Halcones work books, the binding was coming apart, which irritated the EpC beneficiaries.
9. In some EpEs it was observed that the consumable materials used in vocational training were not being supplied by the agents on time. Fifty percent of this material must be supplied by the agent and the rest by INFOTEP.

10. Another situation in the EpEs is that sometimes, for a confectionary course for instance, INFOTEP does not have enough resources to bring in ovens or refrigerators to keep the materials they need to work with; therefore, the spaces need to turn to the community to borrow an oven and a refrigerator.
11. Many spaces have what they call visitors and listeners, who are actually beneficiaries that are not declared as such because the maximum quota of 30 beneficiaries has been reached. The opposite case was also observed: 30 NNAs registered and a much smaller number was attending. The first situation evidences the lack of more spaces, and the second tells us that some spaces are being underused.
12. INTEC has developed the project's MIS to the beneficiaries' statistics. The part corresponding to the registration of data is ready and was worked on using Access, which offers many management possibilities. However, the data analysis part is incomplete. This means that the system has not completed the part that gives them the data that the project requires automatically, such as rates and other descriptive statistics at any time.
13. Some facilities provided by the communities lack restrooms or are in poor conditions. So NNAs must abandon the spaces to use the services. Some of the toilet facilities that do work in these spaces have been installed for the use of adults. For example, one of the community leaders interviewed showed some concern with respect to NNAs using them as well: "We can pass diseases on to the children."
14. Some of the QLDynamics used are not well received by all the beneficiaries—for example, the welcome circle. Some children said that it was what they like the least at the EpCs. Some facilitators added that sometimes it was difficult to have the children do this. They seem to get tired of the routine, although it may be full of movement and voices. In turn, some beneficiaries of the EpE pointed out that they dislike the kind of songs they sang: "They are for little kids."
15. In Samaná, the project did not foresee anything and there is no EpE. There is a space that is not funded by the project but by Samanenses Ausentes, which does not follow the method of the EpEs. Therefore, an EpE is required here. One of the principals told us that, when cruise ships arrive at the port, a group of young girls from her school make up any excuse and leave the school to go and meet with the tourists in what she believes could be commercial sexual exchanges. That is why an EpE is required.
16. The project does not have an official plan to monitor beneficiaries who have graduated from the spaces. As explained before, this prevents the project from knowing in a systematic manner the academic and vocational performance and the future labor status of the beneficiaries that have completed their time in the spaces.
17. The project has designed a battery of educational material aimed at the NNAs (27 different types of material); however, it has failed to produce material to sensitize other kinds of beneficiaries, such as parents and local authorities.

18. Since the duration of the spaces is not the same as that of school year (it lasts 18 months) there is often a phase lag when beneficiaries change or need to change the school shift. For example, this might mean that if a beneficiary attending the afternoon shift at the space and the morning shift at school is promoted to a higher grade offered only in the afternoon shift, that beneficiary can no longer attend the space even if it has not been completed yet and gets left behind. Maybe the beneficiary can enter another space that operates in the morning; however, the beneficiary has to leave the space where he/she began the cycle, which is not advisable.
19. Given the profile of the project beneficiaries, in most cases there are no protocols or guidelines for the referral of cases that require professional care.
20. As far as it could be observed, the project is not working very hard to identify and benefit youngsters who may be involved in sex exchanges. It is not a population with whom the project may have developed much experience.
21. Upon examining the journal library of the project, it was observed that the journal articles published about the project are few and mostly focused on celebrations concerning the closing of projects rather than on pertinent descriptions about what is being developed.

## 4.2 LESSONS LEARNED

It is more convenient for the project to have the spaces located within a school. It is easier for all beneficiaries.

Unpaid domestic work at home and chores helping parents are not considered as work (even though they are) but rather are considered “obligations that must be taught at an early age so that they learn how to do these chores.” In other words, these kinds of “obligations” are seen by parents as part of a learning or educational process, which in many cases is abusive.

## 4.3 BEST PRACTICES

Every month, finance gathers particulars on the technical activities of the entire project. Based on these figures, associates of the *Consortio* are compensated on a monthly basis for services they contribute to the project; so that, conversely, if the associates do not report their activities, they cannot charge for their services. In this manner, the reporting of their activities becomes obligatory.

First, project beneficiaries do not need to have a birth certificate to gain access to the project or to the EpCs and EpEs. Also, all consortium agents unanimously try their utmost to obtain birth certificates for beneficiaries that lack one. This is important, since obtaining a birth certificate is essential in education as it provides identity. In cases where obtaining a birth certificate is too complicated, the EpC accepts the child without problems. In one EpE where INFOTEP must certify the training based on some identity document, if the birth certificate could not be obtained, the agent is the guarantor of the beneficiary's identity, as an alternate form of identity recognition in writing (quite often there are nicknames or aliases, by which they are commonly known). However, when parents declare them, they use other names and this creates much confusion.

In the Eastern *bateyes*, some facilitators speak both Spanish and Creole in order to meet the language needs of their beneficiaries.

The payment system of the financial area of the consortium pays for the services delivered by each agent every month; however, the system requires a monthly activity report before the payment, based on which payments are calculated. The project activity report is more updated than with other strategies.

## V RESULTS: EFFICIENCY

---

### 5.1 FINDINGS

#### 5.1.1 Cost-efficiency of the project

The payment the consortium makes for the services for each child at an EpC in 2009 ranges on average between US\$8.58 and US\$10.03 per month. The consortium pays an average of US\$22.50 per adolescent who participates in an EpE. These costs could make the project cost-efficient provided the expected final impact is sustained in the long term, as should happen if beneficiaries participating in the project keep education as a priority to reach the capacities and ages necessary to insert themselves in the labor system after leaving the project.

The project evidences a need for greater financial resources. Certain necessary activities previously mentioned, such as training regarding aspects not envisaged by the project, cannot be covered. It is true that they can be obtained through other projects; however, even if the other projects bear most of the costs, the consortium must also contribute funds and, therefore, requires further funds for unforeseen events.

The human resources used by the project seem to be sufficient and vary according to the agents. For instance, some agents have two facilitators per space and others only one. This is up to the agents, and the number of facilitators does not seem to be so important. The incentive that agents offer is low; it must not be compared with a salary as personnel are considered to be voluntary. Space facilitators are mostly high school graduates with no other academic degree. They are supervised by the area coordinators of each agent. These coordinators program and plan the monthly activities with the facilitators. They provide the consumable materials, which are scarce in some communities.

The project has a high production of educational materials for its beneficiaries. It has 27 different publications of these materials.

### 5.2 BEST PRACTICES

Project facilitators are personnel from the same community as the volunteer. They receive small incentives, which in many cases cannot be compared with a salary, but their enthusiasm and dedication to the project make them key in the project.

It was also observed that a strategy adopted by World Vision in Dajabón is to allow parents, especially mothers, to assist facilitators at the EpEs. This is another way for the community to contribute, as well as for the parents to come closer and identify more with the educational needs of their children.

Workbooks like “Peces” (Fish) and “Halcones” (Hawks) are very much mentioned by the NNAs of the spaces as the work they like the most. They are designed to address subjects under a logical and creative line of thought.

The reading book “El Plan de Anita” (Anita’s Book) is quite illustrative for project beneficiaries to become acquainted with their rights and for them to internalize that their priority is education. It was created by *Plan Internacional*.

This page left intentionally blank.

## VI IMPACT

---

### 6.1 FINDINGS

#### 6.1.1 Current apparent impacts of the project by type of beneficiary

Some evidence of apparent impacts have been observed through interviews and visits performed within this evaluation. These impacts have been divided in the following chart by type of beneficiary.

**Table of impacts perceived by types of beneficiaries**

##### **Children and Adolescents:**

- Prevention of school abandonment due to reasons associated with learning problems.
- Literacy of some beneficiaries or improvement of their reading and writing skills. A mother reported, "When my son entered the EpC he could not read or write. He did not know the letters. I do not read very well. And thanks to the EpC now my son reads the paper every day." A teacher explained, "Many of the NNAs in those spaces do not know how to read and write or have many difficulties to do that. To some extent that is why they are behind or overage. And there [at the EpC] they do learn how to read and write. That, we could observe." An 11-year-old beneficiary, in turn, shared, "I was ashamed because I did not know how to read or write, and I pretended to do so. But at the EpC they taught me and now I read anything and I do not need to hide at school so they will not find this out."
- Leveling of grades as a solution to overage. To achieve leveling, the project has worked with a program created by MOE to this effect. An interviewed mother reported, "My daughter was far below the grade she should be for her age. But with what she made at the EpE she managed to be examined and was moved two grades up at school." One of the interviewed beneficiaries shared during one of the visits, "I think that after the work I made at my EpC, this month I can take a test so that I may be moved to a higher grade than the one I am in now."
- Prevention of enrollment in jobs caused by learning difficulties.
- Removal of NNAs enrolled in general child labor.
- Increase of the knowledge that they are entitled to education rights and that they cannot be forced to work. "I am a child and nobody can force me to work and remove me from school."
- Increase of their self-esteem and confidence on their capacity to learn. "Now I am no longer slow or unable to study." "Now I am one of the best in my classroom."
- Learning of artistic expressions. "Here, one is set to paint and make things [craft work]."
- Learning of vocational skills at the EpEs.
- Improved quality of communication between beneficiaries and their families. "Before the EpE, my daughter did not talk with me. What she did was to disregard what I was telling her. Now my daughter is different, she talks to me and she tells me what she does. We are closer."

### **Children and Adolescents (continued)**

- Beneficiaries behavior changes at home and at school. One teacher said, “This boy used to come to school to cause trouble. Now he comes and he has the homework ready and another attitude. He is no longer a trouble seeker.” An EpE beneficiary’s father said, “My daughter attended a private school, and to make her get up and go to school was an issue. She did not study at all. She used to feel sick when she was told she had to go to school and cried a lot. She was afraid of school. I changed her to a public school and sent her to an EpE. Now, this year, she is in the honor roll at school. And the teacher she had at the private school is the same she has at the public school for the grade she is in now. My daughter has become a first-class student. She no longer throws a tantrum not to go to school, but rather goes very happily.”
- Fewer opportunities (less time at their disposal) for the beneficiaries to be compelled to perform routine and forced domestic chores.
- Increase of the beneficiaries’ socialization capacity. “Since I came to the EpC, I have made many new friends.”

### **Parents**

- Less concern about learning problems. “Before, I thought my daughter was a cretin. That she would never learn anything. Now she is really studying. She is even attending a course to make things with stones and I want you to see what she has done.”
- Reappraisal of parents toward their offspring in a positive sense: from shame to pride.
- Less concern regarding possible school abandonment of their offspring.
- Some parents report they currently prioritize their children’s education more than them finding a job.
- The majority pay more attention to their children.
- Some challenge themselves to learn new educational aspects through their children after observing positive changes in them.
- They feel at ease having their children looked after in a safe place, most of all those living in urban areas.

### **Community**

- Closely involved in the problems of its children and adolescents.
- Good involvement with the project. A community leader said, “It is not theirs; it is ours.”
- Residents have better education and developed vocational skills.
- Benefits from other initiatives of the consortium agents in other areas like health, housing, and more from other donors.

## **6.1.2 Apparent current impacts on agents**

- Improvement of strengths to enable teamwork with shared targets and objectives.
- Improvement of the capacity to work with governmental institutions in a harmonious and respectful environment. The government is perceived as an ally of the NGOs.
- Some agents showed they were motivated to seek and develop new projects close to or related to this project in the fight against child labor. (See the IDDI case in “best practices.”)

### **6.1.3 Apparent current impacts at a governmental level and on public policies**

- Helps reduce overage students at schools.
- Teaches literacy to students who, for some reason, had not learned how to read and write. It helps improve reading and writing abilities.
- Works to balance student performance.
- Trained teachers and educational personnel in general from the target communities on educational techniques such as the QL methodology.
- Reduces negative feelings like fear, rage, or indifference in the beneficiary population. “I am no longer afraid of school.”
- Adds vocational skills to the beneficiaries. On a small scale (not comparable with a polytechnic school).
- Contributes to reducing the number of NNAs enrolled in child labor.
- Contributes to preventing NNAs from abandoning school or engaging in child labor.

The Government of DR has received the project educational strategies very willingly. MOE’s openness toward projects that benefit DR public education is evident. The project is perceived as a complement that rests on the needs and lines of action set by the MOE.

### **6.1.4 Emerging aspects and opportunities that the project must take into account to increase its impact and relevance**

Several aspects that can qualify as emergent because they were not contemplated in the project and for which most of the agents have not been trained for include the following: (1) the need to teach NNAs to read and write, as explained above; (2) aggressive behaviors shown by many beneficiaries when they enter the spaces; and (3) numerous abuses, at least verbal, which such beneficiaries have suffered and which have undermined their self-esteem and self-confidence. In many spaces, it was reported that the project was working with NNAs whose parents were drug dealers or were in prison because of drug involvement. NNAs who were victims of incest or rape were identified in other spaces. Children with special needs, such as those with mental retardation, were also identified.

The training project facilitator in skills for teaching reading and writing to beneficiaries is necessary and relevant. Other agencies and donors have projects to train teaching staff to teach reading and writing, as is the case with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), which has been working in a project along this line since 2002. This agency is in the best position to contribute this aspect to the project. They have already developed the experience and educational materials, making it a very good opportunity to cover one of the project’s needs.

Another opportunity the project can take hold of is the experience of ILO-IPEC in raising awareness of community members. They also have materials developed for this purpose. Moreover, the DR office has produced (and continues producing or sponsoring) videos that explain the subject matter issues simply and clearly and which may be perfectly used to raise the awareness of parents and community members. It was previously mentioned that, during the interviews with the parents of project beneficiaries, these parents had already been exposed to some activity aimed at raising awareness concerning the risks of child labor; however, they had no recollection of it. This could indicate that it is necessary to find instruments that may be more attractive, such as using videos and staying away from lectures with broader content that disperse attention and do not achieve the ultimate goal of the intervention.

Concerning the adoption of a beneficiary follow-up plan in the project for those who complete the program, INFOTEP has a follow-up system for their trainees that could be profitable for EpEs. This is where INFOTEP interfaces with the project. Within the already existing system, with special encoding for the project beneficiaries, INFOTEP can offer the results of the trained personnel follow-ups randomly performed from time to time.

It is relevant to point out that some agents as well as MOE personnel posed the need for school children to learn English. Even though it is included in the public educational system curricula, multiple challenges have prevented adequate learning of the language. The observed opportunity consists of the initiative of *Caminantes en Boca Chica* (Travelers in Boca Chica), one of the NGOs subcontracted by CRS. *Caminantes* took advantage of the presence of a North American volunteer in the country and its community. She is currently working in some EpCs in that community, at least in building the foundations for learning English. This volunteer reports—through very simple exercises, like identifying body parts and songs—that she is taking some steps, at least to accustom the beneficiaries’ to hearing English phonetics. This example should serve as a good opportunity for the spaces.

## 6.2 BEST PRACTICES

With funds from the Spanish Cooperation, IDDI currently has a Therapy Center for Children and Youths in the north area of the national district. It is in this area that IDDI has many of its spaces with the consortium and outside the consortium. This center offers therapy care for its beneficiaries and their relatives. Psychological evaluations, counseling, talks, and workshops to stimulate parental education are offered there, in addition to training professionals and personnel involved in the children area.

The personnel of the IDDI spaces refer to this center (which is free) all the cases that need specialized attention, which is very frequent, taking into account the profile of project beneficiaries.

## VII SUSTAINABILITY

---

### 7.1 FINDINGS

#### 7.1.1 Project finalization and sustainability plan

The project includes a finalization and sustainability plan that could be effective. There are three aspects that the project must analyze carefully in the plan. The first one concerns the training of MOE teaching staff, through ISFODOSU, in the QL methodology and other components, with funding from INAFOCAM. The purpose is to disseminate the QL methodology not only to basic education teachers, but to those of higher grades as well. To that effect, INAFOCAM must include these training courses in its annual budget. This has not occurred to date, and there are currently no signs that this will happen.

Another aspect concerns the steps taken to decentralize MOE. By now, MOE is immersed in processes and lines of action, which do not focus on decentralization.

The last aspect to consider is if MOE maintains the implementation of full-time day schooling as an objective. This objective is not included in the Decennial Plan designed by MOE. What MOE is currently implementing as a pilot plan is the sole full-time working day for teachers, which is something completely different. It is a working schedule of 35 hours per week in which the teacher extends the schedule from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. During that time, apart from their regular classes, teachers will have to, among other activities, plan and evaluate their students, devote time to parents, and offer tutoring to students that have somewhat fallen behind.

MOE has no immediate plans concerning the full-time schooling of students. The supposition is that there would be a schedule from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. for regular classes, offering lunch and then, from 2:00 p.m. onwards, activities similar to the ones of the project. Interviewed MOE personnel explained that the process to change the current system to a full-time shift would take some time; in the case of Chile, for example, it took 10 years. At present, two experiences will be carried out as a pilot plan, but these are the only immediate plans in this respect.

#### 7.1.2 Initiatives to incorporate foreign resources to the project

Incorporating resources from outside the project has been an initiative of the project staff more than the consortium in itself. But some actions have taken place as a consortium. An example is the inclusion in the consortium of the *Sur Futuro* organization, which will fund its own spaces following the project model. They will start with two EpCs, one in Najayo and one in Padre de las Casas.

Along this line, another best practice of the consortium is that more than two-thirds of the facilities where the project spaces operate have been provided by the communities. They operate in a community center and, in the East area, there are initiatives of syndicates to provide facilities.

IDDI is one of the leading agents in this respect, which—as already stated—incorporated psychological support and treatment services to the project in the north area of Santo Domingo, where it currently works with the spaces. This support came from Spanish Cooperation and *Caja de Madrid* (Bank of Madrid) for child protection purposes. IDDI itself has opened 29 self-supported spaces in Puerto Plata, in neighborhoods of Santo Domingo, in Monte Plata, and in Bayona (these last two geographical areas, in general, have traditionally had few programmatic interventions). Other agents also have spaces financed by other donors. For instance, *Samanenses Ausentes* self-finances with their own resources some of the spaces in Samaná. *Caminantes en Boca Chica* has managed to obtain funds from the Government and Spanish Cooperation to build, renovate, and properly recondition physical structures, which operate as facilities for labor training. Owing to this aid, these NGO facilities can be recognized by INFOTEP as adequate and accepted facilities to offer labor education.

In many communities, MOE contributes school snacks for the beneficiaries. Furthermore, it has assigned four highly professional and experienced technicians to the central office of the consortium, in addition to the other 26 technicians assigned at the different geographical areas.

Involvement of local authorities and the central government with the project is good, a positive sign that the fight against WFCL has the support of key figures like the Vice President of the Republic, who has shown interest in the matter for years. Likewise, an important number of public servers support the project, among which stand out very qualified secretaries, under-secretaries, and directors with a deep understanding of the issue at stake.

The project benefits from the presence of these governmental professionals, as they not only endorse it, but they have the capacity to offer pertinent feedback regarding the different situations the project may encounter.

### **7.1.3 Challenges and opportunities in the coordination with the government sector**

To date, the coordination with the government sector has been very good, especially with MOE.

Some challenges emerged in the coordination with INFOTEP. Even though the consortium and that institution have signed an agreement, follow-up of this agreement has not been sufficient by both parties, least of all by INFOTEP. In the first place, INFOTEP is an institution for technical professional training, and the project needs for the EpEs are not meant to obtain a professional training in itself, but rather training to build the learning foundations for vocational skills. This differentiation between what one institution offers and what the other needs is evidenced in the number of labor training hours. The project has established about 150 hours for labor training. This period is normally shorter than the one offered by INFOTEP in any of its courses. It is true that some courses are shorter than others; however, this must not be a parameter to select training, but rather to do what the project beneficiaries need or wish. This is why the agreement should be reviewed and unclear aspects should be clarified.

Another challenge faced by the project concerning INFOTEP is negotiating the courses of action of the INFOTEP regional offices. Unnecessary delays were observed in the training in some geographical areas, caused mainly by problems understanding the requested services, as well as a

lack motivation in offering them. It is also worth analyzing that the INFOTEP regional offices are, on occasion, short of human and material resources and it is, therefore, necessary to schedule the delivery of these services well in advance.

Nevertheless, even with the difficulties described, the openness shown by INFOTEP management toward the project has been very positive and fruitful. The services it lends are very important for the EpEs. This makes it easier to search for solutions.

#### **7.1.4 Challenges and opportunities in the coordination with ILO-IPEC**

As seen before, coordination with ILO-IPEC is characterized by good articulation opportunities for the project—for example, being able to use the DR video production that ILO-IPEC already has to raise the awareness of parents and of the community.

Challenges encountered include the coordination between both institutions, which does not seem to be as close as it should be between organizations sharing one donor such as USDOL. Furthermore, despite some differences between the methodological models and approaches (and this is positive, because strategies must have different offers), the projects that both institutions develop a similar, so a closer relationship should be expected to enable the exchange of experiences from both projects and even to coordinate and assign tasks that could benefit them both.

#### **7.1.5 Challenges and opportunities in the coordination with other international and/or multilateral organizations and NGOs**

The project has had very good opportunities to coordinate with other international organizations, such as USAID. Likewise, the project must come into closer contact with the actions UNICEF and its agents are carrying out regarding the prevention and eradication of sexual commerce work among youth.

As has been observed, some NGOs are inserting themselves into the consortium by adopting the spaces as their working methodology because they consider them beneficial. In this respect, multiple opportunities of joint work are observed, maybe not in the purchase of NGO services (although it could occur in the long term), but relationships could be developed exchanging project components to apply in different scenarios.

## **7.2 LESSONS LEARNED**

Even if there may be an agreement with an institution, like the one with INFOTEP, the demand for services must not rest entirely on the written agreement. The project agents need to negotiate with the local authorities of INFOTEP. It is important to build capacities for this type of negotiation within the project. Many local authorities of INFOTEP do not know about the project, so it is necessary to inform them about it and get them involved.

## 7.3 BEST PRACTICES

One of the best practices observed in this project has been the harmonious relation between MOE and the project. Relations between the Government and the NGOs have not always been harmonious and are characterized by marked elements of rivalry. However, in this case, they worked as a team, trying to satisfy the needs of one another. MOE provides the project, in almost 20% of the cases, the facilities for its spaces in schools. It works closely with the project, selecting the potential project beneficiaries. It has provided the project with the program necessary to level students. In some communities, it supplies the project beneficiaries with school snacks. There is excellent communication between the project agents and the school teachers, continuously exchanging guidelines and even material for the supervision of homework. Another practice observed was that some teachers followed up on beneficiaries who completed spaces and kept track of their record within the school system, as was the case in Castillo with the associate *Universidad Católica Nordestana*. MOE has also assigned highly trained personnel to the project.

Another government institution, *Instituto Dominicano de Telecomunicaciones* (the Dominican Telecommunications Institute), contributed a facility as an office, with all communication means available for the area coordination of the project in Dajabón. The arrangement was carried out by the coordinator of the area.

*Caminantes en Boca Chica* carried out a pilot to provide support and follow-up to the beneficiaries who completed the EpE. They selected seven beneficiaries who had taken the confectionery course and contracted them to make confectionery varieties to serve at the parties and special occasions of *Caminantes*. Furthermore, they motivated them to sell their products. According to what the NGO reported, the products prepared by the beneficiaries who completed the EpE were very good and well accepted. This NGO is exploring how to formulate and receive support for a project to help those who complete the EpE to put into practice what they learned through INFOTEP in the spaces.

## VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 8.1 KEY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The first key conclusion and recommendation for the project is given by the evidence that the educational strategy seems to have become an objective more than a means to achieve a target. The target is the eradication of child labor; education is the strategy. However, the project is generally recognized by its contributions to education. To avoid this confusion, the project should further improve its final goal to reach all types of beneficiaries, as well as increase and intensify its actions addressed to the community to make them aware of child labor dangers. To this end it must engage very effective techniques to get this message through to the target audience. This is why the evaluator has suggested that, given the chance, the videos produced by ILO-IPEC should be reviewed and, in case they are appropriate, be used to this end. Producing videos is expensive, which makes it reasonable to take maximum advantage of those productions already available in the country. It is good to remember that watching a video is much more appealing for this population than a talk lasting one or two hours. With the use of videos, it is possible to carry out an analysis or comments session on their content. Working with videos produces more participative and more attractive results at the same time. It is true that to watch videos, the agents must have the necessary electronic devices, but the cost of video players is low and the agents can afford them.
2. The potential beneficiaries are selected by school personnel and community leaders. This voluntary work has been effective, but could be improved by using guidelines to enable inclusion of beneficiaries, mostly female, forced to perform household chores that are dangerous and interfere with their education and development, but go unnoticed by the project as “natural” or “traditional.” Furthermore, this suggestion has a bearing on a component any project must have: gender equality. It is important to point out that educating to prevent restricting women to the domestic environment favors a better development of communities, apart from preventing women from taking the “natural” job or the one for which women are prepared when they are old enough, which is paid domestic help, though these are precisely the jobs being developed.
3. The project contributes to the communities and the country with outstanding educational efforts, but the appeal of the project for the communities must not rest entirely on the eradication of child labor and strengthening of education. The target and strategy are results that could be too abstract for a population whose poverty profiles turn them concrete. The project must have more concrete attractions; therefore, the need for the project to be able to access school snacks in all its spaces is of utmost importance. This aspect must be negotiated with MOE in all those spaces that are nearby schools. Those which are not must look for a solution, such as buying light food elements from a local supplier. Some beneficiaries were withdrawn from the project by their parents due to the lack of snacks in the spaces. Also, in some locations, NNAs do not attend the spaces in order to go to other projects that do provide snacks. A mother in one of the localities suggested giving the children, especially girls, some vitamin dose. It is well known that the DR diet does not promote vegetable consumption, and only recently has become open

to eating more fruits, which contain vitamins. So, the suggestion is justified. The project should weigh this suggestion to ponder its feasibility. This can be contributed through donations, after investigating the ideal dose and the way to administer the vitamins. Something as simple as a vitamin supplement could increase attraction to the project. Aiming to have good nutrition must not be a luxury or a dream.

4. Project facilitators are key elements to achieve the objectives successfully. These voluntary personnel, selected from the same community where the project is being implemented, have at least secondary education and may or may not have technical or professional education. This is not an impediment to act as facilitators. The real obstacles are the contingencies that facilitators find at the spaces, such as NNAs who cannot read or write. The project must be able to afford to train them in user-friendly literacy techniques. USAID offers a good opportunity to talk about the project they have carried out for years in the country. Coordination with this agency is important to access this valuable and necessary resource for the project. Similarly, results also show that facilitators must handle problematic situations every day, such as those NNAs who need another type of special care and services. Evidently, facilitators are not the ones called to solve these problems, but they must be trained to recognize the needs and refer the NNAs to specialized personnel. A good training opportunity is offered by the Therapy Center for Children and Youth of the above-mentioned IDDI, as a best practice. This center can train facilitators about what to do and where to refer or seek help for those cases in their spaces that require it. The last aspect concerning project facilitators is recognizing their voluntary work at all times. If they are paid a salary, their work is no longer voluntary, but there are countless ways to recognize and stimulate these project elements. Agents are advised to elaborate a simple plan to be carried out without too much trouble, so as to schedule activities that may lead to recognition of their importance and, most importantly, an expression of our gratitude. Unrecognized voluntary work has a bad forecast.
5. The existing situation of delays between the project and INFOTEP in vocational training at the EpEs has a simple solution, especially given the importance that this learning entails for the beneficiaries. The first thing is to review the agreement. The following is recommended to this effect:
  - a. Establish clearly that the final objective of the training that INFOTEP will offer does not seek to provide professional training to the beneficiaries of the spaces, but to initiate the preparation of vocational learning.
  - b. This means that the hours of project duration should not be very extensive, and that the availability should be 150 hours (the agreement stipulates 450 hours for all the EpE life span, without specifying that only 150 hours are required for job training); therefore, INFOTEP training must be accommodating to this time load and to the final objective already established.
  - c. INFOTEP should contribute 50% of the consumables, and the consortium agents should contribute the remaining 50%.

- d. INFOTEP should supply the light tools, and the community and the agents should supply the heavy ones.
- e. INFOTEP should cover the trainers' transportation expenses.
- f. INFOTEP should include the beneficiaries of the EpE in its graduate follow-up system and should share regular reports of these follow-ups with the consortium.

Other recommendations on this same line consist of stimulating the agents so that they may identify beforehand trainers already coded and certified by INFOTEP in different vocational areas in their work communities. Another recommendation is to promote the achievement of certification from INFOTEP among the trained personnel of the community. This can save a valuable amount of time for INFOTEP when looking for trainers available in the area. Agents must also look for solutions regarding heavy work tools. The communities themselves are the best resources for this, such as looking for a stove with oven (which can also be donated by the consortium to the community).

## **8.2 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Relevance**

1. The project has to coordinate with UNICEF and their associates the important task of eradicating commercial sexual exploitation of children. This type of WFCL is the least worked on by the project; therefore, with good coordination, the necessary experience to perform it could be acquired. The project could also take advantage from that association of the marked elements of the NNA rights that a agency has and apply them within the project.
2. It is necessary that the project engages in dialogues with agents responsible for work rooms that are interfering with their beneficiaries, as the case is with Dajabón.

### **Effectiveness**

1. The logical framework of the project must always be visible to the personnel. It is recommended that it be printed on poster-type copies to hang in visible places so that all the personnel may see them and keep them in mind.
2. At least as a pilot, it is necessary to start creating a follow-up plan for the project graduates. In the case of the EpEs, it could be easier if they are inserted in the already existing system of the INFOTEP, but in the case of the EpC it is urgent to have it.
3. The consortium agents with self-funded spaces must understand that the timely submission of their activities report is important. Even though the consortium is not buying their services, they have an agreement whereby they have a responsibility to report to the consortium.

4. The number of spaces in schools must be increased, as it gives many advantages to the project, both for beneficiaries' access and for safety issues, and proximity to the school snack, which might be the first meal of the day for poor children.
5. The same premises should not be shared by two simultaneous spaces. Interference denaturalizes the work carried out in the spaces.
6. Agents should understand that, given the methodology used in the spaces, consumables must never be lacking. The same goes for consumables for vocational trainings.
7. The project MIS must be finished so that it may offer updated data at any moment required and without great trouble. Monitoring and follow-up actions depend on it.
8. It is recommended that ENTRENA and the consortium revise their daily routine dynamics and their contents. Dynamics, when daily, are evidently routines and lose that necessary element of interaction when they are needed.
9. The project must sponsor the opening of EpEs in Samaná. The current structure is undefined and is not part of the project. Opening that type of space in a tourist locality is fundamental.
10. A solution must be found to the phase lags that occur when there are shift changes in school years affecting so that beneficiaries can remain in their spaces over time.

## **Efficacy**

1. The project should find a way to better inform its agents about the general progress of the project. Agents must be aware of the project course. This is why regular internal reports are recommended.

## **Sustainability**

1. The project must have access to greater financial resources to be able to face contingencies, as well as to include activities that may enable improvement and scope of objectives. Agents do it individually, but it is recommended that the consortium carries it out as a group.
2. With the results obtained in this assessment, it is suggested that the project make a feasibility exercise with the project finalization plan that analyzes the objectives of training the school teaching staff of MOE in the QL methodology, in the centralization processes, and in the implementation of full-time schooling. Halfway through the project, there is no clear forecast of whether it is possible to comply with those objectives.
3. The consortium must strive to improve its capacity to acquire funds considering the opportunities existing in the country. To this effect, it must seek information about all initiatives that can be helpful for its program tasks and negotiate with the agents its possible use or exchanges.

4. It must work on a better public image. A project like this one must be outstanding before the citizens; therefore, it is suggested that it analyze more massive dissemination possibilities.
5. Finally, the project must provide greater support to those agents who, for one reason or another, are not at the same level as the rest. Likewise, those agents must accept follow-up by the project. It is not expected that all agents and subcontractors perform at the same level, but there must be a minimum common denominator among all the agents so that no great differences are perceived among them.

This page left intentionally blank.

---

# ANNEXES

---

This page left intentionally blank.

# ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

---

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

for the

### Independent Midterm Evaluation of

### Combating Child Labor Through Education II Dominican Republic

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-16573-07-75
Financing Agency: Grantee Organization:	U.S. Department of Labor DevTech Systems Inc., in association with Acción para la Educación Básica (EDUCA) and Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC)
Dates of Project Implementation:	September 30, 2007 to February 28, 2011
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Midterm Evaluation
Evaluation Field Work Dates:	April 27 to May 8, 2009
Preparation Date of TOR:	March 19, 2009
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US\$4,979,106
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), a n a gency of t he U .S. D epartment of L abor (USDOL). OCFT a ctivities inc lude re search on international c hild labor; supporting U.S. government policy on i nternational c hild labor; a dministering and ove rseeing cooperative agreements w ith organizations working to eliminate child labor a round the w orld; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, t he U .S. C ongress ha s a ppropriated ove r \$72 0 million to USDOL f or e fforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to s upport technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical c ooperation projects f unded by U SDOL r ange f rom t argeted a ction programs i n specific s ectors of w ork t o m ore comprehensive pr ograms t hat s upport n ational e fforts t o eliminate t he w orst forms o f c hild labor as de fined by I LO C onvention 182. U SDOL-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:<sup>1</sup>

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

Since 1995, the U.S. 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 exploitive 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2007, the U.S. 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 exploitative 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 under the minimum age for employment who are engaged in the worst forms of child labor.<sup>2</sup> In the Dominican Republic, most work performed by children is in the informal sector, as well as agriculture and services.

In urban areas, children work in markets, garbage dumps, repair shops, and on the streets.<sup>3</sup> They perform activities such as washing cars, shining shoes, street sales, and carrying heavy loads.<sup>4</sup> Many urban child workers are migrants from other regions.<sup>5</sup> In rural areas, children work mostly in agriculture and services.<sup>6</sup> Children also work as domestic servants. Short school days and a poor educational system contribute to children working.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> ILO-IPEC, “Latin America and Caribbean,” Region Description. <http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Regionsandcountries/LatinAmericaandCaribbean/lang--en/index.htm>

<sup>3</sup> USDOL, “2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor.” <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/PDF/2007OCFTreport.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

Trafficking in persons and commercial sexual exploitation of children are also serious problems, and international organizations estimate that 2,000 Haitian children are trafficked to the Dominican Republic each year to work in the streets, agriculture, or commercial sexual exploitation.<sup>8</sup>

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in the Dominican Republic, having devoted over 16.4 million US dollars since 1998 to combat child labor in the country.<sup>9</sup> USDOL has also provided over 27.2 million US dollars to regional Central American initiatives which included the Dominican Republic. As a result of these initiatives, thousands of children have been prevented and withdrawn from exploitive child labor. Major initiatives funded by USDOL include a USD 2.7 million 39-month ILO-IPEC project to support the Government's Timebound Program to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor in the Dominican Republic. The project began in 2006 and aims to withdraw 2,900 children and prevent 2,200 children from exploitive labor. In August 2007, DevTech Systems, Inc. completed a 4-year USD 3 million project that withdrew 3,771 children from exploitive child labor and prevented 1,803 children from entering the worst forms of child labor. Regional projects operating in the Dominican Republic and other Central American countries include a USD 8.8 million regional project implemented by ILO-IPEC that seeks to combat commercial sexual exploitation through a variety of activities including capacity building and legal reform. The project aims to withdraw 713 children and prevent 657 children from commercial sexual exploitation in the region. USDOL also supported a 4-year USD 5.7 million Child Labor Education Initiative regional project that ended in March 2009 and worked to strengthen the Government and civil society's capacity to combat child labor through education, and withdrew or prevented 4,105 children from exploitive child labor.

The Government of the Dominican Republic is actively involved in these and other initiatives to combat child labor. The Government has ratified ILO Convention 182 and the Minimum Age Convention 138,<sup>10</sup> and the country has passed legislation mandating the legal minimum age for employment at 14, limiting working hours for youth under 16, prohibiting youth under 18 from dangerous work, and prohibiting forced labor. The country has also passed legislation to combat trafficking in persons, including children, and child pornography.<sup>11</sup>

The Secretary of Labor (SET), in coordination with the National Council for Children and Adolescents (CONANI), is responsible for protecting children against labor exploitation. CONANI is supposed to receive a minimum of two percent of the national budget; however, this is not being met. According to the US State Department, the Government has experienced difficulties regulating the informal sector.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> USDOL, "2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor." <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/PDF/2007OCFTreport.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> USDOL, "Project Status – The Americas." <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/project-americas.htm>

<sup>10</sup> ILO-IPEC, "Dominican Republic: Child Labour Data Country Brief."

[http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do;jsessionid=0a038009cebc093a95745bd479ca905ed064cd1155e.hkzFngTDp6WImQuUaNaKbND3IN4K-xaIah8S-xyIn3uKmAiN-AnwbQbxaNvzaAmI-huKa30xgx95fjWTa3eIpkzFngTDp6WImQuXahuPbx4RbN8Sc2b48OX3b4Dtgj15eMbyknvrkLOIQzNp65In0\\_\\_?productId=7796](http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do;jsessionid=0a038009cebc093a95745bd479ca905ed064cd1155e.hkzFngTDp6WImQuUaNaKbND3IN4K-xaIah8S-xyIn3uKmAiN-AnwbQbxaNvzaAmI-huKa30xgx95fjWTa3eIpkzFngTDp6WImQuXahuPbx4RbN8Sc2b48OX3b4Dtgj15eMbyknvrkLOIQzNp65In0__?productId=7796)

<sup>11</sup> USDOL, "2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor."

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

The Government has a National Plan to Eradicate the Worst Forms of Child Labor (2006-2016) and an Action Plan for the Eradication of Abuse and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls, and Adolescents. The National Steering Committee against Child Labor has been creating municipal and provincial committees around the country to develop strategies to combat child labor on a local level. The Government has also established a monetary transfer program for extremely poor families, with the stipulation that their children do not work and are enrolled in school; furthermore, the country's Agricultural Bank has included a clause in its loan agreements prohibiting recipients from using child laborers and requiring guarantees that recipients send their children to school. To combat trafficking, the Prevention Unit of the Department of Alien Smuggling and Trafficking in Persons, which collaborates with the Ministries of Labor and Education, conducts anti-trafficking seminars at schools across the country and has reached more than 5,000 students.<sup>13</sup>

In addition to participating in USDOL-funded initiatives implemented by ILO-IPEC and other partners, the Government of the Dominican Republic participated in a ILO-IPEC regional project funded by the Government of Spain, a total USD 5.6 million, to eradicate child labor throughout Latin America.

## **Combating Child Labor Through Education II Dominican Republic**

On September 30, 2007, DevTech Systems, in association with *Acción para la Educación Básica* (EDUCA) and *Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo* (INTEC) received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth \$4,979,106 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in the Dominican Republic, 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. This project was designed to build upon a previous child labor Education Initiative project that developed an innovative and well-received school enrichment program, *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growth). DevTech Systems, EDUCA, and INTEC were awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, this project targets 4,250 children for withdrawal and 4,250 children for prevention from exploitative child labor. Specifically, the project targets children ages 6-14 and youth ages 14-17 who are involved in exploitative labor. Priority sectors/areas include: (1) agriculture (on the Haitian border, in the South, East and Northeast "Cibao"); (2) urban informal, domestic and illicit work (in San Francisco de Macoris, Santo Domingo, Santiago/Puerto Plata, San Pedro de Macoris); and (3) illicit activities in tourist and beach areas (Samana, Las Terrenas, Boca Chica, and Eastern region) including trafficking, drug sales and commercial sexual exploitation.

The goal of the project is to contribute to the elimination of exploitative child labor in the Dominican Republic. The project's objectives are to:

---

<sup>13</sup> USDOL, "2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor."

- Withdraw or prevent children from involvement in exploitative child labor through the provision of direct education and training services;
- Strengthen child labor policies, national institutions, and education systems to reduce hazardous child labor and increase school attendance for children working in exploitative conditions;
- Raise awareness of the importance of education for children and mobilize actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
- Support reliable research and data collection on child labor;
- Ensure long-term sustainability of these efforts;
- Encourage public-private sector relationships; and
- Promote corporate social responsibility and codes of conduct certifying child-free labor.

## **II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION**

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The Combating Child Labor through Education II Dominican Republic project went into implementation in September 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 DevTech Systems, EDUCA, and INTEC. All activities that have been implemented from project launch to one month prior to 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 is in accordance with the proposed timeline in the workplan and PMP, identify the challenges encountered in doing so, and make recommendations for improvement;
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 the Dominican Republic and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and DevTech Systems/EDUCA/INTEC, 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, DevTech Systems/EDUCA/INTEC, and other project stakeholders, an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. USDOL/OCFT and DevTech Systems/EDUCA/INTEC management 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 Grantee, the Government of the Dominican Republic 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 US DOL. 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 project's main strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? Please assess the relevance of these strategies.
3. 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?
4. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works?
5. How has the project design fit within existing initiatives, both by the government and other organizations, to combat child labor?
6. Please assess the relevance of the project's criteria for selecting action program regions and sectors and subsequently project beneficiaries.
7. 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. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?
2. At midterm, is the project on track in terms of meeting its targets/objectives? If not, what seem to be the factors contributing to delays and how far behind are they in terms of target numbers and objectives?
3. Assess the effectiveness of the "direct action" interventions, including the education interventions provided to children (i.e., building upon the existing *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growth, or "EpCs"), implementing additional EpCs, implementing the new *Espacios para Emprender* (Spaces for Entrepreneurs, or EpEs) program for adolescents,

and providing resources and education materials for children and adolescents). Did the provision of these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/trafficking and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs? Please pay particular attention to the EpE programs since they are newly designed in this project and have not yet been evaluated.

4. Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children *prevented* and *withdrawn* from exploitive labor/trafficking.
5. Assess the effectiveness of the specific models (i.e. *Espacios para Crecer*, or Spaces for Growth, and *Espacios para Emprender*, or Spaces for Entrepreneurship) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of exploitive child labor.
6. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (i.e. agriculture; urban informal, domestic and illicit work; and illicit activities in tourist and beach areas, including trafficking, street sales, and commercial sexual exploitation)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the *worst* forms of child labor in the country?
7. Are there any sector-specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?
8. 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?
9. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial (controls), of this project?
10. What management areas, including technical and financial, need to be improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives?
11. How has working with a large number of subcontractors assisted the project in meeting its objectives and how has it created challenges?
12. Since children without birth certificates or other documentation in the Dominican Republic may be precluded from receiving some governmental benefits, such as access to education past the 6th grade, how has the project worked to ensure that all children and adolescents are equally eligible for receiving services the project offers, including vocational training through INFOTEP (the national vocational training center)?
13. The project design is based on using subcontractors that have an ongoing presence in the communities to deliver educational services. They are contracted to meet a certain level of quality and educational attendance in the EpCs and EpEs. Within these requirements are there specific qualifications for the facilitators? Are these met? If yes, what are some

examples of how this was successfully achieved? If not, what recommendations can be made?

14. Are the subcontractor teams responsible for coordination of the EpCs effective? If yes, what are some of the success factors? If not, what are some recommendations?
15. What are some examples of effective data collection systems that might be replicated?
16. What is the status of the relationships or synergies between EpC/EpE and schools? What are some lessons learned? How can this be improved if deemed necessary?
17. Does the evaluator have recommendations for the strengthening of the EpE program?
18. Is the SEE support effective? If yes, what are some of the emerging good practices? If not, how can the SEE improve or upgrade its support? Are there ways that the SET can better support the project? How could other government and private sector entities better support the project?

### **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 systems designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?

### **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?

### **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 successes in initiating and maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?
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 Ministries of Labor, Education, 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?
7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations?
8. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?
9. 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/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children ([http://www.unicef.org/media/media\\_tools\\_guidelines.html](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 be made for the different actors involved and activities conducted and the progress of implementation in each locality.

#### **B. Midterm 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 Julia Hasbún Martínez. She will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with Macro and the project staff; assigning the tasks of the national consultant for the field work; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; a 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.

Several guides will be created to get information from each type of informant.

### 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 and adolescents withdrawn and/or prevented and their parents, as well as former beneficiaries of Project.)
- 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 a selection of project sites. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted CL sectors. 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. Those interviews will be arranged and held with the help of the Project's staff; other interviews or qualitative techniques will be decided on by the evaluator in the field in order to collect data without any help from the Project.

Several qualitative techniques will be conducted by the evaluator, such as one-on-one interviews, group interviews (with less than six interviewees), and focus group discussions (FGDs) (with more than 6 interviewees).

For child beneficiaries, only one-on-one interviews will be conducted, to avoid the problem of children potentially repeating what other respondents may say. With adolescents and parents, any of the previously described techniques will be used, and the evaluator will decide which technique is appropriate given the circumstances. With interviews arranged by project staff and partners, these three types of techniques will be used; any other informants will be reached through one-on-one interviews.

## **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 not met 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 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 their 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.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>	<b>Proposed Date(s)</b>
Phone interview with DOL and Grantee Staff/Headquarters	Macro, DOL, Grantee, Evaluator	March
Desk Review	Evaluator	March to April
Question Matrix and Instruments due to Macro/DOL	Evaluator	April 10
Finalize TOR and submit to Grantee and DOL	DOL/Macro/Evaluator	April 20
International Travel		April 27
Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders	Evaluator	April 28-29
Field Site Visits	Evaluator	April 30 to May 5
National Stakeholder Meeting		May 7
International Travel		May 8
Post-evaluation debrief call with DOL		May 11
Draft report to Macro for QC review	Evaluator	May 25
Draft report to DOL & Grantee for 48 hour review	Macro	May 27
Draft report released to stakeholders	Macro	June 1
Comments due to Macro	DOL/Grantee & Stakeholders	June 12
Report revised and sent to Macro	Evaluator	June 25
Revised report sent to DOL	Macro	June 29
Final approval of report	DOL	July 6
Finalization & distribution of report	Macro	July 20

## **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 **May 25, 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 **June 25, 2009**, as indicated in the above timetable. **All reports including drafts will be written in Spanish. A final version of the report will be translated into English.**

## **V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT**

Macro International, Inc. has contracted with Julia Hasbún Martínez to conduct this evaluation. Ms. Hasbún Martínez has 12 years of experience working as an external consultant in evaluation and research for health care agencies and NGOs in Dominican Republic and Latin America. She holds a licenciatura, or a advanced degree, in educational psychology from the Universidad Nacional Pedro Henríquez Ureña in Santo Domingo and has recently consulted on several projects for organizations such as UNICEF, Family Health International, and Population Services International, conducting qualitative and quantitative studies on topics such as HIV/AIDS/STIs, reproductive health, drug use, human rights, and gender issues. She is fluent in Spanish and English. Ms. Hasbún Martínez will work with OCFT, Macro, and relevant DevTech Systems/EDUCA/INTEC staff to coordinate the evaluation of 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 Fernando Ogando, the project's field contact official in Santo Domingo (fogando@devtechsys.com and (809) 682-1616) to initiate contact with field staff. The primary points of contact for the project in the United States is Tonya Gianonni (tgianonni@devtechsys.com or (703) 312 6038).

## **ANNEX B: GUIDES USED DURING FIELDWORK**

---

Guides 1. and 2.	For Project personnel and agents .....	B-2
Guide 3a.	Personnel of the Ministry of Education .....	B-6
Guide 3b.	Personnel of the Ministry of Labor .....	B-8
Guide 3c.	ILO-IPEC personnel .....	B-10
Guide 4.	Local personnel .....	B-12
Guide 5.	Community Leaders .....	B-15
Guide 6.	Beneficiaries' Parents .....	B-18
Guide 7.	Children beneficiaries of the Project .....	B-20
Guide 8.	Adolescent beneficiaries and former beneficiaries of the Project .....	B-21
Guide 9.	Multinationals .....	B-23

## **Guide 1. and 2. Project personnel and agents**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. What are your responsibilities within the Project?
2. Besides these responsibilities, do you have any other, even if they do not belong to you?
3. Have the assumptions and realities on which the Project was based on at the beginning changed or are they still the same? Identify what is the same and what has changed.
4. What are the main Project strategies designed to prevent child labor and traffic? Why are those strategies appropriate?
5. What would you say are the obstacles and threats that the Project must face to eradicate child labor?
6. What has the Project done to face those challenges? Have those actions been effective? Why?
7. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
8. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
9. Describe the criteria used to select the Project area of action, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries.
10. Could you identify what other types of initiative and/or methodology should be included in the Project?
11. Do you think that the Project design simplifies the achievement of the five proposed objectives? What objectives do you think the Project facilitates more? What objectives do you think the Project facilitates less? Why?
12. At this midterm point of the Project, do you think the final objectives and goals will be achieved? What objectives or goals do you think are the most difficult to achieve? How far are they from achieving the goals? What are the factors that make it difficult to achieve those objectives or goals?
13. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why do you think EpCs have or have not been effective? Why do you think EpEs have or have not been effective?

14. Creating EpEs has been the newest experience within the Project. What do you think is achieved by creating and implementing these new spaces?
15. Comparing EpC and EpE, would you say that the effectiveness of their strategy is the same or different? Why?
16. What are the things EpCs contribute that EpEs do not? What are the things EpEs contribute that EpCs do not?
17. Which one of the two types of spaces is easier to implement? Why?
18. With regard to the needs of the population to be intervened by the Project, do you think the Project responds to all or most of those needs or only to some? Discriminate by EpC and EpE.
19. How would you say the EpCs contribute to increase educational opportunities, community sense of ownership, community development and awareness about child labor dangers?
20. How would you say the EpEs contribute to increase educational opportunities, community sense of ownership, community development and awareness about child labor dangers?
21. Would you say the Project has been able to accurately identify children and adolescents at risk or already enrolled in child work in agriculture, domestic help, drug trafficking and dealing, illicit activities at tourist beaches of the country and sexual commerce?
22. Can children and adolescents lacking a birth certificate access the EpC and EpE Project? What proportion? What are the restrictions?
23. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
24. Could you share a lesson learned, in general or by sector, about the types of Project effectiveness?
25. Is the Project monitoring system easy to implement? Why?
26. Do you think the Project monitoring system is efficient and responds to the required information needs? Why?
27. Is the beneficiaries' labor status monitored during holidays and after leaving school?
28. What would you say are the Project managerial strengths (both the technical and the financial aspects) and why? Provide examples. According to your perception, what aspects, technical as well as financial, must be improved to guarantee a better achievement of the Project objectives and goals? Why?

29. Do you think this Project is cost-efficient based on the range of activities and the direct and long term impact it seeks to achieve? Why?
30. Do you think the financial and human resources of the Project are sufficient or appropriate to achieve the results it seeks?
31. What other alternatives are there to improve these resources?
32. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
33. What has the influence and impact of the Project been (if any) on the organizations working to eradicate child labor and traffic? Provide examples.
34. What do you think has been the impact of the Project on the government sector, mainly referred to education and child labor prevention? Provide examples.
35. How would you say the Project educational component has been received by the communities and the Government? Is it perceived, for instance, as something they themselves could implement or replicate in the future?
36. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?
37. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
38. At this midterm point of the Project, could you point out any good practice that could be replicated in other areas or that could contribute with innovative solutions to the current state of the problem? Which?
39. Does the Project have a Finalization and Sustainability Plan for when it is completed? Do you think that plan will be feasible and efficient?
40. How successful has the Project been to gain access to financial funds other than the ones of the Project itself? What have those experiences been?
41. Do you think there are good forecasts for self-sustainable funds? Why?
42. What have been the main challenges and achievements in initiating and maintaining financial support associations with other projects or funds of the United States Department of Labor?
43. Please, briefly describe the involvement of the local authorities and Central Government with the Project. What benefits do you perceive from this involvement to eradicate child labor and traffic? What aspects should be reinforced or improved?

44. What do you think the main challenges and achievements have been to initiate and maintain coordination with the governmental sector, such as the Labor and Education Departments and other organizations in this Project?
45. What do you think the main challenges and opportunities have been to initiate and maintain coordination with ILO-IPEC in this Project?
46. What do you think the main challenges and opportunities have been to initiate and maintain coordination with other international and/or multilateral organizations in this Project?
47. What do you think the main challenges and opportunities have been to initiate and maintain coordination with NGOs and OBCs in this Project?
48. What steps do you think should be taken to achieve and promote the sustainability of the Project?
49. What aspects would you point out as strengths in the Project association?
50. What aspects do you think should be improved in the association and coordination of the Project?

### **Guide 3a. Personnel of the Ministry of Education**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you think that the assumptions and realities on which the Project was based on at the beginning are still the same or something has changed? Identify what is the same and what has changed.
2. What are the main Project strategies designed to prevent child labor and traffic? Why are those strategies appropriate?
3. What would you say are the obstacles and threats that the Project must face to eradicate child labor?
4. What has the Project done to face those challenges? Have those actions been effective? Why?
5. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
6. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
7. Describe the criteria used to select the Project area of action, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries.
8. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
9. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why do you think EpCs have or have not been effective? Why do you think EpEs have or have not been effective?
10. Creating EpEs has been the newest experience within the Project. What do you think is achieved by creating and implementing these new spaces?
11. What are the things EpCs contribute that EpEs do not? What are the things EpEs contribute that EpCs do not?
12. Which one of the two types of spaces is easier to implement? Why?
13. Do you know if children and adolescents lacking a birth certificate can access the EpC and EpE Project? What proportion? What are the restrictions?
14. What do you think about this? Why?

15. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
16. Have you had access to the Project monitoring system? What is your opinion?
17. Do you think the Project monitoring system is efficient and responds to the required information needs? Why?
18. Do you think this Project is cost-efficient based on the range of activities and the direct and long term impact it seeks to achieve? Why?
19. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
20. What do you think has been the impact of the Project on the government sector, mainly referred to education and child labor prevention? Provide examples.
21. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?
22. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
23. At this midterm point of the Project, could you point out any good practice that could be replicated in other areas or that could contribute with innovative solutions to the current state of the problem? Which?
24. Please, briefly describe the involvement of the local authorities and Central Government with the Project. What benefits do you perceive from this involvement to eradicate child labor and traffic? What aspects should be reinforced or improved?
25. What do you think the main Project challenges and opportunities have been in initiating and maintaining coordination actions with you and the SEE?

### **Guide 3b. Personnel of the Ministry of Labor**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you think that the assumptions and realities on which the Project was based on at the beginning are still the same or something has changed? Identify what is the same and what has changed.
2. What are the main Project strategies designed to prevent child labor and traffic? Why are those strategies appropriate?
3. What would you say are the obstacles and threats that the Project must face to eradicate child labor?
4. What has the Project done to face those challenges? Have those actions been effective? Why?
5. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
6. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
7. Describe the criteria used to select the Project area of action, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries.
8. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
9. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic?
10. What do you think about this? Why?
11. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
12. Have you had access to the Project monitoring system? What is your opinion?
13. Do you think the Project monitoring system is efficient and responds to the required information needs? Why?
14. Do you think this Project is cost-efficient based on the range of activities and the direct and long term impact it seeks to achieve? Why?

15. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
16. What do you think has been the impact of the Project on the government sector, mainly referred to education and child labor prevention? Provide examples.
17. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?
18. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
19. At this midterm point of the Project, could you point out any good practice that could be replicated in other areas or that could contribute with innovative solutions to the current state of the problem? Which?
20. Please, briefly describe the involvement of the local authorities and Central Government with the Project. What benefits do you perceive from this involvement to eradicate child labor and traffic? What aspects should be reinforced or improved?
21. What do you think the main Project challenges and opportunities have been in initiating and maintaining coordination actions with you and the SET?

### **Guide 3c. ILO-IPEC personnel**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you think that the assumptions and realities on which the Project was based on at the beginning are still the same or something has changed? Identify what is the same and what has changed.
2. What are the main Project strategies designed to prevent child labor and traffic? Why are those strategies appropriate?
3. What would you say are the obstacles and threats that the Project must face to eradicate child labor?
4. What has the Project done to face those challenges? Have those actions been effective? Why?
5. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
6. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
7. Describe the criteria used to select the Project area of action, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries.
8. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
9. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why do you think EpCs have or have not been effective? Why do you think EpEs have or have not been effective?
10. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
11. Have you had access to the Project monitoring system? What is your opinion?
12. Do you think the Project monitoring system is efficient and responds to the required information needs? Why?
13. Do you think this Project is cost-efficient based on the range of activities and the direct and long term impact it seeks to achieve? Why?

14. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
15. What has the influence and impact of the Project been (if any) on the organizations working to eradicate child labor and traffic? Provide examples.
16. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?
17. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
18. What do you think the main Project challenges and opportunities have been in initiating and maintaining coordination actions with ILO-IPEC?

#### **Guide 4. Local personnel**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. What is the role you play in the existing coordination between the community and this Project?
2. What are the factors you would say facilitated your participation?
3. Have the assumptions and realities on which the Project was based on at the beginning changed or are they still the same? Identify what is the same and what has changed.
4. What are the main Project strategies designed to prevent child labor and traffic? Why are those strategies appropriate?
5. What would you say are the obstacles and threats that the Project must face to eradicate child labor?
6. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
7. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
8. Describe the criteria used to select the Project area of action, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries.
9. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
10. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why do you think EpCs have or have not been effective? Why do you think EpEs have or have not been effective?
11. Creating EpEs has been the newest experience within the Project. What do you think is achieved by creating and implementing these new spaces?
12. What are the things EpCs contribute that EpEs do not? What are the things EpEs contribute that EpCs do not?
13. With regard to the needs of the population to be intervened by the Project, do you think the Project responds to all or most of those needs or only to some? Discriminate by EpC and EpE.

14. How would you say the EpCs contribute to increase educational opportunities, community sense of ownership, community development and awareness about child labor dangers?
15. How would you say the EpEs contribute to increase educational opportunities, community sense of ownership, community development and awareness about child labor dangers?
16. Would you say the Project has been able to accurately identify children and adolescents at risk or already enrolled in child work in agriculture, domestic help, drug trafficking and dealing, illicit activities at tourist beaches of the country and sexual commerce?
17. Can children and adolescents lacking a birth certificate access the EpC and EpE Project? What proportion? What are the restrictions?
18. What do you think about this? Why?
19. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
20. Could you share a lesson learned, in general or by sector, about the types of Project effectiveness?
21. Do you think the financial and human resources of the Project are sufficient or appropriate to achieve the results it seeks?
22. What other alternatives are there to improve these resources?
23. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
24. (If it does not come out spontaneously) Have the Project beneficiaries' school marks changed, are they the same or have they become worse? Ask to show cases in the mark records.
25. Comparing the Project beneficiaries with those children and adolescents who are not in the Project, who have a better school performance? Why?
26. What do you think of the INFOTEP courses offered for the EpEs? Please provide details.
27. What are these INFOTEP courses lacking? Why?
28. What do you think has been the impact of the Project on the government sector, mainly referred to education and child labor prevention? Provide examples.

29. How would you say the Project educational component has been received by the communities and the Government? Is it perceived, for instance, as something they themselves could implement or replicate in the future?
30. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?
31. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
32. At this midterm point of the Project, could you point out any good practice that could be replicated in other areas or that could contribute with innovative solutions to the current state of the problem? Which?
33. Please, briefly describe the involvement of the local authorities and Central Government with the Project. What benefits do you perceive from this involvement to eradicate child labor and traffic? What aspects should be reinforced or improved?

## **Guide 5. Community Leaders**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you know the Project that is being carried out in your community, Spaces to Grow and Spaces for Entrepreneurship?
2. Have you had any active participation in this Project? Which?
3. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
4. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
5. Do you know how the place and children and adolescents who participate in this Project are selected? How?
6. Do you know if a child or adolescent lacking a birth certificate can access as Project beneficiary? What do you think about this?
7. Do you think the criteria to select the beneficiaries are correct or not? Why?
8. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
9. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why do you think EpCs have or have not been effective? Why do you think EpEs have or have not been effective?
10. With regard to the needs of the population to be intervened by the Project, do you think the Project responds to all or most of those needs or only to some?
11. How would you say that the EpCs and EpEs contribute to increase educational opportunities, community sense of ownership, community development and awareness about child labor dangers?
12. Would you say the Project has been able to accurately identify children and adolescents at risk or already enrolled in child work in agriculture, domestic help, drug trafficking and dealing, illicit activities at tourist beaches of the country and sexual commerce?
13. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
14. Could you share any learned lesson in your community about the effectiveness of the Project?

15. Do you think the financial and human resources of the Project are sufficient or appropriate to achieve the results it seeks?
16. What other alternatives are there to improve these resources?
17. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
18. What has the influence and impact of the Project been (if any) on the organizations working to eradicate child labor and traffic? Provide examples.
19. What do you think has been the impact of the Project on the government sector, mainly referred to education and child labor prevention? Provide examples.
20. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?
21. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
22. Could you point out any good practice that could be replicated in other areas or that could contribute with innovative solutions to the current state of the problem? Which?
23. Please, briefly describe the involvement of the local authorities and Central Government with the Project. What benefits do you perceive from this involvement to eradicate child labor and traffic? What aspects should be reinforced or improved?
24. Does the community agree with the Project or not? Why?
25. Have you attended any Project activity? Which?
26. What do you think of that activity?
27. What is your opinion about what the Project is trying to achieve by rescuing working children and adolescents or preventing child labor? Is there anything you do not agree with? What?
28. Do you think the local authorities are aware of child labor dangers? Why?
29. Would you say that beneficiaries' parents are pleased with the Project or not? Why?
30. Would you say there has really been a change of perception in the parents involved in the Project that may change their attitude about making or letting their children work?
31. And parents of the community in general, what is their opinion in this respect?

32. Do you think the Project really contributes to removing children and adolescents from jobs to which they should not be submitted? Provide examples.
33. Would you say that the Project helps children and adolescents who have abandoned school to go back to it? Provide examples.
34. Do you know the courses INFOTEP offers within the Project? What is your opinion about them?

## **Guide 6. Beneficiaries' Parents**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you know the Project that is being carried out in your community, Spaces to Grow and Spaces for Entrepreneurship?
2. Have you had any active participation in this Project? Which?
3. Do you have any son/daughter who is a Project beneficiary?
4. Before gaining access to the Project, was your son/daughter working in agriculture, domestic help or other activities? If positive, what did he/she work in? How many hours a day?
5. Does your son/daughter currently work? If positive, how many hours?
6. Please, tell how your son/daughter started participating in the Project.
7. Do you think this Project is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context of this community? Why?
8. Do you know how the place and children and adolescents who participate in this Project are selected? How?
9. Do you know if a child or adolescent lacking a birth certificate can access as Project beneficiary? What do you think about this?
10. Do you think the criteria to select the beneficiaries are correct or not? Why?
11. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
12. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why do you think EpCs have or have not been effective? Why do you think EpEs have or have not been effective?
13. With regard to the needs of the population to be intervened by the Project, do you think the Project responds to all or most of those needs or only to some? Which ones?
14. What benefits or good deeds do you see in the Project? How has your son/daughter benefited from it? Provide examples.
15. What negative aspects do you see in the Project? Provide examples.

16. Do you think that children and adolescents entering this Project improve their school learning? Provide examples. Ask about marks.
17. Would you say that the Project helps children and adolescents who have abandoned school to go back to it? Provide examples. Do you think that children and adolescents should work? Under what conditions? Are these conditions possible? Are they real?
18. How would you say that the EpCs and EpEs contribute to increase educational opportunities, community sense of ownership, community development and awareness about child labor dangers?
19. Could you share any learned lesson in your community about the effectiveness of the Project?
20. Do you think the financial and human resources of the Project are sufficient or appropriate to achieve the results it seeks?
21. What other alternatives are there to improve these resources?
22. Have you been able to perceive to date some type of impact of the Project on its beneficiaries, the community, the educational system or the Project's final objectives? Which?
23. Have you attended any Project activity? Which? What is your opinion?
24. Does the community agree with the Project or not? Why?
25. And you, are you pleased or not? Why?

## **Guide 7. Children beneficiaries of the Project**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you know the Spaces to Grow Project that is being carried out in your community?
2. Do you participate in these spaces?
3. Tell me how you participate. Please provide details.
4. Do you attend school? At what time?
5. At what time do you come here?
6. Do you come everyday?
7. When you cannot come, why is it so? Ask if it is because of some other responsibility.
8. Do you like being here? Why?
9. What do you like to do the most?
10. What is it you like to do the least?
11. What would you like this space to have that it doesn't have?
12. What are your marks at school?
13. Before coming here, what were your marks: good, bad or fair?
14. You have worked for money, namely, were you or your parents paid for something like sowing or harvesting, cleaning houses, running errands or accompanying persons? (If he/she worked) Tell me what you did and how much you were paid. How many hours?
15. (If he/she worked) Did you like that work? Why?
16. And now, do you work? In what do you work? How many hours? (For those who still have not worked). What age do you think you will be when you start working?
17. (For everybody). At what age do you think one should start working? Why?
18. What do your parents say about the age one should start working on?
19. What would you like to work in? Why?
20. At school, does your teacher agree with your coming here? What does he/she say?
21. And your parents, do they like your coming here? What do they say to you?
22. Is there anybody who does not like your coming here? Who? What does he/she say?

## **Guide 8. Adolescents beneficiaries and former beneficiaries of the Project**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Do you know the Spaces for Entrepreneurship Project that is being carried out in your community?
2. Do you participate in these spaces?
3. Tell me how you participate. Provide details. (Resources and material received, etc.)
4. Do you attend school? At what time?
5. Have you ever abandoned school? What was the reason?
6. How was it that you went back to school (if he/she did)?
7. At what time do you come here?
8. Do you come everyday?
9. When you cannot come, why is it so? Ask if it is because of some other responsibility.
10. Do you like being here? Why?
11. What do you like to do the most?
12. What is it you like to do the least?
13. Do you take INFOTEP courses?
14. What courses have you taken or are you taking?
15. Do you like those courses? Why?
16. What are teachers like? Would you say that you learn what they teach or not?
17. What is the best thing of the INFOTEP courses? Why?
18. What do you like the least of the INFOTEP courses? Why?
19. Do you think that when you finish, you will be able to work at something you learned here?
20. What would you like this space to have that it doesn't have?
21. What are your marks at school?
22. Before coming here, what were your marks: good, bad or fair?

23. You have worked for money, namely, were you or your parents paid for something like sowing or harvesting, cleaning houses, running errands or accompanying persons? (If he/she worked) Tell me what you did and how much you were paid. How many hours?
24. (If he/she worked) Did you like that work? Why?
25. And now, do you work? In what do you work? How many hours?
26. (For those who still have not worked). What age do you think you will be when you start working?
27. (For everybody). At what age do you think one should start working? Why?
28. What do your parents say about the age one should start working on?
29. What would you like to work in? Why?
30. At school, does your teacher agree with your coming here? What does he/she say?
31. And your parents, do they like your coming here? What do they say to you?
32. Is there anybody who does not like your coming here? Who? What does he/she say?

## **Guide 9. Multinationals**

Explaining objectives. Asking for authorization to record the interview.

1. Have the assumptions and realities on which the Project was based on at the beginning changed or are they still the same? Identify what is the same and what has changed.
2. What would you say are the obstacles and threats that the Project must face to eradicate child labor?
3. Do you think the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context where it is developed? Why?
4. Would you say the Project design fits other government initiatives or those of other organizations with similar objectives?
5. Describe the criteria used to select the Project area of action, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries. Do you think they are adequate?
6. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
7. According to your perception, do you think that the Project educational interventions, such as creating EpCs for children and EpEs for adolescents and distributing educational resources and material has been effective to prevent child labor and traffic? Why?
8. With regard to the needs of the population to be intervened by the Project, do you think the Project responds to all or most of those needs or only to some?
9. Would you say the Project has been able to accurately identify children and adolescents at risk or already enrolled in child work in agriculture, domestic help, drug trafficking and dealing, illicit activities at tourist beaches of the country and sexual commerce?
10. Do you know if children and adolescents lacking a birth certificate can access the Project?
11. Would you say that the Project has accurately identified the worst forms of child labor exploitation in most of the cases or only in some? Which yes and which no and why?
12. What has the influence and impact of the Project been (if any) on the organizations working to eradicate child labor and traffic? Provide examples.
13. What do you think has been the impact of the Project on the government sector, mainly referred to education and child labor prevention? Provide examples.
14. Have you perceived if there is any type of new tendencies to which the Project should respond to improve its assertiveness and relevance? Which?

15. Have you perceived if there is any type of new opportunities the Project should count on to increase its impact? Which?
16. What do you think the main challenges and opportunities have been to initiate and maintain coordination with other international and/or multilateral organizations in this Project?