

**Independent Final Evaluation of the  
Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH) Project**

**Financing Agency:** U.S. Department of Labor

**Grantee Organization:** Winrock International

**Dates of Project Implementation:** September 30, 2009–March 31, 2013

**Evaluation Field Work Dates:** November 25–December 11, 2012

**Cooperative Agreement Number:** IL 19515-09-75-K

## Executive Summary

The Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH) project was implemented to reduce the number of children engaged in exploitive child labor in the country. The project was implemented through a partnership of Winrock International, the Forum for African Women Educationalists—Rwanda (FAWE-Rwanda), and SNV Netherlands Development Organization in Rwanda (SNV-Rwanda). The REACH project emphasized child labor in smallholder farming in seven Rwandan districts using an education initiatives approach.<sup>1</sup> The project began September 30, 2009, and ended March 31, 2013. Field work for a final evaluation was carried out November 26–December 10, 2012.

The following were project objectives:

1. Withdraw 4,800 children from exploitive labor and prevent 3,500 children from entering into such labor in agricultural targeted sectors in seven districts of Rwanda.
2. Reduce barriers to education and strengthen systems in formal school; catch-up programs; and model farm school (MFS), a vocational training program for out-of-school youths
3. Strengthen existing or nascent institutions and policies on child labor that can have an impact on withdrawal, prevention, and remediation.
4. Raise awareness of the problems associated with child labor by sensitizing policymakers, community focus groups, farmers cooperatives, and others to child labor issues
5. Collect data and perform research to support policy and institutional development as well as project activities
6. Ensure sustainability of efforts by integrating the activities associated with the four functional objectives so that they are mutually reinforcing

The project targeted a total of 8,300 who were to be withdrawn from or prevented from entering exploitive child labor through smallholder farming and animal herding. Project interventions were implemented in seven of Rwanda's rural districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare.

The final evaluation had the following purposes:

1. Assess whether the project met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so, based on the project document, project deliverables, and results.
2. Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project.
3. Provide documented lessons learned, good or promising practices, and models of intervention from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in Rwanda and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors
4. Assess whether results from project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national levels and among implementing organizations
5. Assess how REACH has addressed the recommendations from the midterm evaluation and results
6. Assess whether steps have been taken to ensure the project's approaches and benefits continue after completion, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations

The evaluation also served as important accountability function for the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) and Winrock International. All activities that have been implemented over the life of the project until the time of the final evaluation were considered. The evaluation report focuses on the areas of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability.

---

<sup>1</sup> See evaluation Terms of Reference for details.

To ensure thoroughness, the evaluator used a combination of methods:

- Preparation of detailed methodology, including guidelines for questioning
- Document review, including those directly related to the project; those related to the overall context in Rwanda regarding education and child labor issues; available drafts of the National Policy on the Elimination of Child Labor (NPECL) and other potential issues of importance; and documents related to the current socioeconomic situation in Rwanda and its potential impact on the project and the evaluation process
- Individual interviews and/or focus group discussions with stakeholders from a wide range of groups, including national, provincial, district, and local education policymakers and providers; local authorities; project partners and other agencies working on child labor in the country; teachers; community-based organizations (CBOs); and communities, parents, and children
- Individual and small group discussions with project staff members in the central office and with the project partners
- Observation of the stakeholders and their work in different settings as well as their networking actions, combined with field visits and interviews
- Stakeholder meeting at which initial findings were presented, discussed, and enriched with additional input from the participants

The project design and implementation adequately supported the five USDOL Child Labor Elimination Program Goals on reducing exploitive child labor through direct educational services and sustainable livelihoods of target households, strengthening policies, raising awareness, supporting research and evaluation, and ensuring the long-term sustainability of the efforts it was funded to support. The main project strategies and activities were relevant and appropriate, given the cultural, economic, and political context in which the project operated. The project was in line with and supportive of the Rwandan Labor Law,<sup>2</sup> which is comparatively comprehensive in terms of labor that is prohibited for children.

The design made maximum use of the existing and comparatively well-organized national structures and systems. As confirmed by final evaluation interviewees, the project correctly identified obstacles to eliminating exploitive child labor and accurately identified the worst forms of child labor in the country. While children in Rwanda are engaged in a range of different kinds of exploitive labor, the project concentrated on children in agriculture. This choice was important because child labor in Rwanda is widely prevalent in various kinds of agriculture and livestock rearing sectors.

The project achieved its objectives and was effective in meeting the needs of the target population, including children *prevented* and *withdrawn* from labor. The project was able to achieve the outputs overall<sup>3</sup> although, at the national level, an indicator on adoption of the NPECL could not be achieved before the final evaluation. Progress toward adoption has been made but, as in other countries, it is difficult to be held accountable for the adoption of government policies; projects do not have full control over such situations.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> *Official Gazette of the Republic*. (2009). Rwanda Law n° 13/2009 of 27/05/2009. Kigali, Rwanda: Government of the Republic of Rwanda.

<sup>3</sup> The term "outputs" was used for reporting on the extent to which objectives were met.

<sup>4</sup> Winrock International, FAWE-Rwanda, & SNV-Rwanda. (2009). *National Action Plan adopted target: Year 2* (Project document under USDOL and Winrock International Cooperative Agreement: Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children [REACH]). Washington, DC: Winrock International and USDOL.

The project advocated with the government on the implementation of a national Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS), but the government indicated that the NPECL first needs to be adopted. The current concept of the eventual CLMS is primarily focused on identifying and monitoring child labor but is not linked to a child protection referral system.<sup>5</sup> Given the well-organized government structures in Rwanda, the evaluator is of the opinion that an effective CLMS system integrated into the child protection referral systems is possible.

The project accurately identified children engaged in, or at risk for, working in the target sectors identified in the project strategy. Targets were slightly exceeded with regard to the number of children to be withdrawn or prevented from exploitive child labor. Girls constituted 52% of the beneficiaries. Somewhat more than one-half (4,200) of the beneficiaries were in formal primary and secondary schools. A total of 1,731 children were provided with catch-up classes, while 2,300 older children were integrated into MFS agriculture and livestock training. The evaluation found that very few children appeared to still be subjected to exploitive child labor. These included children in MFS who indicated that, at the time of the evaluation, they were engaged in light work while they waited for the potential financial benefits of their MFS project to grow.<sup>6</sup>

The project partner, SNV, implemented a program to channel awareness raising about child labor throughout the country using its network of thousands of members referred to as clients (i.e., individuals who are members of local entities supported by SNV). Most of the clients are members of different local agricultural cooperatives. The project also undertook other awareness-raising efforts, including through radio, some television, and a quarterly newsletter describing project activities. There were some delays in maximizing the usefulness of visual communication materials, such as posters, that were only being widely distributed toward the end of the final evaluation. The mobilization of local entities and individuals had positive results, including active involvement in awareness raising.

Children could explain and were very aware of the negative impact of child labor. Some of the parents interviewed indicated that they knew child labor was “bad for the children”; following project support, parents indicated they were more convinced than ever to not engage their children in exploitive child labor. Although implementing awareness-raising techniques using children’s own voices was not included in the REACH project document, such awareness raising would have been effective and should be considered for future programs. The project supported some child participation in the seven schools where murals with messages on child labor were painted. However, very few child-to-child, child-to-parent, and child-to-community awareness-raising efforts were in evidence during the evaluation visits.

Research was conducted in the form of a baseline study,<sup>7</sup> a study on child labor in awareness raising,<sup>8</sup> and a study of child labor in the tea sector in three districts.<sup>9</sup> To contribute to the collection of reliable data on child labor, the project also developed a database with associated monitoring tools to track project beneficiaries. The development of the monitoring database was intended as a pilot exercise toward the eventual development of a CLMS. Some interviewees stated that the baseline report was too late to use for informing the overall project design, project components, and project locations. Despite this, however, the study provided useful insights into local situations and helped to frame specific activities in project sites. The study on awareness raising was intended to

---

<sup>5</sup> It is linked to child protection data collection but not referral.

<sup>6</sup> Children provided examples of their “light work.”

<sup>7</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2010). *Baseline assessment on child labor in seven districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

<sup>8</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2011). *Assessment on child labor awareness with SNV stakeholders in Rwanda: Research report*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

<sup>9</sup> Winrock International. (2012). *Child labor in the tea sector: Case study of Nyamasheke, Nyaruguru, and Gicumbi*. Kigali, Rwanda: Winrock International.

inform the awareness-raising efforts of project partner SNV-Rwanda; while useful for its purpose, the study did not have substantial scope for extrapolation to the general population. The study on the tea sector was primarily qualitative; therefore, insights were mostly descriptive in nature and difficult to generalize. The evaluator does believe, however, that useful information was obtained and clear, useful recommendations were made.

According to all stakeholders in the communities, the most important project component was the provision of formal school supplies<sup>10</sup> and uniforms. Children in MFS noted that they had also received materials to help them with their learning process, such as tools and equipment.<sup>11</sup> Some children, such as those in beekeeping, also received protective clothes to wear when tending to the hives. In some instances, only a few sets of protective clothes were initially provided and more were added later, including during the time of the final evaluation. Children in the MFS groups indicated that, while the initial supply of tools and equipment was sufficient for the initial training period, they still needed more to be successful.

Children and parents in formal schools complained that the project had not foreseen support for the payment of school fees. Since 2003, government regulations have stipulated that schools should not require students to pay school fees to attend; however, school fees are still common practice in Rwanda. The amount of the fees are set by individual schools and their parent-teacher associations.

Explanations for the reasoning behind the continued payment of fees were centered on the need to motivate teachers to continue to teach in public rather than private schools. Examination fees also need to be paid and present another cost for households. As will be discussed in Section 5.3.3., all of these costs still potentially form a major impediment to keeping children in school and out of child labor.

Several activities were carried out to raise the effectiveness of the existing educational system. The local government and community members including local leaders, teachers, parents, and children appreciated the education quality improvement component of the project. The key elements were teacher training on various subjects, improvement of school buildings and environment, and agriculture clubs. The project also established an information and communication technology (ICT) center that trained more than 100 teachers in computer literacy. The initiation of the ICT center was a good project concept that has the potential to maximize the benefits of other actions in Rwanda to improve education in schools through digital technologies.

School hours for children in project-supported catch-up programs were long. For children in the combined 4th–6th grade, classes were from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. with full days on Saturdays. Several children also pointed out that they needed to walk far to reach the school for their catch-up classes. Community members, parents, and community activists (CAs) noted that one of the problems of the catch-up program is that the schools were unable to provide food for the children even if they spent long hours there. Children and teachers reported improved examination results for almost all children, with some showing as much as 30% or greater improvement. Teachers in some schools were so happy about the result of the catch-up programs that they wanted to permanently institutionalize it into their schools.

Older children, aged 16–18, who were not interested in returning to formal schools or who had dropped out at a young age were integrated into the MFS system. Local specialists provided training to children in MFS on subjects such as advanced farming skills (e.g., growing pineapple, vegetables,

---

<sup>10</sup> “Formal school supplies” included items such as backpacks, pencils, pens, mathematical sets, and notebooks.

<sup>11</sup> The types of tools and equipment for MFS students varied for different groups, depending on their agricultural activities. Most received hoes, gloves, boots, and soap; sanitary pads were provided for girls; and beekeeping suits and hives were provided for children involved in beekeeping.

and bananas), beekeeping, and livestock rearing (e.g., pigs or goats). The children also learned how to set up a cooperative, some basic entrepreneurship skills and how to link to microfinance institutions (MFIs). All new MFS trainers were trained in Kigali, Rwanda, followed up by quarterly meetings that included refresher training. Children and their parents were quite enthusiastic about their MFS training, although, at the time of the evaluation, most believed that their acquired skills only served to supplement their income, not supplant it.

Stakeholders at all levels who were interviewed for the final evaluation indicated that poverty is by far the foremost reason for child labor in Rwanda. General awareness of the importance of education was quite strong, and most families would not send their children to work if they had sufficient incomes. The interviewees, and stakeholder workshop participants, all emphasized the importance of scaling up any livelihoods component in future projects.

The project's livelihoods interventions were primarily channeled through the MFS program and the Conditional Family Scholarship Support (CFSS) program to provide training for poverty reduction in 140 households. The concept of CFSS was generally quite good at helping address poverty but were still too small; only a fraction of the families needing CFSS could be reached due to overall project budget constraints. The CFSS concept thus needs to be scaled up in any future project and include longer training on entrepreneurship, community-based savings schemes, linkages to MFIs, and follow-up support. Linkages of CFSS households to MFIs have started but savings are still limited. The CFSS beneficiaries were selected on the basis of vulnerability and child labor issues instead of on a community basis; therefore, the groups were composed of people who may not have known each other before the training—which is not necessarily conducive to group cohesion.

The project monitoring system was tightly integrated with the community-based mentoring system. The project used a combination of CAs, mentors, and local leaders to increase awareness and understanding of the dangers of child labor, create community ownership, and increase the capacity of communities to address child labor issues. The project monitoring system was designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project. Although some elements of the beneficiary monitoring system were found to be complex, the system was streamlined to facilitate data collection and data entry.

The project strategies were generally efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used as compared to qualitative and quantitative outputs. Coordination between the project implementing partners (i.e., Winrock International, FAWE-Rwanda, and SNV-Rwanda) was quite good overall. Coordination with other entities such as Association for Integrated Development of Rwanda (ARDI) and Gako Organic Training Center (OTC) was also good. Efficiency was sometimes compromised because the different agencies had different administrative and financial management systems, which caused some delays.

Sustainability was included as one of the five main project outputs. As a result, planning for sustainability was well integrated in the project design, and a more detailed exit and sustainability plan was developed. Various approaches were included to achieve sustainability, including awareness raising and advocacy, capacity and institution strengthening, research, development of CFSS and MFS, and education quality improvement models for Rwanda. The project was quite successful in building potential for sustainability in most of the project areas.

However, at least one-half of the formal education beneficiaries and their parents interviewed told the evaluator that the children would drop out of school after the end of the project. Lack of school supplies and uniforms and inability to school and examination fees were cited as the principal reasons for possible drop out. The evaluation team tried to verify whether children and their parents might make such statements about possible drop out to positively influence their appeals for a project extension. Despite the evaluator's explanations that the project would not be extended to

cover another full academic year and that any future project might be implemented in other locations, the interviewees persisted in this opinion. Project staff did work actively with local authorities, teachers, volunteers, and others to ensure that beneficiary children remained in school even after the completion of the project. Special attention was paid to advocating for the allocation of funding from available government programs to assist former project beneficiaries, other former child laborers, and vulnerable children.

In all focus groups conducted at local levels, strong requests for additional assistance for other child laborers in the project areas were made.

#### Key Recommendations

1. Harmonization of policy and legal frameworks as linked to child labor issues, adoption of the NPECL, and full enforcement will still require more attention in Rwanda.
2. An effective CLMS system integrated into a child protection referral systems is suggested for Rwanda. The CLMS should not just be limited to identifying and monitoring child laborers; it should also include referral of such children to various services in accordance with their needs. Monitoring of children's access to—and results of—the effects of these services needs to be included in the CLMS or digitally cross-linked to child protection databases.
3. The rapid growth of the digital revolution, including in Africa, can be explored to determine how future projects can integrate the CLMS and associated referral systems into a digital information systems starting at community level.<sup>12</sup> The pervasive presence of mobile phones—and increasingly, second-hand smart phones—has potential for the effective identification, referral, and monitoring of children in exploitive child labor.
4. Advocacy and awareness raising skills of children should be developed to eliminate exploitive child labor and promote education. Children are often their own best advocates. Particularly through the arts, they can sustainably communicate relevant messages.
5. A master trainer system of children in MFS skills should be developed. For farming, beekeeping, and livestock raising, such a system may be useful for future projects.
6. Because the impact of MFS will be fully evident only after at least 1 more year, follow-up impact studies approximately 18 months after the end of the project could be very informative for lessons learned about this project component.
7. Given the high coverage of mobiles phones and computers in schools across the country and to save on the high cost of printing awareness-raising messages, manuals, and guidelines, the further development and sharing of information using digital technologies should be explored.
8. Replicate the ICT center concept, including training for teachers; add training of government staff on eventual CLMS data entry; and enter into an agreement with local government to continue to operate the center after project support ends. Also, children can serve as apprentice trainers in the ICT center.
9. Where project baselines are implemented, conduct project end-line studies to assess changes in attitudes and practices.
10. Identify solutions in the form of household labor-saving technologies and linkages to projects that can provide water supplies and energy supplies close to home. Carrying water and firewood is challenging for households and if children do not help, mothers who are already overburdened with work or who may be pregnant and/or carrying a small child will be expected to do all of this work.

---

<sup>12</sup> Please see an article on similar aspects of digital development in Africa: The Innovation Knowledge Foundation. (2012). *The next frontier of development*. Milan, Italy: Author. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from [http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93-the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde\\_788017\\_member\\_194395666](http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93-the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde_788017_member_194395666). Also see the foundation's general Web site at <http://www.thinkinovation.org>.

11. The provision of project support for school fees needs to be assessed on a country-by-country basis and even possibly a community-by-community basis. Where the risk of exploitive child labor is greater, some support for school fees can be provided while simultaneously working with the national and local governments on the issue of school fees
12. Scale up the CFSS program and provide more support for intensive training on entrepreneurship, community-based savings schemes, linkages to MFIs, and follow-up. Technical support for the development of community-based savings schemes, which include substantial numbers of local households to ensure adequate savings for investment borrowing, should be implemented.
13. Where projects are implemented through a joint partnership of agencies, future projects need to ensure that project partners agree to adhere to common procedures for project procurement and reporting.

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	ix
Acknowledgements.....	xi
Acronyms .....	xii
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Final Evaluation Purpose .....	2
3. Methodology .....	3
3.1. Overall Approach to the Evaluation.....	3
4. Design and Relevance.....	4
4.1. Main Obstacles or Barriers.....	4
4.2. Political, Cultural, and Economic Context.....	5
4.3. Accurately Identify the Worst Forms of Child Labor in the Country.....	6
4.4. Adequate Support the Five USDOL Child Labor Elimination Program Goals.....	7
4.5. Accuracy of Project Assumptions.....	7
4.6. Project Adjustments Following Midterm Evaluation .....	7
5. Effectiveness.....	8
5.1. Summary of Project Achievement of Targets and Objectives .....	8
5.2. Overview of Project Achievement of Outputs .....	9
5.2.1. Withdrawing Children From and Preventing Children From Entering Exploitive Child Labor Through Direct Education Services.....	10
5.2.2. Strengthening Policy and Institutions to Combat Child Labor Through Education ....	12
5.2.3. Raising Awareness and Mobilizing Actors .....	15
5.2.4. Research and Collect Reliable Data on Child Labor .....	18
5.3. Direct Action Interventions.....	21
5.3.1. Accurately Identified and Targeted Children.....	21
5.3.2. Formal Education .....	24
5.3.3. School Supplies and Uniforms .....	24
5.3.4. Education Quality.....	26
5.3.5. Nonformal Education.....	27
5.3.6. Model Farm Schools .....	28
5.4. Livelihoods Interventions.....	31
5.5. Monitoring and Mentoring Models .....	33
5.6. Capacity Strengthening and Integration of Mentors, Community Activists, and Local Authorities .....	34
5.7. Specific Lessons Learned and Good Practices According to Sectors .....	35
6. Efficiency .....	35
6.1. Coordination With Implementing Partners .....	35

6.2. Monitoring System Designed and Implemented Efficiently .....	36
6.3. Management Strengths and Challenges .....	37
6.4. Leveraging of Resources .....	38
7. Impact.....	38
7.1. Systemwide Impact, Including Impact on Partners and Other Organizations.....	39
8. Sustainability .....	40
8.1. Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan Integrated Into Project Design .....	40
8.2. Sustainability of Project Effects .....	40
8.2.1 Maintaining Partnerships With Other Organizations .....	41
8.3. Sustainability of Monitoring Systems .....	42
9. Conclusions.....	42
9.1. Most Important Outcomes, Lessons Learned, or Best Practices .....	42
9.2. Key Recommendations .....	43
Annex 1—Additional Recommendations.....	45
Annex 2—Schedule .....	46
Annex 3—List of Interviewees .....	51
Annex 4—List of Stakeholder Workshop Participants.....	54
Annex 7—Workshop Schedule and Key Success and Challenges Identified by Participants.....	56
Annex 8—References.....	60
Annex 9—Terms of Reference .....	63

## Acknowledgements

The evaluator would like to thank the entire project team for their patient and extensive input into the evaluation process. The project staff was helpful, straightforward, and accommodating. Thanks also go to national and local government officials, children’s mentors, educators, community representatives, parents, and especially to the children for sharing their comments. The evaluator would further like to thank the interpreter for her language facilitation and information about the local context in Rwanda.

## Acronyms

ARDI	Association Rwandaise pour la Promotion du Développement Intégré (Association for Integrated Development of Rwanda)
ASC	Advisory Sustainability Committee
CA	community activist
CBO	community-based organization
CPC	Child Protection Committee
CFSS	Conditional Family Scholarship Support
CLMS	Child Labor Monitoring System
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FAWE-Rwanda	Forum for African Women Educationalists—Rwanda
Gako OTC	Gako Organic Training Center
GOR	Government of Rwanda
ISCCL	Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee on Child Labor
ICT	information and communication technology
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JADF	Joint Action Development Forum
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MFS	model farm schools
MFI	microfinance institutions
MINEDUC	Ministry of Education
MIFOTRA	Ministry of Public Service and Labor
NCC	National Commission on Children
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NPECL	National Policy on the Elimination of Child Labor
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OLPC	One Laptop Per Child
REACH	Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children
SACCO	Savings and Credit Cooperatives
SCREAM	Support Children’s Rights Through Education, the Arts and the Media
SNV-Rwanda	Netherlands Development Organization—Rwanda
UCW	Understanding Children’s Work
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
USDOL	United States Department of Labor

## 1. Introduction

The Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH) project was implemented to reduce the number of children engaged in exploitive child labor in the country. As indicated by several interviewees, although most families in Rwanda clearly want to educate their children, many struggle to send them to school and keep them out of child labor. The REACH project emphasized child labor in smallholder farming in seven Rwandan districts using an education initiatives approach.<sup>13</sup> The project began September 30, 2009, and ended March 31, 2013. Field work for a final evaluation was carried out November 26–December 10, 2012.

The following were project objectives:

1. Withdraw 4,800 children from exploitive labor and prevent 3,500 children from entering into such labor in agricultural targeted sectors in seven districts of Rwanda
2. Reduce barriers to education and strengthen systems in formal school, catch-up programs, and model farm school (MFS) vocational training program for out-of-school youths
3. Strengthen existing or nascent institutions and policies on child labor that can have an impact on withdrawal, prevention, and remediation
4. Raise the awareness of the problems associated with child labor by sensitizing policymakers, community focus groups, farmers cooperatives, and others to child labor issues
5. Collect data and perform research to support policy and institutional development as well as project activities
6. Ensure sustainability of efforts by integrating the activities associated with the four functional objectives so that they will be mutually reinforcing

The project objectives were translated into five key expected outputs:

1. Withdrawing and preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through direct education services
2. Strengthening policy and institutions to combat child labor through education
3. Raising awareness and mobilizing actors
4. Research and collecting reliable data on child labor
5. Sustainability

The project targeted a total of 8,300 children who were to be withdrawn from or prevented from entering exploitive child labor in agriculture on smallholder farming and animal herding. Project interventions were implemented in seven of Rwanda's rural districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare.

The most important project activities included the following:

- Support for children in formal primary school and middle schools with scholarships and/or school materials as needed
- Transitioning catch-up program<sup>14</sup> for dropouts
- Support for out-of-school youths to attend MFS (i.e., agriculture-related vocational education) and advocacy and technical support for the integration of MFS into district programs, budgets, and plans of action
- Provision of technical support to the Government of Rwanda (GOR) for the development of the National Action Plan on Child Labor

---

<sup>13</sup> See evaluation Terms of Reference for details.

<sup>14</sup> Children attended transition/bridging education or afterschool tutoring to help them reintegrate into formal school or improve their examination results.

- Capacity strengthening of the Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee on Child Labor (ISCCL), district authorities, community activists (CAs), mentors, and other local institutions on policy and other child labor–related issues
- Provision of technical support for the development of a Child Labor Monitoring System (CLMS)
- Provision of advocacy and technical support for the integration of CLMS and CAs’ work in district plans of action.
- Awareness raising of local authorities, religious leaders, CAs, mentors, and other key opinion leaders on the withdrawal from and prevention of child laborers from entering exploitive forms of labor and education of them
- Training of farmers cooperatives and businesses on national laws on child labor
- Conducting and disseminating relevant research on child labor
- Working to leverage private-sector support for the REACH project.
- Promotion of sustainability, including through capacity and institutional strengthening; sustainability conference; and technical support for policy development and integration into plans of action

## 2. Final Evaluation Purpose

The following were the purposes of the final evaluation:

1. Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so, based on the project document, project deliverables, and results
2. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it was suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL)
3. Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project
4. Provide documented lessons learned, good or promising practices, and models of intervention from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in Rwanda and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors
5. Assess whether results from project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national levels and among implementing organizations
6. Assess how REACH has addressed the recommendations from the midterm evaluation and results
7. Address key achievements and success of the project, as well as how challenges have been handled
8. Identify key, innovative strategies for combating child labor that could be used in the future, especially related to community participation and ownership and stakeholder involvement
9. Assess whether steps were taken to ensure that approaches and benefits will continue after the completion of the project, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations

The evaluation also served an important accountability function for USDOL and Winrock International. The evaluation considered all activities that were implemented over the life of the project until the time of the final evaluation.

The evaluation report focuses on the areas of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Specific questions from the Terms of Reference pertaining to each of the areas were answered. The evaluation considered the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it was suited to the priorities and policies of the host country and USDOL. The evaluation assessed the extent to which the project reached its objectives and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those

objectives. The evaluation analyzed whether the strategies employed were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) as compared to the qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs). The evaluation assessed the positive and negative changes produced by the project—intended and unintended, direct and indirect, and any changes in the social and economic environment in the country—as reported by persons interviewed.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1. Overall Approach to the Evaluation

It is important to stress that the evaluation was not intended to criticize but to learn from the past and study how efforts can be further improved in future or ongoing similar projects. Specifically, this meant that the evaluation determined what should be avoided, what can be improved, and what can be added so that the elimination of the worst forms of child labor can more effectively be achieved.

The evaluator viewed the evaluation process as a joint effort to identify the key conclusions that could be drawn in each of these areas. Despite this overall approach, the evaluator was ultimately responsible for the evaluation process, including the report writing.

The evaluator included parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the International Labour Organisation (ILO), International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (available at <http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (available at [http://www.unicef.org/media/media\\_tools\\_guidelines.html](http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html)).

The evaluation adheres to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation quality guidelines and definitions as indicated in the documents at the following Web sites: [www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf) and <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/12/56/41612905.pdf>. Gender and cultural sensitivity are integrated in the evaluation approach.

The evaluation team thus adhered to confidentiality and other ethical considerations throughout. Although a consistent approach was followed in each project site to ensure grounds for a good qualitative analysis, the evaluation incorporated a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries.

To ensure thoroughness, the evaluator used a combination of methods:

- Preparation of detailed methodology, including guidelines for questioning
- Document review, including those related directly to the project and those related to of the overall context in Rwanda regarding education and child labor issues; and any available drafts of the National Policy on the Elimination of Child Labor (NPECL) and other potential issues of importance; and documentation to understand the current socioeconomic situation in Rwanda and its impact on the project and the evaluation process overall.
- Individual interviews and/or focus group discussions with stakeholders from a wide range of groups, including national, provincial, district, and local education policymakers and providers; local authorities; project partners and other agencies working on child labor in the country ; teachers; community-based organizations (CBOs); and communities, parents, and children
- Individual and small group discussions with project staff in the central office and with the three project partners: Winrock International, the Forum for African Women

Educationalists—Rwanda (FAWE-Rwanda), and SNV Netherlands Development Organization in Rwanda (SNV-Rwanda)

- Observation of the stakeholders and their work in different settings as well as their networking actions, combined with field visits and interviews
- Stakeholder meeting during which initial findings were presented, discussed, and enriched with additional input from the participants

The evaluator first met with senior project staff in Kigali, Rwanda, to finalize the issues to address and obtain their further input into the evaluation process. This was followed by joint discussions on the evaluation subjects. Individual meetings were held in Kigali with key project and partner personnel. Some individual and/or small group meetings with project staff of Winrock International and of other partners also took place in the field. After the initial interviews in project headquarters were completed, the evaluator made field visits to meet with local stakeholders and observe actions.

Locations for field visits were identified in line with guidelines provided by the evaluator. These include the need to include stakeholders from successful implementation sites, as well as those where the project faced more challenges.

Given that the evaluation took place during the school vacation, it was not possible to select children randomly from ongoing classes. The project had invited mentors—teachers who provided support and monitoring of the children—to ask children to come from their homes to meet with the evaluator and an interpreter. In some cases, this resulted in the arrival of large groups of children. Given that most children were eager to talk to the evaluation team, the evaluator decided to talk to all of the children who arrived; sending children home without including them in the discussions would have disappointed them. In some cases the teachers invited a smaller group of beneficiary children to meet the evaluation team. In those instances, the evaluator believed that the mentors had responded correctly to the request to make sure that the children represented a good sample of those who were successful through the project as well as those who continued to face challenges.

The evaluator met with the senior project staff on the evening of December 9, 2012, for an initial discussion of principal findings to be presented at a stakeholder’s workshop, which was held December, 10, 2012. A few small factual corrections were made as a result of these discussions.

The stakeholder workshop presentation concentrated on good practices identified at the time of the evaluation, lessons learned, and remaining gaps as identified by all the stakeholders. The role of the evaluator was to analyze and represent the viewpoints of the various individuals and documents consulted. The evaluator used her experience from similar evaluations to share and enrich understanding of the information gathered during the evaluation. The meeting time was used to present the major preliminary finding and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda was determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff.

#### **4. Design and Relevance**

The project design was good overall and in line with social, cultural, political, and economic realities in Rwanda. The design made maximum use of the existing and comparatively well-organized national structures and systems.

##### **4.1. Main Obstacles or Barriers**

As confirmed by final evaluation interviewees, the project correctly identified obstacles to eliminating exploitive child labor in the country: Poverty linked to the aftereffects of the Rwanda genocide, the HIV pandemic and associated high number of orphans, cultural acceptance of child

labor, poor educational facilities and teacher quality, insufficient monitoring and support for vulnerable children, and lack of official policy and action on exploitive child labor in Rwanda.<sup>15</sup> The project design was conducive to addressing these obstacles although, as will be seen in Section 5 on Effectiveness, some elements such as addressing poverty still need a great deal more attention.

The project designers also identified other obstacles affecting education quality, such as the 2009 transition away from French to English<sup>16</sup> in primary schools. French is now only being taught as a language in secondary schools. Many primary school teachers had difficulties learning English despite a major government program to support the transition.<sup>17</sup> The REACH project design included some training on English through an information and communication technology (ICT) teacher resource center.

#### 4.2. Political, Cultural, and Economic Context

The main project strategies and activities in withdrawing or preventing children from exploitive child labor are relevant and appropriate, given the cultural, economic, and political contexts in which the project operated. The project was in line with and supportive of the Rwandan Labor Law,<sup>18</sup> which is comparatively comprehensive in terms of labor that is prohibited for children. The Labor Law also includes a description of specific sanctions to be applied to those who transgress the law on child labor. Under age 16, only light work is allowed, and it must only take place outside of school hours and not otherwise interfere with education. Only nonexploitive labor is allowed for children between the ages of 16 and 17. The law has other positive elements. For example, Article 7 includes specific descriptions of the role of labor inspectors in determining whether any existing child labor is in line with the law. Labor inspectors are able to identify and enforce laws in both formal- and informal-economy child labor, although references in the Labor Law primarily refer to formal employment situations. The Labor Law, further, includes specific references to actions that the government must undertake to eliminate child labor. These include mobilization for enrollment and retention of working children into schools and support to families as a compensation for their loss of income. Ministerial Order n°06 of 13/07/2010<sup>19</sup> defined the worst forms of child labor in Rwanda. The project design and implementation built upon on these laws to reinforce advocacy and awareness raising. The design also focused on supporting the development and adoption of the NPECL. A new penal code that includes strengthened articles on human trafficking was adopted in July 2012.

The GOR has a policy on orphans and vulnerable children (OVC).<sup>20</sup> Children in child labor are identified as one of the 14 categories to be addressed under the OVC policy. Rwanda is, furthermore, implementing a policy of education for all. At the stage of project design, 9 years of basic education were mandatory. In 2012, education for 12 years was made obligatory although, in practice, it will be some time before this can be realized. The project design supported the implementation of these policies through the various project components.

---

<sup>15</sup> Winrock International, FAWE-Rwanda, & SNV-Rwanda. (2009). Project document under USDOL and Winrock International Cooperative Agreement: Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH). Washington, DC: Winrock International and USDOL.

<sup>16</sup> With Kinyarwanda as the first language.

<sup>17</sup> Schools were assigned at least one teacher who spoke English well who was either from an English-speaking country or a Rwandan who had lived as a refugee in countries such as Uganda. Teachers were also taught English during school holidays.

<sup>18</sup> *Official Gazette of the Republic*. (2009). Rwanda Law n° 13/2009 of 27/05/2009. Kigali, Rwanda: Government of the Republic of Rwanda.

<sup>19</sup> *Official Gazette of the Republic*. (2010). Ministerial order n°06 of 13/07/2010 (ministerial order determining the list of worst forms of child labor, their nature, categories of institutions that are not allowed to employ them and their prevention mechanism). Kigali, Rwanda: Government of the Republic of Rwanda.

<sup>20</sup> Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Local Government, Information and Social Affairs. (2003). *National policy for orphans and other vulnerable children*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

Rwanda has a well-structured government system with linkages from the central government to district, geographic sectors, geographic cells, and villages. Although there has been concrete progress on decentralization,<sup>21</sup> the authority of the central government is still widely respected; therefore, laws, policies, and guidelines carry quite a bit of weight at local levels.

Rwanda has a system of mandatory community service that is implemented in all localities once a month.<sup>22</sup> For one-half day, all adults older than 18 are required to participate in activities such as cleaning the community, repairing schools, maintaining roads, or offering other services for free. Following the work, meetings are held to discuss community issues. The project tapped into this system by including discussions of child labor and identification of child laborers into such meetings.

The Ministry of Gender and Family Promotion has a well-defined system on child protection, including a specific individual at village level who is responsible for child rights issues. The project design and implementation tapped into this system to identify, train, advocate, and raise awareness for the withdrawal and prevention of child labor. The project, moreover, used the existing sector and village structures to identify the project child beneficiaries. While in many countries it is necessary to establish special community structures for these purposes, the project did not need to do so in Rwanda. The project also worked with communities to identify special community activists and mentors. Such individuals can eventually be incorporated into existing local government and other structures for sustainability (see Section 8 on Sustainability for details).

The project design included awareness raising to change the existing cultural mindset,<sup>23</sup> which views child labor as useful socialization and learning of work skills. The design emphasized increased understanding between acceptable child work and exploitive child labor. Interestingly, however, the project's baseline survey indicated that only 3% of the children interviewed thought that "learning a skill" was a reason for child labor. The majority of children (88%) indicated that poverty-related reasons were the principal reasons for child labor.

The design included consideration of gender issues, such as the lower school performance of girls, through catch-up programs. The catch-up programs helped girls and boys to reintegrate and/or improve their school examination results. The inclusion of FAWE-Rwanda as one of the three implementation partners also reinforced attention to gender.

Although the Rwandan economy is currently growing at more than 7%, poverty remains a challenge for a sizable segment (45%) of the population that still lived below the poverty line in 2010.<sup>24</sup> The project design included a component on stimulating the development of livelihoods among 140 project households, as well as through the MFS component for older children.

### **4.3. Accurately Identify the Worst Forms of Child Labor in the Country**

The project accurately identified the worst forms of child labor in the country. While there were children in Rwanda in a range of different kinds of exploitive labor, the project concentrated on children in agriculture. This choice was important because child labor in the Rwanda is widely prevalent in various kinds of agriculture and livestock rearing sectors. Some children also work in the

---

<sup>21</sup> Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Affairs. (2007). *Rwanda decentralization strategic framework: Towards a sectorwide approach for decentralization implementation*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

<sup>22</sup> Rwanda Governance Board. (2012). *Fostering good governance for sustainable development: Umuganda*. Retrieved December 22, 2012, from <http://www.rgb.rw/main-menu/innovation/umuganda.html>.

<sup>23</sup> Term used by a project staff member.

<sup>24</sup> African Development Bank, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations Development Programme, & United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. (2012). *African economic outlook: Rwanda 2012*. Available at [www.africaneconomicoutlook.org](http://www.africaneconomicoutlook.org).

agricultural supply chain and distribution of agricultural products and other products, including cross-border with Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Rwandan children on the Uganda border are, for example, involved in illegal trade to transport maize flour, rice, cement, salt, and liquor. Rwandan children also work in Uganda as herders. Rwandan children on the DRC border assist with illegal trade by helping people with disabilities push their trailers containing goods such as potatoes, beans, and cooking oil into DRC. Children also help with transport of goods, such as sugar, cloth, and liquor, from DRC into Rwanda. Some children work in fishing boats on Lake Kivu, which includes cross-border travel. The project conducted sensitization training with DRC and Rwandan local authorities, parents, and other stakeholders in Rubavo District about the dangers of children's involvement in such child labor.

The project ultimately included some children in other sectors who were identified as vulnerable and in need of withdrawal from highly exploitive child labor (see Section 5.3.1). These children included child domestic workers (241 children); construction or brick production workers (136 children); small-scale traders (93 children); and mining, quarrying, and sand collection workers (35 children).

#### **4.4. Adequate Support the Five USDOL Child Labor Elimination Program Goals**

The project design and implementation adequately supported the five USDOL Child Labor Elimination Program Goals it was funded to support. Project staff worked to reduce exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services and the promotion of sustainable livelihoods with a portion of the target households. The project also contributed to relevant policy development at national and local levels, awareness raising, and mobilization of a wide array of actors to eliminate exploitive child labor and promote education. Research was conducted to add to the knowledge base on child labor and relevant effective development strategies. Further, integrated approaches were taken to help ensure sustainability through the overall project strategies; these approaches especially included work with local authorities, CAs, and mentors.

#### **4.5. Accuracy of Project Assumptions**

The project assumptions proved to be accurate overall, although the assumption that the currency would remain stable proved to be untrue. The evaluator did not, however, discern any strong impact of the currency instability. No environmental or political circumstances increased poverty in target regions. Communities and parents were open to change and were able to identify and agree to withdraw child laborers so they could return to school. Communities provided space for project interventions such as catch-up programs and MFS. Teachers, government officials, and community members remained receptive to training and allocated time to facilitate and/or attend project-initiated training.

The evaluation Terms of Reference required an assessment of how successful the project was in revising strategy in response to political and economic shocks in the country. This question was considered to be not entirely relevant given that no major shocks had occurred although, given regional tensions, issues may arise in the future that may have an impact on sustainability.<sup>25</sup>

#### **4.6. Project Adjustments Following Midterm Evaluation**

The project staff tried to address all of the recommendations based on the findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation. That report included three key recommendations and an additional nine more detailed recommendations.

---

<sup>25</sup> See Section 8 for details on other sustainability issues.

**Table 1—Midterm Evaluation Recommendations and Steps to Address**

Key Midterm Evaluation Recommendations	Brief Summary of Steps Undertaken/or Not Undertaken to Address Recommendations
Make classrooms more child-friendly and improve the learning environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided seven schools with mural paintings and messages on child labor</li> <li>• Carried out additional school renovation projects at three schools</li> <li>• Designed and produced child-friendly posters with child labor and education messages and distributed them in December 2012 to all REACH schools</li> <li>• Provided seven preprimary schools with educational learning materials, including age-appropriate toys, books, crayons, and other items</li> </ul>
Increase appreciation and acknowledgement toward volunteers (mentors and CAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued quarterly training to CAs and mentors</li> <li>• Procured additional incentive for volunteers, including bags, t-shirts, and shoes to assist them in their work and show appreciation</li> <li>• Provided certificates of work for all volunteers during the December 2012 quarterly training</li> </ul>
Finalize the National Five-Year Strategic Plan and National Policy for the Elimination of Child Labor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worked closely with the Ministry of Public Service and Labor (MIFOTRA) and other stakeholders to finalize the draft NPEC) and the accompanying National Five- Year Strategic Plan that is awaiting the Inter-ministerial Cabinet’s approval</li> </ul>

Other midterm evaluation recommendations implemented included training on alternative disciplinary methods to corporal punishment, inclusion of local stakeholders in sustainability planning, ongoing support for mentors on accurate data collection, and intensification of beekeeping MFS training.

## 5. Effectiveness

*“I want to be a leader of tomorrow.”*

—Primary school girl withdrawn from child labor

The project’s objectives were reached. The project was effective in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document, including children *prevented* from child labor and *withdrawn* from such labor.

### 5.1. Summary of Project Achievement of Targets and Objectives

The project was able to achieve all of the outputs overall<sup>26</sup> although, at the national level, an indicator on adoption of the NPECL could not be achieved before the final evaluation. Progress toward adoption was made but, as in other countries, it was difficult for a project to be held accountable for the adoption of government policies. Projects do not have full control over such situations.<sup>27</sup> Government bureaucracies tend to move slowly, using complex systems to gain adoption of legal frameworks and policies.

<sup>26</sup> The project uses the term “outputs” for reporting on the extent to which objectives were met.

<sup>27</sup> Winrock International, FAWE-Rwanda, & SNV-Rwanda. (2009). *National Action Plan adopted target: Year 2* (Project document under USDOL and Winrock International cooperative agreement: Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children [REACH]). Washington, DC: Winrock International and USDOL.

## 5.2. Overview of Project Achievement of Outputs

**Table 2—Overview of Key Results Toward Meeting the Project Outputs<sup>28</sup>**

<p><b>Output 1) Withdrawing and preventing children from involvement in exploitive labor through direct education services.</b></p> <p><b>Key Results Toward Meeting the Objective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As of September, 2012 TPR, REACH withdrew 5,020 from child labor and prevented 3,511 children from entering child labor.</li> <li>• REACH beneficiaries provided education services in primary school, middle school (Tronc Commun), catch-up, and MFS programs.</li> <li>• 1,050 teachers were trained (who were not mentors or CAs) on child labor in Rwanda and how to withdraw children from or prevent children from entering child labor.</li> <li>• 15 preprimary teachers were trained on child labor, improved preprimary-appropriate teaching techniques and curriculum, and seven schools were provided with preprimary classroom learning materials.</li> <li>• More than 100 teachers were trained in computer literacy at the Nyamasheke ICT center and the community was provided with access to computers, the Internet (optic fiber), printing, and scanning services.</li> <li>• 140 CFSS mothers were provided small enterprise training.</li> <li>• 7 schools were renovated.</li> <li>• 7 schools were provided school murals and paintings with awareness-raising messages.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 2) Strengthening policy and institutions to combat child labor through education.</b></p> <p><b>Key Results Toward Meeting the Objective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project staff met with GOR at least 14 times to technically support the development of NPECL and the eventual CLMS. The policy is not yet adopted, but REACH contributed substantially to the document throughout the entire process. MIFOTRA and National Commission on Children (NCC) were provided with a suggested draft monitoring form to be used at the local levels for streamlined data collection.</li> <li>• Project staff held 160 meetings at the district and sector levels to support policy and institutional strengthening. Most of these meetings took place during awareness-raising campaigns spearheaded by REACH in coordination with local authorities.</li> <li>• Project staff assisted the City of Kigali in drafting guidelines on stopping urban child labor.</li> <li>• Project staff provided training and awareness raising to staff at national and local institutions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Output 3) Raising awareness and mobilizing actors.</b></p> <p><b>Key Results Toward Meeting the Objective</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project staff, in coordination with local authorities, organized child labor campaign weeks in each district.</li> <li>• Project staff worked with 140 volunteer CAs and more than 500 mentors. All volunteers were trained repeatedly (on a quarterly basis) on child labor issues regarding policy, selecting and monitoring children, best mentoring practices, and so forth.</li> <li>• All clients of project partner SNV-Rwanda, representing more than 100,000 people, were trained in identifying exploitive child labor incidents and how to deal with them.</li> <li>• The project had a presence at all Joint Action Development Forum (JADF) meetings at the district level to engage other community nongovernmental organization (NGO), government, and private-sector representatives in discussions on child labor.</li> <li>• Awareness-raising materials, TV, and radio programs on child labor were developed and disseminated. Posters were developed for schools, government offices, health centers, and other community locations as part of the ongoing awareness campaign, Protect Me From Child Labor.</li> </ul>

<sup>28</sup> Table adapted from input provided by project staff.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project produced and disseminates quarterly newsletters on project activities.</li> </ul>
<b>Output 4) Research and collect reliable data on child labor.</b>
<b>Key Results Toward Meeting the Objective</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project staff conducted a baseline study, child labor in tea production study, and an awareness-raising survey and developed ad hoc papers.</li> <li>Project staff developed a database and monitoring tools to track children withdrawn from or prevented from entering child labor.</li> </ul>
<b>Output 5) Sustainability.</b>
<b>Key Results Toward Meeting the Objective</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project staff developed two toolkits for stakeholder use after the project: The Winrock-REACH Child Labor Community Engagement Toolkit and The Winrock-REACH Model Farm School Curriculum and Community Engagement Toolkit.</li> <li>Project staff hosted a Sustainability Conference on February 6–7, 2013. The conference had 200 participants. The toolkits, key outcomes, successes, and challenges were shared. Participants made recommendations to MIFOTRA on sustainable measures to continue to eliminate child labor after the close of the project.</li> <li>Project staff incorporated sustainability in all project activities. By using strategies such as conducting community-based awareness campaigns, providing simple monitoring tools, training of 700 volunteers, and garnering in-kind donations and support from local authorities, the project staff built a model that can be carried on after the end of the project.</li> </ul>

### 5.2.1. Withdrawing Children From and Preventing Children From Entering Exploitive Child Labor Through Direct Education Services

Project targets were slightly exceeded with regard to the number of children withdrawn from or prevented from entering exploitive child labor. Girls constituted 52% of the beneficiaries. Somewhat more than one-half (4,200) of the beneficiaries were in formal primary and secondary schools. A total of 1,731 children were provided with catch-up classes, and 2,300 older children were integrated into MFS training. Some children in catch-up classes attended regular school sessions that were supplemented with catch-up tutoring after school. Other children attended transitioning classes to help them integrate back into school. Some additional children attended a concentrated catch-up program that integrated 3 primary school years into 1 intensive school year to enable them to enter secondary school. Children who attended catch-up classes in combination with normal school sessions were only counted once. An additional 200 children from 140 households received assistance through support provided to their mothers in the form of livelihoods training and linkages to microfinance institutions (MFIs).

**Table 3—Overview of Number of Children Withdrawn From or Prevented From Entering Exploitive Child Labor**

ACTION TAKEN	Prevention			Withdrawal			TOTAL	%	Target
	F	M	Subtotal	F	M	Subtotal			
Catch-up	367	433	800	461	470	931	<b>1,731</b>	20.29%	<b>1,600</b>
CFSS	58	53	111	51	38	89	<b>200</b>	2.34%	<b>200</b>
All MFS	--	--	--	1,192	1,108	2,300	<b>2,300</b>	26.96%	<b>2,200</b>
Primary	1,056	944	2,000	350	350	700	<b>2,700</b>	31.65%	<b>2,700</b>
Secondary	370	230	600	542	458	1,000	<b>1,600</b>	18.76%	<b>1,600</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,851</b>	<b>1,660</b>	<b>3,511</b>	<b>2,596</b>	<b>2,424</b>	<b>5,020</b>	<b>8,531</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>8,300</b>

The evaluation found that very few children appeared to continue work in exploitive child labor. The children in MFS indicated that, at the time of the evaluation, they were engaged in light work while they waited for the potential financial benefits of their MFS project to grow.<sup>29</sup> That finding was striking, given that so many MFS children were not working and that it takes time for the financial benefits of agricultural and livestock work to result in significant income. Beekeeping, growing fruits and vegetables, and rearing livestock take time and are subject to climate conditions and other challenges, such as the illnesses of animals. Estimates for such projects to raise sufficient funds to cover basic needs of all group members were 2–3 years.

Formal-school beneficiaries reported that they were now doing only relatively light work at home or part-time work because they were enrolled in the project. These children reported that, in their free time, they “revise classwork, dig in the family home garden, cook, visit relatives, visit classmates.” A few children also mentioned carrying some firewood and fetching water for their own family although, due to time constraints, the evaluator was unable to pursue these points in detail by asking for details about the weight and distances of such items carried. Children did state that the loads of firewood were lighter than before.

Carrying water and firewood remains a challenge for households because, if children do not help, mothers who are already overburdened with work or who may be pregnant and/or carrying a small child will be expected to do all of this work. Solutions to this problem need to be identified. When identifying intervention locations, future projects need to consider high levels of child labor as well as challenging locations in terms distances to obtain energy for cooking or water. Projects can promote linkages to agencies that can assist with provision of water points and alternate sources of cooking fuel or energy-saving devices.

A group of children, including some who acted as household heads, indicated that they had difficulties raising funds to (help) support their siblings after returning to school. The household heads indicated that they, and their siblings, were all in school and reported that they did not have regular jobs but that they needed to work around their neighborhood doing small tasks for neighbors to be able to cover their basic needs. One child reported, for example, “I might do some small jobs like carrying water for some people if they ask me. Not a steady job, just from time to time for 50 francs per time.”

The project design did not foresee a project endline study, although an assessment to analyze such issues and households’ current understanding of activities around the home that could be acceptable for children to do would have been useful. An endline study could be useful to future projects.

The evaluator met interviewees in several locations who reported that an increasing number of children who were not enrolled in the project were no longer working in some forms of child labor. One executive secretary<sup>30</sup> of a geographic sector and a sector education officer stated that “a few [non-project] children are still working in tea gardens in our sector but not as many as before.” It was not, however, possible to ascertain the extent of these withdrawals from child labor because there was no monitoring of such cases.

The interviewees added, however, that stopping children from working in tea production did not automatically end children’s work in exploitive labor. These sector authorities reported that there were no longer any children working in tea factories but some smallholder tea garden farmers still employed their own or other people’s children. These interviewees noted that it is more difficult to control the child labor on such smallholder farms.

---

<sup>29</sup> Children provided examples of their “light work.”

<sup>30</sup> Heads of sectors have the title of sector executive secretary.

School authorities in one location reported<sup>31</sup> that some children who were not enrolled in the project had stopped working in tea gardens and were in school but had, subsequently, dropped out of school again. Follow-up visits to the homes of such children indicated that they had left for Kigali to engage in domestic work or were engaged in herding. Regrettably, it was not possible to verify how many children might be in this situation. A well-integrated CLMS system could, in the future, help to track such children unless, of course, they cannot be identified after moving to a new location.

Sector authorities in another location found some instances of children who wanted to start working in tea factories so that they could be identified as vulnerable and receive assistance. Fortunately, the sector authorities had discovered the situation and discussed the matter with the tea factory owners and the children were sent back to school.

### 5.2.2. Strengthening Policy and Institutions to Combat Child Labor Through Education

The project staff provided technical input into policy and strategy development during meetings and workshops at national and local levels and provided feedback on various drafts of the NPECL. Meetings and workshops were concentrated at local levels where the need for such support was greatest. Output 3 on mobilizing actors also had a cross-cutting impact on Output 2 on strengthening institutions. The project staff provided training on child labor issues to local leaders (CAs) and mentors, which helped to strengthen the capacities of local institutions. Most CAs played a role in CBOs and some were employed in local government. Mentors are teachers who form part of local education systems.

While the project contributed to the NPECL and associated 5-year strategic plan, official central government adoption was still pending at the time of the evaluation field work. As already stated, projects cannot be held accountable for adoption of government policies, despite active advocacy work. Adoption of policies and legal frameworks, rightly, requires review and discussion across different government areas and levels.

Child labor projects in several countries have included outputs and indicators for the adoption of legal and policy frameworks in their logical frameworks. Future projects should preferably not include such outputs and indicators because they are often not realistic. Even where legal frameworks and policies are adopted during a project's lifetime, it is difficult to attribute adoption to a project. In most cases, a variety of advocates work to ensure adoption, including other projects, national and international entities, and the media. As a result, such an output or indicator cannot be a true positive or negative measure of effectiveness. Instead, the clear contribution of a project to the *development* of legal and policy frameworks, strategies, and approaches may be tracked. Solid proof of *advocacy* efforts, which also includes the effective mobilization of a wide range of stakeholders, can also serve as useful measures.

The NPECL was recently reviewed by the Rwandan Cabinet. During the stakeholders workshop, it was announced that the Cabinet had requested additional updated data on child labor in the country before officially approving the policy. The Cabinet requested MIFOTRA to update the data because figures on child labor presented in the NPECL draft were based on the 2008 Child Labor Survey. MIFOTRA is working with the National Institute of Statistics in Rwanda to determine how to obtain updated data.

Together with other partners, including ILO and UNICEF, the project staff repeatedly advocated for official adoption of the NPECL. Given that the country's labor law has fairly detailed articles on

---

<sup>31</sup> According to one sector staff member interviewed.

conditions under which child labor is allowed—or not allowed—the basic legal framework is sufficient.<sup>32</sup>

Detailed data on child labor prevalence and conditions dates back to the national Child Labor Survey conducted in 2008.<sup>33</sup> An Understanding Children’s Work (UCW) study was conducted in 2010–2011.<sup>34</sup> The UCW contains rich detail on child labor and youth employment but it was not intended as a prevalence survey. ICF International conducted a study in three districts in the Northern Province of Rwanda.<sup>35</sup> The REACH project also conducted a project baseline study and a study of child labor in tea production that contributed to an overview of the current situation. The recent national census included some questions on child labor but, according to one interviewee, the census interviewers did not correctly understand the definition of child labor. The demarcation between child labor and child work was not clear so the results are likely, “not credible.”

The MIFOTRA staffing charged with specifically working on child labor issues at the national level is still very limited. There has been substantial turnover of national staff and the responsible person also works on other issues, most notably social security, so the time he can allocate to child labor is restricted.

The GOR has a number of useful programs that are relevant for action on child labor, including the fund for vulnerable families that is allocated at the geographic-sector level. A program of “one cow per family” is also being implemented, although it is still only partially successful because it takes time to effectively build such programs.<sup>36</sup>

Children included in the OVC policy categories<sup>37</sup> are to be prioritized under vulnerability support programs. Systems for referral of children to these programs are still ad hoc, however, and will need to be further developed in a future national CLMS system. The current concept of the CLMS is primarily focused on the identification of child laborers and the monitoring of their situation. In the future, referrals of child laborers to various programs assisting vulnerable children will need to be well delineated and integrated. Integration would, in this context, mean a well-structured referral system from community level to cell, sector, and districts level for provision of support and monitoring.

The project staff had the intention of working with MIFOTRA to set up a national CLMS. However, it had not yet been fully developed because the ministry indicated it would only be possible after adoption of the NPECL. The project staff did develop a special format using Microsoft Excel to enable labor inspectors to begin tracking child labor. The project staff also proposed to the NCC that a CLMS be integrated into the national child protection data collection system.

Given the well-organized government structures in Rwanda, the evaluator is of the opinion that such an effective CLMS system integrated into the child protection referral systems is possible. The proposed NPECL policy already included a component on linking CAs and mentors to the government child protection system. It focused primarily on identification and monitoring but did

---

<sup>32</sup> United States Department of State. (2012). *Trafficking in persons report 2012*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/192587.pdf>.

<sup>33</sup> Government of Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Public Service and Labour, National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda (2008). *Rwanda National Child Labour Survey—2008 (RNCLS—2008)*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

<sup>34</sup> ILO, UNICEF, & World Bank. (2011). *Understanding children’s work and youth employment outcomes in Rwanda- Country report—June 2011* (Report on the Understanding Children’s Work Programme). Kigali, Rwanda: United Nations Rwanda.

<sup>35</sup> ICF International. (2012). *Child labor in agriculture in Rwanda*. Calverton, MD: ICF International.

<sup>36</sup> African Smallholders Farmers Group (2012). *The “One Cow Per Poor Family” programme in Rwanda*. Retrieved December 20, 2012, from <http://www.asfg.org.uk/success-stories/the-one-cow-per-poor-family-programme-in-rwanda>.

<sup>37</sup> Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Local Government, Information and Social Affairs. (2003). *National policy for orphans and other vulnerable children*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

not include a referral system. Data will need to be channeled to the national level to ensure that the GOR has access to the requisite data needed to adjust policies and strategies.

At the national level, the NCC is responsible for child protection issues in the country, including monitoring of interventions and data. Other committees with links to child rights issues also exist.<sup>38</sup> The country has Child Protection Committees (CPCs)<sup>39</sup> at the district, geographic sector, cell, and village levels. Government staff working in various positions relating to children's issues are appointed to the CPC at each administrative level. Other members include the police, civil society representatives, children representing the local children's forum, and religious leaders. At the village level, trained volunteers—who also receive some small incentives—take overall responsibility for issues related to child protection, including identification of cases, referral, monitoring, and so forth. These village-level committees are composed of the village chief, person in charge of social affairs, women's and children's representatives, and local leaders.

The rapid growth of digital technology can be explored to determine how future projects can integrate the CLMS and associated referral systems into digital information systems, starting at the community level.<sup>40</sup> The pervasive presence in Africa of mobile phones, and increasingly of secondhand smart phones,<sup>41</sup> has potential for the effective identification, referral, and monitoring of children in exploitive child labor. Examples from other countries can be used to inspire more effective CLMS through involvement of local communities using such digital technology. In the Philippines, for example, a participatory community monitoring program uses mobile phones and mobilization to report on local education issues, which helps to improve school education services.<sup>42</sup>

Project partner FAWE-Rwanda contributed to the development of a national girls' education policy and helped to make sure that child labor was incorporated into the policy. FAWE-Rwanda also made sure that a discussion of child labor was included in a teachers' capacity-strengthening conference. A recommendation was made to include child labor in the teachers' training curriculum. However, the FAWE-Rwanda project staff representative indicated that the report was not yet available so information about inclusion of child labor in the final document was not certain.

The GOR recently updated the required number of years of education from 9 to 12. It is uncertain to what extent this can be realized in practice, given the difficulty of households in covering the cost of school supplies, school uniforms, and fees. Although the government abolished the payment of official school fees in 2003, most schools still charge fees to cover various school-related costs. Individual schools and their parent-teacher associations set the amounts. The project team worked with teachers, district, and sector education officers to help ensure that REACH beneficiaries and other vulnerable children were not required to pay school fees so that fees would not have an

---

<sup>38</sup> Such as the Rwanda National Human Rights Commission; Lower Chamber Committee on Social Affairs, which also covers employment issues; Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Human Rights and Petitions; and National Commission for Refugees.

<sup>39</sup> Rwanda Civil Society Platform. (2012). *The mapping exercise on child protection programs in Rwanda: Report*. Kigali, Rwanda: Lex Chambers Ltd.

<sup>40</sup> Please see an article on similar aspects of digital development in Africa: The Innovation Knowledge Foundation. (2012). *The next frontier of development*. Milan, Italy: Author. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from [http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93-the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde\\_788017\\_member\\_194395666](http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93-the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde_788017_member_194395666). Also see the foundation's general Web site at <http://www.thinkinovation.org>.

<sup>41</sup> In one interview with an MFS group, the community-based trainer attempted to film the focus group with a smart phone. The evaluation interpreter stopped the filming to protect children's right to privacy.

<sup>42</sup> Information collected is gathered on a Web site and is also available offline. Checkmyschool.org reports on individual school budgets and conditions and allows users to track conditions in their localities as well as report anomalies between reported and actual conditions. Checkmyschool.org. (2012). *Checkmyschool helps citizens access information, send feedback, and resolve issues on education services*. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://www.checkmyschool.org/main-page>.

impact on whether a child attended school. Unfortunately, the evaluation team was unable to meet with the Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) representative who was the project's focal point within the ministry.<sup>43</sup>

MIFOTRA also indicated that the ministry's collaboration with the project team had been excellent. It was noted that the system of CAs and mentors was particularly useful because such individuals can inform the labor inspectors of existing exploitive child labor issues. MIFOTRA also stated that most of the ministry's work on child labor is channeled through the district labor inspectors. Each district, unfortunately, currently only has one labor inspector. It was also indicated that the district labor inspectors alert MIFOTRA on local issues and sites to inspect so their role is essential. Including the labor inspectors in any existing, or future, actions on child labor will be indispensable to success in the elimination of exploitive child labor in Rwanda.

To improve the situation with respect to urban child labor, in particular rural children engaged in domestic work, the project team worked with the Kigali City Council. Guidelines on such child labor issues were developed conjointly with MIFOTRA central government staff as well as labor inspectors from two districts and other local stakeholders. The guidelines established mechanisms of preventing and combating illegal child labor in Kigali. The guidelines were published in the *Official Gazette of the Republic N°49* on December 3, 2012. MIFOTRA indicated that the guidelines are expected to serve as a model for the development of additional guidelines to address various types of urban child labor. It should be added that the development of the guidelines was not included in the original REACH project design or budget but was included in project actions as the need to support the Kigali City Council was recognized.

### 5.2.3. Raising Awareness and Mobilizing Actors

At the time of the evaluation field work, the primary means of awareness raising was through direct interpersonal communications by project staff, CAs, mentors, SNV-Rwanda, advisors and associated local authorities. Such awareness raising was very effective and was one of the project's strong points.

Mobilizing actors for the development of sustainable approaches to eliminating exploitive child labor in project districts was focused through national focal points in the MIFOTRA and MINEDUC and local authorities at district, geographic sector, and cell levels. At community level, CAs and mentors were mobilized to support specific project implementation with the ultimate goal of establishing a network of trained individuals to support sustainable government approaches.

The project staff noted that, despite awareness raising about exploitive child labor in the country before to the REACH project, awareness was limited at project inception. Exploitive child labor in agriculture had not yet been addressed much it was challenging to work with communities to raise their awareness. It was particularly challenging to help individuals at various levels understand the difference between child labor and child work in agriculture. The project team did find that the direct interpersonal contacts enabled them to clarify these differences by allowing for the recognition of the importance of socialization through child work as opposed to exploitive child labor. As the project staff reported, even medical doctors attending the 8th National Pediatric Conference in November 2012 could not initially understand the issues surrounding child labor but were quickly convinced using the project's awareness-raising methods.

The project partner SNV-Rwanda implemented a program to channel awareness raising on child labor throughout the country using its network of thousands of members referred to as clients (i.e.,

---

<sup>43</sup> A communication issue occurred that prevented the team from meeting with the person concerned, although he did participate in the stakeholders' workshop at the end of the mission.

individuals who are members of local entities supported by SNV-Rwanda). Most of the clients are members of different local agricultural cooperatives. SNV-Rwanda has 15 field advisers working with the agricultural cooperatives around the country. SNV-Rwanda also works with 12 organizations, including as the Association for Integrated Development of Rwanda (ARDI), which promotes beekeeping, and the Gako Organic Training Center (OTC), both of which were linked to the REACH project.

SNV-Rwanda covered all Rwanda's districts, including those that did not have organized structures. Training on child labor ranged from 2.5 hours to a full day of training. In those locations where SNV-Rwanda was not yet working, whole-day workshops on child labor were organized.

The project team developed a special toolkit on child labor to be used by the SNV-Rwanda field advisers.<sup>44</sup> The toolkit was developed for geographic sector trainers and included explanations of the relevant international conventions and national laws on child labor. The evaluator found that the toolkit was relatively complex although, with training, the SNV-Rwanda trainers could understand the guidelines and adapt them for use with their members in their programmatic implementation areas.

The SNV-Rwanda noted: "The first times we did this [training] there was quite a bit of resistance from the cooperative members. They felt they could not reach their current level if they did not have child labour and that child labour is a process to develop a child. We were able to explain the difference between CW and child labour and, as a result, understanding grew."

The project team also undertook other awareness-raising efforts, including use of radio, TV, and a quarterly newsletter describing project activities. There were some delays in maximizing the usefulness of visual communication materials because project posters and other visual materials were only being widely distributed toward the end of the final evaluation.

Local authorities were effectively mobilized on child labor, as evidenced by inclusion of the discussions on child labor in monthly and community meetings, quarterly JADF meetings at sector level, as well as other activities.<sup>45</sup> The JADF was originally piloted by SNV-Rwanda and officially adopted in 2007 for implementation as a national strategy in all districts. The JADF is composed of local authorities and private-sector and civil-society representatives and meets for the purpose of local development planning, monitoring, and promoting cooperation between members.

The mobilization of local entities and individuals had positive results, including active involvement in awareness raising. Local government in several locations provided agricultural land for MFS agricultural activities. Local schools contributed land and human resources to assist with the establishment of school vegetable gardens for the agriculture clubs stimulated through the project. Authorities indicated that at least some project beneficiaries would be assisted after the project ended through the program to assist the most vulnerable families in the geographic sectors.

Children reported that mentors and the project district coordinator and/or mobilizers shared information about the dangers of exploitive child labor with them. Children stated points such as, "mentors teach us about stopping child labor, going back to school, not being absent from school and taking care of the school supplies that we were given."

Children could explain and were very aware of the negative impact of child labor. When asked if child labor was good or bad, children in all groups quickly shouted out that it was "bad." Asked how

---

<sup>44</sup> Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH) Project. (2010). *Child Labor Sensitization Toolkit: Designed to be used in the REACH sensitization*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

<sup>45</sup> SNV-Rwanda. (2009). *Joint Action Development Forum in Rwanda: Experiences and lessons learned*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

they knew it was bad, they related that mentors and CAs had told them; several groups also indicated that, “We did not need them to tell us it was bad, we already knew it ourselves!” In two groups, children also added that their parents also already knew that “child labor is bad before the project came.”

Children provided reasons why they thought that child labor was bad: “You may even move away from home to work and not know where you are” and “You work but do not go to school and you have to carry heavy loads which is not good for our bodies as we are too young for that.” Others added, “It is not fair to carry heavy loads when you are ten years old.” Children in one primary school shared additional comments, including “We have to respect our parents and do what they say, so if they ask us to do it [child labor] then we do it,” and “They used to beat us to do this work before, but not anymore. We do not have to do it.” In one group, children said that “Parents tell us to take our responsibilities to help the family with child labor but some of them do not take their own responsibilities ...” In another school, children mentioned points such as, “Sometimes your parents may tell you to go grow crops for someone but we know we are not old enough.”

Children in all groups interviewed could state that doing light housework was acceptable, saying for instance, “Children can do some small chores at home but they should not be doing working digging in the fields.” Children could give examples of acceptable work at home, mentioning sweeping, cooking, washing dishes, and helping with some laundry.

Children in all groups were also very able to list the rights of the child as listed in the UNICEF Convention on the Rights of the Child. Whenever a child mentioned “the right to play,” their point was greeted with enthusiasm by the rest of the children present. Some children also said that since the project was implemented they had some time to play whereas this had not been possible before.

A geographic sector head (executive secretary), some CAs, and mentors noted that the best entry point for discussions with parents about child labor was to focus first and foremost on education. By placing special emphasis on the child’s right to go to school and that child labor interferes with this right, it was possible to raise awareness effectively. Another successful tactic was to stress that exploitive child labor can prevent children from “growing tall.”

Parents indicated that teachers had talked to them about child labor issues. In some children’s focus groups, children also indicated that they had taken the initiative to talk to their parents. Some of the parents indicated that they knew child labor was “bad for the children” and, following project support, were more convinced than ever to not engage their children in exploitive child labor. At the same time, parents indicated that it was very difficult to avoid child labor when they cannot pay for school supplies, uniforms, and school fees.

Mentors in a primary school where murals with messages on child labor and education had been painted on the walls in October indicated that more children “left exploitive labour and joined this school because of the murals that are outside now. I do not know the number.” The evaluator was not able to verify whether this statement was correct because the mentors were not able to provide details. The extent to which mentors wanted to stress the importance of education and detriments of child labor by sharing this point was, nevertheless, an interesting point.

Although implementing awareness-raising techniques using children’s own voices was not included in the REACH project document, such awareness raising would have been effective and should be considered for future programs. The project supported some children’s participation in the seven schools where murals with messages on child labor were painted. Methods using child-to-child, child-to-parent, and child-to-community awareness raising were, however, hardly found during the evaluation visits. In several schools, children said they were not included in awareness raising in any

organized way. However, children in one school expressed interest in such activities, stating, “We do not have songs, poems, or other activities about child labour. If we have one we would sing one for the community, though.” There were two instances where children had developed their own songs, and in one instance a poem about child labor, but these had originated through the children’s own initiative. The fact that the children were sufficiently resourceful to decide to make their own songs indicated that increasing such efforts could be beneficial. Interest existed in passing on messages on child labor using the arts.

Children often are their own best advocates and, particularly through the arts,<sup>46</sup> can sustainably communicate relevant messages. When children own the child-labor message, they can expand their communication skills to other development subjects. Children can also be included in writing newsletters, sharing songs and stories about child labor on radio shows, and many other activities.

#### 5.2.4. Research and Collect Reliable Data on Child Labor

The project team conducted research in the form of a baseline study,<sup>47</sup> a study on child labor in awareness raising,<sup>48</sup> and a study of child labor in the tea sector in three districts.<sup>49</sup> To contribute to the collection of reliable data on child labor, the project team also developed a database with associated monitoring tools to track project beneficiaries. The development of the monitoring database was intended as a pilot exercise toward eventual development of a CLMS.

##### Baseline Survey

The project’s baseline survey was validated during a stakeholder workshop in September 2010 and finalized in November 2010, 1 year after project inception.<sup>50</sup> As a result, some interviewees stated that the report was too late to use in informing the overall project design, project components, and project locations. Despite this, however, the study provided useful insights into local situations and helped to frame specific activities in project sites. Some of the baseline findings, such as the impact of children’s domestic work for others and household/agricultural work for their own family, were striking. The study noted, for example, that some children worked many hours—an average of 26 hours per week—to take care of their own family livestock or work on family agricultural land. The baseline survey thus recommended that attention be given to this factor when raising awareness about child labor and education.

Baseline studies can have several primary purposes, such as informing project design and providing details about project locations and types of actions. Depending on baseline survey content, collected data can also be used to inform awareness-raising methodologies and messages and to fine-tune networking with local stakeholders and/or other project elements. Baseline surveys that include a statistically viable quantitative approach can also be used to determine child labor prevalence in (potential) project areas. Such prevalence data can then be compared with results from an endline survey to determine whether the project contributed to child labor reduction in locations studied. Prevalence base and endline studies can be particularly helpful when assessing whether a project has had an impact on child labor beyond the specific project beneficiaries who are tracked through

---

<sup>46</sup> Such as using the ILO SCREAM package: International Labour Organisation. (2012). *Support Children’s Rights Through Education, the Arts and the Media (SCREAM) education pack and resources*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author. Available at <http://www.ilo.org/ipec/Campaignandadvocacy/Scream/SCREAMresources/lang--en/index.htm>.

<sup>47</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2010). *Baseline assessment on child labor in seven districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

<sup>48</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2011). *Assessment on child labor awareness with SNV stakeholders in Rwanda: Research report*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

<sup>49</sup> Winrock International. (2012). *Child labor in the Tea Sector: Case study of Nyamasheke, Nyaruguru and Gicumbi*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

<sup>50</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2010). *Baseline assessment on child labor in seven districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

the project monitoring system. Such studies can be, however, quite time consuming and expensive if they are to be statistically valid.

In the case of the REACH project baseline, the study was mostly focused on obtaining information on the context, types, and prevalence of child labor in the project districts as well as on the education and learning conditions of child laborers. The baseline survey also was intended to provide information for the selection of project beneficiaries and potential refining of the project's logic framework and related performance management plan. Finally, the baseline was intended to gather data on the attitudes about child labor from key informants in the project districts. No endline survey was planned or budgeted for, although some evaluation interviewees said they believed that additional children were withdrawn from child labor beyond the direct beneficiaries.

The overall approach, sampling process, selection of key informants, questions, and reporting were generally good. A purposive sampling approach was used at the geographic-sector level. Purposive sampling normally is conducted to select respondents who meet certain characteristics or criteria for being included in the sample. In the REACH project situation, this was households where children met criteria that might predispose them to be involved in child labor, such as children who dropped out of school or children who were frequently absent from school. Within each identified geographic cell, a list of such households was drawn up from which a random sample of 50 households was subsequently selected for in-depth interviews. Using purposive sampling was logical within the project context because it helped to ensure that sufficient children in child labor, or at risk for child labor, were included in the sample to inform the project. The use of purposive sampling did not, however, allow for baseline conclusions concerning child labor prevalence as compared to the general populations in the districts. It did, nevertheless, allow the project team to obtain some insights into the relative proportions of children in different types of child labor in the geographic cells studied.

The survey form for children included a few questions that were rather complicated. For example, a few questions had 8–20 potential answers from which children needed to select their most important answers. Keeping all these options effectively in mind and then choosing their preferred answer could be difficult, particularly because few children would be able to read and understand the survey form. A few of the questions could be interpreted in different ways, so results might be questioned. In one case, for example, the question presupposed that children had a good understanding of child work versus child labor when they were asked, "Do you think it is good for children to work in the home?" This may have led to answers that could be misleading because children may have mostly been thinking of child work and/or their responsibility to help their parents. Given that children throughout the world assist their parents with various household chores, it was not surprising that 80% of children responded that it was good. During the evaluation, however, as a result of awareness raising children apparently understood the difference between child work and child labor.

Interesting findings from the baseline survey included the fact that more than 96% of respondents thought that education was important for children. Approximately one-half of all children reported having been ill or injured as a result of child labor. The baseline survey also included other useful information, such as household access to radios, which can be useful when planning awareness raising and access to MFI.

## Awareness-Raising Survey

The awareness-raising study<sup>51</sup> was designed to inform the SNV-Rwanda campaign to raise awareness among SNV-Rwanda members and others in all 30 Rwandan districts. Data were collected from 984 respondents during regular meetings of JADF and other groups to assess the existing public awareness of child labor issues. Local leaders, local authorities, SNV-Rwanda partners, civil society representatives, and others stakeholders attended the meetings and participated in the study. The study included a questionnaire that requested respondents to use rating scales to indicate their attitudes, as well as open-ended questions to assess their knowledge of child labor.

The study was primarily focused on collecting information on respondents' perceived prevalence of different types of child labor, attitudes and knowledge about child labor issues, education issues, and child labor gender issues. The study was not intended as an analysis of the attitudes of the general public and needs to be interpreted with care. Consequently, while the study can add to the general knowledge base of child labor and education in Rwanda, it cannot be referred to as representing overall knowledge and attitudes in the districts. Results thus need to be considered within the framework of SNV-Rwanda's goal: To understand perceptions of likely participants in the SNV-Rwanda awareness raising-programs on child labor and related education. At the same time, the evaluator believes that the collected information represented the views of locally important stakeholders in the 30 districts of Rwanda.

The survey indicated that most respondents had at least some knowledge that laws on child labor existed, even if they were unclear about details. Attitudes toward child labor did not always support knowledge, however, with the majority of respondents "tolerating" child labor in all districts, "especially where there is an economic gain or when there is need for survival not just for the child, but for the family as a whole."<sup>52</sup> The results showed that if resources to pay for secondary education were scarce, preference for educating boys would be 42% as compared to 8% for girls, and the remainder would allow other factors to determine their choice. Both older—aged 50–60 years—and younger—aged 15–24 years—respondents had less awareness of the detriments of child labor. A new study to determine whether attitudes and knowledge of the respondents noticeably changed since the SNV-Rwanda and other REACH project activities would be useful.

## Child Labor in the Tea Sector Case Study

The project team implemented a case study of the tea sector in Nyamasheke, Nyaruguru, and Gicumbi Districts. The primary objective of the study was "to gain understanding of the current situation of child labor in tea production" and "provide support and recommendations to the tea industry with the goal of eliminating child labor and removing Rwandan tea from the US Department of Labor (USDOL) List of Goods Produced with Child Labor or Forced Labor (2010 and 2011)."<sup>53</sup> The study was published in 2012; therefore, some actions on tea growing have already been implemented but most of the recommendations still need to be implemented on a wider and more integrated scale. The respondent sample was composed of individuals in locations with high potential for child labor in tea growing. The study was primarily qualitative, so insights were mostly descriptive in nature and were difficult to generalize. Despite this situation, however, the evaluator believes that useful information was obtained and clear, useful recommendations were made.

---

<sup>51</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2011). *Assessment on child labor awareness with SNV stakeholders In Rwanda: Research report*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

<sup>52</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2011). *Assessment on child labor awareness with SNV stakeholders In Rwanda: Research report*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project, p. 57.

<sup>53</sup> Winrock International. (2012). *Child labor in the tea sector: Case study of Nyamasheke, Nyaruguru, and Gicumbi*. Kigali, Rwanda: Winrock International, p. 9.

Awareness of the detriments of child labor in tea growing was quite high among the 237 children and 157 parents included in the study. More than one-half of the children who responded in all three districts indicated that they worked in tea growing. In most instances, children worked for local tea cooperatives or for nonfamily neighbors (small shareholders). Little or no child labor was found in tea factories. The study respondents indicated that there were high reported rates of mistreatment of children at the workplace in tea growing, as well as exposure to a variety of hazards.<sup>54</sup>

Survey recommendations included the implementation of integrated child labor monitoring across the entire supply chain. Involvement of all types of actors would be needed at each level, from cooperatives and small holders to tea factories. Tea factories will need to work to ensure that no tea that is supplied is produced with child labor. The evaluator recommends that such a monitoring system within the tea sector be integrated into the national CLMS that is expected to be implemented across Rwanda (after adoption of the NPECL).

### 5.3. Direct Action Interventions

The target groups, including beneficiaries, CAs, mentors, local authorities, and civil society groups, experienced changes in their lives through the project, albeit at different levels of scale. Lives of children and their families were changed through ending exploitive child labor and increasing education. In some households livelihoods started to improve, although the number of families that benefited from the project's livelihoods components was small. Community activists, mentors, local authorities, and civil society benefited primarily from awareness raising and capacity strengthening. As already stated in Section 5.2.1, the services provided through these direct action interventions resulted in children being withdrawn from or prevented from entering child labor.

#### 5.3.1. Accurately Identified and Targeted Children

The project team accurately identified children engaged in, or at risk for working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy. The focus was primarily on children in agriculture, although communities also identified some rural children in other types of child labor. Such children were included because of their high vulnerability and the importance of providing a well-integrated response in project areas. In addition, the process used to identify children included local government and community structures. It was especially important to strengthen capacities of such structures by providing experience on identifying and addressing all types of exploitive child labor in their localities. The majority of children were thus engaged in various types of agriculture, such as small-scale farming, tea plantation work, sugar cane work, livestock herding, and rice growing.

Although child labor in coffee growing or rice production was considered in the project document as key types of sectors where exploitive child labor might be found, in practice few children were found to be working in rice or coffee growing in the project areas. The baseline survey found fewer than 1% of children on average had left school to work in coffee production and 4% in rice production in the geographic cells studied across the seven project districts.<sup>55</sup> About 3.5% of children reported having worked in coffee plantations and 1.3% in rice production during the month before the survey. Most of the children were working in various types of small-scale farming, transportation (especially carrying heavy loads), tea and sugar cane growing, or livestock work.

---

<sup>54</sup> Pesticides, exposure to dust, carrying heavy loads, injuries, etc.

<sup>55</sup> Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, & FAWE-Rwanda. (2010). *Baseline assessment on child labor in seven districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

**Table 4—Children Withdrawn, By Type of Child Labor**

Withdrawal by Type of Child Labor	Girls		Boys		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Farming (various small scale)	1,171	46%	979	40%	2,150	43%
Transportation	635	25%	711	29%	1,346	27%
Tea plantation	197	8%	155	6%	352	7%
Sugar cane	142	6%	147	6%	289	6%
Cattle herding	118	5%	131	5%	249	5%
Domestic worker	132	5%	109	4%	241	5%
Construction and brick making	39	2%	97	4%	136	4%
Selling various items	32	1%	61	3%	93	2%
Rice plantation	29	1%	23	1%	52	1%
Mining, quarrying, and sand collection	13	1%	22	1%	35	1%
Weaving and artisan	10	0.4%	23	1%	33	1%
Coffee plantation	12	1%	9	0.4%	21	0.4%
Hotel, restaurant, and kiosk	3	0.1%	6	0.2%	9	0.2%
Fishing		0.0%	5	0.2%	5	0.1%
Other	6	0.2%	3	0.1%	9	0.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,539</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2,481</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5,020</b>	<b>100%</b>

The project team used good, transparent, and effective methods for identifying children to be withdrawn from or prevented from entering child labor. Local authorities and leaders initially helped to identify CAs, who in turn helped to identify potential mentors. Children reported that, by far, most had been identified by CAs and mentors. Some children were not sure whether the teachers and/or other local leaders who had identified and helped them to enroll in the project were CAs or not.

The project team made good use of the Rwandan government structure and systems to identify the beneficiaries. Rwanda has a system of regular monthly community meetings during which several activities are carried out, including discussions about important local issues. Special community meetings can also be called. In some cases, the issue of child labor and identification of children was conducted during the normal meetings. In several locations, community meetings were also held with a special request to vulnerable households with children in labor to attend. The families were then interviewed to determine whether their children met the selection criteria.

The project included comparatively<sup>56</sup> well-defined and detailed criteria<sup>57</sup> to identify children *at risk* for exploitive child labor; for example, “children living in extreme poverty” were selected using government criteria that were further defined at the community level by the CAs, mentors, and community leaders according to community wealth standards. Other criteria for at-risk children included orphans and children who lived in child- or grandparent-headed households, who had siblings engaged in worst forms of child labor, showed symptoms of emotional or physical abuse,

<sup>56</sup> As compared to similar projects in other countries.

<sup>57</sup> Winrock International, FAWE -Rwanda, & SNV- Rwanda. *Monitoring and evaluation guidelines*. (2011). Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

and had high school absenteeism rates. Criteria for selection of children in exploitive child labor were similarly well defined.<sup>58</sup>

The vast majority of children included in the evaluation focus groups confirmed that they had worked in various types of exploitive child labor. Children reported that they had been working, “carrying heavy loads on my head; carrying big things on bicycles; pushing heavy wheel barrows; working in the fields.” Some children shared that they had been employed in domestic work, and two of these children openly shared that they had been abused.<sup>59</sup> Some local authorities in border areas also noted that some of the project beneficiary children had also worked to carry loads cross-border into Uganda or DRC. In one instance a focus group of children independently—without being solicited to do so—reported that some members of their group had done such work but were no longer engaged in it.

The evaluation did not use a random sampling technique to identify children for the focus groups.<sup>60</sup> It was, therefore, uncertain how many children were actually prevented from entering as opposed to withdrawn from child labor. It was clear, however, that almost all of the children interviewed were no longer in exploitive child labor.

Initially the project team had intended to include children younger than 12 as “prevented” and older children as “withdrawn.” The team found, however, that quite a few children younger than 12 were in exploitive work and needed to be included. The project staff also added that it was sometimes difficult to determine which children should be “withdrawn” and which “prevented” because some children only worked seasonally.

In Nyagatare District, the district mobilizer noted that the project was not authorized to directly reach out to the individuals in Uganda, although Rwandan children carried loads into Uganda while Ugandan children were crossing the border to work in agriculture. Some of the children in the focus groups indicated that they had worked in Uganda, saying, “I used to go across to Uganda to look after the livestock of people there.” Another stated, “I was also in Uganda and used to work in agriculture.” Two other children reported that they had worked in Uganda, one as a domestic worker and another selling juices. The former domestic worker said, “It good to now be back home!”

The REACH Project team held discussions during workshops and meetings on cross-border child labor with local authorities in Rwanda. The Rwandan authorities have conducted meetings with authorities in Uganda and note that trafficking appears to have decreased in the district. The United States Department of State (2012)<sup>61</sup> has indicated that Rwanda has improved enforcement on trafficking and forced labor issues, although no traffickers have been convicted.

In some cases, there was a time delay between the selection of children to be included in catch-up classes and actual start-up of these classes. Delays were mostly due to issues surrounding the organizing of the classes within the schools. These delays sometimes led to issues with finding children to start the catch-up classes once these were to begin. Some children could not be found and could not, therefore, be included in the project.

---

<sup>58</sup> Winrock International, FAWE -Rwanda, & SNV-Rwanda. (2011). *Monitoring and evaluation guidelines*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project, pp. 3–4.

<sup>59</sup> Information was shared without prompting. To protect the children, the evaluator did not ask them to share type of abuse in the focus group.

<sup>60</sup> See Section 3.

<sup>61</sup> United States Department of State. (2012). *Trafficking in persons report 2012*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/192587.pdf>.

Some local authorities, CAs, and mentors noted that, although the children identified through the project were successfully withdrawn from child labor,<sup>62</sup> there were still many others who were in or at risk for child labor.

### **Project Beneficiary Identification Forms**

The intake form was designed to cover all ages and children in formal education and potential MFS students. Mentors were trained to use the forms and indicated that these were not too complex. Children indicated that they were indeed the most vulnerable children in their communities. Several interviewees indicated that the public nature of the identification process—in most cases community meetings—helped to ensure that the selection process was transparent.

According to the project staff, many children stated on the forms that they were in child labor in order to qualify, although they were not actually in child labor. Situations were verified by CAs and mentors before children were included.

#### **5.3.2. Formal Education**

*“I am glad that I am not doing exploitive work anymore and that I can get new knowledge in school.”*  
Primary school boy.

The project supported children to reenter or stay in school at the primary or secondary school level, as appropriate. The project provided support with school supplies and school uniforms to help children stay in formal education. Some children were also supported to attend catch-up education (see Section 5.3.5). Teachers also acted as mentors, primarily to help monitor the children and provide them and their families, with guidance on the importance of staying in school and not engaging in exploitive child labor. The mentors were in charge of distribution of school supplies and uniforms as well as verifying reasons for absenteeism.

Schools associated with the project were very receptive and no special issues or resistance to the reintegration of children who had dropped out were identified. Some children were even allowed to reenter school in the middle of the academic year, which is unusual in Rwanda.

The project team had planned a special preprimary program for 5- and 6-year-old siblings of children who were household heads. The preprimary program was conceived to enable the child household heads to attend school and support young siblings with supplies and other assistance to attend existing preprimary centers in their localities. Ultimately, however, during the beneficiary identification process few child-headed households were found with children in aged 5–6 years. The government encourages very young children in child-headed households to be fostered in the community, which may have been one reason for the lower-than-expected number of children in this situation. However, teachers in preprimary programs were provided training sessions on child labor issues.

#### **5.3.3. School Supplies and Uniforms**

*“I did not like school because I did not have a school uniform. I used to be a cow herder but now I have a uniform and I am happy to be back in school.”* Primary school boy.

According to all stakeholders in the communities, the most important project component was the provision of formal school supplies<sup>63</sup> and uniforms. Many children made similar statements, such as “I like that they [the project] gave us what we need for our school requirements.” Children indicated

---

<sup>62</sup> Or if prevented from child labor did not enter child labor.

<sup>63</sup> “Formal school supplies” include items such as backpacks, pencils, pens, mathematical sets, and notebooks.

they received uniforms, pens, other small school supplies such as rulers, notebooks, and school bags. Children reported receiving two sets of uniforms and, in most cases,<sup>64</sup> the uniforms and supplies were provided on time. The uniforms were provided on two separate occasions with an interval of 6 or more months in between. In some locations, children also asked for shoes and/or sweaters. Children in one school noted that they were required to wear only sweaters provided through the school; if they wear their own sweaters “they are taken away.” While such incidents were not commonly identified in the evaluation, they still caused problems for the children in these situations. Future projects need to assess the needs of the children in accordance with the climate and work with schools to ensure that children are not penalized for wearing “nonschool regulation” sweaters. Sports equipment was provided to a few schools, while in other schools children spontaneously expressed the wish that the project had provided sports supplies.

Children and parents complained that the project team had not foreseen support for the payment of school fees. Since 2003, government regulations do not allow schools to charge fees, but attendance in most public schools still requires the payment of fees. Explanations for the reasoning behind the continued payment of fees have centered on the need to motivate teachers to continue to teach in public as opposed to private schools. Teacher salaries in public schools are quite low, according to some interviewees on average approximately US\$ 50 per month. School committees, composed of teachers, parents and community leaders, thus voluntarily set rates for motivational salary supplements for the teachers. The end result is that households still need to pay for school attendance with rates increasing from primary through secondary school. Examination fees also need to be paid and form another cost for households. All of these costs still potentially form a major impediment to keeping children in school and out of child labor.

The project baseline survey had indicated that, across the seven project districts, 50%– 97% of respondents stated that their family had difficulties paying school fees. Sixty percent of respondents indicated that they thought their school would ask them to leave school if they are unable to pay their fees, and 85% thought children would be asked to leave school if they did not have a school uniform—despite the official policy of allowing children to attend school even if they do not wear a uniform.

In one school, children reported that some parents had not been able to pay the school fees but they were allowed to stay in school until the fees were paid. In another school, some children reported that they had been sent home because they could not pay the fees and were only allowed back once the fees had been paid. In future projects, attention needs to be paid to the issue of school fees to help make sure that beneficiaries will not be sent home from any project-supported schools if they cannot pay.

The evaluator does not believe that projects should automatically provide support for school fees, with the potential exception of examination fees, in countries where school fees have been abolished but are still paid indirectly. The provision of support for school fees needs to be assessed on a country-by country basis and possibly a community-by-community basis. Where the risk for exploitive child labor is greater, some support for school fees can be provided while simultaneously working with the national and local government on the issue of school fees. Increased project support for livelihoods development or other innovative means for fundraising to cover such costs can also be explored. These may include public-private sector support, sponsorships by wealthier individuals, prizes for successful students, fundraising festivals, sale of school-produced agricultural products, and so forth.

---

<sup>64</sup> In two situations, parents and children indicated that uniforms were provided several months late and not at the beginning of the school year. The parents reported, however, that the delays were caused by the supplier who did not make the uniforms on time. Children in one focus group also indicated that they did not receive their school supplies at the beginning of the school year.

Projects teams can also explore the establishment of linkages to other agencies, such as the NGO Right to Play, that can assist with identifying sources for sports supplies.

Children in MFS noted that they had also received materials to help them with their learning process, such as tools and equipment. The types of tools and equipment for MFS students varied, depending on the groups' agricultural activities. Most received hoes, gloves, boots, soap, sanitary pads for girls, and beekeeping suits and hives for children involved in beekeeping. All MFS children received safety equipment. Children in beekeeping, for example, received protective clothes to wear when tending to the hives. In some cases only a few sets of protective clothes were initially provided with more added at later stages, including during the time of the final evaluation.

#### 5.3.4. Education Quality

*"We like learning many subjects in class and meeting our friends at school."*

*"We like learning about cleanliness of our physical bodies and surroundings."*

*"We like being able to play at school."* Children in primary and secondary schools.

The project team carried out several activities to raise the effectiveness of the existing educational systems. The local government and community members including local leaders, teachers, parents, and children appreciated the education quality improvement component. The key elements were teacher training on various subjects, improvement of school buildings and environment, and agriculture clubs.

Training was provided to teachers at different school levels. More than 1,000 teachers were trained on child labor issues and mentors were trained on alternatives to corporal punishment and a range of other issues. Training of mentors was conducted on a regular basis and often covered topics that were raised by the teachers, for example the subject of corporal punishment, which is illegal in Rwanda. Fifteen preprimary teachers were trained on improved preprimary-appropriate teaching techniques and curriculum as well as on child labor issues.

Teacher training also covered gender issues, including the promotion of girls' education, not segregating boys and girls, and encouraging girls to participate actively in class. The evaluator noticed that girls participated actively in the focus groups, although it was not possible to ascertain whether this was due to any encouragement by teachers. In most countries, the evaluator has found that girls participate well in focus group discussions across a range of situations.

An ICT center was established that trained more than 100 teachers in computer literacy. The initiation of the ICT center was a good project concept that has the potential to maximize the benefits of other actions in Rwanda to improve education in schools through digital technologies. The government plans to ensure access to computers in all schools, and schools are also slated to have—or may already have—at least one regular personal computer. Rwanda receives support from the One Laptop Per Child (OLPC) program.<sup>65</sup> Approximately 110,000 laptops have been distributed through the OLPC program so far.<sup>66</sup> Many schools still lack such computers but the ultimate goal is to distribute 500,000 OLPC XO computers. Children usually only work with the laptops while at school, although they may take the laptops home if their family pays an added fee. Unfortunately, as some project beneficiaries pointed out, most poor families cannot afford to pay the fee.

---

<sup>65</sup> One Laptop Per Child Association. (2012a). *Country case study: Rwanda 2011—One Laptop Per Child*. Miami, FL, USA: Author.

<sup>66</sup> One Laptop Per Child Association. (2012b). *OLPC across the world: Rwanda*. Miami, FL, USA: Author. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://laptop.org/map/rwanda>.

Teachers whose schools did not yet have computer teachers practiced at the ICT center and started teaching the children simple computer theory. Unfortunately, until schools have the computers and laptops it will be difficult for the children to grasp the concepts.

The ICT center has started to autofinance some of its activities through the sale of printing and photocopying services, which helped to cover the cost of paper and printing cartridges and reduce the drain on project resources. The pilot project of the ICT center was successful, in part because it was implemented in close collaboration with local authorities.

Collaboration with the local government was detailed in a memorandum of understanding that ensured that the local government would take charge of the ICT center once the project ended. The leadership of the ICT center will change. Having an Internet café in the locality is useful, however, and will contribute to local development. The center is likely to be sustainable as an internet café and provider of services such as printing, scanning, and photocopying. The evaluator believes that such initiatives can be scaled up in the future, especially if local children are associated as apprentices to the ICT trainers. As a project staff member noted, "Children learn faster on the computer than the adults, they quickly discover how to use it and once they have, they remember easily." In future projects, some clever project beneficiaries might, for example, learn how to provide administrative and training services to local business and community members. Other children might also be recruited to train their fellow students in their schools as opposed to working only through teachers. Given cultural sensitivities on elder-child authority, it is important not to undermine the role of teachers but children could be teacher assistants.

Education quality was also enhanced through the improvement of school buildings and provision of water supplies, some desks, and toilet renovation as needed in seven schools. In addition, seven schools were provided with preprimary classroom learning materials. Agriculture clubs were sponsored in 34 schools. Most schools preferred to call the clubs environment clubs, which they believed was more appealing to the children and would also cover other issues such as reforestation and environmental cleanliness. The clubs teach members about locally appropriate and successful farming techniques. As the project was implemented in rural areas, there was usually sufficient land to include an agricultural demonstration plot for the children to use.

Children interviewed for the evaluation in a school with an environment club indicated that membership was not restricted to project beneficiaries but was open to any children in their school who would like to be members. Most of the project beneficiary children did indicate that they were members. Club members said that they enjoyed being in the club and were happy to be able to take some of the produce home to their families. The project team reported that, in some schools, the harvest was also sold to help support vulnerable children and/or REACH Project beneficiaries.

Some children stated that education quality could be improved if they did not have to go so far to school, particularly when they have to go to secondary school. They asked for solutions, such as support to be able to board in their secondary school.

### **5.3.5. Nonformal Education**

The key type of nonformal education provided through the project was catch-up training. The MFS could also fall under the category of nonformal education, although the project team tended to refer to MFS as information education. Various forms of catch-up programs were implemented, which all relevant stakeholders (i.e., children, parents, and teachers) considered to be effective.

In some cases, children attended catch-up classes after school and on Saturdays to help them improve their education results. Some children attended catch-up classes during the school holidays so they could reenter school or avoid dropping out due to scholastic difficulties. In another case,

children who had dropped attended an intensive year of classes to combine years 4, 5, and 6 of primary school into 1 year. Most of the children in the intensive class were already older so being able to integrate into secondary school and literally catch up to their former classmates was appreciated.

School hours for children in catch-up programs were long. In the case of children in combined grades 4–6, classes were from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., with full days on Saturdays. Several children also pointed out that they needed to walk far to reach the school for their catch-up classes. Community members, parents, and CAs noted that one of the problems of the catch-up program was the schools' inability to provide food for the children even if they spend long hours at school. In one location, teachers stated that some children go home after the morning session because they are too hungry to stay all day. Despite the long hours of catch-up programs, the children stated that they preferred going to school for many hours than being engaged in exploitive work.

Children and teachers reported improved examination results for almost all children, with some showing improvement of 30% or more. Teachers in some schools were so happy about the result of the catch-up programs that they wanted to permanently institutionalize it into their schools.

### 5.3.6. Model Farm Schools

Older children, aged 16–17, who were not interested in returning to formal schools or who had dropped out at a young age were integrated into the model farm school system. Local specialists provided training to children in MFS on subjects such as advanced farming skills (pineapple, vegetable, banana growing), beekeeping, and livestock rearing (e.g., pigs, goats, rabbits, sheep). Children also learned how to set up a cooperative, some basic entrepreneurship skills, and how to link to MFIs. All new MFS trainers were trained in Kigali, followed up with quarterly meetings that included refresher training. Children and their parents were quite enthusiastic about their MFS training, although, at the time of the evaluation, most believed that their acquired skills only served to supplement their income, not supplant it.

While MFS children wait for their projects to provide sufficient income, they engage in activities such as horticulture farming with their families and selling small items such as eggs or tomatoes. Some older children were hired by their geographic sector authorities to do street sweeping and other light work on a part-time basis. It should be noted that the GOR pays special attention to keeping public spaces and streets clean, even banning plastic shopping bags. The climate is generally good so the work is not particularly hazardous and the children were happy to do such work as opposed to their previous exploitive work. The children also considered their street-cleaning work as a temporary situation to help them until their MFS cooperative would be sufficiently successful.

Many of the children in the different MFS groups that the evaluator met with indicated interest in learning the traditional vocational training skills in subjects such as tailoring,<sup>67</sup> hair dressing, carpentry, and motor mechanics. They indicated that these were subjects that most of them would have preferred to learn about instead of MFS. Children stated that they had provided information on their preferred skills when they were interviewed during the beneficiary identification process and had indicated these subjects. While they were certainly happy with the MFS program, several in different groups stated that they were disappointed to not to be able to learn the traditional vocational subjects. Representatives from ARDI and Gako OCT said independently that such ideas stemmed from the children's lack understanding of the benefits of MFS. A ARDI representative stated, "Children want vocational training because they do not yet know how much they can benefit from beekeeping." A Gako OCT representative noted that, "There is a feeling that agriculture is an area of last resort. If they work in this it is only because they failed in everything else. They also saw

---

<sup>67</sup> The project enabled four beneficiaries to attend a 6-month tailoring program, but this was an exception.

their parents still poor. But in my experience, once they see the benefits they do see the usefulness.” A Gako OCT representative also pointed out that, due to the longer time required to see results and gain a good income from farming and livestock keeping, youths in the MFS may not have seen the full benefits within the project period. Representatives from Gako OCT and ARDI pointed out that it takes a cooperative about 3–3.5 years to be able to reap notable benefits.

At the time of the interviews, the mentors carried out exploratory interviews and did not present the children with specific potential choices; instead, they asked them about their general aspirations. Decisions about which children would go to formal schools and which might attend MFS were made at a later stage.

Notably, key informants to the project baseline had suggested a mix of different skills training for older children, including crop farming, animal husbandry, small-scale businesses, construction, tailoring, and woodwork or carpentry as appropriate for children in their areas. At the time of the evaluation, however, adult stakeholders were very positive about the emphasis on MFS instead of traditional vocations training. Given country priorities, including the importance of agricultural development and the low demand for such service industries mentioned by the children in rural areas, most adult interviewees fully supported the MFS program as opposed to a more traditional vocational skills training program.

Some children also indicated that, despite efforts to include their voice, they believed that they did not have sufficient input into the decisions made about which type of MFS they would engage in. In some places, MFS children were able to choose between rearing goats or pigs. Practical reasons—such as land and livestock feed availability, competent trainers, and other resources—logically influenced project decisions about the type of MFS in the different localities. The project team stated that they did try to explain the reasoning for the types of MFS training provided, but the evaluation interviews indicated that the children did not fully understand or accept the points. Ensuring that children fully understand the reasoning behind the choices in training provided would be helpful in future projects.

Beekeeping (apiculture) is one of the key agricultural products being promoted by the Rwandan government. Given the natural environment in Rwanda, the amount of production and potential quality of honey in the country is generally considered promising and has much potential. The country also has a vibrant association of beekeepers, ARDI,<sup>68</sup> which was actively associated with the project staff to identify and support trainers to educate the MFS students on beekeeping. The association relies on traditional beekeepers who have first-hand experience in the localities where trainees live. Some of the trainers were specially trained by ARDI to work with the MFS children, while others had previously been trained by ARDI.

The REACH Project worked with ARDI to develop a detailed manual on beekeeping for MFS children, although the cost of producing sufficient copies proved challenging. The evaluator suggested sharing digital copies using smart phones and other means to be used in local computers to offset some of the costs.<sup>69</sup> The ARDI approach appeared quite successful and trainers and children alike were enthusiastic about the potential of beekeeping. At the same time, and understandably, children were impatient to see big results. As with other types of MFS training, they wanted to continue but saw it mostly as an activity that could serve to supplement their income from other sources. One group had been able to collect some honey before the evaluation, which they used to pay for

---

<sup>68</sup> The acronym stands for the French Association Rwandaise pour la Promotion du Développement Intégré.

<sup>69</sup> During a focus group with one beekeeping MFS group, the trainer was recording the discussions on a smart phone. The interpreter did ask the trainer to stop recording (which he did). During the evaluation, people with smart phones were in evidence in multiple locations in rural areas. According to some, second-hand smart phones are quickly becoming more common.

community-based health insurance for their members for 1 year. Another group shared their plans to buy livestock for their cooperative using the proceeds of their first batch of honey, which they expected to collect in April 2013. According to ARDI's previous experience, however, apiculture can eventually result in good incomes when beekeepers apply production guidelines and focus on quality.

Children in other MFS subjects were mostly trained by government agronomists and/or local farming specialists. Districts provided the services of agronomists to provide training as one of their inputs into the REACH Project. One group of children that had already graduated from basic MFS training attended a more advanced 3-day course at the Gako OCT. Another group of 22 MFS graduates attended training at biogas companies. Children who had attended the various livestock and farming training were confident about what they had learned. In most cases, the training consisted of teaching the children improved skills to build on traditional knowledge that many had already acquired from their families. Children did say that they had learned new and useful things that would benefit them and their families.

Local authorities in different locations stated that the REACH Project's livestock program had a good fit with government programs, such as the One Cow Per Family program.<sup>70</sup> Such programs are aimed at assisting vulnerable households through training on keeping healthy livestock and a system to share offspring of the livestock with other families. Participating vulnerable households are identified through village committees that make a list of potential beneficiaries, which is verified at the sector level and authorized at the district level. This system is quite similar to the methods that the REACH Project team used to identify child beneficiaries and provided a further example of how the project matched its approaches to existing government structures and systems.<sup>71</sup>

The livestock program also included similar approaches to sharing animals' offspring among different beneficiaries. In one example, a boy received a pig that had two piglets; one piglet was given to another beneficiary who did not yet have a pig and the boy kept the other. Some of the challenges with livestock programs is the time it takes for the animals to grow, and much of the investment is placed in a single or few animals. The turnaround on investment in the animals is long, so children must find other nonexploitive work to do while waiting for financial benefits. Animals can also suffer from illnesses, and obtaining feed for the animals can be challenging even though the project team tried to provide solutions.<sup>72</sup> An agreement was made with a local brewery to supply 4 tons of feed to project beneficiaries to feed their pigs. The project staff indicated that they had advised the children to select different animals but the children were keen on working with pigs. Unfortunately, according to two beneficiaries, the amount of feed that was available was insufficient and they still needed to pay to obtain additional feed. Finding money to pay for such feed was difficult but somehow the children interviewed found solutions, such as selling eggs to passersby on the street. Parents in one group also related that some MFS children in farming lost most of their potato crop due to heavy rains. Despite all of these challenges, however, the beneficiaries would not change anything about this MFS component—in part because of the cultural status associated with owning livestock and earning money—because of the expected benefits.

Most of the MFS groups had not yet opened bank accounts or been formally linked to MFIs because the amount of income being raised was still insufficient. One group reported having opened an

---

<sup>70</sup> Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources. (2012). *Girinka program (one cow per family)*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author. Retrieved December 20, 2012, from [http://www.minagri.gov.rw/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=207%3Agirinka-program&catid=66%3Agirinka&Itemid=43&lang=en](http://www.minagri.gov.rw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=207%3Agirinka-program&catid=66%3Agirinka&Itemid=43&lang=en).

See also

<sup>71</sup> The government does require projects to work with local government for the development of local programs.

<sup>72</sup> Some children reported that some of the animals and/or their offspring had died. The government does provide veterinary support but costs of medicine can still be prohibitive.

account but had not yet been able to start saving into their account because they were still waiting for their crops to produce sufficiently. The groups indicated that they planned to link to the government-supported cooperative savings system, the Savings and Credit Cooperatives (SACCO).<sup>73</sup> The children's plans were already concrete, as in the example of one group that insisted, "We will join the SACCO and every member will give 200 francs per week."

Children in the MFS groups indicated that, while the tools and equipment that were initially supplied were sufficient for the initial training period, they still needed more to be successful. As one beekeeping group indicated, "We will need machines when we get honey from the hives. It is not good to do it with our hands. We do not know yet how we will get the machine." Children also requested more training in their MFS subject areas and wanted to learn other vocational skills, as discussed earlier. A representative of ARDI indicated that some successful beekeepers in nonproject locations were using some of their income from beekeeping to attend vocational skills training. Some children also insisted that they would like to go back to formal school. Children also indicated that they needed assistance to "write our cooperative proposal on the computer. After we give our proposal, the cooperative is accepted at sector level and then it moves up all to Rwanda Cooperative Agency for approval." The children were clearly aware of the process that they needed to follow to establish a cooperative.

For farming as well as livestock training, a system of master training on organic farming may be usefully included in any future projects. The Gako OCT is, for example, very experienced in this area and their representative indicated that longer training for talented youth would enable them to share their knowledge at local levels. The project provided training to 62 children to train other children but, at 3 days, the duration was considered too short. According to a Gako OCT representative, children need approximately 30–35 days of intensive residential training to be fully competent. To become master trainers, such children may then still need additional training on how to transmit their knowledge. Talented children can also become apprentices to adult agronomy trainers through project actions. Subsequently, they can attend organized master training and finally conduct training at local levels as needed. Some master trainers might be able to eventually earn some income from providing training.

The main transition strategies to increase opportunities of MFS graduates to avoid reentry into exploitive child labor are to provide training on cooperative and association formation and provide or link them to entrepreneurship training and MFIs. Graduates of MFS are also provided some tools and equipment during training, which they can use to continue their activities.

#### 5.4. Livelihoods Interventions

Stakeholders at all levels who were interviewed for the final evaluation indicated that poverty is by far the foremost reason for child labor in Rwanda. General awareness of the importance of education was quite strong, and most families would not send their children to work if they had sufficient incomes. The interviewees and stakeholder workshop participants all emphasized the importance of scaling up any livelihoods component in a future project.

The livelihoods interventions were primarily channeled through the MFS program and the Conditional Family Scholarship Support (CFSS) program to provide training for poverty reduction in 140 households. The 140 households included 200 children in or at risk for entering child labor. The project included 20 CFSS households in each project district with 5 households per project geographic sector. The project concept was to develop CFSS leaders in each sector who could then stimulate others to join their groups. The extent to which CFSS households were able to do this can

---

<sup>73</sup> Financial Sector Development Secretariat Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Government of the Republic of Rwanda. (2012). *UMURENGE SACCOs strategy*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

only be measured after more time has passed because most groups need more time and support to become effective.

Training for children on improved farming skills through the school agriculture clubs can also eventually help improve incomes. The provision of these services contributed to stronger opportunities for livelihoods for children of legal working age and the 140 CFSS households, but more time is needed for the realization of full benefits.

The advantages and challenges of the MFS program were discussed in Section 5.3.5. The concept of CFSS was generally quite good to help families address poverty but was too small. Only a fraction of the families needing CFSS could be reached due to overall project budget constraints. The CFSS concept thus needs to be scaled up in any future project and also include longer training on entrepreneurship, community-based savings schemes, linkages to MFIs, and follow-up support.

Linkages of CFSS households to SACCO have started but the savings are still limited. Individual households in the CFSS program have benefitted, although a detailed quantified survey, including on established linkages to MFIs and savings, was still being finalized at the time of the final evaluation. Early indications were that out of responses from 98 households, 49 had opened savings accounts after the CFSS training and 14 had accessed credit after the training.

One of the positive elements of the CFSS program was the success of the training of trainers system. District staff and CAs were trained in Kigali on how to train CFSS households on child labor issues, entrepreneurship, basic bookkeeping, savings schemes, and linkages to MFIs. The training of trainers has a potential multiplier effect, although financial resources will still be needed to replicate the training with more households. One mother summed up her training by saying, “They trained us on job creation and to avoid having our children in exploitive work. Also on how you can start a small business. How to get a microfinance loan.” She went on to explain that she had carefully saved most of the small stipend, equivalent to a total of about US \$10, that was given during the training to cover costs. She subsequently used the savings to buy a few small items to sell from her home. Eventually she was able to build up a small business that, together with some farming, helped to cover most of her basic household costs. The project team reported that they had heard of other instances where former trainees had used the same approach of using their stipend to invest in an activity, although details of the number of trainees who may have used this approach were not available.

The CFSS households organized into small groups. One former CFSS trainee indicated that her group of five households meets every 2 weeks and saves a small amount. She reported that the main challenge was that only five households were selected from each geographic sector to participate in the CFSS scheme. Due to distances between sectors, it was difficult to create larger groups composed of more individuals from different sectors. This means that savings could only accumulate in such groups with difficulty because they are too small. As one other parent indicated, “If there are only few CFSS parents it is not enough. It would be better if it everyone could join.”

Another CFSS former trainee indicated that she had joined a group of 12 people from different localities. This former trainee indicated that she had not yet been able to save any money with her group, saying “I could not yet save because I have not been able to harvest yet. We lead a poor life until harvest.”

Because the CFSS beneficiaries were selected on the basis of vulnerability and child labor issues instead of on a community basis, the groups were composed of people who may not have known each other before the training—which is not necessarily conducive to group cohesion. In the future, it would be advisable for any CFSS system to focus more on the development of effective community-based savings groups. If project budgets do not allow full coverage, alternative

approaches to selecting CFSS are recommended. Instead of trying to ensure that some households from every (or most) project sectors are included, it would be preferable to cover more households in fewer locations.

### 5.5. Monitoring and Mentoring Models

The project monitoring system was tightly integrated with the community-based mentoring system. The project team used a combination of CAs, mentors (most of whom were teachers), and local leaders to increase awareness and understanding of the dangers of child labor; create community ownership; and increase the capacity of communities to address child labor issues.

As stated in Section 5.3.1, the project team worked with local authorities and CAs until mentors could be identified for the children. Project staff indicated that, in the beginning, it was difficult for them to identify children by working only through the CAs but the process was streamlined once the mentors were included and trained. All mentors are teachers in schools with project beneficiaries. Most mentors monitor approximately 12 beneficiary children, although the number may be up to 20 children in a few cases. The mentors indicated that this number was acceptable, as some said, “We mostly just track absenteeism and do awareness raising.” The children in all focus groups interviewed reported that the mentors distributed the school supplies and uniforms. Distribution was done in public and was transparent. No issues were identified with respect to the process mentors used to distribute the supplies.

While some mentors stated that they also provided counseling support to the children, most of the children indicated that mentor counseling was limited to providing guidance, such as advising the children to stay in school and out of exploitive work. Direct support for emotional issues that the children face was limited. Given the number of children each mentor was responsible for, it could be difficult for mentors to provide in-depth emotional support. As always, wherever mentors were also the children’s teachers, it could be challenging for children to feel at ease discussing their personal problems. It would, nevertheless, have been useful for some of the children who were affected by their personal family circumstances such as poverty, HIV, domestic violence, and/or other challenges to feel that they could receive emotional support from their mentors.

The CAs and mentors volunteered their services to the project and were subsequently trained on child labor issues, identification of project beneficiaries, and monitoring. The mentors had the primary task of conducting monitoring children’s school attendance and verifying whether they were working in exploitive child labor outside of school hours. Follow-up meetings and training workshops were provided to CAs and mentors on different subjects, including improved teaching methods as discussed in Section 5.3.3 on Education Quality. Aside from training, CAs and mentors were provided with motivational items such as T-shirts and bags with child labor messages and prepaid mobile phone cards to cover their project-related communication needs. Some mentors indicated that the amount of the prepaid phone cards did not really cover their communication needs. The CAs were provided with bicycles to help them to implement their work, and mentors received monthly incentives to cover transport costs.

As in many situations, there were mentors who appeared to be more dedicated and appreciated by the children than others. Some children in the evaluation focus groups indicated that their mentors conducted home visits, while others stated the mentors had never visited any children’s homes in their area. The children who reported that mentors did not visit homes stated that the mentors’ interactions with the children was limited to tracking school attendance and discussing child labor and education with them at school.

The project monitoring forms were adapted on the basis of the experience of a Winrock International project that was implemented in Tanzania. There were initially a total of eight forms,

including an identification form, intake form, work status form, and an absenteeism form. The number of forms proved to be complicated and time consuming to process, so the project team decided to combine some of the forms, such as the identification and intake forms which, according to the project staff, CAs, and mentors, “resolved a lot of issues.”

Mentors indicated that they had no special difficulties filling in their ongoing monitoring forms, especially after receiving some refresher training. Quarterly meetings were held with the CAs, mentors, and sector authorities to discuss any issues that might have been identified during monitoring. Discussions were held for problem solving and feasible solutions were implemented. Examples of issues included absenteeism or dropping out and geographic mobility of children. District and sector officials in several locations also stated that they meet with CAs and mentors when they visited the project areas for other purposes.

Children in an MFS group also shared information with the evaluator about how they were supported by a trainer whom they viewed as a mentor. They stated, “We have a mentor who comes to visit us twice a week when we hold our meetings. We talk about ideas that might help us to develop like growing maize or pineapples, prevention of HIV, prevention from drugs or being in crime and how to start our own small business.”

#### **5.6. Capacity Strengthening and Integration of Mentors, Community Activists, and Local Authorities**

Commitment and ownership of CAs, mentors, and local authorities to child labor actions was noteworthy. Two key aspects influenced the evaluator’s observation on commitment and ownership. Project capacity strengthening through training, frequent refresher sessions, and meetings formed an important contribution to the ownership outcome. This consistent and repeated input from the project thus contributed to a well-integrated result. The other important element was the integration of the project into the existing governance structures in Rwanda. As indicated in previous sections, the project design and implementation maximized the benefits of work through existing joint local government, civil society, and private-sector structures.

Community advocates and mentors interviewed noted that they had received substantial training on diverse subjects, such as awareness raising on child labor; identifying child laborers; monitoring child labor; pedagogical methods; and most recently, formation of child labor clubs. The mentors received more training than the CAs, which was logical given their roles. Local authorities indicated that their capacities were strengthened on various child labor issues through discussions on integrating project actions into local government programs.

The project team’s actions to work with local government resulted in effective integration of project activities into existing government systems. As in any situations where people work together, integration in some places was more evident than in others. Overall integration was noteworthy, however, particularly as compared to experiences in many other countries where resources at local levels are still minimal.

Local authorities voiced their commitment to addressing child labor in their areas, and CAs and mentors stressed the roles they had played and intend to continue to play. The authorities stressed that they had a good relationship with the project team and appreciated working together with the staff. During project implementation, officials supported the project by reaffirming with school officials that all former child laborers must be accepted back into schools and cannot be refused according to Rwandan laws. The local authorities interviewed were also aware of the actions to train the mentors, as well as the subject matter of training provided. Local authorities attend all official project functions and verified progress when they made field visits to project sites. Due to resource constraints, most such field visits were combined with other work that the officials carried out in

their areas. When community awareness-raising events were conducted, the local government invited the community to attend, not the project team. It should be added that in some locations, parents and mentors still wanted more community meetings so that they could provide direct input into the project as opposed to plans passing primarily through local government.

Local government, further, indicated commitment by providing office space for project staff and land for some of the MFS activities, particularly for growing crops. Most important was, however, the voiced intention to include child labor as a key element when identifying households qualifying for financial support through government-decentralized social support systems.

As stated in Section 5.2.3 on Awareness and Advocacy, the JADF local platforms were well associated with the project and have become aware of child labor issues. Child Protection Committees (CPCs) are already well developed, even if some are still nascent. During the monthly community meetings (see Section 5.3.1), community members can raise issues concerning the problems of children in their area, which can then be channeled to higher levels of authority for any necessary decisions.

### **5.7. Specific Lessons Learned and Good Practices According to Sectors**

Good practices and lessons learned through the project are integrated into various sections of the report and are summarized together in Annex 1. Some additional good practices can be identified. In Nyagatare, the project team worked with the local authorities to address problems with illegal cross-border portering of crude local alcohol. According to the district mobilizer, Rwanda has a strict law prohibiting the brewing of local alcohol, which is relatively easy to apply when adults are involved. As a result, traffickers employed children to carry small bottles across the border in special pockets hidden in their clothes. The project team conducted advocacy and held meetings with the local authorities to discuss ways to prevent such illegal child labor. The local authorities have consequently become more vigilant at the various locations where children have crossed the local river with alcohol contraband.

The project was successful in reducing child labor in tea growing in different locations. Project staff reported that the U.S. Government's list of goods produced by child labor citing Rwandan tea provided a good starting point for discussions to ensure that the issue of child labor in tea growing is addressed. Most of the children working in tea worked collecting tea leaves on small-holder farms rather than large, privately owned plantations. Children who had been involved in tea growing shared the difficulties of their former work with the evaluator. This included long hours starting at 5:00 a.m. with work until "it is dark." Some children had to walk far to reach the work sites and found it hard to carry the heavy baskets, especially when they had to work in the rain. The project team held meetings with the National Agriculture Export Board on a monthly basis to discuss all issues related to ending child labor in tea growing. Meetings were also held with local tea companies to ensure that they understood their responsibilities with respect to child labor in the supply chain.

## **6. Efficiency**

The project strategies were generally efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used as compared to its qualitative and quantitative outputs.

### **6.1. Coordination With Implementing Partners**

Coordination between the project implementing partners (i.e., Winrock International, FAWE-Rwanda, and SNV-Rwanda) was quite good overall. Coordination with other entities such as ARDI and Gako OTC was also good.

Winrock International was charged with overall management of the project and FAWE-Rwanda provided support on a range of project components, including field implementation and education quality strengthening. SNV-Rwanda was primarily involved with awareness raising and advocacy, but was also active in providing input into the MSF scheme and other project components. Collaboration between the project partners began at the conceptual project design phase. As one of the implementing partners stated, “We shared how we work and how we saw our role. We all felt we already had a mandate to work on these project issues so there was no real challenge to our collaboration. We are talking about three experienced organizations coming together to manage this project. Each one has a package to deliver as measured by concrete deliverables.”

Winrock International had experience working on child labor and other development issues. At the time the project was initiated, SNV-Rwanda had experience on general agriculture, honey, coffee, tourism, renewable energy, water and sanitation, and education. The role of SNV-Rwanda was accordingly designed to support project work in these areas. FAWE-Rwanda, as a civil-society organization with experience promoting quality education with special attention to gender, had a strong interest in all of the project components.

Winrock International, FAWE-Rwanda, and SNV-Rwanda project headquarters staff worked in the same building, which facilitated communication and joint effort. Efficiency was sometimes compromised because the different agencies have different administrative and finance management systems that caused some delays. FAWE-Rwanda also has a complex approval system for procurement requiring their board of directors to approve all expenditures. Given the need for FAWE-Rwanda to plan and hold meetings with a minimum quorum present meant that decisions were sometimes slow to materialize. The partner became more flexible with time, which facilitated decision making. Future projects need to integrate the acceptance of project partners to adhere to common procedures for procurement and reporting.

The project staff conducted substantial team building sessions to ensure good cooperation and joint input into project implementation processes.

## **6.2. Monitoring System Designed and Implemented Efficiently**

The monitoring system was designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project. Although some elements of the beneficiary monitoring system were found to be complex, the project streamlined the system to facilitate data collection and data entry. The senior staff realized from an early stage that data entry in decentralized project offices would result in inadequate quality of data entry and might have a negative impact on project implementation. Given the number of geographic sectors that project staff needed to cover, it was deemed impossible for them to do good work with the direct beneficiaries while also being responsible for data entry. Thus, a system was developed through which student volunteers or interns assisted with data entry of the beneficiary monitoring data. The volunteers or interns worked at the project headquarters offices and could easily be overseen by the M&E supervisor. Microsoft Access software was used for data entry, which was found to be a good system for tracking the beneficiaries.

Children, parents, CAs, mentors, and local officials in all project areas visited confirmed that project staff visited them regularly to verify “how we are doing.” As one child stated in a typical comment, “We do see the REACH staff visit us lots of times. He talks to us and asks if things are going well in school and if we are no longer doing exploitive work.” Likewise, MFS children reported being visited frequently by project staff. The frequency of visits to schools varied from twice a month to weekly. Project headquarters staff also made regular field visits to monitor implementation progress.

The CAs had the primary responsibility for the beneficiary intake forms and also followed up with mentors who filled in the monthly beneficiary tracking forms. The mentors were trained once and

provided with refresher training at the regular meetings with project staff. Mentors felt that the forms were clear and not too difficult to complete. The mentors, ICT supervisor, and field staff confirmed that they provide monitoring data to the project once a month.

The project monitoring system to track children's work status was implemented primarily through the mentors. The basis of the system relied foremost on absenteeism records and follow-up visits to children's home if they are absent frequently. Mentors mostly verified afterschool and school-holiday working status by discussion with the beneficiaries.

Data were collected by project staff at the district level and forwarded to project headquarters for data entry and analysis. The project conducted monthly staff meetings with district staff during which any problems noted on the forms were discussed and verified with the mentors in the schools. The management of the project database did not pose any particular challenge, especially after the project team was able to recruit student volunteers or interns to assist with data entry.

SNV-Rwanda also kept close records of their awareness-raising work across the country through their membership.

### 6.3. Management Strengths and Challenges

The project was generally well managed, particularly as a result of good collaboration between the project partners and regular meetings with all staff. Weekly staff meetings were held at the headquarters level, as were monthly all-staff meetings.

District project staff did indicate that, although they were encouraged to contact project headquarters if needed, on a practical basis they implemented most work relatively independently using project guidelines. None of the field staff complained explicitly, although some said that they did feel the weight of responsibility. Timely reporting was also sometimes challenging and resulted in "a lot of pressure," but ultimately most reports were submitted on time. Some district staff members indicated that they needed more financial support for telecommunication to enable them to stay in close contact with project headquarters.

Staff members noted that there had been some turnover of district staff, which caused some difficulties. In all such cases, the staff members who left had found "promotions or more permanent jobs." New district staff members indicated that they faced some challenges when they had to take over, but that they were able to adjust relatively quickly.

FAWE-Rwanda is an association managed by a board of directors consisting of volunteers who hold positions in different settings. Internal financial resources are limited, although FAWE-Rwanda implements projects on HIV and education<sup>74</sup> and girls education policy.<sup>75</sup> Most of the volunteers have substantial backgrounds in education but less so in child labor issues. The FAWE-Rwanda board members mostly learned about child labor and the project while implementing their board responsibilities, including review of project planning, strategies, and reports. FAWE-Rwanda staff assigned to the project consisted of individuals hired on a contract basis. Senior FAWE-Rwanda project staff had worked on projects with which the association had partnered in the past. The most concrete knowledge on child labor issues and its relationship to education resided with these contracted staff whose future depends on FAWE-Rwanda's ability to partner with other projects that can cover their salaries. To ensure that FAWE-Rwanda's board and other members can fully contribute to continuity on child labor issues, it is recommended that key members be provided with specialized training before a project ends. One subject area for such training recommended by a

---

<sup>74</sup> With Global Fund support.

<sup>75</sup> With UNICEF.

project staff member was on the “community asset appraisal” approach. The community asset appraisal helped the project team to identify, assess, and determine the collaboration and roles of the local authorities and other local allies on child labor issues. FAWE-Rwanda members across the country could then use this knowledge to support mainstreaming of child labor into local actions.

#### 6.4. Leveraging of Resources

As already indicated, the project team developed linkages to other organizations, particularly in local government, to address conditions that contributed to child labor. Some of the specific resources leveraged are summarized in Table 5.

**Table 5—Resource Mobilization**

Entity That Provided Resources	Brief Description, Including quantities in US\$ or Number of Materials or Services if In-Kind
District government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided office space (five offices) for REACH district mobilizers or district coordinators</li> <li>• Provided 15 agronomists to serve as MFS teachers</li> <li>• Provided land space for 72 MFS groups (38 beekeeping, 34 other agricultural activities)</li> <li>• Provided human resource time to participate in meetings, monitoring of project actions when visiting project areas</li> </ul>
REACH volunteers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donated time to monitor REACH children and raise awareness in their communities</li> <li>• Student volunteers who assisted with data monitoring entry<sup>76</sup></li> </ul>
Printex (printing company)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Printed newsletters and awareness-raising materials at a discounted rate</li> </ul>
Bralirwa (beer production company, affiliate of Heineken)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided 4,800 kilograms of animal feed to the MFS students in Rubavu District engaged in pig rearing</li> </ul>
U.S. Agency for International Development—funded Rwanda Integrated Water Systems Project (RIWSP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided rain-water harvesting systems to two REACH-supported schools in Rwinkwavu Sector, Kayonza District, both in need of water; the water can be used for food preparation and washing, and for their agricultural clubs and schools gardens (systems are valued at US\$4,700 and US\$5,500)</li> </ul>

#### 7. Impact

Measuring project impact consisted of assessing the positive and negative and primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, and intended or unintended results of an intervention.<sup>77</sup> In the context of the current project evaluation, the long-term impact cannot yet be fully determined although some early indications are evident. The project’s impact on direct individual beneficiaries (i.e., children and their parents) was discussed in Section 5. The evaluation found that there were changes in partners and other organizations working on child labor in the country, education quality, and government and policy structures in terms of systemwide change on child labor and education.

<sup>76</sup> These volunteers did receive a very small stipend.

<sup>77</sup> As indicated by the widely referenced definition of the OECD, DAC: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee. (2012). *Evaluating development impacts: An overview*. Retrieved December 22, 2012, from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/dcdndep/evaluatingdevelopmentimpacts.htm>

### 7.1. Systemwide Impact, Including Impact on Partners and Other Organizations

The project contributed to systemwide impact by focusing on national and local levels of policy and strategy development with respect to child labor and education. The project team conducted advocacy and training to help strengthen institutions and capacities on child labor. While the NPECL has not yet been officially adopted, the government is likely to do so (see Section 5.2.2 for details). Project partner FAWE-Rwanda contributed to the development of a national girls' education policy and helped ensure that child labor was incorporated into the policy.

The project team conducted advocacy on child labor issues within various other committees, such as the Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee on Child Labor and the National Commission for Children, which acts as the primary national child protection committee. Any future project needs to increase harmonization of the ISCL and NCC, which can at least partially be achieved through implementing a joint CLMS system. The NCC provides technical input and is linked to the Rwandan child protection referral systems. Any well-functioning CLMS system needs to be integrated into the government child protection referral systems. Discussions on integrating the CLMS into the child protection referral systems would, thus, provide an opportunity for the ISCL and NCC to work toward the common goal of the elimination of hazardous child labor.

The project team worked intensively with the Ministry of Labor project point of contact on child labor and a Ministry of Education point of contact. While the MINEDUC point of contact was recently replaced, the newly appointed individual was already well aware of the issues and committed to supporting child labor actions in the MINEDUC. The project had an impact on the improvement of education quality (see Section 5.3.4). The models developed on education quality were not entirely innovative because they included established teacher training and improvement of physical school structures. These models, however, demonstrated how education quality and the elimination of child labor can be jointly linked for the overall benefit of children and eventual poverty reduction.<sup>78</sup>

At the national level, the project team also partnered with FAWE-Rwanda and SNV-Rwanda, which have now mainstreamed child labor into their advocacy, awareness raising, and other actions at national and especially at local levels. The impact of the project on FAWE-Rwanda and SNV-Rwanda was discussed in Section 6.1. The capacities of ARDI and Gako OTC on child labor issues were strengthened and will likely continue to have an impact on their programs in the future.

ARDI associated its community-based master beekeepers to implement MFS training. These master beekeepers were trained on child labor issues, which can be expected to contribute to long-term and broader impact.

SNV-Rwanda staff noted that it was their first time working on child labor issues. As a result of capacity strengthening on child labor, the existing SNV-Rwanda network of advisers was able to contribute to potential long-term and broader impact on awareness raising of members. The project team primarily worked with CAs and mentors and less with community child protection committees. At the time of the evaluation, ongoing discussions with the CAs and mentors and local leaders of these committees on establishing mutual linkages were being held. The establishment of the CLMS should ultimately lead to improved roles for these community child protection committees (see Section 5.2.2 for further details).

---

<sup>78</sup> As a result of a more-educated and healthier adult population.

## 8. Sustainability

The project team took steps to ensure the sustainability of project activities and results after the completion of the program. Some—still limited—sources of funding at local levels were identified and partnerships with other organizations and the government were established.

### 8.1. Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan Integrated Into Project Design

Sustainability was included as one of the five main project outputs. As a result, planning for sustainability was well integrated in the project design. The project team further developed a more detailed exit and sustainability plan. Various approaches were included in the project to achieve sustainability. These approaches included awareness raising and advocacy, capacity and institution strengthening, research, development of CFSS and MFS, and education quality improvement models for Rwanda.

### 8.2. Sustainability of Project Effects

The project team was quite successful in building potential for sustainability in most of the project areas. The approach of working closely with local government and other local structures, providing intensive capacity strengthening over time to local mentors and CAs, and working with local trainers for MFS constituted the most important lessons learned for the sustainability of interventions.

Details of the approaches contributing to sustainability were discussed in previous sections. The sustainable influence of the project team's advocacy efforts on national and local level policies and strategies was likely to result in concrete outcomes on child labor and education. Awareness was raised in project implementation areas and was expected to continue as a result of the capacity strengthening of local actors at community, geographic sector, cell, and district levels. Ownership of the child labor and related education messages was evident, which will help to contribute to sustainability. The ICT center was expected to be sustainable because the local government will take over management and the center will raise income by providing services that will enable it to function as an Internet café and office services center. As stated in Section 5.3.4, continued training for teachers and others through the ICT center is likely to be limited due to staff capacity. Research conducted through the project was added to the national knowledge base. The database monitoring system can be adapted and used to inform the development of a national CLMS system.

The project has potential for sustainability initiatives to assist current and future cohorts of project beneficiaries through local government and the associated JADF structures. Some prospects for sustained funding at local levels exist. Local government and local leaders indicated that they can prioritize children in exploitive child labor when allocating local funding to support the most vulnerable families. The amount of funding available to assist vulnerable families was still limited. Some funding was provided through the central government, while in some locations there were collections for mutual support funds among local inhabitants that are used for construction of schools and other purposes. Officials in two locations noted that such funds could potentially be used to help children pay for taking their examinations. Without being prompted, CAs and mentors interviewed for the evaluation indicated that they planned to continue advocating for the child beneficiaries and against child labor into the future.

At the same time, it should be stated that at least one-half of the formal education beneficiaries and their parents interviewed told the evaluator that the children would drop out of school after the end of the project. Lack of school supplies, uniforms, and ability to cover school and examination fees were cited as the principal reasons for dropping out. Although uniforms are not officially required, children stated that they would not want to go to school without one and indicated that they would prefer to drop out if none were available. In one school, all of the children said they would be sent

home if they showed up with no uniform, but in most cases the embarrassment they experienced from not having a uniform was the major challenge.

The evaluation team tried to verify whether children and their parents might make such statements about dropping out to positively influence their appeals for a project extension. Despite the evaluator's explanations that the project would not be extended to cover another full academic year and that any future project might be implemented in other locations, the interviewees persisted in this opinion.

It should be added that the project team worked actively with local authorities, teachers, REACH Project volunteers, and others to ensure that beneficiary children remained in school even after the completion of the project. The project team paid special attention to advocate for the allocation of funding from available government programs to assist former project beneficiaries, other former child laborers, and vulnerable children.

Three groups of children were not aware of the duration of the project, although CAs and mentors were well aware. The project staff expected the CAs and mentors to communicate this information to beneficiary families. The evaluator asked one group of CAs and mentors why they had not shared the information with the beneficiary families. Their answer was, "We were hoping for a project extension or a new project phase. We did not want to disappoint them before knowing for sure if it would happen or not." Along the same vein, children and parents were not aware of—or did not expect—potential support from the local government and other local resources to help the children stay in school. Future project will need to pay special attention to ensure clarity concerning the duration of project support so that children and their families can plan for postproject resources. Ensuring that beneficiary families are well aware can also contribute to the strength of their advocacy on child labor issues and the push to obtain support for their children through various local schemes.

The MFS initiatives have good potential for sustainability although, given the time needed to fully realize benefits, comprehensive benefits will likely only be evident 1–2 years after the end of the project. Follow-up impact studies approximately 18 months after the end of the project could be very informative to learning lessons from this project component.

In all focus groups conducted at local levels, strong requests for additional assistance for other child laborers in the project areas were made. Children, parents, local authorities, CAs, mentors, and MFS trainers indicated that there were still substantial numbers of children needing such assistance. Some focus groups found it difficult to estimate the number of children still needing help, while others made some rough estimates. Individual children in some of the focus groups indicated that they knew, on average, of five other children who were in a similar situation to theirs at the beginning of the project.

The need to substantially scale up support for livelihoods actions with families that include child laborers was also stressed at the national to local levels. Poverty was still the root cause of child labor in Rwanda. Education was generally already prized, although there are some exceptions.

### **8.2.1 Maintaining Partnerships With Other Organizations**

Collaboration with national organizations was discussed in Sections 5.2.2 and 6.1. The sustainability the collaboration is good, especially on awareness raising and capacity strengthening among SNV-Rwanda staff and members and individuals associated with FAWE-Rwanda and ARDI.

At the national level the ILO, UNICEF, MIFOTRA, MINEDUC, other government ministries, and representatives of the tea manufacturers, were included in the Advisory Sustainability Committee

(ASC). This technical committee met to discuss child labor and related education issues and how to sustain some REACH Project activities after the end of the project. The ASC was initiated as part of the project and met on a monthly basis. The ILO collaborated on World Day Against Child Labor while the ILO also attended other joint meetings with the project team.

### **8.3. Sustainability of Monitoring Systems**

The CAs and mentors who were trained on the project monitoring systems understand how to monitor children at the community level. They can help to facilitate the process of formalizing the CLMS created by REACH at the local government level. The REACH Project team compiled all CLMS training materials used during the project and created a CLMS manual that can be used by the government authorities and other stakeholders. The CAs and mentors who were trained on the project monitoring systems should be able to adjust to and implement any eventual CLMS system. These individuals can then be pilot test the full CLMS system, although they will need to integrate their actions with the recommended referral system to be linked to the CLMS. If successfully pilot tested, the most effective former project mentors, in particular, can provide at least some of the capacity strengthening to individuals in new areas where the CLMS will be implemented. Their previous experience and knowledge of child labor issues will likely be useful and may serve to motivate CLMS implementers in the new areas. Such mentors will need to be further trained on how to share their knowledge and experience to train new CLMS implementers.

## **9. Conclusions**

### **9.1. Most Important Outcomes, Lessons Learned, or Best Practices**

Good outcomes were achieved, including the withdrawal from and prevention from entering child labor and successful awareness raising on issues such as the difference between child labor and child work in project areas.

The following are the most important areas associated with project accomplishments:

- Close project work with local government and other local structures resulting in local ownership and good potential for sustainable attention to child labor issues in project areas
- Provision of intensive capacity strengthening repeated over time to local mentors and CAs on child labor issues and to improve education quality
- Implementation of MFS and work with local trainers for MFS.
- Work through existing nationwide systems such as the SNV-Rwanda cooperatives for awareness raising
- Successful pilot testing and implementation of a monitoring database intended as a pilot exercise towards the eventual development of a CLMS
- Close working relationships and building on the strengths of project partners (Winrock International, SNV-Rwanda, FAWE-Rwanda)

The need for continued attention to child labor issues is still evident in the project areas. Evaluation interviewees stressed the need for assistance for more child laborers who had not yet been reached through the project.

### **Key Lessons Learned and Good Practices**

Project capacity strengthening through training, frequent refresher sessions, and frequent meetings contributed to project outcomes on withdrawing children from and preventing them from entering child labor; education quality improvement; and awareness, commitment, and ownership of CAs, mentors, and local authorities. The consistent and, particularly, often-repeated input from the

project team thus contributed to a well-integrated result.

The MFS and agriculture clubs have promise for further scaling up in Rwanda and in countries with similar conditions. The MFS initiatives have good potential for sustainability although, given time needed to fully realize benefits, comprehensive benefits will likely only be evident 1–2 years after the end of the project.

The ICT center was successful, in part, because it was implemented in close collaboration with local authorities and local government, which will continue to take responsibility for the center after the end of the project.

The integration of the project into the existing governance structures in Rwanda was a good practice that can be successful in countries where similar levels of strong local structures exist. The project design and implementation maximized the benefits of work through existing joint local government, civil society, and private-sector structures.

The project team found that the best entry point for discussions with parents about child labor was to focus first and foremost on education. By placing special emphasis on the child's right to go to school and that child labor interferes with that right, it was possible to raise awareness effectively.

## 9.2. Key Recommendations

### **Policy Development, Role of Government, and National Child Labor Monitoring System**

Harmonization of policy and legal frameworks as linked to child labor issues, adoption of the NPECL, and full enforcement still require more attention in Rwanda.

An effective CLMS system integrated into a child protection referral system is suggested for Rwanda. The CLMS should not just be limited to identifying and monitoring child laborers, but should also include referral of such children to various relevant services in accordance with their needs. Monitoring of children's access to—and results of—the effects of these services needs to be included in the CLMS or digitally cross-linked to child protection databases.

The rapid growth of digital technology can be explored to determine how future projects can integrate the CLMS and associated referral systems into a digital information systems starting at the community level.<sup>79</sup> The pervasive presence of mobile phones, and increasingly of second-hand smart phones, has potential for the effective identification, referral, and monitoring of children in exploitive child labor.

### **Advocacy and Awareness Raising**

Advocacy and awareness raising skills of children to eliminate exploitive child labor and promote education should be developed. Children are often their own best advocates and, particularly through the arts, they can sustainably communicate relevant messages. When children own the child labor message, they can expand their communication skills to other development subjects. Children can also be included in the writing of newsletters, radio shows, and so forth.

### **Agriculture Clubs and Model Farm Schools**

---

<sup>79</sup> Please see an article on similar aspects of digital development in Africa: The Innovation Knowledge Foundation (2012). *The next frontier of development*. Milan, Italy: Author. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from [http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93-the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde\\_788017\\_member\\_194395666](http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93-the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde_788017_member_194395666). Also see the foundation's general Web site at <http://www.thinkinovation.org>.

A master trainer system of children to teach MFS skills should be developed. In the case of farming, beekeeping, and livestock raising, a system of master training may be useful in any future projects. Talented children can become apprentices to adult extension trainers through project actions and/or conduct training at local levels as needed. Some master trainers may eventually be able to earn income from providing training.

Because the impact of MFS will be fully evident only after at least 1 more year, follow-up impact studies of the MFS initiatives approximately 18 months after the end of the project could be very informative to learning lessons from this project component.

### **Information Technologies**

Given the high coverage of mobile phones and computers in schools across Rwanda, and to save on the high cost of printing awareness-raising messages, manuals, and guidelines, further development and sharing of information using digital technologies should be explored.

Replicate the ICT center concept, including training for teachers; add training of government staff on eventual CLMS data entry; and enter into agreement with local government to continue to operate the center. Children can serve as apprentice trainers in the ICT center.

### **Monitoring**

Where project baselines are implemented, conduct project endline studies to assess changes in attitudes and practices.

### **Actions Related to Child Labor Withdrawal and Prevention**

Identify solutions in the form of household labor-saving technologies and linkages to projects that can provide water supplies and energy supplies close to home. Carrying water and firewood remains a challenging subject area for households because if children do not help, mothers who are already overburdened with work or who may be pregnant and/or carrying a small child will be expected to do all of this work.

The provision of project support for school fees needs to be assessed on a country-by-country basis and possibly a community-by-community basis. Where the risk for exploitive child labor is greater, some support for school fees can be provided while simultaneously working with the national and local government on the issue of school fees.

### **Livelihoods**

Scale up the CFSS program and ensure that more intensive training on entrepreneurship, community-based savings schemes, linkages to MFIs, and follow-up support is provided. Technical support for the development of community-based savings schemes, which include substantial numbers of local households to ensure adequate savings for investment borrowing, should be implemented.

### **Project Management**

Where projects are implemented through a joint partnership of agencies, future projects need to ensure that partners agree to adhere to common procedures for procurement and reporting.

## **Annex 1—Additional Recommendations**

### **Policy, Government, and National Child Labor Monitoring System**

Any future project needs to increase harmonization of the Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee on Child Labor and the National Commission for Children, which can at least partially be achieved through implementing a joint CLMS system.

Future projects should preferably not include outputs or indicators on adoption of legal and policy frameworks in their logic frameworks because they are often not realistic. Projects teams do not have control over the official adoption of government policies and legal frameworks. Instead, the clear contribution of a project to the development of legal and policy frameworks, strategies, and approaches may be at least partially attributed to a project team's efforts. Solid proof of advocacy efforts that also include the effective mobilization of a wide range of stakeholders can also serve as useful measures.

Link child labor projects to government and other programs focusing on improving occupational safety and health of child workers and adult household members.

### **Identification of Project Locations**

When identifying project intervention locations, future projects need to consider high levels of child labor and challenging locations in terms of distances to obtain energy for cooking or water. Project teams can promote linkages to agencies that can assist with provision of water points and alternative sources of cooking fuel or energy-saving devices.

### **Agriculture Clubs and Model Farm Schools**

It is important that children fully understand the reasoning behind the types of MFS training provided. Project staff would need to explain the various training options in greater detail, including the feasibility and potential for success of particular options in their particular situation.

Scale up and link agriculture clubs to nutrition training by local health specialists, using local crops.

### **Actions Related to Child Labor Withdrawal and Prevention**

Ensure clarity among beneficiary families concerning the duration of project support so that children and their families can plan for postproject resources. Ensuring that beneficiary families are well aware can also contribute to the strength of their advocacy on child labor issues and the push to obtain support for their children through various local schemes.

Future projects should include an assessment of the needs of the children in accordance with the climate and work with schools to ensure that children are not penalized for wearing nonschool regulation uniforms, shoes, and/or sweaters.

Increased project support for other forms of fundraising to cover education costs should also be explored. These may include public-private sector support, sponsorships by wealthier individuals, prizes for successful students, fundraising festivals, and sale of school-produced agricultural products.

Annex 2—Schedule

**RWANDA Itinerary for Final Evaluation**

Day	Date	Location	Description	Driving time	Details
Sun	11/25/12	Kigali	Evaluator Arrives in Kigali		
Mon	11/26/12	Kigali	8:45 pick-up from Hotel Mille Colline  9:00-12:30 Meeting with Key Partners at Winrock Office  Lunch 12:30-1:30  1:30-3:30 Continue morning meeting and Discussion of methodology for stakeholders' workshop at Winrock Office  4:00-5:00 MIFOTRA Meeting	10 minutes      10 minutes	WI, FAWE, and SNV staff    WI, FAWE, and SNV staff
Tue	11/27/12	Kayonza District  Child Labor (CL) Sector: Sugar cane, mining, animal herding  *Sleep in Nyagatare	Depart from Kigali at 8:00 am for Site Visit  Bugambira School (1hour visit)  Nyamirama Sector CAs and Mentors (1 hour visit)  Sector Government Meeting (1 hour)  Gahini MFS (1 hour visit)  Drive to Nyagatare	2 hours  15 minutes  15 minutes  15 minutes  2 hours	31 beneficiaries in Primary  CAs and Mentors     Beekeeping MFS Cohort 3, 51 beneficiaries

Day	Date	Location	Description	Driving time	Details
Wed	11/28/12	Nyagatare District  Child Labor (CL) Sector: Herding, cross-border trade, banana growing  *Sleep in Kigali	Depart from Hotel at 8:00 am for Site Visit  District REACH Staff Office (45 minute visit)  Sector Matimba Government Meeting (45 minute visit)  GS Kagitumba School (1hour visit)  Matimba MFS (1hour visit)  CFSS Mother meeting (45 minute visit)  Drive to Kigali	  40 minutes  1 hour  15 minutes  15 minutes  20 minutes  3.5 hours	  Meet with REACH and government staff    24 beneficiaries in Primary and Tronc Commun, and Agriculture club  Goats, 31 beneficiaries
Thursday	11/29/12	Rubavu District  CL Sectors: Sugarcane, fishing, mining  *Sleep in Rubavu	Depart Kigali at 7:00am for Site Visit  Nyamyumba Sector Government Meeting (1 hour visit)  Rubona School (1 hour visit)  Cohort 1MFS Graduates (45 minute visit)  Pre-primary School (1 hour visit)	  3.5 hours  30 minutes  10 minutes  15 minutes	    83 Beneficiaries, Primary and Catch-up  Pig business, MFS graduates

Day	Date	Location	Description	Driving time	Details
Friday	11/30/12	Rubavu District  CL Sector: Tea, fishing, animal herding  *Sleep in Kigali	Depart hotel at 7:30am for Site visit		
			Ryabizige GS (1 hour visit)	50 minutes	155 students
			CFSS Mother (1 hour visit)	40 minutes	
			Focus Group Meeting with families and community members (1 hour visit)	50 minutes	Meet with parents of REACH beneficiaries and community members on Child Labor and Education
			Drive to Kigali	3.5 hours	
Sat	12/1/12	Kigali	Notes Processing		
Sun	12/2/12	Kigali	Notes Processing		
			12:00pm: Depart for Nyamasheke	6.5hours	
Mon	12/3/12	Nyamasheke District  CL Sectors: Tea, fishing  *Sleep in Butare	8:00 Site Visit		
			District Office (45 minute visit)	15 minutes	
			ICT center (1 hour visit)	5 minutes	
			MFS Bushekeri (1 hour visit)	10 minutes	Pineapple and banana farm
			St. Nicholas (Nyamasheke A) (1 hour visit)	10 minutes	CAs and Mentors, 146 beneficiaries
			Drive to Butare	3 hours	

Day	Date	Location	Description	Driving time	Details
Tues	12/4/12	Nyaruguru District Mata Sector  CL Sector: Tea  *Sleep in Kigali	8:00am Site visit		
			Mata Sector Authority Meeting (45 minute visit)	1.5 hours	
			Mata Primary School (1 hour visit)	1 hour	173 students-REACH Beneficiaries-Primary
			Cyvugiza PS (1 hour visit)	1 hour	Catch-up
			Focus Group with families and community members (1 hour visit)	n/a	Meet with parents of REACH beneficiaries and community members on Child Labor and Education
		Drive to Kigali	3 hours		
Wednesday	12/5/12	Kigali      *Sleep in Kigali	Depart from Hotel Mille Colline at 7:45		
			8:00-9:00am ILO Meeting	10 minutes	Discuss CL activities in Rwanda
			9:30-10:30 am Kigali City Council Meeting	15 minutes	
			11:00-12:00 U.S. Embassy Meeting	15 minutes	
			Lunch 12:00-1:00		
			1:30- 2:30 MINEDUC Meeting	15 minutes	
3:00-4:00 ARDI, beekeeping partner	20 minutes				

Day	Date	Location	Description	Driving time	Details
Thursday	12/6/12	Gicumbi District	Depart from Hotel Mille Colline at 7:30am for Site Visit		
		CL Sectors: Tea	Mugina School (1hour visit)	2 hours	17 beneficiaries in Primary, Agriculture Club, School Renovations, Mentors
		*Sleep in Kigali	Shangasha MFS (1 hour visit)	45 minutes	Onions and Irish Potatoes, 27 REACH beneficiaries (associations), Beekeeping
			Shangasha GS School, Focus Group Discussion (1hour visit)	5 minutes	Mentors, 239 REACH beneficiaries in Primary , Secondary, and Catch-up, agriculture club
			Drive to Kigali	2 hours	
Friday	12/7/12	Kigali	Depart Hotel Mille Colline 8am for site visit		
			9:40- 11:00 Visit GAKO Training Center	40 minutes	REACH sponsored 62 MFS graduates to attend agriculture training, in Kabuga
			12:00- 1:00 Lunch in Kigali	40 minutes	
			1:00-5:00 Reserved for meetings with REACH partner staff, as requested by the Evaluator	10 minutes	
Sat	12/8/12	Kigali	Notes Processing		
Sun	12/9/12	Kigali	Preparation of Stakeholder Meeting		
			5:00pm Meeting with REACH Senior Staff		Discussion of preliminary findings to be presented during Stakeholder meeting
Mon	12/10/12	Kigali	9am-3pm Stakeholder Meeting		REACH Stakeholders

### Annex 3—List of Interviewees

<b>Date (2012)</b>	<b>Address or Name of Community</b>
November 26	Winrock International
November 26	FAWE-Rwanda
November 26	Winrock International
November 26	SNV-Rwanda
November 26	Winrock International
November 26	Winrock International
November 26	MIFOTRA
November 27	GS Bugambira
November 27	Nyamirama
November 27	Nyamirama
November 27	Nyamirama
November 27	GS Gikaya
November 27	Nyamirama
November 27	GS Bugambira
November 27	Gahini MFS
November 28	Nyagatare
November 28	Matimba
November 28	Nyagatare
November 28	GS Kagitumba School, Matimba sector
November 28	GS Kagitumba School, Matimba sector
November 28	Matimba MFS
November 29	Nyamyumba
November 29	Rubavu

<b>Date (2012)</b>	<b>Address or Name of Community</b>
November 29	Rubona School
November 30	GS Ryabizige School, Rubavu District
November 30	Rubavu
November 30	GS Ryabizige School
December 3	Kajongo
December 3	Bushekeri MFS
December 3	Bushekeri MFS
December 3	St. Nicolas School
December 3	ICT Center—Nyamasheke
December 4	PS Cyivugiza
December 4	Mata Sector
December 4	Mata Sector
December 4	Mata Primary School
December 4	Mata Primary and Secondary School
December 5	ARDI Kigali
December 5	U.S. Embassy Kigali

<b>Date (2012)</b>	<b>Address or Name of Community</b>
December 5	ILO Kigali
December 5	GAKO Center, Kabuga
December 6	Mugina Primary School
December 6	Mugina Primary School
December 6	Mugina Primary School
December 6	GS Shangasha
December 6	Shangasha MFS

#### Annex 4—List of Stakeholder Workshop Participants

No.	Institution
1	REACH Project
2	REACH Project
3	REACH Project
4	REACH Project
5	REACH Project
6	REACH Project
7	REACH Project
8	Kajongo Sector
9	REACH Project
10	MIFOTRA
11	Nyagatare District
12	Kayonza
13	MINEDUC
14	Nyagatare
15	Nyaruguru
16	Kayonza District
17	REACH Project
18	Kayonza
19	Nyagatare
20	Reach Project
21	Rubavu
22	Rubavu

No.	Institution
23	Rubavu
24	Rubavu
25	Reach Project
26	FAWERW
27	GOR
28	GOR
29	Nyaruguru
30	Winrock
31	Winrock
32	Winrock
33	REACH Project
34	Nyarugenge District
35	FAWE-Rwanda
36	FAWE-Rwanda
37	Rubavu District
38	Nyaruguru District
39	Nyarugenge District
40	STAVAR
41	Nyaruguru District
42	SNV-Rwanda

## Annex 7—Workshop Schedule and Key Success and Challenges Identified by Participants

Time	Agenda	Activity	Facilitation
8:00 a.m.	Participant Registration and Card Activity	Distribution of cards and markers for participants to include three most important project successes and three project challenges	REACH
8:45 a.m.	Introduction	Welcome remarks	REACH
9:00 a.m.	Presentation on Preliminary Final Evaluation Findings	Ms. Zegers presents preliminary findings from the evaluation	ICF International
10:00 a.m.	Question-and-Answer Session	Ms. Zegers and REACH team answer questions regarding the preliminary findings. Ms. Zegers obtains feedback from stakeholders to contribute to the final evaluation	ICF International and REACH
10:30 a.m.	Coffee Break		La Palisse
10:50 a.m.	Group Work	Prioritization exercise of successes and challenges within groups	REACH
11:20 a.m.	Group Presentations	Rapid presentation of group priorities of successes and challenges	REACH
11:45 a.m.	Group Work	Groups draw recommendations for future projects and/or recommendations on how to continue key REACH activities based on priority successes and challenges	REACH
12:30 p.m.	Group Presentations and Discussion	Groups present their recommendations and discuss findings	REACH
1:20 p.m.	Closing Remarks		MIFOTRA
1:30 p.m.	Lunch		La Pallisse

### Key Successes Cited by Participants, in Group Order of Importance

#### **REACH Headquarters Staff**

1. Strong collaboration with local authorities
2. Community volunteering system was an asset/value for money
3. Using Government of Rwanda-based existing selection process for beneficiaries
4. Prepared and trained parents to take over the responsibility of their children's educational expenses and advocacy after the end of the project
5. Involvement of many local organizations in sensitization process
6. Strong training of CAs/mentors through quarterly meetings training; strong training for district labor inspectors, JADF engagement
7. Procuring goats for model farm students
8. Providing uniforms and materials for REACH beneficiaries

#### **Project Field Staff**

1. Prevent and withdraw the children from child labor
2. MFS program help many youth who didn't attend or dropped out of formal school
3. The project raises awareness on child labor to many Rwandese people
4. The beneficiaries received the scholarship materials
5. The project has trained children and parents in different skills

6. REACH staff visit the beneficiaries often and this encourages children to have hope in themselves and to remain in school
7. A large number of teachers were trained in ICT
8. The community interested in using Internet is high permanent

#### **Government**

1. Good results in preventing and withdrawing the children from child labor and reintegrate them into education
2. Successful awareness in the community, parents, and other stakeholders in charge of vulnerable children
3. Scholastic materials have allowed [children] to retain into schools
4. Teachers' training was a real key to support children
5. Warm and smooth collaboration between REACH and local authorities have allowed great achievements

#### **Additional Field Staff and Field Volunteers**

1. To withdraw and prevent the children into child labor, and monitor and follow them in the schools
2. The vulnerable families have been supported in different ways, which allows children to remain or go back to school because families make money to pay the scholarship materials
3. Children and parents have raised their awareness of child labor and they have began to fight against child labor
4. REACH provided material support to the beneficiaries; thus, other beneficiaries have been also trained in different vocational activities

#### **Children** (Note: The children had listed their points in full sentences individually.

Subsequently, the children ranked the statements in order of importance according to their group discussions).

1. "We thank REACH for withdrawing us in the hard life that we were living and now as Gahini Youth, we can discuss and advise each other on concerned issues, after REACH informed us on our Children's rights."
2. "REACH taught us to function as a cooperative, this is wonderful for us."
3. "The 40 kilos of honey have been harvested and it makes us to pay health insurance for our members."
4. "We thank you [REACH], for materials support."

## Challenges

#### **REACH Headquarters Staff**

1. It takes long for mindset change on child labor
2. Lack of harmonized project procedures between associate partners, e.g., procurement process
3. Not enough support for the CFSS beneficiaries (parents) in terms of number of trainings and number of beneficiaries
4. Slow passing of the NPECL
5. Dropout risk for some beneficiaries after the project
6. The project covers a small area of the country/for direct beneficiaries

### **Project Field Staff**

1. The number of the children in child labor is still big, if possible increase the number of children who are helped
2. The closure of the project may mean that some of the children will drop out of the school
3. The poverty in their families
4. During the holidays, some children intend to go back in child labor
5. Limited resources that do not allow to cover many beneficiaries, more work is needed to change the parents' mindset on child labor
6. More computers and equipment are needed for the ICT center (desktops)

### **Government**

1. The project has a small implementation period in relations to the scope and seriousness of the child labor issues
2. Training the children in formal vocational activities, breeding animals, and agriculture, without considering other vocational activities
3. Lack of capacity of USDOL for supporting a wider territory (more areas and districts)
4. The ignorance of some parents and some employers on child labor and the importance of education

### **Additional Field Staff and Volunteers**

1. REACH has been implementing in few districts and sectors
2. The mindset of some parents who encourage their children to fall into child labor
3. The vulnerable families should have been provided livestock for surviving
4. A challenge for the MFS beneficiaries because they were not trained in other vocational activities

### **Children**

1. Some beneficiaries didn't get the support at due time, despite their requests
2. "We started our beekeeping project during the rainy season and we did have enough training by that time, and that is why we got a small harvest, but now we expect a good harvest because of we are now trained well."

## Recommendations

### **Field Staff**

1. Increase community awareness toward local authorities and parents on child labor
2. Motivate parents on IGA (income-generating projects)
3. Advocacy in various stakeholders, such as NGOs, civil society, religious leaders, private sector, local authorities
4. Enhance legal issues and bylaw to punish employers using child labor
5. Capacity building of volunteers and staff
6. More training and workshops to increase child labor awareness
7. Increase, scaling up ICT centers
8. Additional time and resources for the project to reach many more beneficiaries
9. MFS should have more involvement in choosing type of vocational training
10. More intense trainings, workshops at family level on child labor, parenthood to change mindset
  - Startup capital for MFS and CFSS parents
  - CFSS beneficiaries number should be based on baseline realities (140 parents)

- Any project should start by national child labor survey
- The project timing should consider education cycle
- Ensure clarity if animal of MFS dies prior to end of project
- MFS laureates should be facilitated to go back to formal school and vocational training
- Identification of other stakeholders doing similar activities as REACH to support beneficiaries
- Support to MFS laureates such as livestock

 **Local Government Officials at District and Sector Levels**

1. To withdraw and prevent more children from child labor and sponsor and advocate for them to return to schools
2. To sensitize the parents and others who use the children into labor
3. To provide school materials to all vulnerable children
4. To train many more teachers about the child labor
5. To mobilize many local authority on child labor
6. To make a database of beneficiaries who are still working in child labor

## Annex 8—References

African Development Bank, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, United Nations Development Programme, United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. (2012). *African economic outlook: Rwanda 2012*. Available at [www.africaneconomicoutlook.org](http://www.africaneconomicoutlook.org).

African Smallholders Farmers Group. (2012). The “One Cow Per Poor Family” programme in Rwanda. Retrieved December 20, 2012, from <http://www.asfg.org.uk/success-stories/the-one-cow-per-poor-family-programme-in-rwanda>.

Checkmyschool.org. (2012). *Checkmyschool helps citizens access information, send feedback, and resolve issues on education services*. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://www.checkmyschool.org/main-page>.

Financial Sector Development Secretariat Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MINECOFIN), Government of the Republic of Rwanda. (2012). *UMURENGE SACCO strategy*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources. (2012). *Girinka program (one cow per family)*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author. Retrieved December 20, 2012, from [http://www.minagri.gov.rw/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=207%3Agirinka-program&catid=66%3Agirinka&Itemid=43&lang=en](http://www.minagri.gov.rw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=207%3Agirinka-program&catid=66%3Agirinka&Itemid=43&lang=en).

Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Local Government, Information and Social Affairs. (2003). *National policy for orphans and other vulnerable children*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Local Government, Good Governance, Community Development and Social Affairs. (2007). *Rwanda decentralization strategic framework: Towards a sector-wide approach for decentralization implementation*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

Government of the Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Public Service and Labour, National Institute of Statistics of Rwanda. (2008). *Rwanda national child labour Survey—2008 (RNCLS—2008)*. Kigali, Rwanda, Author.

ICF International. (2012). *Child labor in agriculture in Rwanda*. Calverton, MD: Author.

International Labour Organization. (2012). *Support Children’s Rights through Education, the Arts and the Media (SCREAM) education pack and resources*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author. Retrieved December 10, 2012, from <http://www.ilo.org/ipecc/Campaignandadvocacy/Scream/SCREAMresources/lang--en/index.htm>.

Netherlands Development Organization—Rwanda. (2009). *Joint Action Development Forum in Rwanda: Experiences and lessons learned*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

*Official Gazette of the Republic*. (2009). *Rwanda law n° 13/2009 of 27/05/2009*. Kigali, Rwanda: Government of the Republic of Rwanda.

*Official Gazette of the Republic*. (2010). *Ministerial order n°06 of 13/07/2010* (ministerial order determining the list of worst forms of child labour, their nature, categories of institutions that are not allowed to employ them and their prevention mechanism). Kigali, Rwanda: Government of the Republic of Rwanda.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Development Assistance Committee (2012). *Evaluating development impacts: An overview*. Retrieved December 22, 2012, from

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluationofdevelopmentprogrammes/dcdndep/evaluatingdevelopmentimpacts.htm>.

One Laptop Per Child Association. (2012a). *Country case study: Rwanda 2011—One Laptop Per Child*. Miami, FL, USA: Author.

One Laptop Per Child Association. (2012b). OLPC across the world: Rwanda. Miami, FL, USA: Author. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://laptop.org/map/rwanda>.

Paxton, W., & Mutesi, L. (2012). *School funding and equity in Rwanda: An interim discussion paper*. Kigali, Rwanda: Institute of Policy Analysis and Research-Rwanda.

Rwanda Civil Society Platform. (2012). *The mapping exercise on child protection programs in Rwanda: Report*. Kigali, Rwanda: Lex Chambers Ltd.

Rwanda Governance Board. (2012). *Fostering good governance for sustainable development: Umuganda*. Retrieved December 22, 2012, from <http://www.rgb.rw/main-menu/innovation/umuganda.html>.

Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (Reach) Project. (2010). *Child labor sensitization toolkit: Designed to be used in the REACH sensitization*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

The Innovation Knowledge Foundation. (2012). *The next frontier of development*. Milan, Italy: Author. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from [http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde\\_788017\\_member\\_1943956667](http://www.thinkinovation.org/en/blog/2012/12/data-%E2%80%93the-next-frontier-of-development/?goback=.gde_788017_member_1943956667).

Understanding Children's Work Programme. (2011). *Understanding children's work and youth employment outcomes in Rwanda: Country report, June 2011*. Kigali, Rwanda: United Nations Rwanda.

United States Department of State. (2012). *Trafficking in persons report 2012*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved December 18, 2012, from <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/192587.pdf>.

Winrock International, Forum for African Women Educationalists—Rwanda, & SNV Netherlands Development Organization—Rwanda. (2011). *Monitoring and evaluation guidelines*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

Winrock International, Forum for African Women Educationalists—Rwanda, & SNV Netherlands Development Organization—Rwanda. (2009). *Project document under USDOL and Winrock International cooperative agreement: Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH)*. Washington, DC: Winrock International and USDOL, and Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

Winrock International, Netherlands Development Organization—Rwanda, & Forum for African Women Educationalists—Rwanda. (2010). *Baseline assessment on child labor in seven districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

Winrock International, Netherlands Development Organization—Rwanda, & Forum for African Women Educationalists—Rwanda. (2011). *Assessment on child labor awareness with SNV stakeholders In Rwanda: Research report*. Kigali, Rwanda: REACH Project.

Winrock International. (2012). *Child labor in the tea sector: Case study of Nyamasheke, Nyaruguru, and Gicumbi*. Kigali, Rwanda: Author.

---

***TERMS OF REFERENCE***  
for the  
**Independent Final Evaluation of  
Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH)**

---

<b>Cooperative Agreement Number:</b>	IL 19515-09-75-K
<b>Financing Agency:</b>	U.S. Department of Labor
<b>Grantee Organization:</b>	Winrock International
<b>Dates of Project Implementation:</b>	September 30, 2009 – March 30, 2013
<b>Type of Evaluation:</b>	Independent Final Evaluation
<b>Evaluation Field Work Dates:</b>	November 25 – December 11, 2012
<b>Preparation Date of TOR:</b>	October 29, 2012
<b>Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:</b>	US \$4,499,998
<b>Vendor for Evaluation Contract:</b>	<b>ICF Macro</b> Headquarters, 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

## I. BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

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

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$900 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 90 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Reducing exploitative child labor, especially the worst forms through the provision of direct educational services and by addressing root causes of child labor, including innovative strategies to promote sustainable livelihoods of target households;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor, education, and sustainable livelihoods, and the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, address its root causes, and promote formal, non-formal and vocational education opportunities to provide children with alternatives to child labor;
3. Raising awareness of exploitative child labor and its root causes, and the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
4. Supporting research, evaluation, and the collection of reliable data on child labor, its root causes, and effective strategies, including educational and vocational alternatives, microfinance and other income generating activities to improve household income; and
5. Ensuring the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

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

In FY2010, Congress provided new authority to ILAB to expand activities related to income generating activities, including microfinance, to help projects expand income generation and address poverty more effectively. The funds available to ILAB may be used to administer or operate international labor activities, bilateral and multilateral technical assistance, and microfinance programs, by or through contracts, grants, sub grants and other arrangements.

In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the US Congress directed the majority of the funds to support the two following programs<sup>80</sup>:

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

Since 1995, the US Congress has appropriated some \$450 million to support the International Labor Organization's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO/IPEC), making the U.S. Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO/IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; less comprehensive Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include "direct action" components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitative and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by IPEC projects is to increase children's access to and participation in formal and non-formal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a strong enabling environment for the long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

2. *Child Labor Elimination Technical Assistance Programs*

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$900 million to DOL's International Labor Affairs Bureau (ILAB) for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used by the Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 90 countries around the world. To date, DOL-funded child labor elimination projects have rescued some 1.5 million children from exploitive child labor.

Technical cooperation projects funded by DOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. DOL-funded projects seek to achieve five major goals:

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

---

<sup>80</sup> In 2007, the US Congress did not direct USDOL's appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

By increasing access to education, DOL-funded projects help nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor in geographic areas or economic sectors with a high incidence of exploitive child labor.

### *Other Initiatives*

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

### **Project Context**

In Rwanda, children work in agriculture, on tea plantations and in domestic service. Limited evidence suggests that children also herd livestock and produce goods such as charcoal, potatoes, corn, beans, sorghum, banana, rice, and sugar. Children also make bricks and work in mines and quarries. Children working on the street beg, sell goods, and collect garbage. Some children, mostly girls, are victims of commercial sexual exploitation. Children are also trafficked to Uganda, Tanzania, and Kenya for forced labor in agriculture, commercial sexual exploitation, and domestic servitude.<sup>81</sup>

The Government of Rwanda has ratified Conventions 138 and 182 and is an ILO-IPEC participating country. The minimum age of employment is 16 and the minimum age for hazardous work is 18. The 2010 Ministerial Order on the worst forms of child labor prohibits children from working at industrial institutions and in domestic service, mining and quarrying, construction, brick making and applying fertilizers and pesticides. In addition to the national laws, some districts have bylaws against hazardous child labor, sanctioning employers and parents for violations. The law also prohibits slavery, the use of children in armed conflict, recruiting, using or profiting from child prostitution, and using children in pornographic publications or for illicit activities.<sup>82</sup>

The Ministry of Public Service and Labor (MIFOTRA) is charged with enforcing child labor laws and employs 30 labor inspectors, one per district. MIFOTRA trains labor inspectors at least twice a year to identify and investigate child labor violations. The National Advisory Committee on Child Labor coordinate government efforts relating to the worst forms of child labor and is responsible for reviewing child labor laws, advocating for the inclusion of child labor policies in national development plans, interventions and conducting field visits to assess child labor and raise awareness. The Government's National Policy for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children includes strategies to address the worst forms of child labor. The Government has also participated in other efforts to address the problem of child labor, including operating a rehabilitation center for former child combatants and raising awareness of child labor through radio shows and television announcements.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> USDOL, "U.S. Department of Labor's 2009 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor," Rwanda country report, p. 551.

<sup>82</sup> USDOL, "U.S. Department of Labor's 2009 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor," Rwanda country report, p. 552

<sup>83</sup> USDOL, "U.S. Department of Labor's 2009 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor," Rwanda country report, p. 552-554

USDOL has provided USD 21.5 million in regional projects to combat child labor which include Rwanda.<sup>84</sup> In 2004, USDOL funded a USD \$14.5 million regional project implemented by World Vision and the International Rescue Committee, entitled the Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together (KURET) project. Ending in 2009, KURET withdrew and prevented over 7,000 HIV/AIDS-affected children ages 5 to 17 years in Rwanda from the worst forms of child labor through the provision of educational services. In 2003, USDOL also funded a regional project, implemented by ILO-IPEC at USD \$7 million that withdrew and prevented approximately 800 children from armed conflict in Rwanda.<sup>85</sup> In 2009, USDOL funded a \$4.5 million dollar program to combat worst forms of child labor in the agriculture sector in Rwanda.

<b>USDOL-FUNDED PROJECTS IN Rwanda</b>			
<b>YEARS</b>	<b>Grantee</b>	<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>
2003-2007	ILO-IPEC	Prevention and Reintegration of Children Involved in Armed Conflict: An Interregional Program	\$7,000,000
2004-2009	World Vision International Rescue Committee	Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Ethiopia Together (KURET)	\$14,500,000
<b>2009-2013</b>	<b>Winrock International</b>	<b>Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH)</b>	<b>\$4,499,998</b>
<b>Regional TOTAL</b>			<b>\$21,500,000</b>
<b>Rwanda Only Total</b>			<b>\$4,499,998</b>
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$25,999,998</b>

### **Rwanda Education Alternatives for Children (REACH)**

On September 24, 2009, Winrock International received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth \$4.5 million from USDOL to implement an Education Initiative in Rwanda, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the original four goals of the USDOL project as previously outlined. Winrock International was awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the project targets a total of 8,300 children, or more specifically, 4,800 for withdrawal and 3,500 for prevention from exploitive child labor. The project's purpose is to withdraw and prevent children from exploitive child labor in agriculture on smallholder coffee, tea, sugar, and rice farms, as well as through animal herding, and these children will be provided with educational services. Project interventions were to be implemented in seven of Rwanda's rural districts: Nyarugenge, Nyaruguru, Gicumbi, Nyamasheke, Rubavu, Kayonza, and Nyagatare.

<sup>84</sup> USDOL, "Project Status – Africa," [http://www.dol.gov/ilab/projects/sub-saharan\\_africa/project-africa.htm](http://www.dol.gov/ilab/projects/sub-saharan_africa/project-africa.htm).

<sup>85</sup> USDOL, "Project Status – Africa," [http://www.dol.gov/ilab/projects/sub-saharan\\_africa/project-africa.htm](http://www.dol.gov/ilab/projects/sub-saharan_africa/project-africa.htm). See also USDOL, "U.S. Department of Labor's 2009 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor," Rwanda country report, p. 554.

## II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to external mid-term and final evaluations. The REACH project in Rwanda began implementation in September 2009 and had a mid-term evaluation in fall 2011. It is due for a final evaluation in fall 2012.

### **Scope of Evaluation**

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

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

### **Final Evaluation Purpose**

The purpose of the final evaluation is to:

1. Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so, based on the project document, project deliverables, and results;
2. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL;
3. Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project;
4. Provide lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in the country and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors;
5. Assess whether results from project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations;
6. Assess how REACH has addressed the recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation and results;
7. Address key achievements and success of the project; as well as how REACH has handled challenges; and
8. Identify key, innovative strategies for combatting child labor that could be used in the future, especially related to community participation and ownership and stakeholder involvement.

The evaluation should also provide documented lessons learned, good or promising practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor

projects and policies in Rwanda and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and Winrock International. Recommendations should focus around lessons learned and good or promising practices from which future projects can glean when developing their strategies toward combating exploitive child labor.

### **Intended Users**

This final evaluation should provide USDOL, Winrock International, other project-specific stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. Lessons learned and good practices should be used by stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor projects in the country and elsewhere as appropriate. The final report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

### **Evaluation Questions**

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

### **Relevance**

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

1. Did the project adequately support the five USDOL Child Labor Elimination Program goals it was funded to support? If not, which ones were not adequately supported and why?
2. Did the project assumptions prove to be accurate?
3. Were the project's main strategies/activities in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL relevant and appropriate, given the cultural, economic, and political context in which the project operates? Please explain why or why not.
4. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has encountered in addressing child labor in this country (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc)? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?
5. Did the project adjust implementation and/or strategy based on the findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation? If so, how?
6. What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and USDOL?
7. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country.

8. How successful has the project been in revising its strategy in response to political and economic shocks in the country?

### **Effectiveness**

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

1. Has the project achieved its targets and objectives as stated in the project document? What factors contributed to the success and/or underachievement of each of the objectives?
2. Assess the effectiveness of the “direct action” interventions, including the education interventions provided to children (formal education, informal education, non-formal education, and skills training). Did the provision of these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor?
3. Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children *prevented* and *withdrawn* from labor.
4. Assess the effectiveness of the specific monitoring models using teachers, mentors, and community activists on creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.
5. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (agriculture on smallholder coffee, tea, sugar, and rice farms and animal herding)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the *worst* forms of child labor in the country?
6. Are there any specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided, including any lessons learned that are sector-specific?
7. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Were they feasible and effective? Why or why not?
8. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project?
9. What are good or promising practices in this project that are recommended for other projects?
10. What are the main lessons learned from this project in the areas (but not limited to): education and its role in withdrawal and prevention, coordination and collaboration among stakeholders, awareness raising and its role in achieving the project’s objectives, and policy and legislation development?
11. Identify the activities that were carried out by the program which contributed to raising the effectiveness of the existing educational systems, in addition to raising the efficiency of workers in these systems.
12. To what extent has the project achieved the recommendations of the midterm evaluation?

13. Assess the effectiveness of the project's livelihood interventions, including the Model Farm Schools, Conditional Family Scholarship Support Program, business and entrepreneurship training, and linkages to savings and credit programs. Did the provision of these services result in stronger livelihoods for children of the legal working age and their households?

### **Efficiency**

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

1. Is the project cost-efficient?
2. Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?
3. Was the monitoring system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?
4. Has the project developed linkages to other aid organizations, government programs or health providers that provide support to children (e.g. school lunches/snacks, health care cards) to address conditions that contribute to child labor?
5. What transition strategies has the project used for Model Farm School graduates that increased opportunities to avoid re-entry into exploitive child labor?

### **Impact**

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

1. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.)?
2. Assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and non-formal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?
3. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc)?
4. Did the program's target groups experience any changes in their lives as a result of the program's interventions? Identify these changes.
5. What appears to be the project's impact to date, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?
6. Assess the impact of project activities on education quality (both formal and non-formal interventions).
7. The evaluation should look at stakeholders' understanding of child labor and its impact in Rwanda. This could include beneficiaries, families, community

members and government officials. In addition, general awareness on child labor could be examined.

### **Sustainability**

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

1. Will the exit strategy and sustainability plan integrated into the project design likely be effective?
2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustained funding?
3. What have been the major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?
4. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of coordination with implementing partners?
5. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations?
6. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?
7. Will the monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?
8. What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?
9. Identify the most important outcomes, lessons learned, or best practices that should be considered if there is any opportunity to extend this program and what should be avoided in order to improve implementation and for future USDOL projects.
10. Assess the sustainability of effects of the project.
11. Assess the level of involvement of local and national government in the project and how this involvement has built government capacity and commitment to work on child labor elimination.
12. Assess the progress of REACH's work with the GOR to bring attention to child labor and take action to work with the government to combat child labor in Rwanda.

## **III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME**

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

### **A. Approach**

The evaluation approach will be primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used as the timeframe does not allow for quantitative surveys to be conducted.

Quantitative data will be drawn from project reports to the extent that it is available and incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (<http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children ([http://www.unicef.org/media/media\\_tools\\_guidelines.html](http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html)).
3. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
4. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.
5. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and the progress of implementation in each locality.
6. Site visits should include focus groups with KILONGA (direct beneficiaries), focus groups with parents involved in the WORTH groups (indirect beneficiaries) witness mentoring activities, visit professional groups, visit a Worth group meeting and visit parents' RGA.

## **B. Final Evaluation Team**

The evaluation team will consist of:

1. The international evaluator.

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

2. One or more research assistants/interpreters fluent in French and any major tribal languages spoken in the research areas. The research assistant(s) will travel with the evaluator.

One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process.

The responsibility of the research assistant/interpreter in each provincial locality is to ensure that the evaluator is understood by the stakeholders as much as possible, and that the information gathered is relayed accurately to the evaluator.

### **C. Data Collection Methodology**

The evaluation aims to learn from the past project experiences and study how efforts can be further improved in future or on-going similar projects. Specifically, this means that the evaluation will determine what should be avoided, what can be improved, and what can be added so that the elimination of the worst forms of child labor can more effectively be achieved.

The evaluator sees the evaluation process as a joint effort to identify the key conclusions that can be drawn in each of these areas. Despite this overall approach the evaluator will be ultimately responsible for the evaluation process including the report writing.

The evaluator will include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor:

<http://www.ilo.org/ipецinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026> and UNICEF and principles for Ethical Reporting on Children:  
[http://www.unicef.org/media/media\\_tools\\_guidelines.html](http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).

The evaluation will also adhere to the OECD/DACe Evaluation quality guidelines and definitions as indicated in the documents on the following websites:

[www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/55/0/44798177.pdf) and  
<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/12/56/41612905.pdf>.

The evaluation team will thus adhere to confidentiality and other ethical considerations throughout. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach. Although a consistent approach will be followed in each project site to ensure grounds for a good qualitative analysis, the evaluation will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries. Additional questions may be posed that are not included in the TOR, while ensuring that key information requirements are met.

To ensure a thorough evaluation, the evaluator will use a combination of methods so that a well-rounded evaluation can be carried out:

- Preparation of detailed methodology including question guidelines written in French.
- Document review including of direct project related documents, and project tools, but also of the overall context in Rwanda regarding education, child labor issues, the Rwandan National Action Plan to Achieve the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor and other potential issues of importance. The evaluator will also review documentation to understand the current political situation in Rwanda to ensure that she understands the impact it may have on the project and the evaluation process overall. Further review of the impact of the situation will be conducted during the field mission.

- Individual interviews and/or focus group discussions with stakeholders from a wide range of groups including national, provincial, district and local education policy makers and providers, local authorities, project partners and other agencies working on child labor in the country (including within the ILO Rwanda office), beneficiaries, families, Community Activists, educators, teachers, community based organizations, and communities, parents and children. Due to the existing political situation in the country
- Individual and small group discussions with project staff in the central office and with partner NGOs.
- Observation of the stakeholders and their work in different settings as well as their networking actions. This will be combined with field visits and interviews.
- Stakeholder meeting where initial findings will be presented, discussed, and enriched with additional input from the participants. The workshop will reinforce the commitment and engagement of stakeholders in the REACH project and identify best practices, lessons learned and recommendations for continuation of stakeholder engagement for sustainability. The all day workshop with small group sessions should be facilitated by participants from government and key actors with feedback to plenary sessions.

The evaluator will first meet with senior project staff in Kigali—after arriving in the country—to finalize the issues to address and obtain their further input into the evaluation process. This will be followed by initial joint discussions on the evaluation subjects. Further individual meetings will be held in Kigali with the project director, monitoring and evaluation staff and other relevant stakeholders including key REACH personnel.

After this is completed, the evaluator will make field visits to meet with local stakeholders and observe actions.

Locations for field visits will be identified in line with guidelines provided by the evaluator. These include the need to ensure that stakeholders from successful implementation sites, as well as those where the project faced more challenges will be included. Parents' and children's anonymity and privacy will be respected and any issues they raise will be handled with sensitivity to their personal situation and in line with the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children.

Children will be selected for the focus group interviews by the international evaluator with the help of the research assistant/interpreter. The research assistant/interpreter will, as randomly, as possible select 5-8 children from a larger group. In some cases, where random selection is not possible the team will exceptionally accept to meet a group that is pre-selected. In this case, the project will ensure that the children represent a good sample of children who have been successful through the project as well as those that continue to face challenges.

The evaluator will meet with the senior project staff on the evening of the 17th of June 2012 for an initial discussion of principal findings that will be presented at a stakeholder's workshop. The evaluator will also obtain information on any rectification of facts that need to be considered during the presentation the following day.

The stakeholder workshop will take place on the 10th of December, 2012.

The stakeholder workshop presentation will concentrate on good practices identified at the time of the evaluation, lessons learned and remaining gaps as identified by all the stakeholders. The role of the evaluator is to analyze and represent the viewpoints of the various individuals and documents consulted. The evaluator will use her experience from similar evaluations to share and enrich understanding of the information gathered during the evaluation. The presentation in the workshop will be constructive in format and will not dwell on personal or small project details.

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

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

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) exercise on the project's performance in the form of group work. Participants will be asked to identify lessons learnt as well as areas for improvement for future projects.
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

Individual stakeholder participants will be provided with an opportunity to respond and provide additional input into the evaluation conclusions during the workshop. The evaluator has tried this approach in the past and has found it successful. Some small group discussions will also take place. The exact program for the workshop will be decided jointly with the senior project staff during the first week of the evaluation.

Following the workshop, the evaluator will have a final meeting with senior project staff to discuss the overall conclusions of the workshop and the evaluation. After the return of the evaluator from the field, she will draft the first version of the evaluation report. The report will be forwarded for comments and finalized after receiving feedback on the first version.

Information will be collected through interviews which will be triangulated with information collected through observations and analysis of documentation (D). Awareness raising materials (posters, videos, etc. will also be analyzed.)

Child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children will be used following the ILO-IPEC and UNICEF guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor and for reporting.

Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.

Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.

#### **D. Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality**

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

#### **E. Stakeholder Meeting**

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

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

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

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible SWOT exercise on the project's performance in the form of group work. Participants will be asked to identify lessons learnt as well as areas for improvement for future projects.
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project.

## **F. Limitations**

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

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

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

## **G. Timetable**

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

<b>Task</b>	<b>Work Days</b>	<b>Date</b>
Evaluation launch call	1	Thu 10/4/12
First draft of TOR submitted to USDOL	1	Wed 10/31/12
Proposed evaluator candidates, with ICF's recommendation	1	Thu 10/18/12
Logistics call	1	Tue 10/16/12
Minutes from logistics call	1	Wed 10/17/12
Evaluator selected	1	Fri 10/19/12
Solicit input from Grantee on TOR	1	Fri 10/26/12
Identify a list of stakeholders	1	Fri 10/19/12
Finalize field itinerary and stakeholder list for workshop	1	Mon 11/12/12
Cable clearance information submitted to USDOL	1	Mon 11/5/12
Finalize TOR with USDOL and submit to Grantee	1	Mon 11/12/12
Fieldwork	17	Sun 11/25/12 - Tue 12/11/12
Post-fieldwork debrief call	1	Wed 12/19/12
Draft report to ICF for QC review	9	Mon 12/24/12
Draft report to USDOL & Grantee for 48 hour review	9	Thu 1/4/13
Comments due to ICF	1	Tue 1/9/13
Report revised and sent to ICF	1	Wed 1/10/13
Revised report to USDOL	1	Wed 1/10/13
DOL and stakeholder comments following full 2-week review	10	Wed 1/24/13
Final report to USDOL	5	Wed 1/31/13
Final approval of report	5	Wed 2/7/13
Editing	12	Wed 2/25/13
508 compliance review	10	Wed 3/11/13
Final edited report to COTR	1	Thu 3/12/13

Task	Work Days	Date
Final edited report to grantee and key stakeholders	1	Thu 3/13/13

#### **IV. EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES**

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

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/promising practices, and three key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
- V. Project Description
- VI. Findings
  - A. Relevance - Findings - answering the TOR questions
  - B. Effectiveness - Findings – answering the TOR questions
  - C. Efficiency - Findings – answering the TOR questions
  - D. Impact - Findings – answering the TOR questions
  - E. Sustainability - Findings – answering the TOR questions
- VII. Recommendations and Conclusions
  - A. Key Recommendations - critical for successfully meeting project objectives
  - B. Other Recommendations – as needed
    1. Relevance
    2. Effectiveness
    3. Efficiency
    4. Impact
    5. Sustainability
- VIII. Annexes - including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

The total length of the report should be a minimum of 30 pages and a maximum of 50 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

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

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

**After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to ICF Macro on January 7, 2013, as indicated in the above timetable. A final draft is due one week after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT and stakeholders and is anticipated to be due on March 14, 2013, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in English.**

## V. EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

ICF has contracted with Dr. Mei Zegers to conduct this evaluation. Mei Zegers has a Ph.D. in the Social Sciences (Free University of Amsterdam). Her experience lies within the fields of education and training; gender issues, particularly mainstreaming; child labor; organization and analysis and institutional networking; livelihoods/informal economy; and community development. She has been a Team Leader having led groups of up to 30 in design, monitoring and evaluation/impact assessment of projects and organizations, and quantitative and qualitative research. Dr. Zegers has worked on several USDOL projects for ICF where she successfully served as Team Leader on the Final Evaluation Child Labor and Education Project in Pakistan; the Final Evaluation Child Labor and Education project including children trafficked for commercial and sexual exploitation and domestic labor in Indonesia, the Philippines and Zambia; and Final Evaluation child labor and education including children trafficked for domestic labor and agricultural work.

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