



Independent Midterm Evaluation of

EDUCARE Guyana

Partners of the Americas
Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-5-0050

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by:
Susan Grace Upton

Contract No.: DOLQ059622437



11785 Beltsville Drive
Calverton, MD 20705
Tel: (301) 572-0200
Fax: (301) 572-0999
www.macrointernational.com

NOVEMBER 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Acronyms and Terms	iii
Executive Summary	iv
I. Context	1
II. Project Description.....	5
III. Evaluation Objectives.....	6
IV. Evaluation Methodology.....	8
V. Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	9
A. Project Design.....	10
Responses To Specific Questions Raised By USDOL.....	10
Conclusions	12
Recommendations	13
B. Project Design/Implementation	13
Responses To Specific Questions Raised By USDOL.....	13
Conclusions	25
Recommendations	26
C. Partnership And Coordination.....	27
Responses To Specific Questions Raised By USDOL.....	27
Conclusions	31
Recommendations	31
D. Management And Budget	31
Responses To Specific Questions Raised By USDOL.....	31
Conclusions	33
Recommendation	33
E. Sustainability And Impact	34
Responses To Specific Questions Raised By USDOL.....	34
Conclusions	36
Recommendations	36
VI. Good Practices.....	36

ANNEXES

Annex A	Interviews and Visits
Annex B	Documents reviewed
Annex C	Stakeholders' Meeting
Annex D	Terms of Reference
Annex E	Interview guides
Annex F	List of Hazardous Occupations and Processes in Guyana
Annex G	List of SAPs and TREPs

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND TERMS

BOS	Bureau of Statistics
CIDA	Canadian Institute for Development Assistance
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
EFA	Education for All
EI	Child Labor Education Initiative
GINA	Government Information Agency
GOG	Government of Guyana
HCL	Hazardous Child Labor
ILAB	Bureau of International Labor Affairs
ILO	International Labor Organization
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoLHSSS	Ministry of Labor, Human Services, and Social Security
NCERD	National Council for Educational Research and Development
NDC	Neighborhood Democratic Council
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSCCL	National Steering Committee on Child Labor
OCFT	Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking
PCV	Peace Corps Volunteer
POA	Partners of the Americas
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
SAP	School Attendance Program
SWO	School Welfare Officer
TOR	Terms of Reference
TREP	Teenage Re-engagement Program
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VSO	Voluntary Service Overseas
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

(Cover photo – Boys from Zeelugt Primary School SAP)

This report describes in detail the midterm evaluation of the project conducted during September/ October 2007. The report was prepared by Macro International Inc., according to guidelines prescribed by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation was conducted and documented by Sue Upton, an independent development consultant in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the EDUCARE project team, and stakeholders in Guyana.

THANKS

The evaluator would like to take the opportunity to express her appreciation and sincere thanks to the EDUCARE team, Ministry representatives, project partners and SAP and TREP students, and any others who contributed their time to interviews, discussions, and logistical arrangements during the evaluation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In September 2007, an independent evaluator conducted a midterm evaluation of EDUCARE, a project funded by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) in Guyana. The evaluation looked at the project as a whole and its impact in relation to its stated objectives. Activities carried out during the first 23 months were reviewed and assessed with regard to their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, looking at broad project categories including project design, implementation, partnership and coordination, management and budget, and sustainability and impact. After reviewing project documentation, the evaluator spent 2 weeks in Guyana visiting project activities and meeting with the EDUCARE team, government representatives, implementing partners, parents, and children. At the end of this period, a meeting brought together representatives of key project stakeholders to discuss the initial findings and possibilities for the remaining project period. The evaluation aims to be an objective inquiry that can facilitate any corrective action and encourage the strengthening and sustainability of successful aspects of the project. Ultimately, the purpose is to facilitate a learning process to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are being met.

The evaluator endeavored to talk to all key stakeholders, but was not able to gain access to staff in the Ministry of Labor in order to verify certain information and points of view. The Minister's agreement to an interview toward the end of the evaluation was much appreciated, as were his subsequent comments on the draft evaluation report. However, this interview did not entirely compensate for the lack of discussion with the Chief Labor Officer and others within the Ministry of Labor, Human Services, and Social Security (MoLHSS).

In 2005, an exchange of letters between USDOL and the Guyanese Ministries of Labor and Education expressed their joint commitment to address child labor issues, and the Government of Guyana (GOG) welcomed DOL's support to help them build on their previous initiatives. After a competitive awards process, in September 2005 Partners of the Americas (POA) signed a 42-month Cooperative Agreement worth \$2,000,000 with USDOL to implement EDUCARE Guyana, under which POA has an obligation to supplement USDOL funding with US\$2,016,206. The project aimed to reduce the incidence of the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) in Guyana and to withdraw or prevent 3,044 children from exploitative or hazardous child labor. Activities were grouped around three project outputs designed to achieve these objectives:

1. Raise public awareness of the threat of child labor at both national and community levels
2. Strengthen policies and institutions to support direct interventions
3. Strengthen educational systems at both the primary and secondary levels.

The EDUCARE team, in collaboration with the GOG and a variety of schools, training institutions, and Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) partners, implemented the project using a range of strategies which, in addition to project-specific goals, also contribute to the four overall goals of the USDOL Child Labor

Education Initiative (EI):

1. Raise awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilize a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures
2. Strengthen formal and transitional education systems that encourage working children and those at risk of working to attend school
3. Strengthen national institutions and policies on education and child labor
4. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

As a means of informing its interventions and identifying beneficiaries, EDUCARE designed and implemented baseline research in the coastal regions where about 90 percent of the population lives, in order to establish the existing types and incidence of child labor and the profiles of the children affected. More than 5,000 children with low or no school attendance were interviewed, building on and consolidating information available from previous, more limited studies. The project went on to design School Attendance Programs (SAPs) and Teenage Re-Engagement Programs (TREPs) to offer services to children identified during the research and others like them. SAPs provide assistance to vulnerable children in primary schools and TREPs cater to older children who have dropped out of the formal education system. So far, 26 SAPs and 13 TREPs have been initiated by 27 subcontracting partners. These include 8 primary schools or PTAs, 2 Adult Education Associations, 11 community or faith-based groups, the YWCA, and 5 public or private education institutions. The project supports these partners through field visits, training, tools and equipment to enable them to implement the programs and track the work and school status of participating children. Since January 2007, 562 boys and 473 girls have benefited from the services provided and around 1,500 more children are currently enrolling in the second phase programs.

The EDUCARE project was designed to work closely with the National Steering Committee on Child Labor (NSCCL) and the Chief Labor Officer, one objective being to encourage the adoption of a list of hazardous labor in compliance with the International Labor Organization (ILO's) WFCL Convention 182. The NSCCL was created in 2003 as a subcommittee within the MoLHSSS, the lead agency for child labor within Guyana. While EDUCARE's activities are informing the work of this committee, the project's work plan has not progressed as anticipated due to a combination of factors. Among these is the time it has taken to establish the collaborative working relationships with the relevant ministries that are necessary if EDUCARE is to support the GOG in fulfilling its obligations under ILO Convention 182, namely the determination of a list of hazardous labor, the development of a National Plan of Action, and the provision of appropriate education opportunities for children at risk. The Ministry of Labor has included EDUCARE in meetings of the NSCCL. However, concern that the country may be given a negative image has manifested in resistance to discussion of the possibility of existing WFCL in Guyana. The findings of the research initiated by the project are key to establishing the basis for ongoing work, and the length of time taken for the report to be finalized and made publicly available has delayed the process of developing a joint program of work with the GOG. The problem was exacerbated by discussion by project staff of the research findings in a press interview and the subsequent misrepresentation of the content of the interview by the journalist concerned. The

Ministry of Labor was understandably displeased by this event, as it was precisely what it wished to avoid—the labeling of Guyana as having the worst forms of child labor—yet without access to the research concerned, it was not in a position to see that the project’s findings had been misrepresented. However, the Ministry has stated that this leak should not stop EDUCARE from continuing to develop a program of work with the NSCCL and has encouraged the project to work more closely with them. During the evaluation, members of the NSCCL stressed the importance of EDUCARE’s technical and financial support and their appreciation of the promised assistance with the forthcoming campaign to raise public awareness on child labor issues and the series of national and regional consultative workshops that are planned to take place over the next 6 months.

Although a number of project activities are running behind schedule, the project should be able to meet its target number of direct beneficiaries. The research into the extent and types of child labor in Guyana has taken much longer than anticipated and the publication of the final report has been progressively postponed from April 2007 to October 2007. This delay was partly due to the need to send the raw data outside Guyana for statistical analysis as the only competent body inside the country, the Bureau of Statistics (BOS), was unavailable to carry out the work. Some of the project’s initial indicators posed problems for EDUCARE because they were dependent on the idea that the NSCCL would become the coordinating body officially designated as the permanent lead organization for child labor issues. As it is not government policy for the current status of the NSCCL to change, this indicator needs to be revised so that it can provide a realistic indication of progress during the remaining life of the project.

The project’s research and subsequent education programs were developed and implemented in collaboration with the Ministry of Education (MoE), with particular assistance from regional education departments and the School Welfare Service. The baseline child labor research methodology enabled regional education department staff, teachers, and NGO community workers to interview a large number of children from six regions and Georgetown. The extensive efforts that were made to reach children both in and out of school suggest that the findings will be representative of the real situation in Guyana, although some community workers were concerned that the group of children who have never accessed education and who are living and working on the margins of society may be underrepresented. There is considerable interest in extending the research to take in the hinterland regions where there is a perception that more of the WFCL may be found. However, this possibility needs to be balanced against the cost of accessing the scattered communities concerned and the degree to which it would be possible to act on the results of such research within the context of the current project.

Although the results of the baseline study are not yet available, it promises to be of value not only in the measurement of project results, but also as a broad-based, in-depth analysis of the nature and extent of child labor, and the related barriers to accessing education in Guyana’s coastal regions. In addition to being used to identify children participating in EDUCARE-sponsored education programs, the resulting information and database will be available for use by the School Welfare Service and

potentially for use by any other departments and organizations working to ensure that all Guyana's children can access appropriate and relevant education.

The evaluation found that TREPs and SAPs are functioning well and are increasingly effective in assisting the children concerned. The EDUCARE team is succeeding in managing multiple subcontracts and providing capacity building, training, and support resulting in high-quality services and efficient reporting. Subcontractors are a highly motivated and diverse group and offer the project a rich pool of experience, ideas, and creativity, which are complemented by partnerships with other organizations, notably Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO), the Peace Corps, and the National Council for Educational Research and Development (NCERD). The major aspect missing from project interventions thus far is community-level parent education for the parents of SAP and TREP students. While this is planned as an obligatory component of all phase two programs, the necessary training and resources for subcontractors have yet to be fully developed. One reason why this element has not been developed may be the lack of community development expertise within the project team.

TREP students (who were previously not attending any form of education program) have attendance levels of more than 70 percent, which suggests that the programs are succeeding in providing a good balance between structure and flexibility and offering access to a range of attractive skills. However, there is as yet little measurement of quality or attainment as the first phase of programs draws to a close. Some of the activities witnessed by the evaluator were clearly extremely beneficial for the participants in therapeutic and developmental terms, creating a sense of achievement, cooperation, and shared experience. However, the degree to which such skills will be directly applicable to income generation or the employment market is less certain. TREP participants would benefit from individual plans to guide their progress toward realistic opportunities for employment or further education at the end of the program and the impact of both SAPs and TREPs could certainly be enhanced by longer periods of quality intervention. TREP providers talked about the economic pressures on participants, many of whom are working less than before, but still need to contribute to family income, which has an impact on their attendance. What is clear is that the experience gained through attending a TREP improves self-confidence and potential to go onto further training or more satisfying employment, thus offering some protection from exploitation.

There are two groups of children whose needs are not being met by EDUCARE services. The first is made up of children under school-leaving age who do not attend full-time education because of economic or other pressures and who cannot legally participate in TREPs because they are too young. The second group concerns children who fit the criteria for SAPs and TREPs, but are unable to attend a program due to distance or other reasons. These are significant gaps in current provision that the GOG needs to address, in view of the particular vulnerability of the groups concerned.

The project's work with the MoE is coordinated by the recently established Ministry of Education Liaison Committee, which meets monthly and brings together key actors from the ministry and the EDUCARE project director. This arrangement is

working well in that it has established appropriate lines of reporting and ensures the circulation of information about project activities. Agreement in principal to collaboration with the School Welfare Service and a declaration of friendship from the Chief Welfare Officer should result in a concrete plan of action within the near future. The School Welfare Service is currently expanding and is interested in using and developing the database established during the EDUCARE research. The project will train SWOs to use the database to improve the identification, monitoring, and tracking of vulnerable children. This training and the development of a national database is necessary to ensure the systematic inclusion of children who have never been enrolled in school, in recognition of the fact that they make up not only the group most vulnerable to WFCL, but they are also the group most likely to slip through the net into invisibility. If this issue isn't addressed, EDUCARE's focus on child labor among school dropouts risks diverting attention from child laborers who have never appeared on a school register. The MoE played an invaluable role in the EDUCARE research and in supporting the introduction of SAPs and TREPs, both of which use MoE resources. Ministry representatives at both regional and national levels expressed their appreciation of the project, their satisfaction with the research process, and other project activities and their desire to develop their ongoing collaboration with the EDUCARE team.

One aspect that needs to be mentioned is that the project appears to be somewhat underfunded. The project team lacks the four Community Partnership Promoters mentioned in the project document and would really benefit from some community development expertise. While SAPs and TREPs would probably be more effective and benefit the children more if they were longer, financial constraints risk limiting their duration and hence the overall impact of the project. As yet, only around 10 percent of the \$2,016,206 that is POA's contribution to the overall project budget has been leveraged as match funding. Therefore, it seems ambitious to attempt to generate more than half the overall project budget from sources within the project, as subcontractors are either schools working with resources allocated by the government or non-government organizations with limited funding. While such organizations can generate a degree of in-kind match funding, they are not able to provide the substantial cash input that is needed to run a project of this size.

In spite of some shortcomings, it is important to recognize that the project is positively influencing the lives of a considerable number of young people and piloting a variety of interventions that can be refined and developed to serve as models that could be adopted by the GOG and other organizations in the future. The project has a small but committed team, whose members work extremely hard in an environment that is often challenging.

Recommendations

The evaluation led to a number of recommendations concerning EDUCARE, which aim to facilitate and encourage more effective relationships with the GOG and foster national and local ownership, partnership, and sustainability of project initiatives. Other recommendations concern potential further research, various aspects of implementation of the SAPs and TREPs, and suggestions concerning several vulnerable groups of children whose needs are not currently being met.

Recommendations are summarized below and listed in full at the end of the appropriate sections of the report.

1. EDUCARE should seek an opportunity to discuss the project and its objectives with the Minister of Labor and ensure that all relevant ministries are continually consulted and informed concerning all aspects of the project in order to foster a collaborative working relationship and promote the sustainability of project impact.
2. The project team and the School Welfare Service need to define their proposed collaboration and start working together as soon as possible and EDUCARE should continue to support and inform the work of the NSCCL.
3. The EDUCARE baseline study research should be discussed with the MoE and the MoLHSSS and widely circulated as soon as possible to diffuse speculation and provide up-to-date information to inform ongoing debate.
4. Design and implementation of the parent education component of SAPS and TREPs is a priority and POA should look to provide some participatory community development expertise to assist the EDUCARE team.
5. TREP participants would benefit from individual plans leading to realistic options for employment or further education/training at the end of their program and the project team should pursue their proposed collaboration with the Ministry of Health (MoH) to provide reproductive health education as an integral part of TREP programs.
6. The period of intervention of SAPS and TREPs should be extended on a case-by-case basis to develop examples of good practice so that successful models can be increasingly well-defined.
7. Regular opportunities should be available for subcontractors to come together to discuss topics of common interest and share project-related experience.
8. Each SAP and TREP provider should try to develop a sustainability plan for the continuation of some or all of their activities.
9. POA needs to fulfill its funding obligation through a significant injection of funds from outside the project to enable planned activities to be implemented to maximum effect, and implement the evaluation recommendations, namely the addition of community development expertise to the project team, extended periods of intervention for SAPs and TREPs, and the possibility of extending the research to the hinterland regions.
10. An analysis of children under school-leaving age who have lost too much school time to be able to cope with the mainstream curriculum and an analysis of the reasons that led to them effectively dropping out of school would assist the GOG in developing services adapted to their needs. The EDUCARE research will provide such an analysis and subcontractors,

particularly community and faith-based groups, can add to this by sharing their knowledge of such children in their areas. Information about why children refuse places on TREPs or SAPs needs to be collated and analyzed to assist the GOG in developing services adapted to the specific needs of this group. The GOG should also be kept informed of the impact of TREP provision (particularly where the provider is a Ministry of Education [MoE] establishment) so that they can examine the feasibility of supporting the continuation and extension of TREPs to cover more geographic areas, thus better meeting the needs of this vulnerable group of children.

11. The GOG needs to ensure the systematic inclusion of children who have never been to school in a national database of vulnerable children. EDUCARE should work with SWOs, local NGOs, community groups, and Neighborhood Democratic Councils (NDCs) to develop a methodology and ensure that this group is monitored.
12. EDUCARE should actively advocate for the Employment of Children and Young Persons (Amendment) Bill to become law, if this has not already occurred.

I. CONTEXT

The U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) funds international labor projects through its Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB). The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is the office within ILAB that administers grants and contracts to organizations engaged in efforts to eliminate child labor and raise awareness about child labor issues. Since 1995, Congress has appropriated more than \$470 million for ILAB in order to administer international child labor projects, of which \$182 million has been allocated to support efforts to address child labor through the promotion of educational opportunities for children, the basis for the creation of USDOL's Child Labor Education Initiative (EI). EI projects seek to prevent at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor, and seek to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children around the world by increasing access to and the quality of basic education for working children and those at risk of entering work. The EI has four main goals:

1. To raise awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilize a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures
2. To strengthen formal and transitional education systems that encourage working children and those at risk of working to attend school
3. To strengthen national institutions and policies on education and child labor
4. To ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

Guyana has a population of under a million people, who live primarily in towns and villages along the coastal plain. Population growth is low due to migration to the United States and other countries. Guyana is one of the world's poorest countries, among only 18 targeted for debt cancellation to international financial institutions. A diverse ethnic mix includes those of East Indian origin (48%), African origin (33%), Mixed Race (12%), and several Amerindian groups (6%), most of whom live in scattered communities in the interior, or hinterland.¹ The country is divided into 10 administrative regions. The capital of Georgetown is located in Region 4. Socioeconomic activities focus on exploitation of abundant natural resources, including forests and wildlife used for timber, hunting, and eco-tourism; gold, bauxite, diamonds, and other minerals; soils and climates suitable for agriculture; and coastal and fluvial water resources, including fisheries. The recent resolution in Guyana's favor of a long-term maritime boundary dispute with implications for access to offshore oil reserves offers new potential for economic growth.

Guyana is a signatory to ILO conventions 138 and 182 but has not as yet determined a list of hazardous child labor as required by the ILO convention 182 (see article 4 in the box on page 3). A National Steering Committee on Child Labor (NSCCL) within

¹ Guyana's Bureau Of Statistics, 2005

the Department of Labor reporting to the Chief Labor Officer regularly brings together representatives from government and other organizations with the aim of developing and implementing a national plan of action.

Guyana's education system was once one of the best in the Caribbean, but has declined over recent years. The government has taken steps to improve the situation, including promotion of child-centered learning models, the development of distance-learning resources, support for teacher training centers in the hinterland, some provision of vocational education for older children, and provision of alternative education programs to cater to out-of-school youth. A number of internationally funded projects have contributed to education system reforms. Education is free and compulsory for children from 5.5 to 14.5 years old. Students aim to complete 6 years of primary and three of secondary by age 15, and the expectation is that most will stay in school two more years to gain qualifications before going to work or into further education. While Guyana has relatively high levels of both primary and secondary enrollment, Ministry of Education (MoE) data for 2004 indicated primary school dropout rates ranged from 5 percent to 18 percent, with the higher rates occurring in the hinterland regions. Dropouts from standard secondary schools ranged from 8 percent to 23 percent, and highest of all were the dropouts from primary tops, where the first few forms of secondary were added onto an existing primary school. Primary tops dropout rates varied between 10 percent and 76 percent. Nationally, slightly more girls dropped out than boys and an estimated 3 percent to 8 percent of children never entered school at all, especially in the interior.

School attendance levels were also a factor to consider when assessing the relationship between education and child labor. Data for 2001 showed primary attendance levels ranging between 59 percent in Region 1 to 82 percent in Region 4 and Georgetown. Overall secondary attendance ranged from 59 percent in Region 2 to 78 percent in Regions 9 and 10. At the secondary level, the overall figures were dragged down by particularly poor attendance for community high school and primary tops programs.

Prior to EDUCARE, research into child labor in Guyana was largely contained in two reports: The ILO's 2002 Danns report, which examined the situation of children in the Worst Forms of Child Labor (WFCL), and the 2005 survey of WFCL in Parika, carried out by Guyana's Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with the International Labor Organization/Canadian Institute for Development Assistance (ILO/CIDA) Regional Child Labour Project Office. Danns saw child labor in Guyana as both a reflection and a cause of poverty, the majority of child laborers coming from impoverished backgrounds, and poor households relying on their children's earnings to survive. Work reduces the time that children spend in school, thus limiting their educational attainment and future earning potential. The report described child labor in Guyana as "pervasive, ubiquitous, but largely unrecognized," involving children from all ethnic groups who are "driven by culture, parental neglect, family breakdown and economic necessity to work for their own upkeep or that of their family and relatives." A BOS survey in 2001 estimated that 27 percent of children under 14 performed "paid or unpaid work for a non-household member, did four or more hours of housekeeping chores per day, or did other family work (farm or

business)” but Danns suggested that the actual proportion of working children may be twice this level, particularly if children from 15 to 17, (who may legally work in Guyana) are included.

The Parika Survey focused on children under 18 involved in WFCL injurious to their health, social, or academic development. The study identified 65 victims of WFCL in Parika, about 5 percent of local children between 6 and 17 years old. Of 133 working children found in a broader surrounding area, 86 percent were boys and 14 percent girls; 53 percent ranged in age from 15 to 17 years, 41 percent from 10 to 14, and 6 percent from 5 to 9. They worked in vending (32%), agriculture (17%), fishing (17%), as shop assistants (10%), as freight handlers (7%), and at a variety of other tasks (19%). Each had attended local schools and 66 percent had attended secondary school. However, 89 percent had not attended school during the term prior to the study, and 37 percent were unable to read. In addition, the EDUCARE project document mentioned that UNICEF lists a figure of 19 percent for the incidence of child labor among 5- to 14-year-olds, using as the criteria the amount of hours worked. Many of that number were not in the WFCL subgroup, the size of which was considered uncertain.

ILO definitions relative to child labor, which are the internationally recognized standard, are contained in Convention 182, The Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention (1999) and Convention 138, The Minimum Age Convention (1973). Some key aspects are outlined in the box below.

From the Worst Forms of Child Labour Convention 182:

Article 3

..... the term *the worst forms of child labour* comprises:

- (a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, such as the sale and trafficking of children, debt bondage and serfdom and forced or compulsory labour, including forced or compulsory recruitment of children for use in armed conflict;
- (b) the use, procuring or offering of a child for prostitution, for the production of pornography or for pornographic performances;
- (c) the use, procuring or offering of a child for illicit activities, in particular for the production and trafficking of drugs as defined in the relevant international treaties;
- (d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.

Article 4

...The types of work referred to under Article 3(d) shall be determined by national laws or regulations or by the competent authority, after consultation with the organizations of employers and workers concerned, taking into consideration relevant international standards, in particular Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Worst Forms of Child Labour Recommendation, 1999.

From the Worst Forms of Child Labour Recommendation 1999:

Hazardous work

...In determining the types of work referred to under Article 3(d) of the Convention,

and in identifying where they exist, consideration should be given, inter alia, to:

- (a) work which exposes children to physical, psychological or sexual abuse;
- (b) work underground, under water, at dangerous heights or in confined spaces;
- (c) work with dangerous machinery, equipment and tools, or which involves the manual handling or transport of heavy loads;
- (d) work in an unhealthy environment which may, for example, expose children to hazardous substances, agents or processes, or to temperatures, noise levels, or vibrations damaging to their health;
- (e) work under particularly difficult conditions such as work for long hours or during the night or work where the child is unreasonably confined to the premises of the employer.

From the Minimum Age Convention 138:

Article 7

1. National laws or regulations may permit the employment or work of persons 13 to 15 years of age on light work which is--

- (a) not likely to be harmful to their health or development; and
- (b) not such as to prejudice their attendance at school, their participation in vocational orientation or training programmes approved by the competent authority or their capacity to benefit from the instruction received.

Thus, at the start of the EDUCARE project, available data suggested significant numbers of children with low attendance or who had dropped out of both primary and secondary education. Previous research studies covered limited geographic areas and used different definitions of child labor, thus producing varying estimates of the numbers involved and the age groups concerned, resulting in a lack of clearly defined broad-based information on the actual character and scope of the child labor problem.

Guyana has a number of labor laws that protect children (see box below) but the relevant departments often lack the necessary human and financial resources to provide the required monitoring and enforcement, and cases of child labor go unreported. The MoLHSSS has principal responsibility for enforcing legislation relating to child labor. Within the Ministry, an anti-trafficking in persons unit has been established to enforce anti-trafficking laws. In addition, the MoE has responsibility for enforcing provisions of the Education Act relating to the employment of children.³

Child Labor Laws and Enforcement

- The law sets the minimum age for employment at 15 years, with some exceptions. Children less than 15 years of age may be employed in technical schools provided such work is approved and supervised by the public authority.
- Children younger than 16 years are prohibited from night work and employment in industrial undertakings.

³<http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/PDF/2006OCFTreport.pdf>

- There are penalties of fines for employers and parents who are guilty of direct involvement with child labor.
- All forms of trafficking are prohibited by law, and penalties include life imprisonment, forfeiture of property, and payment of full restitution to the trafficked person. Special provision is made for the evidence of victims who are under 18 years.
- Although child pornography or prostitution is not specifically mentioned in Guyanese law, the laws prohibit the selling, publishing, or exhibiting of any obscene matter and the abduction of a girl under 18 years for “unlawful carnal knowledge.” Also, the law sets the age of sexual consent at 16, thus prohibiting sex with children younger than 16, regardless of profession of consent.
- Forced labor, including by children, is prohibited by the constitution. The law sets the minimum age for voluntary enlistment in the armed forces at 18 years.
- The Education Act restricts the employment of children and includes penalties for parents who do not ensure that their children attend school.

From DOL OCFT Child Labor Report 2006 – see footnote for reference

In October 2005, Partners of the Americas signed a 42-month cooperative agreement with USDOL to implement the EI project entitled, EDUCARE Guyana, with the aim of carrying out further research and supporting the development of effective education programs in response to the identified realities.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

EDUCARE aims to reduce the incidence of child labor in Guyana. The project plans to withdraw or prevent 3,044 children from exploitative or hazardous child labor by supporting programs to ensure that these children are educationally better positioned to contribute to society. The project has identified three specific outputs to enable the achievement of these objectives:

1. Raise public awareness of the threat of child labor at both national and community levels;
2. Strengthen policies and institutions to support direct interventions; and
3. Strengthen educational systems at both the primary and secondary levels.

Research to better define the extent and types of child labor in existence in Guyana and the profile of the children involved has been a major part of project activity to date. The study was based on data drawn from school attendance registers in regions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and Georgetown. Research teams including teachers, officers from regional education departments, and NGO community workers interviewed more than 5,000 children. Among these were those with less than a 75 percent school attendance rate; those who had dropped out of school; and other children identified within the communities concerned, some of whom had never accessed education. The data gathered is being analyzed and the final report is expected before the end of 2007.

EDUCARE asked schools and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to design School Attendance Programs (SAPs) and Teenage Reengagement Programs (TREPs) to cater for the children identified during the research phase and others in similar circumstances. Since January 2007, five organizations have been providing SAP services comprising school meals; after-school remedial literacy; and some school uniforms in seven primary schools in regions 3, 6, and 7, with assistance to a few additional children in Georgetown schools. A total of 524 boys and 378 girls have benefited from SAP services. In September 2007, another 11 organizations started to offer school meals, after-school literacy clubs, and parent education in 15 primary schools targeting 1,236 children across Regions 2, 4, 5, and 6. A further 280 students at the Sophia Special School are also being targeted with enhanced curriculum provision, IT equipment, and school meals within the SAP program. Based on the experience of the first phase, all these phase two SAPs are offering holistic services, which include a hot meal, after-school literacy, and parent education. EDUCARE is providing 2 days of training for literacy club teachers and is in the process of developing resources for parent education. Stage two SAPs plan to work with more than 1,500 children.

TREPs were designed to cater to older children who had dropped out of the formal education system. In January 2007, 4 organizations started to offer programs to 27 boys and 91 girls in Regions 3, 6, 7, and 10. Activities included combinations of literacy and numeracy, catering, construction, electronics, carpentry, garment construction, various crafts, IT, and business skills. From September 2007, a further seven organizations started a second phase of TREPs, offering broadly similar activities to around 181 boys and 205 girls in Regions 2, 4, 6, and 10. These TREPs also included a parent education component.

In addition to working with schools, community organizations, and NGOs in the field, EDUCARE is represented on the NSCCL and encourages the development of national child labor policy and practice. The project aims to work closely with the MoE and the Ministry of Labour, Human Services and Social Security (MoLHSSS) to ensure that project initiatives concerning both education and child labor are integrated into government activities. The project team consists of the project director, specialists in education and monitoring & evaluation, a finance officer manager, and a Peace Corps volunteer (PCV).

III. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The midterm evaluation looked at the project as a whole and its overall impact in relation to its stated objectives. The activities carried out during the first 23 months of the Cooperative Agreement were reviewed and assessed with regard to their relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The evaluation aimed to—

- Help individual organizations identify areas of good performance and areas where project implementation can be improved.
- Assist OCFT to learn more about what is or is not working in terms of the overall conceptualization and design of EI projects within the broad

- OCFT technical cooperation program framework.
- Assess the degree to which objectives relevant to the country-specific situation they address have been achieved.
- Assess progress in terms of children's working and educational status (i.e., withdrawal and prevention from the worst forms of child labor; enrollment, retention, and completion of educational programs).

And more specifically, to—

- Assess the suitability and clarity of EDUCARE's WCFL and ECL definitions and consistency of use throughout the project;
- Ensure the quality of research used to establish the baseline study on the nature and extent of child labor (given its critical role at the national level);
- Evaluate the reliability and comprehensiveness of the project's child labor monitoring systems;
- Assess the role of the project in facilitating sustainable policy and program development at the national level through its work with the NSCCL and other activities.

To achieve these objectives, various aspects of the project were divided into the following five categories:

1. **Project Design** and the extent to which EDUCARE activities complement and strengthen government programs to combat child labor and provide Education For All (EFA) were examined. The role of the project in facilitating sustainable policy and program development at the national level through its work with the NSCCL and other activities was also assessed.
2. **Project Design / Implementation** looked at the degree to which the project supported the four EI goals and progress toward meeting its stated purpose and outputs at its midway point. Measurement of USDOL common indicators was assessed, as was the degree of understanding of the project's operational definitions of WFCL and ECL. This section of the report examines the project's child labor tracking and monitoring systems, its database, and the identification of children participating in project activities. Project impact on school attendance and educational quality are discussed and implementation issues arising during the evaluation analyzed.
3. **Partnership and Coordination** identified any major issues and challenges of initiating and developing project partnerships and any partnership opportunities that warranted greater attention.
4. **Management and Budget** assessed management strengths and any technical or financial management areas that could be improved and the degree of success in leveraging nonproject resources to support and develop activities.
5. **Sustainability and Impact** looked at EDUCARE's strategies for sustainability and project impact to date on the various groups concerned.

The evaluation is an objective inquiry that can facilitate any corrective action and encourage the development and further use of successful aspects of the project. Ultimately, the purpose is to ensure that vulnerable children's needs are being met through project interventions and that the best possible use is made of emerging good practice. It is above all a learning process.

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

After initial analysis of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the evaluator carried out a desk review of key project documents (listed in Annex B). Before visiting the field, a phone call with the USDOL Project Manager ensured a common understanding of the Terms of Reference (TOR) and priorities for the evaluation. A provisional program of field visits and interviews was agreed upon with the Project Director, including key informants emerging both from the desk review and EDUCARE recommendations and selected project partners implementing phase one and two TREPS and SAPs in different regions. This program took into account the evaluator's request that visits include examples of the most successful activities as well as any that were problematic. The evaluator traveled to Guyana for 2 weeks, and evaluation activities took place from September 17 to 28, 2007.

Key informant interviews began with a wide-ranging discussion with the EDUCARE team, which covered aspects of project design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, management, and sustainability. The evaluator also had the opportunity to talk to Partners of the Americas' (POA) Washington-based Vice President for Programs when she visited Guyana during the evaluation. Interviews at the government level included the Minister of Labor, the Minister for Human Services and Social Security, and representatives from the MoE at both the national and regional levels. These discussions facilitated an assessment of the relationship between EDUCARE activities and the national approach to Education for All (EFA) and eliminating child labor. The evaluator's lack of access to personnel from the MoLHSSS meant that it was difficult for the evaluation to cover government child labor policy and initiatives as fully as would have been desirable. The evaluator also met representatives from the NSCCL, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO), National Council for Educational research and Development (NCERD), and the Peace Corps, and observed part of a training session for teachers running school literacy clubs.

Meetings with subcontractors took the form of semi-structured interviews with concerned representatives from the schools and NGOs. The evaluation included visits to both phase one and phase two SAPs and TREPs across the different regions as described in the table below. ***Meetings with parents and children*** took place when feasible in each community or site visited. The majority of field visits included discussions about child labor and education with groups of boys and girls involved in project activities. During the event, it only proved possible to meet with two groups of parents, principally mothers. In Parika, the evaluator was able to visit a poor riverside area and witness children working and talking about their experiences with local community workers. These meetings and the accompanying site visits

enabled the evaluator to assess levels of community involvement and ownership of project activities, the degree of satisfaction concerning the project’s achievements, and approaches and prevailing attitudes concerning education and child labor. Visits to schools, SAP activities, and TREPs enabled observation and assessment of the gender breakdown and general age of participants; the atmosphere and dynamics between staff and young people, the quality and content of the activity they were engaged in, the physical environment, materials and facilities available, in brief whether the activity seemed likely to appropriately meet the objectives for which it was designed.

Summary Table of Field Visits to Subcontractors (details in Annex A)

Regions Visited	Subcontractors Visited	SAPs/ TREPs Visited	Parents & Children Interviewed
3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and Georgetown	14 organizations were visited and discussions took place with 9 men and 18 women organizers	3 TREP Ph. 1 5 TREP Ph. 2 3 SAP Ph. 1 3 SAP Ph. 2	- 52 girls & 32 boys in small groups - 171 children in mixed groups – class observation - 14 mothers and 1 father

On September 28, 2007, at the end of the field visits, a **stakeholders’ meeting** in Georgetown brought together 26 representatives of organizations involved with EDUCARE Guyana. These included individuals from government departments, the project’s school and NGO subcontractors, USDOL, and others contributing to project activities (see Annex C). The first part of the meeting consisted of a presentation of the evaluator’s initial findings in order to verify her understanding of the project and provide an opportunity for corrections and reactions. During the second part of the meeting, participants worked in groups to discuss questions concerning future project activities that had emerged from the evaluation process. A summary of this exercise can be found in Annex C.

V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section examines how the project is responding to the Guyana education and child labor environment, the strategies it has developed, and the activities it is implementing. These findings, conclusions, and recommendations are grouped in the five categories identified under the evaluation objectives—

- Project Design
- Project Design / Implementation
- Partnership and Coordination
- Budget and Management
- Sustainability and Impact

The findings of the evaluation are organized around the questions posed by USDOL in the TOR, taking the opportunity to not only respond to each question, but to

expand on the issues concerned, as appropriate. Conclusions and recommendations complete the evaluation of the relevant issues.

A. Project Design

Responses to specific questions raised by USDOL

1. *How does the project's design fit into overall government programs to combat child labor and provide education for all? Do EDUCARE activities strengthen and/or expand, without duplicating, Ministry of Education and Ministry of Labor, Human Services and Social Security programs?*

One of the principal pieces of legislation governing **child labor** in Guyana is the Employment of Children and Young Persons Act. The Employment of Young People and Children (Amendment) Bill updates and consolidates the provisions of the Principal Act. This Bill was originally passed and sent to the President for assent in 2006, but the process was interrupted by the elections, requiring it to be returned to parliament. On April 13, 2007, GINA (Government Information Agency) announced that the Minister of Labour would re-introduce The Employment of Young Persons and Children (Amendment) Bill addressing matters already approved by the National Assembly.⁴ The report went on to explain that the legislation brings the provision in the Principal Act into conformity with labor conventions acceded to by Guyana. However, the bill was not in fact reintroduced as planned. On October 8, 2007, GINA reported that GOG was working to expedite the re-introduction of several labor Bills in the National Assembly before the end of the year.⁵ The report quoted the Minister of Labour as saying, "We are now in the process of going through the formal government mechanism, that's the Parliamentary and Cabinet committees, so we will bring these (Bills) definitely during this Sitting of the National Assembly." The Bills include the Employment of Young Persons and Children (Amendment) Bill 2007 which specifies the definition for persons who should not be employed, including those under 15 years of age. The Principal Act restricted the employment of young persons under 16 years of age. Following the amendment to the definition of "*young person*," these restrictions on employment will now apply to persons who are above 15 and under 18 years. Guyana is a signatory to ILO convention 182, which commits ratifying nations to taking immediate action to secure the prohibition and elimination of the WFCL and requires countries to define an appropriate list of hazardous child labor within their national context (as previously described on page 3). While an informal list is already in existence in Guyana (see Annex F), it has been suggested that it be redefined and formally adopted as an instrument or regulation based on the amended act that is awaiting passage before parliament. The passage of this bill into law will provide the legal context for GOG to fulfill the obligations described above.

The EDUCARE project was designed to work closely with the GOG through the NSCCL and the Chief Labor Officer, one objective being to encourage the adoption of

⁴ <http://www.op.gov.gy/stories/070413.html>

⁵ <http://www.gina.gov.gy/archive/daily/b071008.html>

a list of hazardous labor. Project design envisaged the formalization of the role of the NSCCL, which is a subcommittee within the MoLHSSS, chaired by the First Lady and bringing together a range of representatives from government and non-government bodies.⁶ The Committee was created in 2003 within the context of an ILO/CIDA Regional Child Labor Project, which has since come to an end. The NSCCL meets on a monthly basis and is in the process of defining the way forward for its work on child labor issues within the MoLHSSS, the lead agency for child labor within Guyana. EDUCARE plays an important role in informing and supporting the work of this committee. This role is demonstrated by its contributions to the forthcoming campaign to raise public awareness on child labor issues and to the planning and funding for a series of national and regional consultative workshops to debate and agree upon definitions of child labor in Guyana, which will take place over the next 6 months.

The debate around the existence of the WFCL within Guyana has constituted a major stumbling block for EDUCARE's relationship with the Ministry of Labor. The project's goal is the reduction and eventual elimination of the WFCL in Guyana, while the Minister of Labor does not think that Guyana has a major problem in this area. This lack of a common understanding has made it difficult for the project and the ministry to work together effectively. The awaited research report is likely to suggest that there is less of a problem than anticipated, or reported recently in the press.

Concerning moves toward the achievement of EFA, EDUCARE complements and reinforces government initiatives in a number of ways. Where primary education is concerned, the project's provision of school uniforms and hot meals assists and enables children from poor families to access education. After-school literacy clubs are designed to complement teaching that takes place within school hours. They emphasize fun activities and are often run by teachers in school classrooms, using the phonics approach that is promoted by the MoE. These teachers will be able to apply the ideas and techniques introduced during the EDUCARE training sessions to their overall teaching practice. The planned parent education component will ideally bring parents who may not be accustomed to frequenting local schools into greater contact with their children's school activities, thus encouraging attendance and achievement.

Although the occasional duplication of services does arise, it is being managed to maximize the effective use of the funds available. Examples include Zeelugt Primary School in Region 3, where the MoLHSSS provided school uniforms for some children, so the EDUCARE funds earmarked for uniforms were reallocated to school meals, thus enabling more children to benefit. In Bartica, World Bank funding for school meals enabled school feeding started by EDUCARE to continue when the SAP program came to an end, thus complementing the project activity.

⁶ Ministries of LHSSS, Education, Health, Culture Youth and Sports, and Amerindian Affairs, the BOS, the Guyana Police Force, the University of Guyana, the Guyana Teachers' Union, the Consultative Association of Guyanese Industry (CAGI) and the National Commission on the Rights of the Child

While there are both government and quasi private initiatives offering skills training to young people, these tend to rely on self-referral and, due to high demand, they can select their students, leaving those at the bottom of the pile with few opportunities. EDUCARE is fairly unique in that it identifies and seeks out specific vulnerable young people, provides free services, and encourages program completion through actively supporting and tracking student progress. Two of the current TREP subcontractors are government institutions that are offering services specifically designed for the target group for the first time, as part of the EDUCARE initiative. Working with schools and government skills training institutions as project subcontractors encourages the integration of project activities into overall education provision. Models for working with vulnerable children can be piloted and assessed by the bodies concerned and offer the potential for application after the project intervention comes to an end. It is also important to note that EDUCARE is trying to encourage TREP contractors to use a competency-based system of assessment and evaluation. This system would complement the delivery and assessment system with the Basic Competency Certificate Programme (BCCP) that the Ministry of Education has introduced to some pilot secondary schools and intends to roll out across the secondary sector. This program is designed as an alternative and more accessible qualification for a significant proportion of secondary students who currently drop out or do not gain any Caribbean Secondary Education Certificates (CSECs) by the time they leave after 5 years of secondary schooling.

A major component of the EDUCARE's work to combat child labor and increase access to education involves collaboration with the national School Welfare Service. After some initial difficulties in developing a common understanding of the possibilities offered by the project and how these might be effectively exploited, this relationship now seems set to take off. The service is currently expanding to employ more SWOs to better meet the needs of vulnerable children. EDUCARE plans to support this work by sharing the database developed through its research, and training SWOs to operate and adapt it to improve identification, monitoring, and tracking of at-risk children in the course of their work. The service has identified a shortage of equipment and other resources as a primary need so it remains to be seen to what extent the project is also able to assist in this regard.

Conclusions

The project design fits well into government programs to provide EFA in that it complements and strengthens the services provided by the MoE and has the potential to influence future service provision. The research process has already served to highlight issues around school attendance and encouraged moves to get children back to school. EDUCARE is trying to facilitate policy and program development at the national level through its work with the NSCCL and School Welfare Service, although this has been a slow process to initiate. The project is supporting the work of the NSCCL and progress toward developing national consensus on definitions of hazardous child labor. Public awareness of child labor will be enhanced by the planned consultation process and publicity campaign. At the end of the day, it will be public perception at both the national and international levels that will inform political will to tackle child labor in Guyana. The EDUCARE research will serve to provide up-to-date information to inform the debate. If the

relationship between EDUCARE and the Ministry of Labor can be improved through more frequent communication, it will enhance the project's potential to assist the GOG in fulfilling its obligations under the terms of Convention 182.

Recommendations

- EDUCARE research should be discussed with the MoE and the MoLHSSS and widely circulated as soon as possible to diffuse speculation and provide up-to-date information to inform ongoing debate.
- EDUCARE should continue to support and inform the work of the NSCCL.
- EDUCARE and the School Welfare Service should define their proposed collaboration and start working together as soon as possible.
- EDUCARE and the MoLHSSS should meet regularly to discuss the project's contribution to the GOG's progress toward its child labor objectives, in an effort to build a bridge across misunderstandings and establish mutual respect and effective collaboration.
- EDUCARE should advocate for the Employment of Children and Young Persons (Amendment) Bill to become law, if this has not already occurred.

B. Project Design/Implementation

Responses to specific questions raised by USDOL

1. *Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the four EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?*

The project initially drew attention to the importance of education through its research, which was based on children with low or no school attendance, and it continues to do so through the coordination of TREPs and SAPs. The NSCCL's forthcoming public awareness campaign and consultative workshops will raise awareness about how child labor can adversely affect a child's education and hence, his or her future prospects. Project services target working children and those at risk of working. SAPs are contributing to increased access to and the quality of primary education for 11- to 14-year-olds while TREPs serve to provide a second chance for young people who have dropped out of the formal system. On occasion, this program is enabling participants to rejoin the formal system or access further professional or technical training. Collaboration with the NSCCL and the School Welfare Service serves to strengthen national institutions and policies on education and child labor. Thus the project seems to be actively working to support three of the four EI goals.

The degree to which project design supports the fourth EI goal concerning the sustainability of project efforts is more difficult to judge. Each SAP and TREP typically runs for 9 months to a year and it has yet to be demonstrated that participating children will sustain the benefits after such a relatively short intervention. Phase two programs probably have more chance of stimulating sustainable change due to the addition of training for after-school literacy teachers and parent education, but this latter element has yet to be implemented. While subcontractors may be keen to continue activities after the project finishes, the

degree to which they will be able to access the necessary resources is uncertain. However, the increased capacity of SAP and TREP providers to implement, monitor, and report on activities will remain with the individuals and organizations concerned when the project finishes, so this is one aspect that can already be seen as more durable. The project is working to raise public awareness and build institutional capacity to respond to the needs of vulnerable children. It is too early to say to what degree these efforts will promote sustainable change and policy development, but the mere fact of raising the issues and provoking debate is a move in this direction.

2. *At midterm, is the project on track in terms of meeting its stated purpose and outputs in the project document? If not, what seem to be the factors contributing to delays? Were the project purpose and outputs realistic?*

The project is a bit behind in meeting its target of withdrawing or preventing 3,044 children from engaging in exploitive or hazardous labor by provision of SAPs and TREPs. The figures currently available tell us that a total of 1,035 children, or 34 percent of the total target population had been withdrawn, prevented, and enrolled by August 2007, half way into the project. Targets for the current year are ambitious but not impossible if subcontractors are able to enroll the number of children that they have predicted. TREP enrollment presents the greatest challenge, as it has proved difficult to locate some of the children originally identified by the EDUCARE research. These children tend to be dispersed over a wide area, so limited numbers of them live in close proximity to each TREP.

The majority of activities under Output 1 (Raising public awareness) have been rescheduled because of the length of time it has taken to define and agree upon the planned activities in collaboration with the NSCCL and School Welfare Service. Marches to mark the World Day Against Child Labor were organized in three locations and these were clearly memorable and enjoyable events for those involved. The forthcoming series of workshops being organized by the NSCCL and supported by EDUCARE will feed into both a national conference and public awareness campaigns, thus contributing to the achievement of this output. Probably the most concerning delay that is not linked to external factors is in implementing parent education for parents of all children in EDUCARE-sponsored programs. This issue is discussed later in this section.

Activities under Output 2 (Policy and institutional development) are also running considerably behind schedule. The research into the extent and types of child labor currently existing in Guyana has taken much longer than anticipated and the awaited publication of the final report has been progressively postponed from April 2007 to October 2007. This postponement is partly due to the need to send the raw data outside Guyana for statistical analysis, as the only competent body inside the country, the BOS, was unavailable to carry out the work. Other activities based on collaboration with the NSCCL and work with the School Welfare Service are currently underway, but the pace at which they proceed is not entirely controlled by the project, being dependent on the common accord of all concerned. Some of the project's initial indicators are posing problems for EDUCARE because they are

dependent on the idea that the NSCCL would become the coordinating body officially designated as permanent lead organization for child labor issues. As there is no policy for the current status of the NSCCL to change, this indicator needs to be revised so that it can provide a realistic indication of progress during the remaining life of the project.

The SAPs and TREPs that are the principal component of Output 3 (Education system strengthening) took longer to get going than originally envisaged, mainly due to the time taken up by the research and the identification of target children. However, they are now fully operational and results and lessons from the first phase are feeding into phase two programs. EDUCARE, as part of its pre-evaluation submissions to DOL, had suggested that phase three might only concern SAP programs. This issue is currently under review, and serious thought is now being given to phase three concentrating on TREP programs, starting in January 2008. A third phase of SAP programs would require a project extension, and this has been tabled as an option. These are decisions that need to be made soon so that the work plan can be fully updated, together with the log frame, to reflect the current reality. This update will help to ensure that the project can complete its plan by the end of the project period and avoid the situation of being continually behind with planned activities.

The project purpose is ambitious in that it entails sustainable change in attitudes and behavior of children and their parents through interventions of relatively short duration (typically 9 months to 1 year) but the results will speak for themselves, ideally enabling the most effective activities to be identified and developed both within the project timeframe and beyond. Project outputs are also ambitious and Output 2 could be redefined to reflect current realities. The project entails a heavy workload for a relatively small project team, which has probably contributed to activities being somewhat behind schedule, alongside factors already mentioned that are beyond the project manager's control.

3. *In terms of project purpose, is the project able to accurately measure results in terms of USDOL common indicators (withdrawal and prevention)? If not, why not?*

Subcontractors compile basic information on each child enrolled in a TREP or a SAP, which enables the project team to classify them according to the project's operational definitions (see box below) for the withdrawal/ prevention categories. In this way, the project is able to accurately measure results in terms of the common indicators, subject to certain questions concerning the definitions, which are addressed in the response to the following question.

4. *Does the project have clear operational definitions of the target population(s)? Are relevant staff, subcontractors, and partners aware of these definitions?*

The vast majority of cases of WFCL identified by the EDUCARE research seem likely to fall within the fourth category of Convention 182 “**work which, by its nature**

or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.” Due to the lack of any nationally determined list of hazardous labor that this might cover, EDUCARE was obliged to create some definitions to guide the implementation of the project. These do not pretend to fulfill the ILO Convention 182 requirement that types of hazardous labor should be nationally determined after consultation with the organizations of employers and workers concerned, and are purely for the project’s operational purposes. (see box on page 3).

Four categories of children who would be withdrawn from WFCL and two categories of children prevented from entering WFCL are being used to identify and classify the children enrolled in project-initiated education programs.

Operational definitions of target populations

Withdrawn categories:

1. Any child under the age of 15, who is involved in any work that falls within the ILO definition of WFCL, regardless of their level of attendance at school. These children will be considered withdrawn & enrolled once they have returned to school, and have ceased participation in work falling under this category.
2. Any child under the age of 15 who is out of school or has less than 60% attendance and who is undertaking any form of chores, paid or unpaid work, within or without the home will be defined as participating in ‘exploitive’ child labor. These children will be considered enrolled once they have started to receive EDUCARE direct services, and this is reflected in their attendance.
3. Any child aged between 15-17, who is in or out of school and involved in any WFCL. In the context of Guyana, the majority of these cases would be in hazardous labor. Their withdrawn status would be satisfied once they are regularly attending a TREP, and that the type of work is no longer a cause for concern.
4. Any child aged between 15 to 17 who is involved in any form of work, but the undertaking of that work in terms of its location puts that child at risk. This would include work on the streets or in markets as vendors, touting in bus parks, where exposure to language and behavior that is likely to be corrupting, settings where general environmental risks are high (though the work itself might be low risk), and where the child is vulnerable to recruitment into illicit or criminal activities. The child will be considered as ‘withdrawn’ once they are enrolled and are participating in a TREP, and no longer exposed to the risks outlined above.

Prevented categories:

5. Children aged 11 and under who are currently enrolled in primary schools and do not fit any of the ‘withdrawn’ categories, but do demonstrate an attendance profile below 75%, or who are currently not in school. These children will be supported through a school-level SAP, delivered in partnership with the relevant primary school and in some cases with further localized support from an NGO contractor.
6. Children aged between 11-14, who are currently out of school and are not working. These children will be returned to secondary school, through the Ministry of Education Placement Unit, or the Regional Education Departments. EDUCARE will provide some financial support as well as academic support, through Holiday Outreach Programs and Accelerated Learning Programs. There are also ongoing discussions with the Ministry of Education as to how EDUCARE can assist the Regional School Welfare Officers to locate, place and track these children.

The clarity of these definitions might be improved by separating the criteria for participation in an EDUCARE program and those for classification as withdrawn or prevented. There are some aspects that need further explanation:

Category 2: What is meant by *“and this is reflected in their attendance”*? It seems to suggest that children will only be counted as withdrawn if they achieve a certain level of attendance, but it is unclear what level of attendance and how this is interpreted when compiling the numbers of children withdrawn.

Category 3: Similarly, how is it judged that *“the type of work is no longer a cause for concern”*?

Category 4: How realistic is it to assume that enrollment in a TREP (sometimes for as little as 3 hours a day) will result in a child being *“no longer exposed to the risks outlined above”*?

In addition to the above, the evaluator was told that the project defines working five or more hours daily work in the home as exploitive, while three or fewer hours per day is acceptable, which isn't entirely consistent with Category 2 above. Contrary to the initial expectation, most of the children defined as withdrawn were participating in SAPs. Many TREP participants fell into the prevented category, but children within the TREP age group (14-17) were not reflected in the “prevented” categories defined above. EDUCARE included some of the types of hazardous labor found on a list provided by the MoLHSSS in its child monitoring forms, although no one seemed too clear about precisely how and by whom this list was originally compiled (see Annex F).

Definition of child labor and its different categories is complex and something of a minefield, particularly regarding older children. Yet what seems important is to remain in touch with the realities faced by the children concerned. During the evaluation, subcontractors delivering TREPs talked about the economic pressures on participants, which mean that while many of them are working less than before, they still need to contribute to family income, and this sometimes impacts their attendance. What is clear is that the experience gained through attending a TREP improves self-confidence and potential to go onto further training or more satisfying employment, thus offering some degree of protection from exploitation.

While the project staff members are aware of EDUCARE's specific definitions for child labor, subcontractors and other partners gave fairly accurate but less age-specific definitions based on school attendance and working status. Partner organizations demonstrated awareness of the dangers and existence of various types of child labor. Many organizations related direct experience of WFCL and were deeply concerned by the lack of appropriate services to tackle the situation. The consultation process planned by the NSCCL will provide an important opportunity for such local knowledge and experience to feed into the agreement of national definitions.

5. *Does the EDUCARE monitoring system and database effectively identify potential beneficiaries and track them while enrolled and/or withdrawn?*

Are participating children tracked adequately? Are all potentially qualified children being served?

EDUCARE provides the names of children identified during its baseline research to subcontractors providing SAPs or TREPs in the areas where the children live. Service providers then track down as many of these children as possible and encourage them and their parents to take part in the program. Any unfilled places are then allocated to other local children who fit the target group criteria, and their names are added to the database. It has often proved difficult to reach children who were sometimes identified more than a year earlier. Some have moved and others no longer fit the criteria or do not wish to be part of the program. Once a child has accepted a place, providers fill in a form, collecting the following information:

- Date of enrollment, name, date of birth, gender, address, and telephone number
- Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of parents/guardians
- Child's school history, including name of school, attendance levels, grade, achievement
- Child's work history and current status, including reasons for working, income earned and details of occupations and employers, places and hours worked and any injuries sustained.

Providers then track each child on a monthly basis. The frequency of monitoring was recently increased from quarterly so that problems can be detected earlier. Monitoring forms record changes in the educational or working status of the child, as well as participation in different aspects of the program (attendance, meals, remedial tuition, parent attendance and education for SAPs, skill areas covered and parent education for TREPs). This exhaustive tracking means that providers have to collect a lot of information, some of which may be difficult for a child to quantify and express (e.g., hours worked in the home) and this level of monitoring may prove to be too time-consuming to be feasible. However, the need to regularly sit down with each child individually does provide an opportunity to remain tuned into the individual's situation and can be used as an opportunity for counseling or advice, should the need arise. One SAP visited during the evaluation had succeeded in involving all six of the teachers in the school, making each responsible for monitoring the progress of 10 SAP students. It becomes much more feasible to carry out 10 interviews each month than to be faced with a daunting 60 or more, but it is still no mean task for busy primary schools to undertake. Only experience will show whether the accuracy of the information will suffer because of the increase in work load. If this does become evident it may be necessary to reduce the frequency of some aspects of the monitoring or look for other appropriate strategies.

It has been suggested that SWOs might assist with the tracking process and the EDUCARE team investigate whether information accuracy declines as their work with the School Welfare Service develops. It would certainly be a valuable way of ensuring that SWOs have a developed understanding of the issues affecting children in the schools that they cover. It may be, however, that the SWOs need to concentrate on developing systems to cover all the schools in their areas, drawing on the elements of the EDUCARE tracking that they see as the most pertinent, rather

than becoming directly involved in monitoring for the purposes of project reporting in a limited number of schools. In spite of the recent recruitment of more SWOs, they are still relatively few and have limited transport resources to cover the geographic areas concerned.

Some phase one NGO subcontractors had difficulty accessing information from schools that were initially reluctant to spend the necessary time to gather or share the information. EDUCARE encourages NGOs to establish working relationships with teachers and make themselves available to go and collect information from the registers themselves. While some providers are more proactive than others, EDUCARE reinforces the need to track children who fail to attend a program. In line with current school practice, if a child is absent from a SAP or a TREP for 30 consecutive days and followup visits prove futile, he or she is considered as having dropped out. At the end of a SAP program EDUCARE will continue to track participants who remain in school until the project finishes. TREP children who transfer to secondary or further education are counted as completing, as are those who finish the TREP itself.

Not all potentially qualified children are being served because some are not willing or able to participate and others do not have access to a project program in their area. There is no collated record of specific reasons why children refuse a place on a project program, but anecdotal evidence suggests that it can be related to the need to provide family income or lack of cash to pay transport costs. Such children are likely to come from economically deprived families where their parents may have little understanding of the importance of the educational opportunity that is on offer. The second group that does not benefit from EDUCARE services is made up of children under school-leaving age who cannot legally participate in TREPs, but who have been too alienated by their experience of the formal system and have fallen too far behind their peers to attempt a return to full-time school-based education. The project is unable to serve these particularly vulnerable groups of children who cannot attend full-time education because of economic or other pressures. Both these categories of children are especially exposed to exploitation through child labor. EDUCARE and the GOG should identify ways to provide services to meet the needs of these at-risk children.

6. *What impact is the project having on retaining students in school and on educational quality? Can these be measured? What is the impact of educational interventions, if any, on project withdrawal and prevention indicators?*

As a result of concern accentuated by the EDUCARE research process, Regional Education Departments have implemented a number of truancy campaigns and some parents sent their children back to school. Some SWOs suggested that the fact that the research teams were seen around localities asking questions about children out of school actually encouraged school attendance and it seems entirely possible that this was the case. Similarly, it would be valuable to assess whether attendance levels increased immediately after the release of the tentative findings from the project's baseline study and implementation of the truancy and attendance

campaigns by MoE regional departments. If so, this significant result can be attributed directly to the efforts of the MoE, and indirectly to the research of the EDUCARE project. EDUCARE designed SAPs and TREPs to cater to children identified during the research, and other locally identified children fitting the criteria fill any remaining places.

After 6 months of activity, overall figures for SAPs show that participants' average school attendance had risen from 38 percent to 59 percent and the percentage with more than 75 percent attendance had risen from 19 percent to 43 percent. However, within these results, only three of the five providers showed noticeable increases in attendance, while one of the other two showed little change, and the other showed a fall in attendance levels. Over the same period, TREPs showed average attendance of 71 percent, with 68 percent of participants having more than 75 percent attendance. There was considerable variation between different providers. Considering that these are young people who were not attending any form of education before the arrival of the project, these levels of attendance suggest that TREPs are on the right track toward successfully addressing the needs of those concerned. The project team will need to work with providers and participants to analyze these results alongside different aspects of the services offered in an attempt to identify the factors that most influence change and the barriers that still exist.

Realizing that providing school meals alone will not necessarily produce the desired results, the project team has introduced a more holistic package of intervention for the second phase programs that are just beginning. One innovation that will improve quality is 2 days' training for two teachers from each SAP to provide them with approaches, ideas, and resources to make after-school literacy clubs both enjoyable and effective. The training also offers non-threatening techniques for testing in order to measure progress. An experienced special needs teacher (a volunteer from VSO working for NCERD) is providing the training, supported by the project's education specialist. The evaluator had first-hand knowledge of the difference between children who had attended such a class (run by a PCV and another VSO volunteer) and those who had not. The former were more able to express themselves clearly and easily and had the confidence to experiment with an unfamiliar activity and answer questions about their ideas and experience. Overall, their demeanor was open and enthusiastic, which will assist them in attracting the help and support they need from their teachers and others.

While the project does not have any direct measurement of educational quality, the team has been proactive in introducing changes that will improve quality of services on offer. In addition to quality, it is important to think about whether the current length of interventions (9 months for the majority of TREPs and 1 school year for SAPs) is enough to create lasting change for individual children concerned. This topic is discussed further at the end of this section.

One long-term issue is the degree to which EDUCARE's added value will continue to help vulnerable children after the end of the program. Project managers hope to promote this assistance by supporting exchange visits between SAP programs, visits to after-school clubs by the VSO trainer, and some follow-up training opportunities for the teachers concerned. Such activities will encourage continued use and further

development of the techniques and approaches presented during the initial 2-day training.

Where TREP's are concerned, there is as yet little measurement of quality or achievement as the first phase programs draw to a close. Some of the activities witnessed by the evaluator were clearly extremely beneficial for the participants in therapeutic and developmental terms, creating a sense of achievement, cooperation, and shared experience. However, the degree to which such skills will be directly applicable to income generation or the employment market is less certain. Some of the TREP's are specifically designed to provide entry-level skills to a variety of trades/professions and some others offer an opportunity to try different aspects of a particular trade (e.g., construction). What happens to TREP graduates after the end of the program will define whether a TREP is a significant and life-changing intervention or a happy interlude that has little long-term influence on a young person's lifestyle. This question needs to be addressed with providers both collectively and individually. Possibilities are already being examined by the project's education specialist and might include individual plans developed with each participant that would be subject to regular review to ensure that the young person remains on track. In light of the fact that employment openings for young people remain quite limited, opportunities for TREP groups to continue to meet for mutual support and encouragement could also be considered, as well as possibilities for opening small production units, as the Sunshine Women and Youth Group is hoping to do.

7. *What other major design/implementation issues should be brought to the attention of Partners of the Americas and USDOL?*

EDUCARE Research

Although the results of the baseline study are not yet available, it promises to be of value, not only in the measurement of project results, but also as a broad-based, in-depth analysis of the nature and extent of child labor and the related barriers to accessing education in Guyana's coastal regions. In addition to being used to identify children participating in EDUCARE-sponsored education programs, the resulting information and database will be available for use by the School Welfare Service and potentially to any other departments and organizations working to ensure that all Guyana's children can access appropriate and relevant education. Although it is difficult to discuss the research findings before the report is available, the evaluation can comment on the methodology and possibilities for extending the research to cover the hinterland regions.

EDUCARE provided 2 days' training for the research teams, which were drawn from regional education department staff, teachers, and NGO community workers working primarily in their own communities. The research questionnaires were piloted and revised before being used to interview more than 5,000 children. These were identified by local schools, which provided lists of children who had less than 75 percent attendance or who had dropped out of school. Other children were identified within the communities concerned during the course of the research, so children who did not appear on school registers were also taken into account to some

extent. However, there is a need for more systematic inclusion of out-of-school children in the database and in the ongoing work of SWOs, as they make up not only the most vulnerable group, but also the group most likely to slip through the net into invisibility. If this issue isn't addressed, EDUCARE's focus on child labor among school dropouts risks diverting attention from child laborers who have never appeared on a school register. The research questionnaires were long and the number of respondents was high and it is important to recognize the commitment of the researchers, many of whom worked far beyond their allotted hours and made great efforts to locate and interview the children concerned. The identified children were widely dispersed, which necessitated researchers going into communities where they did not always feel at ease and where they were not known. Interviews took place either in the presence of a parent or guardian or with children on their own. Some children may have been reticent about answering questions concerning their behavior, particularly concerning sexual relationships, which makes it more difficult to gauge whether they may have been involved in a WFCL as defined by ILO Convention 182. In any research, some potential for bias is inevitable and overall EDUCARE and the research teams seem to have gone to great lengths to produce accurate information reflecting the realities of the children concerned. It would have been informative to understand something about the points of view of their parents, but this did not fall within the scope of this enquiry.

There has been some discussion about extending the research to cover the hinterland regions because there is a perception that higher levels of the more damaging types of child labor may exist there. Such a move would complete the current research so that an up-to-date nationwide picture of child labor is available. During the stakeholders meeting, research in the hinterland and the design of programs based on the results were identified as priorities for the second half of the project. It was suggested that the help of PCVs, community leaders, and village councils could be accessed through local government. About 9 percent (about 70,000 people) of Guyana's population live in Regions 1, 7, 8, and 9, an area that covers well over half of the entire country. As access to the dispersed and isolated communities concerned is difficult and expensive and project resources in terms of time and money are limited, this proposal will need careful consideration and consultation with the ministries concerned.

Working with Parents

As already mentioned, EDUCARE has introduced parent education as a component of all phase two SAPs and TREPs. This fundamental aspect of working with vulnerable young people is long overdue and needs to be put into practice as soon as possible. Such education needs to focus on empowering parents to develop their self-confidence and parenting skills, bearing in mind that they may have experienced failure in school, feel themselves to be under achieving as parents or providers, and be subject to emotional deprivation and/or economic pressures. The evaluator's admittedly limited experience of meeting with parents of SAP/TREP participants gave the impression of a depressed and disenfranchised group who see themselves as passive and fairly ineffectual with regard to their children's activities and education. The fact that so few subcontractors responded to the evaluator's request to meet with parents suggests that they are perceived as a group that is difficult to reach and involve. This means that training for those who will facilitate parent

education events will need to tackle this perception so that facilitators have the necessary approaches and tools to initiate a process of parent empowerment.

Such a process will need to help parents to recognize the strengths and resources they undoubtedly possess and to build on these. While it is extremely important to pass on information about the dangers and effects of child labor, any suggestion that this carries a negative judgement of their behavior will be counter productive. If the topic can be approached through a participatory analysis of children's needs and rights, accompanied by information about the various international and national laws and conventions concerned, parents themselves will be able to identify ways in which they can support and encourage their children's progress and development. Another possibility for working with parents is to help them to examine their own needs and to explore the idea of developing ongoing self-help groups. These groups might center on mutual support and problem-solving regarding parenting issues, but could also explore opportunities for economic empowerment if this issue emerges as a common need.

Subcontractors came up with a range of interesting suggestions about parent education, as did participants at the stakeholders meeting. These include the idea of running joint workshops for parents and their children, knowledge of potential facilitators for and experience of parent workshops, visits, tours, slideshows, open days/exhibitions, discussions, sporting events, and drama – so no shortage of inspiration. The project's PCV is in the process of talking to subcontractors and collating a resource base of information that can be used by trainers and parents alike.

The lack of any established community development component of the project or any specialist in this area on the EDUCARE team is, in the evaluator's opinion, a real shortcoming in a project that is developing otherwise innovative strategies and interventions. The fact that the research did not focus on them, providers do not always perceive their importance and the evaluator's observation of attitudes toward them, suggests that parents of vulnerable children are a marginalized group whose opinions are not sought or valued by anyone. Their power to influence their children's behavior and potential to act both as individuals and as a group in their communities is underestimated. If poverty and traditional working practices are root causes of child labor, interventions need to tackle these in order to be sustainable and to benefit more than a limited number of direct beneficiaries. One way of doing this is through working with parents because they have other children and can influence other members of their communities. Without wishing to undermine the importance and value of the work being done by the project's PCV in developing a child labor resource manual, it has to be recognized that this is not a substitute for participatory community development expertise and related activities.

Child Labor and Sexual Abuse

Several subcontractors mentioned sexual abuse being experienced by girls in their programs. Children experiencing sexual abuse are particularly exposed to further exploitation as sex workers. If sexual abuse is as prevalent as suggested during the evaluation, the project needs to play a role in assisting the development of the necessary services so that such children receive the help they need to protect

themselves and to come to terms with their experiences. Several SWOs expressed feelings of helplessness in the face of a lack of resources and inadequate cooperation with other services, suggesting that this is an area of wider concern.

Duration of SAPs and TREPs – Are Current Interventions Long Enough?

SAPs provide services for about one school year. When they come to an end, only a change in the child's original circumstances would prevent him or her from resuming previous attendance patterns. Such changes might include improved skills and integration with peers, greater parental involvement and support or improved economic circumstances or a change in family spending priorities. While it is not impossible that such changes might occur within a year, it is much more likely to happen over a longer period. Stakeholders suggested that SAPs continue for 2 years, focusing on after-school clubs and school meals. They suggested that parents play a greater role by participating in and contributing ideas to the programs.

The same group felt that 1 year was sufficient where TREPs were concerned, but that they should concentrate on fewer skills with more focus on the quality of service delivery. They said TREPs need to help participants focus on their strengths and support them in progressing to higher learning institutions or access job opportunities. The YMCA representative, who has long-term experience in providing skills education, felt strongly that 2 years were necessary for TREPs to be truly effective. There is probably not a one-size-fits-all response to the question. If each TREP had the possibility of continuing for longer, participants who were ready to leave and had found job openings or opportunities to continue their education elsewhere could move on, leaving space for a new intake. Others still needing the services and support could continue for longer. While the length of intervention needs to be balanced against project resources and target numbers, it is an important question for the project team. They need to decide to what degree the project can support longer interventions while still meeting its targets. The introduction of longer term interventions would reduce the administrative workload associated with regularly servicing new subcontractors and would free up more staff time for content and quality-oriented work with established service providers. Longer term interventions would also provide a longer period for working with parents and for gathering information and ideas about child rights and child labor to bear fruit in the communities concerned. POA said that the finance question is the underlying constraint, given that these programs are expensive and are becoming even more so as food and material prices keep rising. Many of the providers already question their ability to deliver quality programs with the resources that are being made available to them, which underlines the importance of POA stepping up its financial input and delivering on its obligation to fund half the project budget.

Reproductive Health Education

Reproductive health education equips young people with the information and knowledge that they need to make informed choices about sexual behavior and the risks involved in sexual activities contrary to Article 3 of the ILO Convention 182 on the WFCL. It enables them to discuss issues of concern and increase their understanding of their own bodies and the risks that being sexually active will

expose them to, including HIV/AIDS. The website for the GOG's National HIV/AIDS Program⁷ provides links to a range of resources for youth and the MoH has prioritized late childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood as important life-stages for health promotion and intervention within its National Health Plan. The MoH has approached EDUCARE to help contact and engage out-of-school youth as part of its program focused on youth-friendly health centers and attempts to encourage youth to access reproductive health and HIV. This collaboration provides an ideal opportunity to ensure that TREP participants have access to reproductive health education and EDUCARE's most recent Technical Progress Reports that the MoH will engage with EDUCARE subcontractors to work with the participants on the TREP programs.

Conclusions

Overall, the project is running behind schedule due to a combination of factors that include the length of time taken by the research process, difficulties in establishing collaborative relationships with government ministries, and a heavy workload for a small team. It is important to establish the content of the work plan for the rest of the project before the end of 2007 and ensure that the necessary resources exist to put it into practice. In making these decisions, the team needs to avoid spreading resources too thinly and should take into account the points of view of other stakeholders to ensure common ownership of project initiatives and outcomes. The projected project revision can then provide the blueprint for the time that remains.

SAPS and TREPs are being refined through experience and are modeling a range of opportunities that are helping children withdrawn or prevented from child labor to reach their potential. Attendance levels for TREPs suggest that they are heading in the right direction toward meeting the needs of the young people concerned, in providing a good balance between structure and flexibility, and offering access to training in a range of skills. These valuable components of the project urgently need be complemented by parent education, the lack of which is a gap in current provision, and reproductive health education would also be a potentially life-saving addition.

Despite some minor inconsistencies, the project has an effective monitoring and evaluation system that enables subcontractors to track beneficiaries and report information to the project team. Future work with the School Welfare Service should help this information to be better exploited at local and regional levels. Operational child labor definitions could be further clarified, but at this stage, this should not take precedence over developing and supporting SAPs and TREPs, as the majority of participants have now been identified and the planned national- and regional-level consultation process will result in agreed-upon definitions for the future.

There are two groups of children whose needs are not being met by EDUCARE services. One group concerns children under school-leaving age who do not attend full-time education because of economic or other pressures and cannot legally participate in TREPs because they are too young. Within this group is an unknown

⁷ <http://www.hiv.gov.gy>

number of children who have never been to school and who therefore do not appear on school registers. One suggestion for ensuring their systematic inclusion is through a national database of vulnerable children that links SWOs with Neighborhood Democratic Councils, which have local residential information necessary for identifying families of out-of-school children. The second group is made up of children who fit the criteria for SAPs and TREPs but are unable to attend a program due to distance or other reasons. These are significant gaps in current provision, which the GOG needs to address, in view of the particular vulnerability of the groups concerned.

Recommendations

...Concerning SAPs and TREPs

- Design and implementation of the parent education component should be a priority and POA should look to provide some participatory community development expertise to assist the EDUCARE team.
- The EDUCARE team should work with TREP providers to ensure that participants have individual plans and objectives leading to realistic options at the end of their program.
- The EDUCARE team should collaborate with the MoH to enable TREP providers to offer reproductive health education, (including HIV/AIDS) as a part of their programs.
- Follow-up to the training for after-school club teachers should include visits from the VSO trainer, exchange visits between clubs, and refresher training opportunities.
- The EDUCARE team should consider to what extent they can extend the period of intervention on a program-by-program basis while respecting their commitment to meet their target number of beneficiaries. Emphasis should be placed on developing examples of good practice rather than on extending programs that are not showing results so that successful models can be increasingly well-defined.

...Concerning the EDUCARE research

- A provisional plan and budget for extending the research to the hinterland regions and any subsequent interventions based on the findings should be prepared and discussed with the relevant Ministries and with other potential partners who might contribute to the necessary human and/or financial resources. These discussions should form the basis for any decision to implement the plan.
- Any subsequent research in the hinterland regions should look at the opinions and perceptions of parents concerning education and child labor.

...Concerning children whose needs are not being met

- An analysis of the numbers of children identified by the EDUCARE research (and others like them) who are under school-leaving age but who have lost too much school time to be able to cope with the mainstream curriculum should be carried out, along with the reasons that led to them effectively dropping out of school. This information would assist the GOG in developing services adapted to their needs. Such an analysis could involve EDUCARE subcontractors,

- particularly community groups, in sharing their knowledge of such children in their areas.
- The GOG needs to ensure the systematic inclusion of children who have never been to school within a national database of vulnerable children. EDUCARE should work with SWOs, local NGOs, community groups, and Neighborhood Democratic Councils to develop a methodology and ensure that this happens.
 - Any available information about why children refused places on TREPs or SAPs should be collated and analyzed to assist the GOG in developing services adapted to the specific needs of this group.
 - GOG should be kept informed of the impact of TREP provision (particularly where the provider is an MoE establishment) so that they can examine the feasibility of supporting the continuation and extension of the provision to cover more geographic areas, thus better meeting the needs of a vulnerable group of children.

...Concerning project documentation

- The project log frame's Output 2 should be revised so that it is based on activities agreed to between government ministries and EDUCARE (Support for the NSCCL's child labor consultation process, work with the School Welfare Service...).
- The project work plan should be updated once plans for the second half of the project are finalized.

C. Partnership and Coordination

Responses to specific questions raised by USDOL

1. *What have been the major issues and challenges of initiating partnerships in support of the project? What major challenges and opportunities have arisen from coordination with Ministers of Education and Labor, and local NGOs?*

The development of a collaborative working relationship based on common understanding between the relevant government ministries and the project team has been challenging. It is not possible for the evaluator to judge if these difficulties are linked to perceptions and relationships between the GOG and the wider donor community or if they exist solely within the context of EDUCARE. Whichever is the case, any opportunities to improve relationships need to be firmly grasped since the project's progress and long-term impact will be that much greater if it collaborates and moves forward with the support and involvement of the ministries concerned. The principal disagreements center on the stage at which traditional work in a family business becomes exploitative or damaging to a child's education and the degree to which the WFCL exist within Guyana. Public discussion of research that is not yet available to the government and the misrepresentation of aspects of this research in the press have served to exacerbate the situation. Once the research report becomes available, there will at least be a common basis for discussion.

Through ratifying the ILO Conventions related to child labor, countries commit themselves to meeting certain internationally accepted labor standards. While a number of laws that protect children are in existence, the GOG has yet to meet all of its obligations in relation to Convention 182, which it ratified in 2001. Outstanding obligations include:—

- The determination of a list of *hazardous work* after consultation with organizations of employers and workers. The Convention makes certain recommendations concerning this list (see box on page 3).
- The design and implementation of *programs of action* to eliminate the worst forms of child labor, in consultation with employers' and workers' organizations and other concerned groups, and the monitoring of the implementation of such programs.

EDUCARE and programs like it exist to offer technical assistance and support in the fulfillment of these obligations and the development of strategies to tackle child labor, but ultimately it is the responsibility of the government of the country concerned to ensure that it is in compliance with the relevant Conventions.

The ILO provides a number of materials to assist governments in fulfilling their obligations and these can be downloaded from the ILO Web site.⁸ Such materials can assist countries in learning from the experience of others and provide ideas and inspiration for moving forward.

Some materials covering issues relevant to Guyana include—

1. The ILO handbook offering practical assistance to parliamentarians in understanding the problem of child labor and its worst forms and outlining effective action to tackle it. (*Eliminating the worst forms of child labour: a practical guide to ILO Convention no. 182 - Handbook for parliamentarians, no. 3, 2002*)

From page 41:

“Ratification of international Conventions provides a stimulus to national action; in no way is it a substitute for national action. Convention No. 182 requires ratifying countries to design and implement programmes of action to eliminate the worst forms of child labour and to monitor the implementation of such programmes.

The content and approach of such programmes clearly have to be tailored to the specific situations, needs and conditions of each country – as well as to regions within countries.

There can be no universal blueprint for action against child labour. Moreover, it should be noted that programmes to combat the worst forms of child labour (which are the subject of this Handbook) generally contain elements necessary for combating all forms of child labour.

⁸ <http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Informationresources/lang-en/index.htm> and follow the link to guidelines and training materials.

It is a question of giving first priority to children at greatest risk and to rehabilitating those subjected to the most abusive and hazardous forms of exploitation. In spite of their differences all national programmes must have three basic objectives:

- to **prevent** the engagement of children in the worst forms of child labour;
- to **remove** children from the worst forms of child labour;
- provide for the **rehabilitation** and **social integration** of such children.

To attain these objectives requires action on five broad fronts:

- **sensitizing public opinion;**
- **legislation;**
- **enforcement;**
- **education;** and
- **support for the children and their families**

2. 2003 Time-Bound Programme Manual for Action Planning (TBP-MAP) – complete kit. The **Time-Bound Programme Manual for Action Planning** is a collection of documents designed to orient policymakers and program designers. It consists of five guide books and numerous informative papers detailing matters covered in the guide books.
3. 2006 Steps toward Determining Hazardous Child Labor (HCL) – toolkit. This material has been prepared at the request of ILO member countries to assist them in determining HCL for the first time or in revising their existing lists. The material is as follows:
 - Describes the six-step process each country should go through in determining HCL and preparing its HCL list.
 - Gives examples showing how four countries have prepared their list according to the six steps.
 - Includes four factsheets providing clarification on legal issues concerning HCL lists: Defining versus Determining; The 16–18 exclusion; Competent authority and The Consultation requirement.
 - Lists laws on HCL from more than 100 countries.

The evaluator takes the opportunity to bring these materials to the attention of EDUCARE, the NSCCL, and the GOG in the hope that they might contribute to the ongoing work over the coming years.

The project's work with the MoE is coordinated by the recently established Ministry of Education Liaison Committee, which meets monthly and brings together key actors from the ministry and the EDUCARE project director. This arrangement is currently working well in that it has established appropriate lines of reporting and ensures the circulation of information about project activities. Agreement in principal to collaboration with the School Welfare Service and a declaration of friendship from the Chief Welfare Officer should result in a concrete plan of action within the very near future. The MoE played an invaluable role in the EDUCARE research and in supporting the introduction of SAPs and TREPs, both of which use MoE resources. Ministry representatives at both regional and national levels expressed their appreciation of the project, their satisfaction with the research process, and other project activities and their desire to develop their ongoing collaboration with the EDUCARE team.

The project's work with the NSCCL has been largely covered in Section A so it remains only to say that this committee, situated within the MoLHSS, continues to cooperate with EDUCARE and appreciates the project's support for its work. The Minister of Labor is currently displeased with EDUCARE because he feels that the project is operating too independently, without sufficient consultation. It is to be hoped that the arrival of the research report will enable the debate to be focused on its findings and that EDUCARE and the Ministry of Labor can find more common ground so that they can better understand each other during the remaining project period. The evaluator would like to point out that the existence of EDUCARE suggests to the international community that Guyana is a country prepared to look at and tackle any child labor issues that it may have.

EDUCARE's other important partnerships are those established with the 27 partners that have signed subcontracts to implement the 26 SAPs and 13 TREPs initiated so far. These subcontractors include 8 primary schools or PTAs, 2 Adult Education Associations, 11 community or faith-based groups, the YWCA, and 5 public or private skills-training institutions. It is clearly challenging to work with such a broad range of organizations spread across seven regions and Georgetown. In addition, the project team has worked on proposals with a number of other potential partners where negotiations have not resulted in contracts being signed for one reason or another. Many subcontractors are unaccustomed to project-style financial management and some have limited computer literacy. All had to be introduced to the project's monitoring and tracking requirements and reporting procedures. Hence, the team has found itself faced with the need for considerable orientation and capacity-building to enable subcontractors to effectively fulfill their role. It is to their credit that the consistent message from subcontractors during the evaluation was one of appreciation for their patience and availability by phone, and their time spent in the field. Although everyone wanted more visits, these are inevitably limited due to the size of the team and the number of subcontractors.

While such a broad range of partners presents some challenges, it also means that the project has a diverse range of experience and resources on which it can draw. There are aspects of the programs that educational institutions can undoubtedly do best and others where community groups would be better to facilitate and initiate activities. Perhaps the ideal situation is where the two groups can work together to complement each other and help to ensure that schools are integrated into their communities, which takes cooperation and understanding on the part of both groups. This collaboration is another challenge for the project—it has to not only manage partnerships with subcontractors, but support them in developing working relationships with their own partners to ensure that project activities run smoothly.

2. Are any significant partnership opportunities being missed?

POA has expressed interest in the possibility of developing partnerships with the private sector and is planning to explore this. There is apparently only limited contact with other agencies concerned with child labor issues such as the ILO and UNICEF. This limited contact is probably due to lack of time, but it may be worth developing these relationships to share experience and information.

Conclusions

The project has charted a difficult course with regard to its essential relationships with government ministries. It is hoped that the resolution of a number of difficulties, the arrival of the research report, and ongoing consultation and collaboration will continue to improve relationships so that the project can move forward and benefit the maximum number of children in the time that remains.

The project team has worked tirelessly to initiate and support the development of partnerships with subcontractors. The possibility of developing partnerships with the private sector might help to raise some funds to enable activities such as research and intervention in the hinterland regions.

Recommendations

- EDUCARE needs to ensure that it collaborates with the appropriate ministries to the greatest possible degree, keeping all relevant parties informed of project plans and the results of project interventions. In order to ensure that this is working effectively ministries can be asked for suggestions about how they would like to see this working and to give some feedback from time to time.
- EDUCARE should provide regular opportunities for subcontractors to come together to discuss topics of common interest and share project-related experience. Exchange visits could also be encouraged and supported.
- Training for parent education should encourage subcontractors to combine the strengths of schools and community organizations when working with parents.

D. Management and Budget

Responses to specific questions raised by USDOL

1. *What are the management strengths of this project?*

Interviews with the EDUCARE team, observation of the team in action, and stakeholder comments lead the evaluator to conclude that the project is efficiently managed by a hardworking and committed group of people. Their team approach works well and members are flexible and multifunctional, each being able to follow up on the others' areas of responsibility when in the field, thus ensuring that field visits are used to maximum effect. An open and democratic leadership style encourages specialists to take full responsibility for their areas of expertise. Team members are also encouraged and enabled to develop their potential in new directions and contribute to the project's ongoing evolution. Effective financial management benefits the project as a whole and subcontractor-related aspects in particular. The finance officer has a good understanding of program activities and plays an extended role in supporting implementing personnel and troubleshooting potential difficulties when in the field, which is much appreciated by project partners. Project staff travel extensively and regularly work long hours. Their willingness to do this demonstrates their enthusiasm for the project and deserves recognition and appreciation.

2. *What management areas, including technical and financial, could be improved?*

The project could benefit from speeding up a bit. Parent education, an essential component of SAPs and TREPs, needs to get going as soon as possible so that it can be effectively integrated into the programs before they are too far advanced. The research report needs to be available to the GOG and other partners as a matter of urgency. While a number of issues already discussed have contributed to some activities falling behind schedule, the project has a small team in comparison with other similar projects and the level of work is probably also a factor in the delays. If POA is able to supplement the team's skills with some community development expertise, (possibly from another child labor project) this would also enable the work to be shared between more people and speed up the implementation.

3. *How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources?*

Under the terms of its agreement with USDOL, POA has an obligation to supplement USDOL funding with US\$2,016,206 in matching funds. Considering that the project has only leveraged resources valued at around \$200,000 by August 2007, this is an area that is cause for considerable concern. Principal sources of leveraged funds are—

- Subcontractors (Match funds committed as part of Tender Process for Contracts).
- Researchers (Extra time given by researchers - free provision of training venues for researcher training).
- Sponsors (Provision of funds from other agencies delivering similar programs to EDUCARE target children—EFA Fast Track Initiative school feeding at St. Anthony's accounts for current figures).
- Program Participation (TREP) (Based on a US\$5 per TREP participant per day as their contribution—transport, lost earnings, etc.)

Less financially significant sources include the project's PCV, the value of free media publicity on Child Labor and EDUCARE activities, and the provision of audio visual equipment for training.

While these are all valuable contributions to project activities, they provide no funds for project management and the PCV is the only leveraged contribution to project personnel. Individual SAPs and TREPs are only able to run for a relatively short period if the project is going to meet its target number of beneficiaries, but there is a question mark over whether this is long enough to have the desired impact. The four Community Partnership Promoters mentioned as part of the project's institutional management framework in the project document have not materialized and the project is consequently lacking in community development expertise.

It has to be asked whether it is feasible to attempt to implement a \$4,000,000 project using match funding generated from within the project for over half of the total budget. The project would be enhanced by additional funding coming from external

sources and POA is strongly encouraged to investigate this.

4. *With the project currently signing multiple subcontracts, do adequate administrative and program procedures and coordination exist? Are the subcontractors aware of and following project guidelines for identifying, defining, tracking and assisting beneficiaries?*

The project has effective administrative and program procedures, in line with its generally good management practice. Without such procedures, it would not be possible to successfully coordinate so many subcontracts. The development of clear financial management systems and effective training and coaching has helped the project to bring even inexperienced subcontractors up to speed relatively fast.

Subcontractors also received orientation and training to enable them to identify and track beneficiaries and the project tools to assist them in this are clear, if somewhat lengthy. Subcontractors are following project guidelines in identifying beneficiaries to the greatest extent that they can. It is only if they fail to locate or identify children who fit these guidelines that they make up any remaining spaces with otherwise vulnerable and needy children who wish to participate.

The evaluator is not aware of any project guidelines for assisting beneficiaries, beyond the need to follow up any absence and encourage a return to the program. Responsibility for the provision of counseling, advice, and support rests largely with individual subcontractors and tends to vary from one provider to the next.

Conclusions

The project is being run by a hardworking and committed team using effective technical and financial management strategies. Having said this, the project is running behind schedule and there are some questions around the long-term impact of project activities. POA is apparently intending to implement the \$4,000,000 project without any provision of externally generated funds to meet its obligation under the Cooperative Agreement with USDOL. This situation may result in a project that is unlikely to meet its potential because it doesn't have the full complement of staff to do the work or the resources to fund the necessary interventions because the cash isn't there to finance them.

Recommendation

- POA needs to find funding from outside the project to implement planned activities to maximum effect and implement the evaluation's recommendations, namely, the addition of community development expertise to the project team, extended periods of intervention for SAPs and TREPs, and the possibility of extending the research to the hinterland regions.

E. Sustainability and Impact

Responses to specific questions raised by USDOL

1. *What steps have been taken so far to promote sustainability and continuation of education strategies for combating child labor beyond the life of the project?*

EDUCARE encourages subcontractors to own their activities and look for how they can extend them after the end of the project. Some first phase SAP schools have been able to continue to feed the children at least for some days of the week after the end of the program and at least one is considering local fundraising to support the continuation of SAP activities. TREP providers have a variety of plans for their graduates after the end of the program, but most are unlikely to be able to continue to provide ongoing TREPs because of the financial implication. One partner that may be able to is the YWCA, where the EDUCARE coordinator envisaged the possibility of looking for internal funding to continue to cater to more vulnerable groups. The MoE is introducing an element of supplementary literacy teaching into all primary schools and one teacher explained that this can build on the methodology and approach used in after-school clubs in participating schools.

Plans for working with SWOs center on transferring the project database to the appropriate regional education offices and training SWOs to use and develop the system to enhance their ability to identify and track at-risk children so that more of these children can be supported to access education.

2. *Was the project's initial strategy for sustainability adequate and appropriate?*

The project's initial strategy for sustainability at the national level focused on its work with the NSCCL, as previously discussed. While this work is ongoing, it is not precisely following the path that was originally anticipated, but is evolving in line with the prevailing circumstances. At the regional level, barriers to institutional capacity-building with the School Welfare Service now seem to have been removed and at the local level, the training and experience of research teams and SAP and TREP providers concerning child labor issues and the identification, monitoring, and support for at-risk children will continue to inform the work of the individuals concerned.

It remains to be seen to what degree these strategies will ensure the sustainability of project impact. What is certain is that they can be enhanced by working with parents and communities to raise awareness of the issues and ways to support vulnerable children. Such initiatives will be complemented by the planned national- and local-level consultation process that will feed into a National Conference and subsequent policy developments.

3. *What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on a) individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.), b) partner organizations*

(local NGOs, community groups, schools, etc.), c) the National Steering Committee, and d) government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?

- a) TREP participants said that they enjoyed their programs because they felt able to ask questions without fear of ridicule and they found their classes more organized and focused than those in mainstream schools. In spite of the fact that many of them are facing challenges linked to their family or living circumstances, they are planning for the future and reported feeling more optimistic and hopeful as a result of experience, skills, and knowledge gained through their TREP. Younger children who were part of SAP programs generally found it more difficult to express their ideas, with the exception of one group, who were missing their after-school club and the PCV and VSO who had run it. The group had clearly derived enormous enjoyment from the experience and had increased their reading and social interaction skills. There was no evidence that the project had any impact on parents so far, but SAP teachers expressed satisfaction with the new skills they were learning and felt better able to meet the needs of children who fall behind or learn slowly. TREP organizers were unanimous in their appreciation of the opportunity provided by the project and their sense that it was meeting a largely unmet need. Resource people from different communities were pleased to be contributing various skills to TREP initiatives, as it made them feel valued and appreciated and gave them an opportunity to help participants enhance their skills.
- b) Community groups enjoyed expanding their activities to help vulnerable children in their communities and training institutions were keen to expand their range of students to include this hard-to-reach group, even if the experience was proving challenging at times. Schools were pleased to have the opportunity to help pupils from poorer families and this enhanced their reputation in their communities. Some providers gained new skills and experience in financial management, computer use, and tracking and supporting of vulnerable children.
- c) The NSCCL is trying to usefully develop and establish its role. EDUCARE is helping NSCCL to reflect on the options available and providing some financial support to enable the NSCCL to implement some initiatives, thus facilitating the committee's plan of action.
- d) The project has drawn attention to child labor issues and the fact that numbers of children are dropping out of formal education for one reason or another. This attention may have contributed to the MoE's decision to recruit more SWOs and step up the frequency of campaigns to draw children back to school. Discussions with the Chief Labor Officer have highlighted the need to develop a formal list of hazardous child labor adapted to the realities in Guyana. These and ongoing discussions may contribute to such a list eventually finding its place in national legislation.

4. *What lessons could be learned to date in terms of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?*

EDUCARE's encouragement for subcontractors to think about the sustainability of their interventions from the start and to take ownership of their activities resulted in some good ideas. These could be enhanced by supporting the development of a sustainability plan with each provider to enable them to put these ideas into practice before the project ends. Ideas could also be discussed and shared between providers at meetings convened for that purpose.

Conclusions

The project's most immediate impact was most evident at the local level where SAPs and TREPs were implemented. Direct beneficiaries would be helped by individual plans to help them set and achieve goals both during and after the end of their programs, and providers of these programs would benefit from more structured support directed toward the development and implementation of plans for sustainability at the organizational level. Parent education will make it more likely that project impact will extend to siblings of the project's direct beneficiaries and filter through into the wider community. Current plans at regional and national levels will ensure a degree of sustainability of project intervention to the degree to which they are eventually able to be implemented.

Recommendations

- Both SAP and TREP providers should try to produce a sustainability plan for the continuation of some or all of their activities, which might include ongoing followup and support for TREP graduates.

VI. GOOD PRACTICES

A number of good practices were in evidence during visits to TREPs and SAPs during the evaluation. Some of these practices were mentioned at the stakeholders' meeting and are also mentioned here to provide a basis for discussion and reflection in the future.

SAPs:

- Involve all the teachers in the school and ask each to oversee a limited number of SAP children so that each child benefits from additional individual attention from a specific adult. Tracking and monitoring responsibilities are shared, thus avoiding overloading particular teachers.
- Use local resource people for SAP activities. Involve VSOs and/or PCVs in after-school clubs and have TREP students take turns in helping to serve lunch to SAP students.

TREPs:

- Provide counseling and/or opportunities to talk to a sympathetic adult on either a formal or informal basis.
- Create small classes to enable more individual attention.
- Ensure that the activities on offer provide a combination of opportunities to succeed and enhance future earning potential while building self-confidence

and social skills.

- Encourage program participants to make the rules governing behavior in the center, give them responsibility in the development of sanctions, and ensure that the rules are kept.
- Have participants go out into the community to carry out interviews.
- Conduct group outings/visits to complement center-based activities.
- Work in groups to encourage cooperation and shared decisionmaking.
- Prepare food and eat together—a life-enhancing activity that participants can build on throughout their lives.

ANNEX B
Documents Reviewed

Cooperative Agreement and Project documents...

Final Guyana SGA 5-05
Non ILO Management Procedure Guidelines (6-3-05)
Non-ILO MPG APPENDICES (6-3-05)
ICLP Risk Assessment for Audits – Guyana
Guyana FY05 Cooperative Agreement 9 8 05 FINAL
POA Project Document Guyana
Partners Program Document Educare Guyana May 2006
Annex B Prodoc Work Plan EDUCARE Guyana (Apr 06)
Annex D EDUCARE PMP Sept 06
Target Annex D Sept. 2006
Annex D. Capacity Target
USDOL comments on Project Document Educare Guyana April 2006
Annex A - Logframe EDUCARE Guyana Final May 2006
Guyana ProDoc, Annexes - USDOL Comments (Jun 06)
Annex A - Logframe EDUCARE Guyana Final Jun 07

Technical Progress Reports and USDOL comments...

Guyana Mar 06 TPR (v.1)
Guyana Mar 06 TPR (v.1) - USDOL Comments
POA Response to USDOL Comments Mar 06 TPR (v.1)
Guyana Mar 06 TPR (v.2) - USDOL Comments (May 06)
Guyana Mar 06 TPR (v.2) - submitted May 06
Partners EDUCARE TPR Sept 2006 (2)
USDOL comments Guyana Sep 06 TPR
122006 EDUCARE Baseline Survey Timeline - Narrative Sept 06 TPR
122006BaselineSurveyTimeline Sept '06 TPR
122006 EDUCARE PMP Track Changes Sept '06 TPR
122006 EDUCARE Work Plan Changes & Narrative Sept 06 TPR
Partners EDUCARE TPR Mar 2007
USDOL comments Guyana March 07 TPR
POA Response to USDOL TPR Comments 032007
Partners EDUCARE TPR Sept 2007
092007 EDUCARE Guyana Work Plan Revised TPR Sept 07
092007 EDUCARE Guyana Logframe Revised TPR Sept 07
032007 Annex E EDUCARE Work Plan Mar 07 TPR

SAP/TREP Documents...

Contract Details SAP
Contract Details TREP
Basic module Child beneficiaries - identification USDOL new definition
Monitoring and Evaluation Child Profile - SAP Reports
Monitoring and Evaluation Child Profile - TREP Reports
Parent Manual-in-progress

Guyana Child Labor /Education studies...

Danns 2002 ILO

Parika Child Labor study –ILO/CIDA

Experience of Dropouts from Primary and Secondary Schools in Linden – 2002

ANNEX D
Terms of Reference

Project Title
Independent Midterm Evaluation

July 2007

Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-5-0050

Financing Agency: USDOL

Type of Evaluation: Independent Midterm Evaluation

Date and Duration of the Evaluation:

Preparation Date of TOR: July 2007

**Total Project Funds from USDOL
Based on Cooperative Agreement:** US \$2,000,000

Vendor for Evaluation Contract: **MACRO INTERNATIONAL,
INC.**

11785 Beltsville Drive
Calverton, MD 20705
Tel: 301-572-0200
Fax: 301-572-0999

I. Background and Justification
--

The U.S. Department of Labor's (USDOL) international technical assistance programs have grown quickly since their inception eight years ago. In total, Congress has appropriated more than \$675 million to USDOL to fund international labor projects through its Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB). These funds are used in a wide variety of projects that cover a range of labor issues, including international child labor issues, and a wide geographical distribution.

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within ILAB. In recent years, OCFT activities have significantly expanded to include research on international child labor, supporting U.S. government policy on international child labor, administering grant and contracts to organizations engaged in efforts to eliminate child labor, and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, Congress has appropriated over \$470 million to ILAB, to administer international child labor projects. Of this amount, over \$292 million has been earmarked by the Congress to support the International Labor Organization's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO/IPEC), \$182 million has been allocated to support efforts to address child labor through the promotion of educational opportunities for children (the basis for USDOL beginning its Child Labor Education Initiative (EI)), \$700,000 has been allocated to support other technical cooperation efforts, and \$2.4 million has been allocated to support research and awareness-raising activities.

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

For ten years, USDOL has provided funding for ILO/IPEC in the form of grants administered by OCFT under cooperative agreements with the ILO. As a result of the Congressional appropriations described above, the U.S. Government is now the leading donor to ILO/IPEC. 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; Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects, and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include "direct action" components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitative and hazardous work. One of the major strategies by which IPEC projects do this is through the increasing children's access to and participation in formal and non-formal education.

Child Labor Education Initiative (EI)

EI projects are to work toward the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of basic education. EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas of high 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. USDOL's EI seeks to nurture the development, health, safety and enhanced future

employability of children around the world by increasing access to and quality of basic education for working children and those at risk of entering work. 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.

In addition to providing direct education and training opportunities to working children and those at risk of engaging in exploitative work, the Child Labor Education Initiative has four goals:

1. Raise awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilize a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
2. Strengthen formal and transitional education systems that encourage working children and those at risk of working to attend school;
3. Strengthen national institutions and policies on education and child labor; and
4. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

Other USDOL-funded International Child Labor Projects

USDOL has supported several international child labor projects that fall neither under the ILO-IPEC program nor the EI. These projects are funded through sole source grant, whereby USDOL provides funding to a particular grantee that submits an unsolicited proposal offering a unique expertise and innovative program idea.

EDUCARE Guyana

On October 1, 2005, Partners of the Americas (POA) received a 42-month Cooperative Agreement worth \$2 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in Guyana aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the four goals of the USDOL's Child Labor EI as outlined above. POA was awarded the EI project through a competitive bid process.

As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, POA must implement a project to improve access to quality education as a means to combat exploitive child labor in Guyana. POA will provide direct education and training opportunities to 3,044 working children and those at risk of engaging in exploitive work, by designing and implementing creative and innovative approaches to: 1) Reduce the number of children engaged in or at risk of entering exploitive child labor; 2) Provide educational opportunities (enrollment) and access for children engaged in, at risk of, and/or removed from exploitive child labor, particularly the worst forms; 3) Encourage retention in, and completion of educational programs; and 4) Expand the successful transition of children in non-formal education into formal schools or vocational programs.

According to the May 2006 Project Document, a pre-project study found that about 27% of Guyanese children were working. It was believed most exploitive child labor (ECL) occurred along the rural coastal highway, with much lesser numbers in the isolated hinterland, although these latter cases were often under more hazardous conditions. Pre-project studies found significant school dropout rates at the primary level, with even more disturbing rates at the secondary level. This was believed to occur in part due to lack of interest in school by students and parents – the benefits of education were perceived to be limited. Hence, improving the quality of education is important.

POA seeks to substantially reduce the incidence of child labor in Guyana. The target population is all children working in exploitive conditions throughout the country. Specific target groups include children doing hazardous labor, such as mining or logging, children involved in commercial sexual exploitation, street children and children who have been absent from school for a considerable period of time.

The EDUCARE project acknowledged the lack of information about the problem of child labor in Guyana. Therefore, one of the main strategies was to document and analyze the scope of the problem, to determine how many children were working under what conditions, why they were working, and other socioeconomic factors related to the problem. This information could then be used to raise public awareness on the issue of ECL and to identify children involved in ECL. The project would then implement several strategies to directly or indirectly reduce ECL, by strengthening public institutions, such as governmental agencies and civil society organizations; improving educational access, programs, and models; and assisting families with resource identification and utilization, and reinforcement of the value of education for their children.

The specific results that were expected from EDUCARE, based on the Logical Framework, include:

Output 1: Awareness Raised.

- 1a) Public knowledge in targeted communities about the difference between acceptable child work and hazardous/exploitative child labor increased
- 1b) Public attitudes in targeted communities towards child labor issues and the awareness of the impact of those issues on society increased

Output 2: Policy/Institutional Strengthening

- 2) Strong, active, permanent national coordinating body with mandate to lead efforts for ongoing reductions in child labor in place

Output 3: Educational Systems Strengthened

- 3a) Barriers to school attendance for at risk children alleviated (SAP)
- 3b) Target communities able to implement and monitor ongoing sustainable school attendance programs
- 3c) Effective re-engagement program attractive to dropouts provided (TREP)

The Project Document identifies the following EDUCARE project goals:

- Remove more than 3,000 children from exploitative conditions and provide access to improved educational opportunities and other services to enable them to stay in school.
- Raise awareness about child labor and its consequences, building support for its elimination
- Greatly improve the quality of information on the nature and extent of child labor in Guyana, including data on its relation to school performance, to inform policy and promote local action.
- Directly address the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) in the main geographic regions and ethnic sectors, and impact policy.
- Form coalitions with supporting networks to resolve child labor issues, including local School-Community Partnerships and a national forum comprising civil society, government, and private sector actors, supported by a well-structured project Advisory Committee.
- Organize and empower participating communities to identify and engage targeted children, their parents, school welfare officers, and employers in removing children from WFCL and entering and retaining them in educational programs.
- Strengthen educational options, both informal and formal, to create more attractive and effective learning opportunities to meet the needs of these children, their siblings, and others at risk.
- Work with parents to access counseling, develop parenting skills, and acquire job skills, business training, and placement services to alleviate economic pressures on the targeted children.
- Establish sustainable measures to combat child labor both nationally, with improved policy and stronger institutions; and locally, by identifying cases and mobilizing community efforts to resolve them.
- Publicize the results, underscoring the dividends and lessons learned, to further expand support for national replication of an effective effort to combat child labor with education.

The EDUCARE project has two principal education interventions. The first is the Teenage Re-engagement Program (TREP), which targets children who have dropped out, or are at risk of dropping out, of school through curriculum on literacy, mathematics, technical and vocational skills, arts and sports, and life skills. The second is the School Attendance Program (SAP), which targets children who are at risk of engaging in WFCL-type work through such interventions as school feeding programs, uniforms, community daycare, and a literacy and mathematics curriculum.

II. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation
--

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with Partners of the Americas. 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 consider all activities that have been implemented over the life of

the project, addressing issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, reliability and recommendations for future projects.

All EI projects, which are funded through cooperative agreements, are subject to mid-term and final evaluations. The EI project in Guyana went into implementation in October 2005 and is due for mid-term evaluation in 2007. The **goals** of the evaluation process are to:

1. Help individual organizations identify areas of good performance and areas where project implementation can be improved;
2. Assist OCFT to learn more about what is or is not working in terms of the overall conceptualization and design of EI projects within the broad OCFT technical cooperation program framework;
3. Assess the degree to which objectives relevant to the country-specific situation they address have been achieved; and
4. Assess progress in terms of children's working and educational status (i.e. withdrawal and prevention from the worst forms of child labor; enrollment, retention, completion of educational programs).

In addition to these overarching goals, the following project-specific goals have been developed by OCFT in consultation with Partners of the Americas staff:

- Assess the suitability and clarity of the project's WCFL and ECL definitions, and consistency of use throughout project;
- Ensure the quality of research used to establish the baseline study on the nature and extent of child labor (given its critical role at the national level);
- Evaluate the reliability and comprehensiveness of the child labor monitoring systems;
- Assess the role of the project in facilitating sustainable policy and program development at the national level through its work with the National Steering Committee and other activities.
- Assess outputs and purpose, in relation to the logframe.
- Provide advice to the project on directions for the final two years.
- Use the evaluation as a means to further engage some of the governmental stakeholders.
- Assess quality issues for the current selection of direct services.

For the purpose of conducting this evaluation, MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC. will provide a highly skilled, independent evaluator to conduct this evaluation to: a) determine if projects are achieving their stated objectives and explain why or why not, b) assess the impact of the projects in term of sustained improvements achieved, c) provide recommendations on how to improve project performance, and d) identify lessons learned to inform future USDOL projects. In addition, the contractor will provide recommendations to refine project-monitoring systems to ensure that project objectives and the measurement of results-based common indicators are being achieved across EI projects. The findings of the evaluations should assist USDOL to

improve project oversight and to take corrective measures where necessary.

The contractor/evaluator will work with the staff of USDOL's OCFT and relevant Partners of the Americas staff to evaluate the projects in question. The OCFT management and project staff will use the evaluation results to inform the relevance of the approach and strategy that are being followed. The evaluation results should also be used by Partners of the Americas and all subcontractors 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.

Specific topics the evaluation should address are as follows:

Program Design Issues

Assess the project design's fit within existing government programs.

Project Design/Implementation Issues

Evaluate the project's progress towards meeting its purpose, outputs, and EI goals. Assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the project's monitoring system.

Partnership and Coordination Issues

Examine partnership challenges and opportunities between the project and governmental and nongovernmental organizations.

Management and Budget Issues

Assess management processes, strengths and weaknesses.

Sustainability and Impact

Evaluate the project's plan for and steps towards assuring sustainability of its interventions. Assess impact to date on direct and indirect project beneficiaries, as well as lessons learned.

III. Evaluation Methodology and Timeframe
--

Desk review

After an analysis of the purpose and scope of the evaluation and the specific questions in the TOR the evaluator will review key project documents including

- Solicitation of Grant Applications
- The EDUCARE project document and Cooperative Agreement
- Documents related to project revisions
- Base line research
- Partners of the Americas Technical Progress Reports and USDOL's responses 2005-2007
- Work plans and planning documents
- PMP and indicator data

- Management Procedures and Guidelines
- Other appropriate project documents

US Interviews

Before visits to the field the evaluator will hold telephone interviews with the USDOL Project Manager and the Partners of the Americas US office to ensure a common understanding of the TOR and priorities for the evaluation. The evaluator will also send a short list of questions to both parties by e-mail to enable some written input into the process. Questions for the USDOL Project Manger will focus on USDOL's impressions of the project design and implementation and any specific concerns about project management and monitoring. Questions for Partners of the Americas will also concern project implementation, management and monitoring, including the relationship with USDOL and the project team in the field.

Identification of key informants and project sites to visit

The evaluator will identify key informants emerging from the desk review and the EDUCARE team will provide a list of their proposed interviewees. EDUCARE will also provide a list of partners, their locations and descriptions of their activities. They will suggest possible field visits based on the time available and the need to cover as broad a range of project stakeholders and activities as is feasible. On the basis of the above a program for the evaluator's 14 days in Guyana will be agreed.

Key informant interviews

1) Interviews with the Partners of the Americas project team will cover all aspects of project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, management and sustainability.

2) Interviews at national and regional level will include representatives from the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labor, Human Services and Social Security in order to assess the degree to which EDUCARE activities are embedded in or encouraging the national approach to EFA and eliminating child labor. The evaluator will also meet representatives from the National Steering Committee on Child Labor, UNICEF, the ILO and any other appropriate organizations to discuss progress made towards the development and implementation of relevant policies and strategies and to what degree EDUCARE is succeeding in networking and collaborating with others working for similar objectives.

3) Meetings with subcontractors will take the form of semi structured interviews with either groups or individuals from schools, local associations and other organizations that deliver project activities. A program will be developed to include both phase one and phase two SAPs (School Attendance Programs) and TREPs (Teenage Reengagement Programs) across the different regions concerned. A list of questions to guide the process will cover project design, implementation, monitoring and sustainability, the partnership with Partners of the Americas and the local and national child labor and education context. The evaluator will endeavor to visit a range of subcontractors and the communities where they are working, where interviews will take place with those involved with project activities.

4) Community/site visits

In each community or site visited the evaluator will meet with small groups of boys and girls who are part of project activities, in order to discuss their opinions and attitudes concerning child labor and education, the activities initiated by the project and how they see the future. In communities where a specific type of child labor is evident the evaluator will make every effort to talk to children concerned. The evaluator will ensure that interviews with children are relaxed and informal, with a limited number of questions and an accent on valuing their points of view and encouraging them to express themselves, so that they have a positive confidence building experience.

Similar focus group interviews will take place with parents, local leaders and teachers, grouped appropriately according to community norms and specific project activities. The evaluator will particularly be looking at the degree of community involvement and ownership of project activities, the degree of satisfaction concerning project achievements and approaches, and attitudes concerning education and child labor.

Wherever possible the evaluator will observe project activities in order to assess the gender breakdown and general age of participants, the atmosphere and dynamics between staff and young people, the quality and content of the activity they are engaged in, the physical environment, materials and facilities available, in brief whether the activity seems likely to meet the objectives for which it was designed.

5) Stakeholders' meeting

At the end of the field visits a stakeholders' meeting will bring together a broad range of actors involved with EDUCARE and/ or with education and/or child labor. This will enable the evaluator to verify her understanding of the project and to facilitate a discussion concerning ongoing project activities within the national education and child labor context.

Timetable and Workplan:

The tentative timetable is as follows:

Tasks	Dates
Desk Review of Project Materials and Interviews with ICLP staff	August-September
International Travel	September 15
Field work	September 17-27
Stakeholder Meeting	September 28
International Travel	September 29
Draft report	Due to Macro October 18 Due to USDOL October 23
Initial approval from USDOL to send report to stakeholders	October 25
Comments due from USDOL and stakeholders	November 6
Finalization of Document	Due to Macro November 20

	Due to USDOL November 27
Total Work Days	

IV. Expected Outputs/Deliverables
--

The Evaluator will submit to ILAB/OCFT **an evaluation report** that incorporates the results of the Tasks (outlined in Section III) in the format prescribed by ILAB/OCFT, which includes at minimum the following sections:

- a. Table of Contents
- b. Executive Summary, providing an overview of the evaluation and summary of main findings and recommendations
- c. List of Acronyms
- d. Evaluation Objectives
- e. Methodology of Evaluation
- f. Findings
- g. Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- h. Conclusions
- i. Recommendations
- j. Annexes, including list of interviews/meetings, site visits, documents reviewed, stakeholder workshop agenda and participants, TOR, cross-reference list of the TOR questions and pages addressed in the report, etc.

The total length of the report should be a maximum of 40 pages for main report, excluding annexes. The organizational format for the presentation of findings, lessons learned, conclusions, recommendations etc. is at the discretion of the evaluator.

The first draft of the report will be circulated by the evaluator to key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final report as appropriate and the evaluator will provide a response to each stakeholder 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. **A first draft is due to MACRO no later than 14 working days (TBD) after return from an evaluation mission, and a final draft is due no later than 10 working days after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT. All reports including drafts will be written in English.**

V. Inputs

The Project of the Americas’ (POA) Guyana project will make arrangements/reservations for and cover the costs related to the stakeholders’ meeting. POA Guyana will also provide a project vehicle and driver to facilitate

evaluator transportation to the various project sites and cover costs of fuel and driver stipend.

MACRO will provide logistical and administrative support for the evaluator, including international travel arrangements (e.g., plane and hotel reservations, providing per diem) and all materials (e.g., access to telecommunications and office supplies) needed to provide all deliverables. MACRO will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

MACRO INTERNATIONAL, INC. or its subcontractors should contact Anabella Bruch, tel. 202-637-6212, email abruch@partners.net, to initiate contact with field staff. Your primary point of contact for the project in Guyana is Ed Denham, 263 Earl's Avenue, Subryanville, Georgetown, Guyana, tel. (592) 225-7781, email educare1@networksgy.com.

ANNEX E Interview Guides

Educare team Guyana - guide POA –questions

Design

1. Are you happy that the project documents (Prodoc, log frame, PMP, work plan...) are coherent and represent what you're doing?
2. How does the project design fit into government anti child labour/EFA programs? (How do activities strengthen and/or expand, without duplicating, ME and MLHSSS programs?)
3. Are there any other issues emerging from the project design?

Design/Implementation

4. Which of the four EI goals does the project support the most/least? Why/How?
5. How, in practice, does the project fit into the local environment? (fit between USDOL expectations and reality in Guyana - external factors, assumptions, barriers...)
6. Is the project on track to meet its stated purpose and outputs? If not, what factors are contributing to delays?
7. Have the initial project purpose / outputs proved realistic?
8. Are you happy with the results of the base line study research? What particular challenges did it present?
9. Does the baseline research meet the information needs of the project? How, in practice, will it be used by the project and other child labour stakeholders?
10. Can you highlight (any other) successes and challenges emerging from project implementation (implementation issues, good practices)

Monitoring and Measurement

11. What are the projects operational definitions of the WFCL and ECL? How are partners informed of these? Do you feel that they understand them?
12. How are children identified by the project? Are all potentially qualified children being served?
13. What systems does the project use to monitor and track children? Are subcontractors aware of and effectively applying these systems?
14. How does the project measure DOL's common indicators of withdrawal and prevention? (Field to reporting – all stages)
15. Is there any measurable project impact on the enrolment / retention of students in education programs?
16. Can increased educational quality be measured within the project framework? Is there any analysis / measurement of how the quality of education is affecting the withdrawal and prevention of children from child labour?

Partnership and Coordination

17. How would you describe the opportunities and challenges of initiating project partnerships? Ministries (National and regional levels)
 - Schools
 - NGOs
 - Community Associations
 - UNICEF/ ILO / Other international organizations
18. To what degree do you see capacity building with partners as part of the role of the project? What sorts of capacity building (if any) are you currently engaged in?
19. Are any significant partnership opportunities being missed?
20. How would you describe your working relationship with the POA US office?
With USDOL?

Management and budget

21. What are the management strengths of the project? Does it run effectively? Do the management tools work well?
22. Are there technical and /or financial management areas that you'd like to improve?
23. Are project administrative procedures enabling effective project coordination, management and reporting with sub contractors? (What is working well and what isn't?)
24. Has USDOL provided any technical assistance? How useful was it? Any suggestions for improvements?
25. How effectively do the reporting formats present the progress and achievements of the project? Any suggestions for improvements?
26. Has the project been able to leverage any non USDOL resources?– list of sources, amounts and use of leveraged funds

Sustainability

27. What was is the project's strategy for sustainability? Is it appropriate and adequate?
28. Have any lessons been learned in terms of sustainability? (accomplishments or weaknesses)
29. What steps have been taken so far to promote continuation of the project's anti CL and education strategies?
30. Can you describe the project's impact to date on
 - a) Individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.),
 - b) Partner organizations (local NGOs, community groups, schools, etc.),
 - c) The National Steering Committee, and
 - d) Government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labour issues?

Government Ministries – National/ Regional

National Steering Committee guide questions as appropriate

1. How would you describe the situation with regard to child labour and education in Guyana? (Key issues, current debates)
2. How relevant is the Educare project to the situation in Guyana?

3. How does the Educare project design fit into government anti child labour/EFA programs?
4. Do Educare activities complement and reinforce ME and MLHSSS programs? Is there any duplication?
5. Are there any aspects of Educare project interventions that you find particularly effective / that you would like to see changed or improved?
6. To what degree do you think that Educare initiatives and activities will be sustainable after the end of the project in 2009?
7. Have you seen the Educare research concerning child labour and education in Guyana? Will it be of use to you other than in relation to Educare?
8. How does the National Steering Committee on Child Labour operate (role and responsibilities)?
9. Are any specific issues currently being addressed by the National Steering Committee on Child Labour? Are there likely to be significant changes in policy or practice as a result?
10. How does Educare contribute to the activities of the National Steering Committee on Child Labour?
11. Are you aware of how Educare defines WFCL and ECL? Do you agree with these definitions?

12. Do you think that the processes that Educare uses to identify and monitor at risk children might be of use beyond the life of the project? (To government departments, to schools, to NGOs, to community organizations...?)
13. Is Educare having any noticeable impact on enrolment and retention? On educational quality? – If so how would you describe the impact?
14. How would you describe the strengths and challenges of your relationship with the Educare project team Is there anything they or you could do to improve the partnership?
15. Has the project had any impact on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labour issues?

Educare Subcontractors - guide questions

Understanding of the issues/project

1. Can you describe the activities you are carrying out in relation to the EDUCARE project?
2. What has been most successful? What has been difficult? Why...?
3. What are you aiming to achieve through project activities?
4. What are the challenges / constraints around education in this region?
5. What do you understand by child labour (WFCL /ECL?)
6. Are there any other initiatives working on child labour issues (government or otherwise)?

Design/Implementation

7. How does the project design fit into government education / child labour policies / provision? Do project activities duplicate any other initiatives?
8. How do project activities fit in with your other activities and how have local children and parents reacted?

9. Do you think Educare activities are the best way to tackle the issues? Any suggestions for improvement or other suggestions?
10. Can you highlight (any other) successes and challenges emerging from project implementation (implementation issues, good practices)
11. Have you worked on similar projects in the past? How does it compare?

Monitoring and Measurement

12. Have you talked about defining WFCL and ECL with the Educare team? Can you explain these definitions? What do you think about them?
13. How are do you identify children to take part in project activities? Are you reaching all potentially qualified children? (Why not – constraints)
14. How do you monitor and track children? Are these new systems set up by the project? How well do they work? Do they pose any difficulties? (ask to see tracking tools)
15. How do you measure the quality of the education on offer to students? Is the project having an effect on educational quality? How?
16. Are project activities having any impact on the numbers of children enrolling and remaining in education?

Partnership and Coordination

17. Has participating in EDUCARE presented you with any new opportunities?
18. Has it presented any major challenges?
19. Have you received any training to help you implement Educare activities? What did it cover? How useful was it? Are their areas where you feel you need further training?
20. Has Educare helped to build the capacity of your organization? How?
21. Have you got any ideas or suggestions concerning any aspect of Educare or other partners they might work with?
22. How would you describe your working relationship with the POA?
23. Do you work with any other organizations on this project or similar types of work?

Management and budget

24. Does the project partnership run effectively? Do the management tools work well?
25. Are there technical and /or financial management areas that you'd like to improve?
26. Do project administrative procedures enabling effective project coordination, management and reporting? (What is working well and what isn't?)

Sustainability

27. How sustainable are project activities? What are you doing to ensure that initiatives continue after the end of the project? Do you think they will continue?
28. How would you describe the project's impact on children and their parents?
On teachers?
On your organization as a whole?

Parents / local adults – guide questions

Ideas/ link to project

1. How did you first hear about the Educare program initiatives?
2. Are the activities it offers helping you and your children? How?
3. Why do you think children dropout of school?
4. Do you have any suggestions about how to encourage them to stay in education?

Child labor

5. What sort of work do you think is appropriate for younger /older children?
6. What do you understand by child labor? – is it an issue in your community?
7. Do you know any children involved in domestic/hazardous/exploitive work?

Role as parent / link to project activities

8. How are you involved in the Educare activities?
9. Would you like to be more/ less involved?
10. How do you monitor and encourage your child's school/programme attendance?

Change and the project

11. Has anything changed as a result of project activities
 - Has the project improved the quality of education of children? How? (specific examples)
 - Are more children enrolled in education than before the project started? (Explore – how many, who, what sort of education, why...)
 - Are children doing different work? ...
 - Are less children working? (explore specific changes)

Project activities

12. Apart from Educare, does the government or any other organisation work on providing education and fighting child labor in your community? (Which)
13. How is Educare different (methods, attitudes, focus)? Is it meeting needs that were not met before
14. What are the things you like/don't like about this project?
15. Is the project doing anything new?
16. What do you think about the way X subcontractor is working with you? Do you have any suggestions to help them do a better job?
17. Has the project given you any surprises or made you change your ideas in any way?

The future

18. What are your personal plans for your children's future?
19. Will any of the activities be able to carry on when the project finishes? How? Would you like the activities to continue? Any ideas about how to make that happen? Who or what organisation has – or should have – responsibility for this?
20. What effect will the end of the project have on your child?
21. Do you have any questions about any aspect of the project?

Children – guide questions

SAPs

1. Can you describe a typical school day?
2. Are there things that you like about school? That you don't like?
3. Do you think coming to school will be useful to you in the future? How/Why not?
4. What sorts of things stop you getting to school on some days?
5. Does your family like you to come to school or do they prefer you to do something else?
6. What project activities are you involved in? (adapt according to site concerned/ activities on offer)
7. What do you think about them?
8. Does anything need to change to make it easier for you to stay in school?
9. Do any of you do any work when you're not at school? For who? What sort? Do you earn money?...
10. What sort of work do you think children should/shouldn't do?
11. What do you hope to do in the future?
12. Do you have any questions about any aspect of the project?

TREPS

1. How long have you been coming to this program?
2. What are you learning here?
3. What do you like / not like about it?
4. Has being part of the program changed anything in your life? (routine, family relationships, self esteem...)
5. How do you think what you are learning will help you in the future?
6. Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the program?
7. What did you do during the day before you enrolled on the program?
8. Do you do any kind of work when you're not attending the program? For who? What sort? Do you earn money?...
9. What sort of work do you think children should/shouldn't do?
10. Has the project given you any surprises or made you change your ideas in any way?
11. What do you hope to do in the future?
12. Do you have any questions about any aspect of the project?

ANNEX F
List of Hazardous Occupations and Processes in Guyana

(EDUCARE was provided with this list from within the Ministry of Labor but was given no indication of its precise origins. It appears to come from previous discussions, but has no legal standing.)

- ✓ Workshop such as spray-painting, welding, bodywork, jewelry etc.
- ✓ Sawmilling – preservation of lumber
- ✓ Pest control services
- ✓ Prostitution – use of drugs
- ✓ Farming/agriculture – children spraying pesticides etc. exposure to toxic chemicals
- ✓ Furniture manufacturing – varnishing, spraying etc
- ✓ Trawler work and small boat fishing
- ✓ Use of explosives seasonal – Xmas time
- ✓ Logging and saw milling – power driven saw
- ✓ Conducting mini buses
- ✓ Coal mining
- ✓ Power driven wood-working machines
- ✓ Exposure to radioactive substances – parents engaged in repair of computers, televisions etc.
- ✓ Poultry farms – slaughtering of chicken, meat packaging processes
- ✓ Block making – burnt bricks and cement blocks
- ✓ Construction sites – exposure to cement dust/hollow blocks
- ✓ Lifting and carrying of heavy weight
- ✓ Work between 10 p.m. and 8 a.m. – commercial sex workers, fishing, waitresses, vending, begging
- ✓ Working in mining areas
- ✓ Ferrying passengers
- ✓ Factories – rice-mills, chowmein, lemonade, soft drinks, garment machinery
- ✓ Hunting – exposure to dangerous weapons/animals

ANNEX G
List of SAPs and TREPs

No.	Region	Name of Organisation	Program	No of Children		Major Activities
				Boys	Girls	
Phase 1- started January 2007						
1	Region 3	Zeelugt Primary	SAP	524	378	School Feeding and Afternoon Literacy Clubs
2	Region 3	Sunshine Women & Youth Organisation with Parika Salem, Philadelphia, Greenwich Park Primaries	SAP			School Feeding and Afternoon Literacy Clubs, Provision of school uniforms
3	Region 3	Malgre Tout Primary (Vreed -en-hoop Seventh Day Church - Community Service Department)	SAP			School Feeding and Afternoon Literacy Clubs. The group will continue into Sept 07 to feed children at the school on at least 1 day a week.
4	Region 6	Fort Ordinance Parent Teachers Association	SAP			School Feeding and Afternoon Literacy Clubs
5	Region 7	St. Anthony's Primary	SAP			School Feeding and Afternoon Literacy Clubs
6	Region 10	Denise Institute of Catering	TREP	38	95	Catering Course for Girls. Including agriculture, business, IT and Communication / Numeracy.
7	Region 3	Sunshine Women & Youth Organisation	TREP			Garment Construction, leather craft, IT and literacy.
8	Region 7	Adult Education Association Inc. Bartica Branch (A.E.A)	TREP			Craft, Catering, Literacy for Girls only.

9	Region 6	Adult Education Association Inc. Berbice Branch	TREP		Construction, Woodwork, Electrical Installation. F: Catering. All: IT, literacy and Sport.
Phase 2 - started September 2007					
10	Region 2	Essequibo Alliance / CV Nunes Primary School	SAP	Target 1,263	Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
11	Region 4	Arundel Congregational Church/ Buxton Primary	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
12	Region 4	Golden Grove/ Golden Grove Primary SAP	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
13	Region 4	Ambassadors of Christ Ministries / Friendship Primary, Company Road & CHS Buxton	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
14	Region 5	West Berbice Women's/ Bath Primary School	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
15	Region 5	Belladrum Primary	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
16	Region 6	Alness SDA/ McGowan & Alness Primary Schools	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
17	Region 6	New Amsterdam Primary	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
18	Georgetown	Enterprise Primary	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
19	Georgetown	Sophia Special School	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.

20	Georgetown	Global Perspective/Children of Hope Outreach - South GT - 4 Primary Schools (Sophia, Ketley, South Ruimveldt, St. Pius)	SAP		Provision of hot meals, after-school literacy/numeracy clubs, parent education. Tracking of children.
21	Region 2	Cotton Field Secondary	TREP	Target 547	This is an options course using a secondary school after normal school hours. Craft, carpentry, electrical, catering.
22	Region 4	Golden Grove Concerned Residents TREP	TREP		Textile design and Garment Construction. Included is IT, literacy, numeracy.
23	Region 4	Ambassadors of Christ Ministries / Friendship Primary, Company Road & CHS Buxton	TREP		Carpentry, Masonry, IT, Catering
24	Region 6	Guyana Business School	TREP		Garment Construction, Welding, IT and Literacy and Numeracy.
25	Region 6	Roadside Baptist Church	TREP		Electrical Installation, Craft, Textiles, Catering, IT, Numeracy and Literacy
26	Region 6	New Amsterdam Practical Instruction Centre	TREP		Carpentry & Joinery, IT, Numeracy and Literacy
27	Region 10	Linden Technical Institute	TREP		Masonry, Electrical, Construction, Block-making.
28	Georgetown	YWCA	TREP		25 students on the 2nd year of a 2 year option course. 55 students in 2 year options course. Options include - textiles, business management, dressmaking, plumbing, catering, child care, IT, numeracy and literacy.