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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On September 30, 2007, DevTech Systems, Inc. (DevTech), in association with Acción para la Educación Básica (EDUCA) and Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC), received a 3.5-year cooperative agreement worth US$4 million from the United States Department of Labor (USDOL). DevTech and its associates implemented an Education Initiative (EI) project in the Dominican Republic aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and by supporting the goals of the USDOL EI project. This project was designed to build upon a previous child labor EI project that developed an innovative and well-received school enrichment program, Espacios para Crecer (EpC, or Spaces for Growth). The project, implemented by a network of international and local non-governmental organizations (which participate as members of the “EpC onsortium”), began on September 30, 2007, and is scheduled for completion on February 28, 2011. It is important to note that the EpC Consortium predates the Association (of DevTech, EDUCA, INTEC) and will continue to exist even after the end of the grant period. The association of DevTech, INTEC, and EDUCA is a sub-set of the EpC Consortium. The Association comprises the grantees of this cooperative agreement and is responsible for executing and complying with its terms.

Since 2001, the U.S. Congress has provided some US$269 million to USDOL to support the EI, which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. A wide range of international organizations and NGOs, as well as for-profit firms, are implementing these projects. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn from labor and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the project seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitive child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn or prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work.

In the Dominican Republic, as in many other countries, the issue of child labor is a consequence of extreme economic inequality and a weak educational system. Most child laborers work in the informal sector, and in areas such as domestic service, construction, transportation, and tourism. In rural areas, children work mostly in agriculture, in the production of coffee, rice, sugarcane, tomatoes, potatoes, and garlic, where they are exposed to hazardous conditions and long hours. According to USDOL reports and interviewees, commercial sexual exploitation (CSE) of children is also a problem, especially in tourist locations and major urban areas, and the Dominican Republic is a source and destination country for trafficking of children for CSE. Migrant and trafficked children from Haiti also work in exploitive labor. In what is likely a conservative measure, the 2000 International Labour Organizatio (ILO) Survey of Child Labor...
found that approximately 437,000 children and adolescents in the Dominican Republic were working, with rates of child labor being higher among boys, adolescents, and in rural sectors.\(^1\)

To aid efforts to address these problems, USDOL has provided US$16,200,170 to combat exploitive child labor in the Dominican Republic, as well as an additional US$27,422,102 on regional efforts in Central America that included the Dominican Republic. The Government of the Dominican Republic has participated in several country-level and regional projects funded by USDOL. The Government of the Dominican Republic has also ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, ratified ILO Conventions 182 and 138, and is a participant country with ILO’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour. The minimum age of employment in the country is 14, although the law provides exceptions for child actors and entertainers and for some types of light harvesting work within family and community practices. These types of exceptions must be approved by the Ministry of Labor. There are special restrictions for minors under 16 years old with respect to night work and the maximum labor hours per day. Children under 18 are prohibited from hazardous work and some other areas of work, such as sugarcane handling, gaming, and certain work in hotels, though exceptions can be made for apprenticeships. Forced labor is prohibited by law; the law also prohibits and sanctions the trafficking of persons and child prostitution.\(^2\)

The country has made some efforts with regard to combating child labor. The Ministry of Labor in the Dominican Republic, in coordination with *Consejo Nacional para Niños y Adolescentes* (CONANI, or the National Council for Children and Adolescents), is responsible for preventing child labor and enforcing related laws. The Dominican Republic Secretariat of Labor dedicates labor inspectors to investigate child labor complaints, and the national judiciary has lawyers dedicated to prosecuting child labor violations. The Office of the Attorney General also investigates and prosecutes crimes related to trafficking in persons. The Government of the Dominican Republic has two national plans to address child labor and CSE: the National Plan to Eradicate the Worst Forms of Child Labor (2006–2016) and an Action Plan for the Eradication of Abuse and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls, and Adolescents. The Office of the First Lady coordinates *Programa Progresando* (the Progressing Program), which provides income-generation opportunities to parents of children at risk for CSE. The country’s Agricultural Bank has also included a clause in its loan agreements that prohibits recipients from using child labor and guarantees that business owners send their children to school.\(^3\)

This is the context in which the project operates. As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project targets 4,250 children for withdrawal and 4,250 children for prevention from exploitive child labor by providing education and training opportunities through the EpC project. The project targets children age 6–14 and adolescents age 14–17 who are involved in or at risk of exploitive labor. Priority sectors and areas are (1) agriculture (on the Haitian border, in the South, East, and Northeast “Cibao”); (2) urban informal, domestic, and illicit work (in San Francisco de Macoris, Santo Domingo, Santiago/Puerto Plata, and San Pedro de Macorís);


\(^2\) Ibid.

and (3) illicit activities in tourist and beach areas (Samana, Las Terrenas, Boca Chica, and Eastern region) including trafficking, street sales, and CSE.

Like the midterm evaluation, the final evaluation examines issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, and replicability, and it provides recommendations for current and future projects. The evaluation was carried out by one international evaluator: political scientist José Antonio Lucero. In consultation with ICF Macro and the project staff, Lucero formulated the methodology for the evaluation. During his time in the Dominican Republic, Lucero was responsible for (1) conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; (2) analyzing the evaluation material gathered; and (3) presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting. Fieldwork for the final evaluation took place November 10–23, 2010.

The evaluator found that most of the recommendations from the midterm evaluation were acted upon, and the project has attained a high level of success in achieving its objectives. Overall, the project was very well designed to address the five goals that orient USDOL-supported efforts: the withdrawal and prevention of children and adolescents (*niños, niñas, y adolescentes* [NNAs]) from labor, the strengthening of policies, raising awareness, supporting research, and ensuring long-term sustainability. First, through hundreds of project centers across a wide geographic range, the project provided direct services to over 15,000 NNAs, allowing the project to withdraw and prevent a number of NNAs well beyond its stated numerical goals. Second, the existence of the EpC consortium and close work with the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Education positioned the project well to meet the goals of strengthening policy, raising awareness, and working toward long-term sustainability. Third, through the steady improvement of monitoring and evaluation systems, the project was able to create a reliable set of instruments and a database on the conditions of child labor and the effectiveness of project interventions.

Nevertheless, the final evaluation found that there are some concerns with certain aspects of the coordination and implementation of project activities, as well as worries about project sustainability. To that end, this evaluation makes the following recommendations as an input for the final months and weeks of the project, as well as for the elaboration of new projects in the future.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Work toward creating a database of the personnel trained by the project. In order to take advantage of the human capital and professionalization that the project has generated, a record of the network of facilitators and coordinators should be kept by the EpC consortium, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Labor, and other stakeholders. In addition to providing more recognition to those who contributed much to this national effort, keeping a record of such individuals can strengthen future efforts and provide a readymade reservoir of human capital.
2. Use graduations and other “closing” ceremonies to generate alliances among local and national actors. In addition to inviting relevant representations from the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Education, these events should also include local political and business leaders. The local media should also be invited to record any commitments or pledges of support.

3. Taking advantage of the expressions of support made by representatives of the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Education at the stakeholders meeting, greater efforts should be made to increase the role of ministries in EpC consortium activities.

4. Building on the significant private sector participation that has already been part of project activities, an effort should be made by the EpC consortium to bring in additional firms, especially actors from the tourism sector, who have thus far been noticeably absent in their participation in campaigns against child labor.

5. Given the valuable data collected by the monitoring and evaluation specialist from INTEC, these data should be made available for additional research projects by INTEC students, taking, of course, appropriate precautions to protect the privacy of project beneficiaries.

6. Increase work with parents. While not the only possibility, one possible way to increase contact with parents is through offering Espacios para Emprender (Spaces for Entrepreneurship) vocational training to parents of beneficiaries, especially mothers. Several interviewees noted that increased efforts needed to be made to include parents in educational initiatives. One coordinator noted that the project was one that dealt primarily with symptoms, not causes. While deep causes of child labor are difficult to address with any single project, shifting the focus of interventions from individual NNAs to families would be a realistic and reasonable way to move toward more holistic solutions.

7. Strengthen not only NGOs, but local communities. The project staff members correctly note that working with many Dominican NGOs helps strengthen their organizational and technical capacities. As community ownership is an especially important concern, any additional efforts to enhance the capacity of community organizations could have important implications for project sustainability.

8. Integrate psychological services. Given the physical and structural violence that many NNA beneficiaries experience, several project coordinators and facilitators were in agreement that psychological services should be made available to NNAs and be part of future project design.

9. Coordinate calendars of USDOL, the project, and the Dominican school system. As the project activities end, they do so in the middle of a school year. Many parents expressed their concern about this, and it reflects a structural difficulty in coordinating USDOL funding calendars with local academic calendars. USDOL might consider alternative funding schemes; perhaps projects could be expanded to 4.5 years, allowing some flexibility in initiating and concluding program activities.
10. Reconsider the payment system, which obliges subcontractors to provide full reporting before receiving payments. As this generated considerable tension among subcontractors and as there are alternative methodologies that have been successfully tried in the country, other strategies for ensuring or incentivizing project compliance should be considered.

11. Finally, given the central role that facilitators play in the project, additional compensation should be considered. This may also address the high turnover rate of facilitators. Compensation may also take various forms, including university scholarships and internships, perhaps supported by private sector firms that have been supporting project activities.
I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The final evaluation of the Espacios para Crecer (EpC, or Spaces for Growth) project in the Dominican Republic was commissioned by the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) as an independent process and conducted under contract to ICF Macro. The final evaluation is specified as a requirement in the project document and cooperative agreement between USDOL and the grantee. Implemented by a network of international and local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), which participate as members of the “EpC consortium,” the project began on September 30, 2007, and is scheduled for completion on February 28, 2011. It is important to note that the EpC Consortium predates the Association (of DevTech, EDUCA, INTEC) and will continue to exist even after the end of the grant period. The association of DevTech, INTEC, and EDUCA is a sub-set of the EpC Consortium. The Association comprises the grantees of this cooperative agreement, and is responsible for executing and complying with its terms.

1.2 EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

This evaluation provides USDOL, DevTech, EDUCA, INTEC, the members of the EpC consortium, and other project stakeholders with an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of project implementation. Via the stakeholders meeting, the evaluation offered some concrete recommendations for final adjustments as the project ended. Identifying lessons learned and good practices, this report also explores the contributions of this project, which may be helpful in the expansion of the project’s benefits and the development of future projects.

Per the terms of reference for the evaluation (Annex A), developed by USDOL in conjunction with the project team and in consultation with the evaluator, the scope of the evaluation includes an assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL cooperative agreement with DevTech. The evaluation assesses the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project documents.

Specifically, the evaluation examines issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, and replicability, and it provides recommendations for current and future projects. The purpose of the evaluation is to—

1. Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so;

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 project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations; and

6. Help the project continue building and raising awareness about child labor and exploitation in the Dominican Republic and to raise awareness of the EpC and EpE programs.

This evaluation also explores models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in the Dominican Republic and elsewhere. It serves as an important accountability function for USDOL and DevTech, and recommendations focus around lessons learned and good practices from which future projects can learn.

The questions to be addressed are organized in five categories: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. These categories are defined as follows:

- **Relevance**: Consideration of the relevance of the project design to the context of child labor and to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country; the relevance of the strategies and internal logic; and the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL.

- **Effectiveness**: The extent to which the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those objectives.

- **Efficiency**: Analysis as to whether the strategies employed by the project are efficient in terms of resources used (inputs) as compared with its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs).

- **Impact**: Assessment of the positive and negative changes—intended and unintended, direct and indirect—as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country.

- **Sustainability**: Assessment of whether the project has taken steps to ensure that approaches and benefits continue after completion of the project, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations.

Annex B lists the evaluation questions and provides page references where each is addressed in this report. All questions posed in the terms of reference, under each of the themes, above are addressed in the evaluation.
1.3 **EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

1.3.1 **Evaluation Team**

The evaluation was carried out by one international evaluator: political scientist José Antonio Lucero. In consultation with ICF Macro and the project staff, Lucero formulated the methodology for the evaluation. Before conducting fieldwork, Lucero reviewed relevant project documents and had preliminary phone conversations with the USDOL project manager and Dominican Republic project director. During his time in the Dominican Republic, Lucero was responsible for visiting project sites; conducting interviews with project personnel, stakeholders and beneficiaries; and facilitating other data collection processes. The evaluator was also responsible for an analysis of the evaluation material gathered and for presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholders meeting.

1.3.2 **Evaluation Approach**

Given the time allotted for the study (2 weeks of fieldwork), the methodology of the evaluation was primarily qualitative, as the timeframe did not allow quantitative surveys to be conducted. Quantitative data, however, were drawn from project reports to the extent available and were incorporated into the report. The evaluation approach was independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff sometimes provided introductions in the field, but they were not present during field interviews. The following additional principles were also applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives were triangulated for as many of the evaluation questions as possible.

2. Efforts were made to include parents’ and children’s voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the guidelines of the International Labour Organization’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) on research with children on the worst forms of child labor[^4] and the United Nations Children’s Fund’s (UNICEF’s) Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children.[^5]

3. Gender and cultural sensitivity were integrated in the evaluation approach. In interviews and site visits, the evaluator took into account gender distributions and dynamics. Additionally, issues of race and nationality received special consideration, especially where program activities operated in communities with Haitian migrant populations.

4. Consultations incorporated a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowed additional questions to be posed that are not included in the terms of reference, while ensuring that key information requirements were met.


[^5]: Available at [http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html](http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).
5. As far as possible, a consistent approach was followed in each project site, with adjustments made for the different actors involved, activities conducted, and progress of implementation in each locality.

1.3.3 Evaluation Preparation

Before the field visit, the evaluator reviewed project and other background documents provided by USDOL through ICF Macro. Project briefings were facilitated by ICF Macro with relevant USDOL staff and DevTech, EDUCA, and INTEC management teams. During the preparation phase, the evaluator, together with project staff and ICF Macro, confirmed the evaluation team membership and the stakeholders to be interviewed. Together, they then set up a preliminary schedule for the visit. The evaluators prepared a methodology, including the source of data and method of collecting information for each evaluation question.

The evaluator conducted field visits in 7 of the 15 zones in which the project works (Samana, Duarte, Santiago, Azua, Haina, San Juan de la Maguana, and Santo Domingo). Though time constraints made it impossible to visit all project sites and zones, efforts were made to select schools, referral centers, and homes in each zone that varied in terms of the duration of project activities, services provided, age and gender of beneficiaries, rural or urban context, and the perceived success of project activities.

Additionally, the evaluator met with regional education and community authorities, and with officials from the Ministry of Labor, the Ministry of Education, and ILO-IPEC.

1.3.4 Schedule

As detailed in Annex D, desk review of project documents began in October 2010 and continued through November 2010. The fieldwork was conducted between November 8 and November 22, 2010.

1.3.5 Interviews with Stakeholders

Questions for each stakeholder group were based on the evaluation questions and oriented to cover the issues of relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency, and sustainability, as well as challenges encountered by the implementing agency and recommendations to improve implementation.

The first 2 days of the evaluation were spent meeting with and interviewing project teams in Santo Domingo. During the remainder of the evaluator’s time in the field, he conducted field visits to various zones of the project and interviewed as many stakeholders as possible.

Interviews were conducted with DevTech, EDUCA, and INTEC project teams, and various subcontractors including staff of Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (Association of Absent Samanenses), Universidad Católica Nordestana (Catholic University of Northeast), Catholic Relief Services, Acción Callejera (Street Action), Plan International, Fundación Sur Futuro

---

6 A list of documents reviewed can be found in Annex C.
(Foundation on the Future—a recently added, self-sustaining partner), ENTRENA, World Vision, and Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral (Dominican Institute for Integral Development). Interviews were also conducted with school directors/principals, teachers working with the project and providing project services, parents of children participating in the project, direct beneficiaries (children participating in all educational services), volunteers working with the project, local authorities, representatives from the Ministry of Education, ILO-IPEC, and NGOs working with the project. The evaluator asked to meet with representatives of the Ministry of Labor, but due to scheduling problems, these interviews were canceled. Ministry of Labor personnel did, however, attend the final stakeholders meeting. A list of persons consulted in the evaluation is given in Annex E.

Additionally, the evaluator observed classroom dynamics, activities at the EpC and Espacios para Emprender (EpE, or Spaces for Entrepreneurship) events, and infrastructure and environment of educational sites. The evaluator also participated in one meeting of the EpC consortium coordinators, held in Santo Domingo.

### 1.3.6 Stakeholder Workshop

Following the field visit, a national stakeholders workshop was convened in Santo Domingo. The purpose of the workshop was to present the initial findings of the evaluation and emerging recommendations, to seek further input and recommendations from stakeholders toward improving the final implementation of the project, and to seek further input and evaluations toward the implementation of future projects.

The meeting was attended by approximately 50 people, including representatives from the Ministry of Labor, the Ministry of Education, and the EpC network. A representative from USDOL also participated. During the meeting, the evaluator presented preliminary findings followed by an open discussion, which included involvement by stakeholders and project teams.

A list of agencies represented at the stakeholder meeting is included as Annex F.

### 1.3.7 Analysis and Conclusions

The conclusions drawn in the report are based on analysis of project technical progress and other reports; observations of project implementation; and interviews with child beneficiaries, stakeholders, and project staff. These observations were collected through 15 group interviews with beneficiaries, 49 individual interviews with stakeholders, and 20 interviews with project staff. While some of the conclusions represent the judgment of the evaluator based on the array of information available, the report also indicates, where appropriate, the source of a particular viewpoint, noting wherever possible the existence of consensus among stakeholders as well as points of contention.
1.4 LIMITATIONS

Given the short time allotted for fieldwork, the observations and conclusions included in this report are necessarily partial. There was not sufficient time to visit all the project sites and, given the substantial distances that exist between centers, the time spent in any one place was necessarily limited. Additionally, as with all preannounced evaluations, the presentation of project results is not necessarily the same as the results that could be gauged by surprise visits and longer-term, more in-depth research. Nevertheless, this evaluation identifies patterns that emerged in spite of differences in region and service, as well as some exceptional or unique circumstances that are of particular importance.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Section II provides an overview of the project. Later sections address the findings of the evaluation with respect to relevance (Section III), effectiveness (Section IV), efficiency (Section V), impact (Section VI), and sustainability (Section VII). The final section offers conclusions and recommendations (Section VIII).
II PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 CONTEXT AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, an agency of USDOL. OCFT activities include researching 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 US$780 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services

2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school

3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures

4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor

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—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at risk of entering exploitive labor.

USDOL reports annually to Congress on the performance of its programs. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees are accurate, relevant, complete, reliable, timely, valid, and verifiable.

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

2.1.1 Project Context

In the Dominican Republic, as in many other countries, the issue of child labor is a consequence of extreme economic inequality and a weak educational system. Most child laborers work in the informal sector, and in areas such as domestic service, construction, transportation, and tourism. In rural areas, children work mostly in agriculture, in the production of coffee, rice, sugarcane, tomatoes, potatoes, and garlic, where they are exposed to hazardous conditions and long hours. According to USDOL reports and interviewees, commercial sexual exploitation (CSE) of children is also a problem, especially in tourist locations and major urban areas, and the Dominican Republic is a source and destination country for trafficking of children for CSE. Migrant and trafficked children from Haiti also work in exploitive labor. In what is likely a conservative measure, the 2000 Survey of Child Labor estimated that approximately 437,000 children and adolescents in the Dominican Republic find themselves working, with rates of child labor being higher among boys, adolescents, and in rural sectors.7

Contributing to this problem is an unfortunately weak formal primary and secondary educational system. A 2009 study, which compared student performance in most of the countries in Latin American and the Caribbean, found that children from the Dominican Republic consistently had the worst test scores in math, science, and reading. Additionally, the Dominican Republic is one of the countries that spends the least per capita on education in the region. Though the law stipulates that 4% of the country’s gross domestic product must be dedicated to education, government expenditure is considerably less than that amount despite facing large infrastructural problems, including an estimated 30,000 deficit in classrooms and the fact that most Dominican elementary students are in school for less than 2.5 hours a day.8 Thus, it is not surprising to find graphs comparing the national percentages of students scoring in the lowest level of performance in science tests (Figure 1).
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To aid efforts to address these problems, USDOL has provided US$16,200,170 to combat exploitive child labor in the Dominican Republic, as well as an additional US$27,422,102 on regional efforts in Central America that included the Dominican Republic. The Government of the Dominican Republic participated in country-level and regional projects funded by USDOL, including the 39-month, US$2.7 million ILO-IPEC project to support the Government’s Time-Bound Program to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor. The project ended in December 2009, and it withdrew 3,171 children and prevented 2,371 children from exploitive labor. The Government of the Dominican Republic participated in a 7-year US$8.8 million project implemented by ILO-IPEC, which concluded in April 2009 and sought to combat CSE through a variety of activities, including capacity building and legal reform. The project withdrew or prevented 1,888 children from CSE. The Dominican Government participated in a 4-year US$5.7 million EI regional project called Primero Aprendo (First I Learn) and implemented by CARE; the project worked to strengthen the capacity of governments and civil society to combat child labor through education. This project also withdrew or prevented 4,105 children from exploitive child labor.9

The Government of the Dominican Republic has ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, ratified ILO Conventions 182 and 138, and is an ILO-IPEC participant country. The minimum age of employment in the country is 14, although the law provides exceptions for child actors and entertainers, and for some types of light harvesting work within
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family and community practices. These types of exceptions must be approved by the Ministry of Labor. Minors are not allowed to perform night work, and hours of work per day for children under 16 are limited. Children under 18 are prohibited from hazardous work and some other areas of work, such as sugarcane handling, gaming, and certain work in hotels, though exceptions can be made for apprenticeships. Forced labor is prohibited by law; the law also prohibits and sanctions trafficking of persons and child prostitution.\(^{10}\)

The U.S. Department of State reports that the country has made some efforts with regard to combating child labor. The Ministry of Labor in the Dominican Republic, in coordination with Consejo Nacional para Niños y Adolescentes (CONANI, or the National Council for Children and Adolescents), is responsible for preventing child labor and enforcing related laws. The Dominican Republic Secretariat of Labor dedicates labor inspectors to investigating child labor complaints, and the national judiciary also has lawyers dedicated to prosecuting child labor violations. The Office of the Attorney General investigates and prosecutes trafficking of persons crimes. The Government of the Dominican Republic has two national plans to address child labor and CSE—the National Plan to Eradicate the Worst Forms of Child Labor (2006–2016) and an Action Plan for the Eradication of Abuse and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls, and Adolescents. The Office of the First Lady coordinates Programa Progresando (the Progressing Program), which provides income-generation opportunities to parents of children at risk for CSE. The country’s Agricultural Bank has also included a clause in its loan agreements that prohibits recipients from using child labor and guarantees that business owners send their children to school.\(^{11}\)

### 2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

On September 30, 2007, DevTech, in association with EDUCA and INTEC, received a 3.5-year cooperative agreement worth US$4 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in the Dominican Republic aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitive child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the five goals of the USDOL program. This project was designed to build upon a previous child labor EI project that developed an innovative and well-received school enrichment program—EpC. DevTech was awarded the project through a competitive bid process. Implemented by a network of international and local non-governmental organizations (which participate as members of the EpC consortium), the project began on September 30, 2007, and is scheduled for completion on February 28, 2011. It is important to note that the EpC Consortium predates the Association (of DevTech, EDUCA, INTEC) and will continue to exist even after the end of the grant period. The association of DevTech, INTEC, and EDUCA is a sub-set of the EpC Consortium. The Association comprises the grantees of this cooperative agreement and is responsible for executing and complying with its terms.

As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project targets 4,250 children for withdrawal and 4,250 children for prevention from exploitive child labor by providing education and training opportunities through the EpC program. The project targets children age 6–14 and adolescents age 14–17 who are involved in exploitive labor. Priority sectors and areas are (1) agriculture
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\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. 112.

\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 112–113.
(on the Haitian border, in the South, East and Northeast “Cibao”); (2) urban informal, domestic, and illicit work (in San Francisco de Macoris, Santo Domingo, Santiago/Puerto Plata, San Pedro de Macoris); and (3) illicit activities in tourist and beach areas (Samana, Las Terrenas, Boca Chica, and Eastern region) including trafficking, street sales, and CSE.

The project’s development objective is to contribute to the elimination of exploitive child labor in the Dominican Republic. Specific objectives are to—

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

Some of the project’s approaches and strategies to its direct interventions, awareness raising, and capacity building include—

- Building upon the previous child labor EI project that developed EpC;
- Implementing additional EpCs through NGOs and a university;
- Developing a comprehensive adolescent EpC model (EpE);
- Improving data collection on education and child labor at the national level;
- Raising awareness on the dangers of child labor;
- Encouraging corporate social responsibility;
- Working with business associations to develop codes of conduct on exploitive child labor;
- Collaborating with university business departments; and
- Developing public-private sector relationships.
2.2.1 Midterm Evaluation

A midterm evaluation was conducted in April and May of 2009 by an independent international consultant. The evaluation consisted of document review; individual and group interviews with project staff, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders; site visits (observation) in San Juan de la Maguana, Santo Domingo, Nagua, San Francisco de Macorís, and Dajabón; and a stakeholders workshop.

The evaluator found that the design of the project was relevant and appropriate for the withdrawal and prevention of children from exploitive labor. The evaluator spoke to many beneficiaries who had been withdrawn from hazardous work or work that kept them out of school and who were now enrolled in educational activities. The evaluator found that the project also met the needs of its beneficiaries, many of whom were overage for their grade level, by providing leveling services. A best practice identified by the evaluation is that the project does not require its direct beneficiaries to have a birth certificate for them to gain access to the spaces. The evaluator found problems with finding spaces for the classes and with lack of awareness among parents and communities about the problems of exploitive child labor. The evaluator also identified areas for the project to pursue sustainability.

The key recommendations from the midterm evaluation were as follows:

- Train project facilitators in skills for teaching reading and writing to children;
- Better utilize ILO-IPEC materials and resources and improve collaboration between the project and ILO-IPEC and UNICEF;
- Review the agreement between the project and Instituto Nacional de Formación Técnico Profesional (INFOTEP, or the National Institute of Technical-Vocational Training) to solve delays in vocational training;
- Finish the project management information system; and
- Revise the daily communication and dynamics between ENTRENA and the consortium, and improve the consortium’s capacity to capture funds, considering the funding opportunities existing in the country.
III EVALUATION FINDINGS—RELEVANCE

3.1 FINDINGS

3.1.1 Analysis of Project Assumptions and Strategies

As its point of departure, the project has established an excellent understanding of the magnitude of the problem of the worst forms of child labor. Using data from Encuesta Nacional del Trabajo Infantil (ENTI, or the National Survey of Child Labor), the project had an appreciation for the quantitative scope of the problem. According to the 2000 ENTI survey data, the problem affected 436,000 children and adolescents, as well as a qualitative understanding of the kinds of labor, in both urban and rural areas, that was putting these children and adolescents at risk.12

Because of economic hardship and the serious deficiencies of the formal educational system, many students fall behind in their studies or abandon school altogether. In many cases, students would face embarrassing situations of being in the same grade with much younger children and lack even basic reading and writing skills.

Using age-appropriate educational strategies to reach both young students (age 6–14) and adolescents (age 14–17), the project relied on tested Quantum Learning strategies. These strategies were used to create attractive and effective pedagogical spaces that could provide accelerated education to help younger students who had fallen behind to catch-up with others and return to school. In the case of adolescents, the strategies were also used to help students receive vocational education, which would not only provide them with a great set of marketable skills but also enhance their sense of self-worth and self-esteem.

3.1.2 Identification of Principle Barriers or Obstacles

As will be discussed, the project design took into account the uneven development, which has generated some positive macroeconomic benefits for the economy but has not alleviated—and has even exacerbated—economic inequality and the marginalization of many sectors of the Dominican Republic. Additionally, the project team and consortium members are aware of the tremendous and continuing challenges facing the educational system in the country. As this evaluation was being conducted, the president of EDUCA, the lead organization in the EpC consortium, delivered a well-publicized speech in which he outlined some signs of improvement in education policy, but also signaled the enduring and troubling weakness of the educational system. The educational system exhibits some of the worst indicators in terms of student performance and the lowest levels of per capita expenditures on education in the region (the Dominican Republic dedicates 1.98% of its gross domestic product to education, well below the regional average of 5.1%).13

While economic necessity is unquestionably the underlying cause of much of the problems of child labor in the Dominican Republic, there is also a daunting cultural problem in that child labor is often not seen as a problem, and indeed often seen as a benefit. One local coordinator summarized the view of some parents in the following way: “Many parents say work is not a problem, it is what prevents children from becoming delinquents.” A local community leader remarked that, like many in the community, she herself had worked as a young girl. According to the midterm review, the project had not generated significant changes in the views of local parents up to that point. Parents continued to have positive views of working children, and they continued to have a relative lack of familiarity with legal prohibitions of child labor. However, the parents interviewed for the final review indicated a keen appreciation for what the program had done for their children and for the dangers of child labor. This may have reflected both the increased number of meetings with parents conducted by the EpC consortium members and the regular visits of EpC facilitators to the families of beneficiaries. While the number of parents interviewed for this evaluation was small and not necessarily representative (in a scientific sense), there were clear signs of a community awareness of the project goals.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) team has also generated important data about local contexts and obstacles. For example, the M&E team conducted several surveys in the various provinces where the project has centers. The team has also generated a detailed account of poverty rates, prevalence of worst forms of child labor, as well as levels of awareness and sensitivity among different populations in each province. The data confirm that, in zones with EpCs, levels of reported child labor are lower and levels of awareness are higher than in zones without EpCs, even among parents who do not have children attending EpCs. The same survey finds, however, that awareness is not as high as expected among institutional agents, such as officials at CONANI, the government agency whose portfolio directly involves adolescents and children.14

These data also demonstrate that there are areas and populations that require greater attention, but the M&E instruments and data allow the project a nuanced understanding of those challenges. While there had been some challenges in receiving data from the implementing subcontractors and local centers, M&E specialists commented that one of the outcomes of the project was contributing to the technical capacity of local NGOs and contributing to a greater culture of accountability among grassroots organizations in the Dominican Republic.

An additional consideration that perhaps should be part of the M&E surveys is the level of social capital, an especially important consideration for community “ownership” of EpCs and EpEs that can be enabled by a tradition of local organizing. Some subcontractors placed EpCs in communities where they had helped build the organizational capacity of communities for years and, in some cases, decades. In these communities, the buy-in of the local community was clear. In other communities, where subcontractors had weaker ties to local organizations and leaders, EpCs were usually seen as positive influences, but ones that depended on the generosity of outsiders.

One final and important obstacle concerns the issue of undocumented *niños, niñas, y adolescentes* (NNAs, or boys, girls, and adolescents). Like many other countries in the region, the absence of legal identity documents (e.g., birth certificates) is a widespread problem and creates a serious obstacle for the protection of citizenship rights. The project made it clear to its subcontractors and school administrators that beneficiaries lacking a birth certificate or other forms of documentation should not be barred from participation in the program. Even in the case of EpE training (conducted by INFOTEP, a state agency that requires documentation), the project was able to find a creative solution: identities were verified based on other people’s testimony. Subcontractors also assisted beneficiaries in obtaining legal documents, to the extent possible, in individual cases. The process of acquiring legal documentation is often cumbersome, expensive, and time-consuming. Moreover, if the problem of nondocumentation exists over several generations, there are significant difficulties in obtaining documents for young children. This problem is a broad one and goes beyond the scope of this project.

### 3.1.3 Economic, Political, and Cultural Context and Relationship to Other Initiatives

Project documents demonstrate an accurate assessment of the economic context that is at the heart of the problem the project addresses. The economic context also functions as a potential constraint on project effectiveness. Among the key findings of this evaluation, the following are worth emphasizing:

- Though the economy performed well during the early year of this project, the last few years have been increasingly difficult. In part due to the close relationship with the United States, exemplified by trade agreements like the Dominican Republic–Central America Free Trade Agreement (DR-CAFTA), the recession in the U.S. economy has negatively affected economic performance in the Dominican Republic.

- The Dominican Republic suffers from marked income inequality; the poorest half of the population receives less than one-fifth of the gross domestic product, while the richest 10% enjoys nearly 40% of the national income.

- Rapid economic changes ushered in by DR-CAFTA, a continued growth in tourism and large-scale investments in mining, and the production of sugarcane for ethanol are creating conditions for continued exploitive child labor in the informal sector.\(^{15}\)

Politically, the project articulates its efforts with existing national and international initiatives to address child labor. In addition to the explicit declaration in Article 56 of the Constitution, which classifies the elimination of child labor as a “high national interest,”\(^ {16}\) there are additional national plans already mentioned. One such plan is the National Strategic Plan for Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor (2006–2016), the product of the collaboration between the Government and various organizations, including several members of the EpC consortium. As DevTech was involved in a previous USDOL-funded project, *Primero Aprendo*, in which the
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\(^{15}\) Revised Project Document, June 24, 2009, p. 3.

EpC methodology was successfully utilized, the project has an extensive understanding of the actors and processes involved in education and labor policy. The project also coordinates its efforts with international agencies like ILO-IPEC, and it has participated in regionwide initiatives. Some of these initiatives include ILO’s Hemispheric Agenda on Decent Work, and the Road Map to Eradicate Child Labor by 2020 in Central America and the Dominican Republic. The former was supported by ILO-IPEC, USDOL, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Spanish Agency for International Affairs and Cooperation.\(^7\)

Overall, the project was very well designed to address the goals that orient USDOL-supported efforts for the eradication and prevention of child labor, the strengthening of policies, raising awareness, supporting research, and ensuring long-term sustainability. First, as described in more detail later, through hundreds of project centers across a wide geographic range, the project has been able to provide services to over 15,000 children and adolescents, allowing it to withdraw and prevent a number of children and adolescents well beyond its stated numerical goals. Second, the existence of the EpC consortium and close work with the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Education positioned the project well to meet the goals of strengthening policy, raising awareness, and working toward long-term sustainability. Third, through the steady improvement of M&E systems, the project was able to create a reliable set of instruments and a database on the conditions of child labor and the effectiveness of project interventions.

The project has designed a highly relevant strategy. The project balances a common set of tested educational models (EpC, EpE, and Quantum Learning) with a decentralized structure in which local subcontractors and—even more importantly—teachers adapt to local conditions. As different regions have particular economic activities (e.g., tourist or agricultural activities) and cultural conditions, local actors can respond to local particularities. EpC teachers are encouraged to develop class projects that reflect local traditions and address local problems. These class projects involved cultural activities, like the creation of original songs and plays, which take up issues important to local communities like public health and domestic violence. During classroom visits, the evaluator observed students performing a serious of skits dramatizing some of these issues and revealing their understanding of what healthy community and family practices should be like. These performances included raps and skits on cholera, family dynamics, and child labor.

Additionally, the project has made good progress in disseminating codes of conducts, which (in the words of one interviewee) suggest a more “fundamentalist” attitude toward child labor—that is, taking a very clear and strong stance against the idea and practice of child labor. These codes of conduct strongly encourage companies to make every effort to ensure that their goods and services are not produced or delivered by children or adolescents. EDUCA, an organization that is constituted by 34 business firms and has excellent ties with many others, has done much to spread this sense of corporate responsibility. INTEC, another key associate of the project, has also led by example, designing a code of conduct that requires all entities that supply goods and services to the university to certify that they do not use child labor. Other private sector partners that have been contacted in the dissemination of codes of conduct include the Asociación Nacional de Jóvenes Empresarios (the National Association of Young

Entrepreneurs) and the National Association of Hotels and Restaurants. However, the evaluator did not have the opportunity to meet with representatives of these organizations or gauge the extent of the adoption of these codes. At this stage, adoption of and compliance with these codes rely on self-regulation; thus, the codes lack the force of legal restrictions. Nevertheless, they are important steps in educating employers and society in general about the risks of child labor.

3.2 LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

One of the more notable features of the project is the relatively large number of subcontractors, conceptualized as consortium “partners” or “implementing agents” (gestores). As the midterm review reflects, working with various local organizations allowed the project to take advantage of local knowledge and to contribute to the capacity of several grassroots organizations. That said, not every local organization counted with the same amount of “local knowledge.” While some organizations did indeed have years of experience in a local community, others made the decision to use this opportunity to branch out to new communities where there were no preexisting relationships and often very little existing communal organization, resulting in uneven results across different zones. One lesson from this experience is the importance of taking advantage of existing community relationships and being aware of the social capital available in different communities, a resource that, as discussed later, can be crucial for the sustainability of projects.

Among the many strengths of working with local partners and grassroots organizations, one of the most valuable assets of the local teams is the participation of young people from the community as project technicians or coordinators. While this was not the case with all local subcontractors, in organizations like Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral, Inc. (IDDI—Dominican Institute for Integral Development) and Caminante, the active role played by young people—who had themselves often experienced extremely difficult and even dangerous labor conditions—was a powerful example to beneficiaries and their families. These team members were living examples of both the dangers of child labor and the paths toward professional and personal empowerment.

Echoing one of the findings of the midterm evaluation, the incorporation of NNAs who lack legal documentation and efforts to help these students acquire legal documents remain best practices.
IV EVALUATION FINDINGS—EFFECTIVENESS

4.1 FINDINGS

4.1.1 Achievement of Project Goals

According to the latest available project data (August 2010), the project had reported the following results:

- Number of children or adolescents who had participated in EpCs or EpEs: 15,684
- Number of children or adolescents who were prevented from entering exploitive labor: 7,751
- Number of children or adolescents who were withdrawn from exploitive labor: 4,293
- Total number of children or adolescents who were withdrawn or prevented: 12,044

These numbers go well beyond the original project goals. However, two caveats are in order. First, these are not final numbers. The withdrawal or prevention of many children had not been confirmed at the time of this August 2010 data collection; thus, there is a discrepancy between numbers served and prevented/withdrawn. Accordingly, the final project tallies will result in an even greater number of beneficiaries than these numbers reflect. Second, these numbers do not include the significant number of children who “audited” the EpCs or EpEs—that is, children who were not formally enrolled but, with the permission of the teachers, regularly attended program activities. While some might argue that these children should have not been allowed to participate, it speaks highly of the community members who served as teachers who saw it difficult to turn away children from their own community. One local project coordinator mentioned in an interview that the final graduation ceremonies find a way to honor the work of these children who demonstrated the dedication and commitment to attend these activities, and the teachers who made it possible. Thus, in terms of numbers of direct beneficiaries, there is no question that the project more than met its numerical goals.

The conceptual and pedagogical contribution of the EpC model has been a celebrated success. Briefly, the EpCs are 4-hour afterschool (or “before school”) programs designed to help children age 6–13 improve their school performance, incorporating creativity and play. The EpC has three basic components: academic leveling (focusing on math, reading, and writing), recreation (physical education, music, theater, art, and literature), and life skills. Selected as one of the finalists for the Wise Award from “Transforming Education” and lauded by U.S. Senator Tom Harkin in a speech to ILO, the EpC model has been widely recognized for the strength of its Quantum Learning methodology, as well as its low-cost and high-quality materials. The designers of Quantum Learning methodology describe it as “an integrated school model designed to initiate change, enhance teacher capacity, and increase student achievement.”

---

A primary goal of the model is to create school environments that are engaging and dynamic. Components of the model focus on leadership, researched-based teaching methods, cognitive psychology, learning and life skills, parent and community involvement, and school improvement through evaluation. The model seeks to make content more meaningful and relevant to the lives of students. Quantum Learning is based on three core beliefs: (1) all people can learn; (2) people learn differently; and (3) learning is effective when it is engaging and challenging. Quantum Learning is based on “Eight Keys of Excellence” and “Tenets of Learning,” some of which are—

1. Everything Speaks;
2. Everything is on Purpose;
3. Experience Before Label;
4. Acknowledge Every Effort; and
5. If It’s Worth Learning, It’s Worth Celebrating.\(^\text{20}\)

Classroom visits confirm that these principles are effectively communicated to facilitators and to students, as they are quite literally the handwriting on the wall in each classroom—in the form of colorful posters listing all of these ideas. Literally tens of thousands of students can now attest to its success in helping them accelerate their education in ways that are fun, empowering, and effective. Its adoption by programs outside of the country (in Colombia and Nicaragua) has made it a particularly successful Dominican Republic “export,” something that has given the EpC and this USDOL-funded project visibility in the eyes of government officials and national leaders around the world. This has itself enriched the debate and discussion over education policy in the country and has resulted in significant numbers of people who are now well versed in this methodology.\(^\text{21}\)

While the EpE methodology, meant to impart vocational training to adolescents, has not received the same international acclaim, it too has made some lasting contributions. It addresses a crucial gap in the Dominican Republic, as vocational training is only available to students that can provide certification of completion of the eighth grade, which many adolescents lack. The EpE program provides training in areas such as pastry making, cosmetology, and computer literacy to adolescents who do not necessarily have the requisite educational level or documentation.

The midterm evaluation reported some delays in the vocational training reported by INFOTEP. Interviews with EpE coordinators as well as INFOTEP officials confirmed that there had indeed been some challenges in the EpE trainings. INFOTEP had never previously worked with a population with the profile of the adolescents identified by the project (i.e., students with often-serious deficiencies in their educational preparation, disciplinary issues, and sometimes the absence of legal documentation, such as birth certificates). To its credit, INFOTEP responded to this challenge by revising its training methods and pedagogical approach. The result was a new

\(^{20}\) Available at [http://www.quantumlearning.com/ql_CRS_model.html](http://www.quantumlearning.com/ql_CRS_model.html).

set of guidelines and trained INFOTEP professionals that have expanded the social reach and impact of this institute.

The Ministry of Education has also been closely involved in the implementation of the EpC and EpE methodology, “lending” several educational experts to the project. This not only enhanced the human capital of the DevTech–EDUCA–INTEC management team, but also provided an additional channel for the transmission of best practices from the project to the Dominican Republic. Additionally, this aspect of the project design contributes to the sustainability of project goals.

The project has also produced print and visual materials (including a very effective DVD), which have been used to raise awareness of the issue of exploitive child labor as well as to showcase the achievements of students and teachers that have participated in EpC and EpE activities. The video is effective; it allows the main actors of the programs to give testimony in their own words and also demonstrates dynamic and engaging classroom activities, many of which the evaluator also had the opportunity to observe. As the video conveys clearly the benefits of the program, it is an important way to communicate to parents and communities what the EpC can offer, thus demystifying the program and showcasing its objectives. Additionally, many of the local coordinators maintain excellent connections with local media, something that has resulted in a series of positive stories in local newspapers, which shed additional light on the theme of child labor and the importance of improving educational offerings.

4.1.2 Effectiveness of Monitoring and Evaluation

Overall, M&E worked well in tracking effective withdrawal and prevention. The project’s performance monitoring plan provided the process by which data related to each EpC and EpE should be collected, using a program called SurveyPro. Each subcontractor reported each month the attendance of each child to monitor work status and retention as close to real-time as possible in order to address any potential problems. These monthly reports were complemented by end-of-semester and end-of-term (completion) reports. These data, as well as the data collected at the time of enrollment and updated to coincide with the USDOL reporting requirements, were stored in the project monitoring database. Additionally, the M&E office conducted regular training and site visits of the EpC and EpE centers in order to provide “experience-near” confirmation of subcontractor reports. As an incentive for reports, the project utilized a fixed-unit cost type subcontract that “provided the structure for the subcontractors to report on a monthly basis the number of children served (attendance records)” and based payment on the level of services. More will be said about this practice later, but it did effectively communicate the importance of regular reporting. Though the M&E specialist reported some ongoing challenges with some subcontractors, overall the project team was confident that the M&E data were accurate and reliable. The evaluator found no evidence to the contrary.

Though this payment system was identified as a “best practice” in the midterm review, critical responses from several NGO directors suggest that this finding might be reconsidered. One NGO director, representing an important international NGO with many years of experience in the country and the region, suggested that this payment system served to undermine a feeling of partnership in the consortium. Even worse, it created tensions and resentment among different parts of the consortium. This director suggested that other payment methods be used in the
future, mentioning the examples of other programs like *Juventud y Empleo* (Youth and Employment) as well as projects of Catholic Relief Services that provide a different approach to payment. Rather than waiting for a full accounting before payment, these programs functioned by providing most of its monthly funding in *advance* of monthly activities, and then confirms delivery of project services. The difference in the systems, according to this director, is one between showing trust in project partners (by paying in advance) and an attitude of mistrust (reflected by prorating payments and making them conditional on reporting).

### 4.2 **Lessons Learned/Good Practices**

There are various positive lessons that emerge from these findings. First, there is ample evidence to support the pedagogical strategies associated with the EpC model, including the recognition of the EpC project as a finalist for the WISE Prize in Educational Innovation. As its use across a greater variety of settings, both within and outside the Dominican Republic, suggests, the EpC model provides an effective, attractive, and low-cost supplement to the official school day, one which helps students perform at higher levels. Additionally, EpC and EpE centers also bring greater visibility to the issue of child labor in the community. Though these spaces were successful, a chronic shortage of space forced several EpC into less-than-ideal settings (outside of schools or sharing cramped spaces within schools) which undoubtedly had negative influences on their effectiveness.

Second, even difficulties in program implementation can generate opportunities to progress. The difficulties in implementing EpE, for example, provided an opportunity for INFOTEP to take stock of a preexisting blind spot in its work and allowed it to expand its training to populations of young people that were previously ruled ineligible or unlikely candidates for its highly regarded training programs.

Third, one good practice that emerged in the management of coordinating a large program with a relatively high number of subcontractors was organizing the regular meetings of local coordinators. In workshops and retreats, local coordinators were able to share experiences, provide advice, and generate feedback to the DevTech–EDUCA–INTEC management team. Additionally, it was in these spaces that the evaluator was able to get the most palpable sense of the existence of an EpC consortium. The collegiality, professionalism, and camaraderie of the various local coordinators from different institutions provided a clear sense of a shared purpose and collective effort to address the problem of child labor in the country.

---

22 WISE stands for the “World Innovation Summit for Education.”
V EVALUATION FINDINGS—EFFICIENCY

5.1 Findings

The project continues to be a cost-effective intervention. As the midterm evaluation report noted, costs per beneficiary are relatively low—approximately US$10 per month for each student in an EpC, and US$22 per month for each student in an EpE. Part of the cost-effectiveness of the program comes from the nature of volunteerism of the facilitators in each center. Though they receive a modest stipend (about US$80 per month to help cover their travel expenses) and extensive training, these facilitators demonstrate a level of commitment that is impressive. The service they provide includes not only 5 days of teaching, but also visits to families on weekends and additional meetings with parents, as necessary, while also completing reporting requirements for M&E.

The project also made payments to local subcontractors contingent on the complete delivery of data on the specific students enrolled in the EpCs and EpEs. The objective of this strategy was to make reporting obligatory and to provide individualized attention to beneficiaries, as the relevant unit of analysis was the specific student, not an overall number of students. While such a disciplined system of monitoring has its advantages, it was not without its critics—several subcontractors saw this system as rigid and hierarchal.

Since the midterm evaluation, the project revised its budget to redirect unused funds toward important additional outputs. First, the project provided additional services, namely a summer camp to provide an additional incentive for children to avoid returning to dangerous or exploitive labor during the months when school was not in session. Second, the project also increased coaching services for its facilitators to provide high-quality training for the local instructors. Third, the program also increased funding for additional longitudinal studies of the long-term impact of EpCs on both individual and school performance. Such a modification, without requiring additional funding from USDOL, provided important direct services and strengthened the project’s monitoring systems.

5.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices

While the cost-effectiveness of the program is clear, it does not come without its potential drawbacks. As noted by project personnel and local coordinators, the low monetary compensation offered to project facilitators brings with it the potential for a high turnover rate among EpC facilitators. Though many facilitators noted the positive benefits of their participation in trainings, they also noted that additional compensation would help support themselves and their families, as many are single mothers. While the evaluator did not interview facilitators who had left their positions, it is a reasonable supposition that economic necessity or family obligations, among other factors, played a role in their decision to leave what was essentially a volunteer position.

Several good practices deserve mention. In San Juan de la Maguana, the volunteer nature of the facilitator position seemed to generate fewer problems than in other zones. Indeed, despite the very small monetary compensation, there were some communities where teams of two or three
facilitators shared the modest stipend and decided to work together in their teaching. These facilitators found that it was more rewarding to work in teams and, in doing so, lowered the individual burdens. The communities in which the evaluator observed such team teaching were also distinguished by their relatively more dense associational networks, with multiple community groups existing and representing a high amount of social capital. Though more research would be needed to confirm this for the areas in which the project works, such associational patterns tend to be found more often in rural communities than in urban ones, where migration patterns often disrupt communal bonds.

An additional good practice was found in providing meals for children in the EpCs, a responsibility assumed by the Ministry of Education and an important incentive for students who often came from communities and families with high rates of unsatisfied basic needs. However, when EpCs where outside of the schools (due to lack of space, many EpCs are housed in community centers or churches), the meals did not arrive for the children—the Ministry of Education would not deliver to nonschool classrooms. While this reflects the structural problems of an educational system that is chronically short on classrooms, better mechanisms for providing meals must be found.
VI EVALUATION FINDINGS—IMPACT

6.1 FINDINGS

6.1.1 Impact on Children and Adolescents

Perhaps the greatest impact is the one that takes place within each of the almost 16,000 NNAs who participated in the project activities. While difficult to quantify the long-term impact of the lessons learned in the EpCs and EpEs, several positive outcomes were reported by interviewees. For example—

- Parent, teachers, and school directors noted remarkable changes in attitude, self-esteem, and behavior for the NNAs in the centers. “Before, these children would not speak. They wouldn’t say good morning,” one school director noted. “You would enter the room and they wouldn’t even see you. Now, it is different. They are well behaved, courteous, and alert.”

- Educational performance among students has improved. There was a consensus among teachers and school directors that NNAs in the EpCs and EpEs had improved greatly in their reading and writing. “All my students are now passing,” one teacher said. Teachers and directors noted that this was a great help in reducing the problem of student overage and repetition. These services provided support for students who had often fallen far behind.

- NNAs are withdrawn or prevented from working in exploitive or dangerous conditions. With EpCs and EpEs, students have productive and rewarding activities. In addition to other benefits, NNAs literally have fewer daytime hours that could be dedicated to working. Sadly, in some communities, the EpCs or EpEs are the only organized extracurricular activities available. One mother commented, “We have nothing else for the children, no sports, nothing. They can’t take the EpC away.” Others were more positive. One teacher said she was convinced that “her” children would not work, for no other reason than that she lives in the community and they know that she “would be watching.”

- The Quantum Learning approach worked not only to reach traditional educational objectives, but also integrated lessons about child labor as well as the rights to which NNAs are entitled. When asked by the evaluator what rights they had, students gave an impressive list that included not only the right to education, nationality, and safety, but also the right to play, the right to be loved, and the right to be children.

- EpEs provide valuable and marketable skills that adolescents can use to enhance their income-generating strategies. One EpE student said frankly, “Thanks to the EpE, I am now able to open my nail salon.”
6.1.2 Challenges in Withdrawing/Preventing

While these impacts are laudable, some caveats and challenges should be mentioned. First, as will be discussed below, there is the concern that if EpCs do not continue beyond the period of USDOL funding, NNAs will return to the streets, the markets, and working at home. This is a question of sustainability, but it was clear from even a short visit to several zones that some communities are more ready and capable than others to give continuity to the work of this project.

Second, there was more optimism for the children in the EpCs than for the adolescents in the EpEs. Part of this concern had to do with the sheer difference in age: younger children are often more receptive to new education strategies and respond to a broader range of activities. Adolescents, when asked to take part in some Quantum Learning activities like singing in a circle, made clear that they were “too old for that.” One EpE facilitator noted the response of one of her students: “If you think I am going to sing, you are crazy.”

6.1.3 Community Impact: Teachers, Families, and Local Leaders

For the facilitators interviewed, working at an EpC or EpE was an important experience. Many described this experience as “transformative” and “life changing.” For many, it convinced them that their professional path would now take them into the educational system. From a human capital perspective, then, this is an important impact.

In the communities, these facilitators also found a new status. Teachers and directors interviewed reported their respect and admiration for the facilitators, not only for their work in the classroom but also for their contributions to the school and community. One EpC teacher was able to make organizing a library a class activity; others made “cleaning the school” another class activity. The EpC was meant to be a way to learn how to be a better part of one’s community, and this was not lost on community members and leaders.

In some cases, Quantum Learning methods and pedagogy were shared with teachers beyond the EpCs and in the broader school systems. While the evaluator cannot provide a quantitative measure of this informal transmission of ideas, it was mentioned by teachers in several schools in various provinces.

For families and community members, there was a great awareness of the issue of child labor and an awareness of their responsibility in keeping children on track so that children would have more opportunities. The message of the EpCs and EpEs went beyond the classroom walls. Some communities, like Los Tramojos in San Juan, for example, has already charged their local “governance committee” (comité de gestión) with the task of finding resources from the local municipality, NGOs, and other sources to fund the EpC once the USDOL funding period is over. Not all communities were as organized or resourceful, but the EpCs and EpEs have clearly made an impression on local officials and community members.
6.1.4 Community Challenges

Though the facilitators interviewed expressed a high level of satisfaction, the fact that local and national project staff noted a high turnover rate in facilitators suggests that there are also significant pressures on these young profesoras. These facilitators have to prepare for 5 days of teaching and are expected to work on the weekends to meet with parents and track down any students who do not show up to the EpC. In addition to the responsibilities of the EpC facilitators, many have family responsibilities and economic necessities that are not covered by the small stipend provided to them. The fact that many facilitators had to be replaced indicates that the “new” facilitators often have little or no training when they step into the EpCs. New facilitators would take part in future activities, but often they would take over a classroom before any regularly scheduled training or coaching section had taken place.

In addition to the challenges for the teachers, there is also the uneven capacity of local NGOs, who are subcontracted to oversee the work of various teachers at various centers. While some NGOs, like Catholic Relief Services or IDDI, have substantial resources and capacity to provide support for their teachers, other local and smaller NGOs lack the basic transportation and administrative infrastructure to attend to often far-flung centers.

Complicating matters further is the lack of physical space for the EpC, which means that the project relies on any space that the community makes available, generating administrative difficulties like the already mentioned failure to deliver meals to NNAs if they are not in school within the formal education system.

6.1.5 National Impact

This project has had a significant impact in large part because of the project’s innovative partnerships with state, civil society, and the private sector. With the support of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labor, the project has been able to insert itself within the broad set of institutional frameworks and plans for the eradication of child labor. The project continues to give the problem high visibility.

The constitution of the EpC consortium, which includes EDUCA and all the NGO “partners” or subcontractors in the project, is an additional way to continue to provide a platform to influence both public opinion and public policy. Additionally, project staff noted that, by working with local NGOs, the project has enhanced the technical capacity and human capital of local Dominican Republic organizations.

The project has made important partnerships with the many philanthropic representatives of the American Chamber of Commerce, especially the following firms: Leche Rica, Propagas, and Ège-Haina. Together, these firms have supported the operations of several EpCs. Since 2007, these firms have contributed over US$1 million to EpC activities. Additionally, the foundation Sur-Futuro also joined the consortium and coordinates EpCs with its own resources, thus expanding the reach of the EpC model.

---
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6.1.6 National Challenges

Though the Government, through the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labor, continues to actively support the project and is publicly committed to various national and international plans dedicated to the eradication of child labor, there are some challenges to the collaboration between the Government and NGOs in this area.

Several interviewees noted that there is a limited history and tradition of collaboration between the Government and non-governmental actors. Despite the fact that many professionals spend time in both government ministries and NGOs (the former director of this project is currently a high ranking official in the Ministry of Education), there remain differences in goals, strategies, and methods that often serve to put some distance between what might appear to be natural partners. Though only anecdotal, it was telling to hear some staff members at the Ministry of Education speak of their colleagues who were now working full time at the project offices. Though these colleagues were still Ministry of Education employees, they were regarded as being somewhat distant from the work of the ministry and more “with the project” than the ministry.

Additionally, despite working closely with the EpC and EpE methodology, these models have not been formally adopted by the Government as part of the educational policies of the state. Though there have been important announcements about new curricula and a presidential call for nothing less than a “revolution in education,” these plans have, as far as the evaluator was able to discern, not involved project models.

In terms of the national impact of the private sector, while there have been notable achievements in finding new resources, the project has fallen short of its stated goal of finding private resources to replace the resources currently coming from USDOL. Additionally, these funds come from a small number of firms. Many more firms have yet to take an active role in the campaign against child labor; perhaps the most notable are companies from the hotel and tourism industry. These companies could play an especially important role in addressing some of the worst forms of child labor and CSE. Thus far, they have been quite silent.

Finally, another challenge in bringing change to labor practices is that, as one consortium member put it, “cultural change is slow.” There continues to be, despite the best efforts of the project members and others, a view that child labor is not harmful, that it is a “normal” part of a child’s upbringing, and that—in poor settings (all too common in the Dominican Republic)—child labor is a necessity. This view was reported by several facilitators and some parents as still being common in their communities. These attitudes are, as the political economist Joseph Schumpeter once said, “coins that do not readily melt.” Nevertheless, change is certainly possible, and some of the project surveys demonstrate that, in communities where EpCs and EpEs are based, ideas about the appropriateness of child labor and awareness about legal norms that prohibit it are beginning to change in positive directions.

---

6.2 LESSONS LEARNED/GOOD PRACTICES

Working with different kinds of institutions, this project has made a significant impact on local and national scales. One of the lessons learned from this experience concerns the uneven results that such initiatives can have. It is not surprising that different zones reported different levels of success, which are understood in terms of NNAs withdrawn/prevented, awareness raising, educational performance, and other goals. It is important that these differences be discussed not only by M&E specialists but also by the various consortium partners. This discussion will allow us to understand if these differences in outcome have to do with preexisting social conditions (like the social networks that exist, type of labor, and rates of poverty) or with the differential capacity of local NGOs to provide direct services and oversight.

Another lesson learned is the importance of incorporating parents in project activities. Several local coordinators noted that while NNA beneficiaries certainly could serve as important “leaders of tomorrow” (as the program explicitly encouraged them to be), much more could be done in reaching out directly to families in the communities. One example provided by several coordinators was the possibility of offering vocational training not only to adolescents, but also to the parents of beneficiaries. Offering “EpE-style” opportunities, even on a more limited scale than the actual EpEs, could help provide parents with important work skills that may enhance their income-generating potential and further spread awareness.

An additional lesson learned is the importance of psychological services to NNA beneficiaries. While some subcontractors were able to offer these services, they were not contemplated as part of the project activities. Project facilitators, as volunteer teachers, do not have the training for this kind of intervention, but many noted the need for additional resources to provide to NNAs who have often experienced various kinds of physical and mental trauma.

A good practice that deserves particular mention and is worthy of replication is the presence of regular workshops for local coordinators and facilitators to share experiences and suggest solutions to common problems. The collective experiences were mentioned by several project participants as among the more valuable experiences offered by the program. Not only are these spaces important for learning, they also encourage the creation of broad networks of action that can serve as foundations for additional policy interventions. The inclusion of more members from the state—from local teachers to ministry officials—in these kinds of spaces may also serve to overcome the distance between state and civil society that some interviewees lamented.

Another good practice is the creation of “summer camps,” which generated considerable excitement among NNA beneficiaries. These interventions also reveal the need to design supplementary activities for months when schools are not in session. Though that can require additional resources, these spaces may provide increased opportunities to incorporate families and community members in activities.
7.1 Findings

Sustainability is often a great challenge to projects in resource-scarce environments. However, the project has given the issue considerable attention in the design of project activities as well as in their exit plan. At the end of the project, there are positive developments to report as well as some challenges.

7.1.1 Conceptual Sustainability: The Power of Good Ideas

Both the EpC and EpE represent successful models that have been introduced into the repertoire of educational policy and development practice. The EpC, as already noted, has been a particular recipient of praise, earning international recognition and being replicated in other countries in the region. As the program has created valuable educational materials, designed in consultation with Ministry of Education officials, it is a ready-made supplement to the formal education system. The EpC also relies on specific and tested methods, which are “scripted” and ready to use, but also provides spaces for creativity and play within that established structure. The low cost of these spaces constituted an additional strength.

Though the EpEs have received less attention than the EpCs, they too have generated positive results. The integration of INFOTEP training in particular was an important step. While modifications and corrections had to be made to the INFOTEP trainings, which previously had not worked with a population of at-risk youth that represented the target population in this project, interviews with students who were completing EpE courses found them to be very useful. In the urban community of Zurza, several young people noted the new microentrepreneurial possibilities that INFOTEP training made available. Zurza is a community with a history of crime and poverty, but thanks to programs like the EpE, one student commented that “now he felt proud to say he was from Zurza.”

7.1.2 Financial and Institutional Sustainability

As the USDOL funding period comes to an end, there is some concern about the ability to continue EpC and EpE activities. The two most promising possibilities for sustainability, the adoption of these programs by the Dominican Republic state and the replacement of USDOL funds with contributions from the private sectors, have not been fully realized. While representatives of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labor speak highly of the program and have included consortium members in discussion over future policies, EpCs and EpEs are still not a part of Ministry of Education policies and not reflected in the 2011–2012 budget. Though the contribution from the private sector will allow a small number of EpCs to continue operating, many communities face tremendous uncertainty as the project comes to a close.

Many parents and local community members expressed their concern, and even dismay, at the prospect of the EpCs and EpEs not having future funding, and thus effectively disappearing from their communities. Some expressed the hope that the Government would still contribute some
funding; others expressed hope that international agencies or NGOs could support these activities. What was more promising was the example of communities like Los Tramojos that had already begun seeking support for their own centers. Rather than waiting for outside support to arrive, the community saw it as their responsibility to give continuity to “their” EpC. One possible avenue mentioned was funds allocated to members of the national legislature (the barrilito), which must be used for “social services.” A concerted lobbying effort to pressure legislators to use those funds in supporting EpC and EpE activities may be one additional way to find much-needed resources. Local municipalities and businesses represent additional, if limited, sources of funding.

Among the broader issues raised by these concerns is the need for greater alliance on the local level, linkages not simply between NGO and community but with local businesses, local political leaders, and national representatives. In some cases (as in the case of subcontractors World Vision, IDDI, Fundacón Sur, and Catholic Relief Services), these relationships have been cultivated and they provide the foundation for the continuity of many EpC and EpE activities; in other cases, they are only now being seen as a possibility for project resources.

Finally, there has been excellent communication with national and international agencies. Collaboration with the Ministry of Education has been especially close, and contact with the Ministry of Labor has taken place in the context of similar vocational training efforts, such as in the Dominican Republic Secretariat of Labor’s World Bank–supported vocational training program, Juventud y Empleo. Communication and coordination have also been fluid and ongoing with the local representation of ILO. In an effort to expand the scope and reach of like-minded efforts to eradicate the worst forms of child labor, dialogue with ILO ensured that the EpC/EpE activities would take place in different locations from those in which ILO was already working. Additionally, ILO and the project worked together in several training sessions. These kinds of coordinated efforts help consolidate a broad network of concerned professionals and organizations. Nevertheless, without more explicit commitments for activities after the USDOL funding period ends, there remains the concern that these kinds of collaborations will become less frequent with the EpC consortium.

### 7.2 Lessons Learned/Good Practices

A lesson learned is that sustainability must be a multiscalar concern (from national to local levels, from project management to subcontractors to communities) and that it requires sustained attention from the very beginning of the project. While state adoption of project activities is often the best-case scenario, other contingency plans are needed to address the all-too-likely possibility that the state does not take over project responsibilities. A good practice built into the project is an alliance with private sector firms; these alliances have already ensured that several EpCs will continue to function into 2011, past the final project date. Additionally, the efforts of some communities to secure additional funding for their centers are encouraging.

The design of the EpC consortium as a long-term consultative and lobbying group is a good practice, as the development of such spaces constitutes both an intrinsic good (serves as a space of mutual support and enrichment) and an instrumental good that can lead to further gains in securing support from state and civil society.
Nevertheless, work must be conducted to make sure that the EpC consortium continues to function. Some consortium members were openly skeptical. “To tell the truth,” one NGO director commented, “the consortium does not really exist.” While some meetings of consortium members had generated some lasting relationships between individual members, meetings of the directors of the consortium organizations are too rare to generate a consolidated sense of collective unity. As the project ends, there were no plans for future consortium meetings.
VIII CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 CONCLUSIONS

The project—Combating Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic—has contributed greatly to ongoing efforts to find low-cost, sustainable, interventions for withdrawing and preventing NNAs who are in or at risk of falling into exploitive and dangerous labor conditions.

Ambitiously, the project has established centers over a large part of the national territory, including urban and rural zones, and has accomplished much—including the withdrawal or prevention of over 12,000 NNAs. This broad community presence, as well as multimedia campaigns, have contributed to greater awareness of the problem of child labor and of legal prohibitions against it.

In working with multiple subcontractors, the project has been able to have a large geographic reach as well as take advantage of the subcontractors’ respective local connections and expertise. Coordinating actions among international and national NGOs is not without its challenges, however. The continuous M&E activities, for example, can require significant efforts to ensure that data flow from hundreds of centers to the M&E team in the capital.

As the program ends, there are also concerns about the long-term sustainability of the gains made by the project. As the state has not assumed ownership of the project activities in the form of new public policies, alternative plans for sustainability must be pursued. The following recommendations represent some possible paths.

8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

8.2.1 Recommendations for the Short Term

As EpC and EpE activities end, some actions are recommended to take place in the last weeks of the project:

1. Work toward creating a database of the personnel trained by the program. In order to take advantage of the human capital and professionalization that has been generated, a record of the network of facilitators and coordinators should be kept by the EpC consortium, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Labor, and other stakeholders. In addition to providing more recognition to those who contributed much to this national effort, keeping a record of such individuals can also strengthen future efforts and provide a ready-made reservoir of human capital.

2. Use graduations and other “closing” ceremonies to generate alliances among local and national actors. In addition to inviting relevant representations from the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labor, these events should also include local political and business leaders. The local media should also be invited to record any commitments or pledges of support.
3. Taking advantage of the expressions of support made by representatives of the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Education at the stakeholders meeting, continuing efforts should be made to increase the role of ministries in EpC consortium activities. The evaluator acknowledges that steps have already been made in this direction and encourages those efforts to continue.

4. Building on the significant private sector participation that has already been part of project activities, an additional effort should be made by the EpC consortium to bring in additional firms, especially actors from the tourism sector, who have thus far been noticeably absent in their participation in campaigns against child labor.

5. Given the valuable data collected by the M&E specialist from INTEC, these data should be made available for additional research projects by INTEC students, taking appropriate precautions to protect the privacy of project beneficiaries.

8.2.2 Recommendations for Future Activities

1. Increase work with parents. While not the only possibility, one possible way to increase contact with parents is through offering EpE vocational training to parents of beneficiaries, especially mothers. Several interviewees noted that increased efforts needed to be made to include parents in educational efforts. One coordinator noted that the project was one that dealt primarily with symptoms, not causes. While deep causes of child labor are difficult to address with any single project, shifting the focus of interventions from individual NNAs to families would be a realistic and reasonable way to move toward more holistic solutions.

2. Strengthen capacity not only of NGOs, but of local communities. The project staff members correctly note that working with many Dominican Republic NGOs helps strengthen their organizational and technical capacities. As community ownership is an especially important concern, any additional efforts to enhance the capacity of community organizations could have important implications for project sustainability. For example, providing local associations of parents with a formal role in the execution of project activities (including the recruitment of and retention facilitators) could root the project more firmly in community networks.

3. Integrate psychological services. Given the physical and structural violence that many NNA beneficiaries experience, several project coordinators and facilitators agreed that psychological services should be made available to NNAs and included in project design.

4. Coordinate calendars of USDOL, the project, and the school system. As the project activities end, they do so in the middle of a school year. Many parents expressed their concern about this, and it reflects a structural difficulty in coordinating USDOL funding calendars with local academic calendars. USDOL might consider alternative funding schemes; perhaps projects could be expanded to 4.5 years, allowing some flexibility in initiating and concluding program activities.
5. Reconsider the payment system, which obliges subcontractors to provide full reporting before receiving payments. As this generated considerable tension among subcontractors and as there are alternative methodologies that have been successfully tried in the country, other strategies for ensuring, or incentivizing, project compliance should be considered.

6. Finally, given the central role that facilitators play in the project, additional compensation should be considered. This may also address the high turnover rate of facilitators. Compensation may also take various forms, including university scholarships, internships, perhaps supported by private sector firms that have been supporting project activities.
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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 US$780 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services;
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school;

3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;

4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor; and

5. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

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

USDOL reports annually to Congress on the performance of its program. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees are accurate, relevant, complete, reliable, timely, valid, and verifiable.

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

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

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated some US$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 timeframe; 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 ILO-IPEC projects is to increase children’s access to and participation in formal and non-formal education. Most ILO-IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assists in building a strong enabling environment for the long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

2. **Child Labor Education Initiative**

Since 2001, the U.S. Congress has provided some US$269 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being

---

In 2007, the U.S. Congress did not direct USDOL’s appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated US$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.
implemented by a wide range of international and non-governmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

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

Other Initiatives

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

Project Context

In the Dominican Republic, children work primarily in the informal sector, and in areas such as domestic service, other services, construction, transportation, and tourism. In rural areas, children work mostly in agriculture, in the production of coffee, rice, sugarcane, tomatoes, potatoes, and garlic where they are exposed to hazardous conditions and long hours. Additionally, commercial sexual exploitation (CSE) of children is a problem, especially in tourist locations and major urban areas, and the Dominican Republic is a source and destination country for trafficking of children for CSE. Migrant and trafficked children from Haiti also work in exploitive labor.26

USDOL has provided US$16,200,170 to combat exploitive child labor in the Dominican Republic, as well as an additional US$27,422,102 on regional efforts in Central America that included the Dominican Republic. The Government of the Dominican Republic participated in country-level and regional projects funded by USDOL, including the 39-month, US$2.7 million ILO-IPEC project to support the Government’s Timebound Program to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor. The project ended in December 2009 and withdrew 3,171 children and prevented 2,371 children from exploitative labor. The Government of the Dominican Republic also participated in a 7-year US$8.8 million project implemented by ILO-IPEC which concluded in April 2009 and sought to combat commercial sexual exploitation through a variety of activities, including capacity building and legal reform. The project withdrew or prevented 1,888 children for prevention from commercial sexual exploitation. The Government also participated in a 4-year US$5.7 million Education Initiative regional project, called Primero Aprendo and implemented by CARE, that worked to strengthen the Government and civil

society’s capacity to combat child labor through education. This project also withdrew or prevented 4,105 children from exploitive child labor.\(^{27}\)

### USDOL-Funded Projects in Dominican Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000–2003</td>
<td>ILO-IPEC</td>
<td>Combating Child Labor in the Commercial Agricultural Sector Phase I in Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua</td>
<td>US$1,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–2005</td>
<td>ILO-IPEC</td>
<td>Preparatory Activities for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor in the Dominican Republic</td>
<td>US$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{27}\) Ibid., p. 113.
The Government of the Dominican Republic has ratified ILO Conventions 182 and 138, and is an ILO-IPEC participant country. The minimum age of employment in the country is 14, although the law provides exceptions for child actors and entertainers. There are restrictions on night work, and hours of work per day for children under 16. Children under 18 are prohibited from hazardous work, and some other areas of work, such as sugarcane handling, gaming, and certain work in hotels, though exceptions can be made for apprenticeships. Forced labor is prohibited by law; the law also provides prohibitions against and sanctions for trafficking of persons and child prostitution.28

The U.S. Department of State reports that the country has made some efforts with regard to combating child labor. The Secretary of Labor in the Dominican Republic, in coordination with the National Council for Children and Adolescents (CONANI), is responsible for preventing child labor and enforcing related laws. SET dedicates labor inspectors to investigate child labor complaints, and the national judiciary also has lawyers dedicated to prosecuting child labor violations. The Office of the Attorney General also investigates and prosecutes trafficking of persons crimes. The Government of the Dominican Republic has two national plans to address child labor and commercial sexual exploitation (the National Plan to Eradicate the Worst Forms

---

28 Ibid., p. 112.
of Child Labor (2006–2016) and an Action Plan for the Eradication of Abuse and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls, and Adolescents. The Office of the First Lady coordinates Programa Progresando, which provides income generation opportunities to parents of children at risk for commercial sexual exploitation. The country’s Agricultural Bank has also included a clause in its loan agreements that prohibits recipients from using child labor and guarantees that business owners send their children to school.29

**Combating Child Labor Through Education II in the Dominican Republic**

On September 30, 2007, DevTech, in association with Acción para la Educación Básica (EDUCA) and Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC), received a 3.5-year Cooperative Agreement worth US$4 million from USDOL to implement an EI project in the Dominican Republic, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitative child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the five goals of the USDOL project as outlined above. This project was designed to build upon a previous child labor Education Initiative project that developed an innovative and well-received school enrichment program, Espacios para Crecer (Spaces for Growth). DevTech was awarded the project through a competitive bid process.

As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the project targets 4,250 children for withdrawal and 4,250 children for prevention from exploitive child labor by providing education and training opportunities through the Espacios para Crecer (Spaces for Growth) program. The project targets children ages 6-14 and adolescents ages 14-17 who are involved in exploitive labor. Priority sectors and areas are (1) agriculture (on the Haitian border, in the South, East and Northeast “Cibao”) (2) urban informal, domestic and illicit work (in San Francisco de Macoris, Santo Domingo, Santiago/Puerto Plata, San Pedro de Macoris); and (3) illicit activities in tourist and beach areas (Samana, Las Terrenas, Boca Chica, and Eastern region) including trafficking, street sales and commercial sexual exploitation.

The project’s development objective is to contribute to the elimination of exploitive child labor in the Dominican Republic. Specific objectives are to—

- Withdraw or prevent children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct education and training services;
- Strengthen child labor policies, national institutions, and education systems to reduce hazardous child labor and increase school attendance for children working in exploitive conditions;
- Raise awareness of the importance of education for children and mobilize actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
- Support reliable research and data collection on child labor;
- Ensure long-term sustainability of these efforts;

29 Ibid., p. 112-113.
• Encourage public-private sector relationships; and

• Promote corporate social responsibility and codes of conduct certifying child-free labor.

Some of the project’s approaches and strategies to its direct interventions, awareness raising, and capacity building include—

• Build upon the previous child labor Education Initiative project that developed *Espacios para Crecer* (EpC, Spaces for Growth);

• Implement additional EpCs through NGOs and a university;

• Develop a comprehensive adolescent EpC model (*Espacios para Emprender*, EpE, Spaces for Entrepreneurship);

• Improve data collection on education and child labor at the national level;

• Raise awareness on the dangers of child labor;

• Encourage corporate social responsibility;

• Work with business associations to develop codes of conduct on exploitive child labor;

• Collaborate with university business departments; and

• Develop public-private sector relationships.

**Midterm Evaluation**

A mid-term evaluation was conducted in April-May 2009 by Julia Hasbún, an independent international consultant. The evaluation consisted of document review; individual and group interviews with project staff, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders; site visits (observation) in San Juan de la Maguana, Santo Domingo, Nagua, San Francisco de Macorís and Dajabón and a stakeholder workshop.

The evaluator found that the design of the project was relevant and appropriate for the withdrawal and prevention of children from exploitive labor. The evaluator spoke to many beneficiaries, who had been withdrawn from hazardous work or work that kept them out of school, and were now enrolled in educational activities. The evaluator found that the project also met the needs of its beneficiaries, many of whom were overage for their grade level, by providing leveling services. A best practice identified by the evaluation is that the project does not require its direct beneficiaries to have a birth certificate for them to gain access to the spaces. The evaluator found problems with finding spaces for the classes, and lack of awareness among parents and communities about the problems of exploitive child labor. The evaluator also identified areas for the project to pursue sustainability.
The key recommendations from the midterm evaluation were—

- To train project facilitators in skills for teaching reading and writing to children;
- To better utilize ILO-IPEC materials and resources and improve collaboration between the project and ILO-IPEC and the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF);
- To review the agreement between the project and INFOTEPI to solve delays in vocational training;
- To finish the project management information system; and
- To revise the daily communication and dynamics between ENTRENA and the consortium, and also to improve the consortium’s capacity to capture funds, considering the funding opportunities existing in the country.

II   PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to mid-term and final evaluations. The field work for final evaluations is generally scheduled three months before the end of the project. The Combating Child Labor through Education II project in the Dominican Republic went into implementation in September 2007 and is due for final evaluation in 2010.

Scope of Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with DevTech. 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 in 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;
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 project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations, and

6. Help the project continue building and raising awareness about child labor and exploitation in the DR and to raise awareness of the EpC and EpE programs.

The evaluation should also provide documented lessons learned, good practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in the Dominican Republic and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and DevTech. Recommendations should focus around lessons learned and good practices from which future projects can glean when developing their strategies toward combating exploitive child labor.

**Intended Users**

This final evaluation should provide USDOL, DevTech, 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 Macro.

**Relevance**

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

1. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five USDOL goals, as specified above? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?

2. Have the project assumptions been accurate?
3. What are the main project strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? What is the rationale behind using these strategies?

4. What are the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country? (i.e. poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc) Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?

5. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works?

6. How has the project fit within existing programs to combat child labor and trafficking, especially government initiatives?

7. Was the project able to offer fair access to educational services for undocumented children? Assess the project’s ability to assist and address the needs of children without identification who are particularly vulnerable to exploitation.

8. Was the research that was conducted on child labor relevant to the context and project goals?

9. Was the project able to pursue its goal of developing codes of conduct regarding child labor? If so, how? If not, what were the obstacles?

10. Was the project able to create an understanding of exploitative child labor among stakeholders? Did the stakeholders understand that the project aimed to eliminate exploitative child labor and not just provide educational services?

11. Did the project adjust implementation and/or strategy based on the findings and recommendations of the mid-term evaluation?

12. What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and USDOL?

**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 the following questions:

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 (i.e. non-formal and formal education, grade leveling, and vocational training). Did the provision of these services results in children being
withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/trafficking and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational programs?

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/trafficking.

4. Assess the effectiveness of the specific EpC and EpE models on increasing educational opportunities, 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, urban informal, domestic, and illicit work and illicit activities in tourist and beach areas including trafficking, street sales and commercial sexual exploitation)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?

6. Are there any sector specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?

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. Were the EpE programs and INFOTEP trainings effective at assisting adolescents involved in or vulnerable to exploitative child labor? Assess the effectiveness of the coordinator and facilitator trainings.

10. Was the project effective at generating community support and “buy-in”?

**Efficiency**

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

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. The project allocated more resources into its monitoring system after the midterm evaluation. Assess the monitoring system and determine if it met the needs and requirements of the project.

4. The project has identified a high turnover of facilitators as adding costs and creating gaps in services. Please assess the causes behind the high facilitator turnover.
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 the following questions:

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. What appears to be the project’s impact, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?

5. What impact has the project been able to achieve in the business sector? Did the project cultivate partnerships with and generate support among the private sector to eliminate child labor? If so, how? If not, what were the obstacles?

Sustainability

The evaluation should assess whether the project has taken steps to ensure the continuation of project activities 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 the following questions:

1. Were the exit strategy and sustainability plan integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?

2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?

3. What have been the major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships in support of the project?

4. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the Ministries of Labor, Education, and Youth, the Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development, as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children’s issues?

5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with the ILO-IPEC?
6. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations?

7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?

8. Will the EpCs and EpEs, monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?

9. What lessons can be learned of the project’s accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?

10. Did the project’s approach of seeking community contributions to the program (e.g., of spaces for the EpCs/EpEs) enhance community “buy-in” and program sustainability?

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

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

A Approach

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

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.

2. Efforts will be made to include parents’ and children’s voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the worst forms of child labor (http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).

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

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

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

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

C Data Collection Methodology

1. Document Review

   • Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents.

   • During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected.

   • Documents may include—
     - Project document and revisions;
     - Cooperative Agreement;
     - Technical Progress and Status Reports;
     - Project Logical Frameworks and Monitoring Plans;
     - Work plans;
     - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports;
     - Management Procedures and Guidelines;
     - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.); and
     - Project files (including school records) as appropriate.

2. Question Matrix

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

3. Interviews with Stakeholders

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

- ILAB/OCFT staff;
- Headquarters, country director, project managers, and field staff of grantee and partner organizations;
- Government ministry officials and local government officials;
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers;
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel;
- Project beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents);
- International organizations, NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area;
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area; and
- Labor reporting officer at U.S. Embassy and USAID representative.

4. Field Visits

The evaluator will visit a selection of project sites. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted CL sectors. During the visits the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus groups with children and parents will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

D Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

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

**E Stakeholder Meeting**

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

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

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

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings;
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings;
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality;
4. Possible SWOT exercise on the project’s performance; and
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 and Work Plan

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Proposed Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone interview with USDOL and Grantee Staff/Headquarters</td>
<td>ICF Macro, USDOL, Grantee, Evaluator</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>October-November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Matrix and Instruments due to ICF Macro/USDOL</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize TOR and submit to Grantee and USDOL</td>
<td>USDOL/ICF Macro/ Evaluator</td>
<td>October 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>November 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>November 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Site Visits</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>November 9-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Stakeholder Meeting</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>November 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Travel</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>November 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-evaluation debrief call with USDOL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>December 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report to ICF Macro for QC review</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report to USDOL and Grantee for 48 hour review</td>
<td>ICF Macro</td>
<td>December 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report released to stakeholders</td>
<td>ICF Macro</td>
<td>December 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments due to ICF Macro</td>
<td>USDOL/Grantee and Stakeholders</td>
<td>January 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report revised and sent to ICF Macro</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>January 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised report sent to USDOL</td>
<td>ICF Macro</td>
<td>January 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final approval of report</td>
<td>USDOL</td>
<td>January 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization and distribution of report</td>
<td>ICF Macro</td>
<td>February 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/good practices, and three key recommendations)

IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology
V. Project Description

VI. Relevance
   A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
   B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

VII. Effectiveness
   A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
   B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

VIII. Efficiency
   A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
   B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

IX. Impact
   A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
   B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

X. Sustainability
   A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
   B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices

XI. Recommendations and Conclusions
   A. Key Recommendations—critical for successfully meeting project objectives
   B. Other Recommendations—as needed
      1. Relevance
      2. Effectiveness
      3. Efficiency
      4. Impact
      5. Sustainability

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

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

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will provide a response to OCFT, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.
While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to ICF Macro on December 15, 2010, 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 January 12, 2011, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in Spanish and then translated into English for the final report.

V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

ICF Macro has contracted with Jose Antonio Lucero to conduct this evaluation. Dr. Lucero is an associate professor at the University of Washington and concentrates on Latin American politics, political and social movements, and comparative politics. He has conducted field research in Bolivia, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, and Peru and has written about indigenous political and social trends in the Andean region. He was a co-evaluator in 2009 for the Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Bolivia midterm evaluation and co-authored the bilingual report. He holds a PhD and an MA in politics from Princeton.

The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, ICF Macro, and relevant DevTech staff to evaluate this project.

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

______________________________

______________________________
## Cross-Reference of USDOL Questions in TOR and Answers in the Evaluation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in TOR</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have the program assumptions been accurate and realistic? How, if applicable have critical assumptions been changed?</td>
<td>13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the project design seem to be adequately supporting the five EI goals? If not, which ones are not being supported and why not?</td>
<td>7, 10, 13–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are the project’s main strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? Please assess the relevance of these strategies.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the main the main obstacles or barriers that the project has identified as important to addressing child labor in this country (e.g., poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education)? Has the project been successful in addressing these obstacles?</td>
<td>13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the project design appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works? Is the project design appropriate within the donor environment, including USDOL’s past efforts?</td>
<td>15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How has the project design fit within existing initiatives, both by the government and other organizations, to combat child labor?</td>
<td>15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Please assess the relevance of the project’s criteria for selecting (action) program regions and sectors and subsequently project beneficiaries.</td>
<td>16–17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question in TOR</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (sugar cane plantations, other commercial agriculture, child domestic work, commercial sexual exploitation, deep-sea fishing, mining/quarrying, garbage scavenging, and pyrotechnics)? In a larger sense, did they accurately identify the worst forms of child labor in the country?</td>
<td>19–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At midterm, is the project on track in terms of meeting its targets/objectives? If not, what seem to be the factors contributing to delays and how far behind are they in terms of target numbers and objectives?</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assess the effectiveness of the “direct action” interventions, including the education interventions provided to children (i.e., formal and nonformal education, educational opportunities during school breaks, and vocational training). Did the provision of these services result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive labor/trafficking and ensure that they were involved in relevant educational services?</td>
<td>19–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In particular, please assess the effectiveness of project interventions that focus on withdrawing or preventing children from engaging in exploitive activities. 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/trafficking.</td>
<td>19–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in TOR</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are the project’s implementation strategies contributing (or not</td>
<td>19–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributing) to the desired project goals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Assess the effectiveness of the specific models on increasing educational</td>
<td>19–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assess the effectiveness of the education component. Does the project</td>
<td>19–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively balance concerns regarding education and child labor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status</td>
<td>21–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of children? Is it feasible and effective? Why or why not? How does the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project monitor work status after school and during holidays?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How was the monitoring system transferred into the field?</td>
<td>21–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What management areas, including technical and financial, need to be</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved in order to promote success in meeting project objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the project cost-efficient in terms of the scale of the</td>
<td>23–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interventions, and the expected direct and long-term impact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial</td>
<td>23–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternatives are there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the monitoring and reporting system designed efficiently to</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet the needs and requirements of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What appears to be the project’s impact to date, if any, on</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Note: Addressed qualitatively in the Effectiveness section.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What appears to be the project’s impact to date, if any, on</td>
<td>25–27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partners or other organizations working on child labor in the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What appears to be the project’s impact to date, if any, on</td>
<td>27–28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on education and child labor issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If applicable, assess the impact, to the extent possible, of</td>
<td>25–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and nonformal interventions). How has the education quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement component been received by the government and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are there any emerging trends or issues that the project</td>
<td>26–29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should and/or could respond to in order to increase the impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and relevance of the project? Are there any emerging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities to take the work further/have greater impact?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. At midterm, are there good practices by the project or the</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing partners that might be replicated in other areas, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered to be innovative solutions to the current situation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question in TOR</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has an exit strategy and sustainability plan been integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?</td>
<td>31–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?</td>
<td>32–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What have been the major challenges and successes in initiating and maintaining partnerships in support of the project, including with other USDOL-funded projects?</td>
<td>31–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assess the level of involvement of local/national government in the project and how this involvement has built government capacity and commitment to work on child labor elimination.</td>
<td>31–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of initiating and maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly the National Child labor Committee and the Department of Labor and Employment, as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children’s issues?</td>
<td>31–32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with the ILO-IPEC?</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral local organizations?</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?</td>
<td>31–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Taking into account the aspects of sustainability identified above, are there any preliminary indications regarding factors that will help or hinder the sustainability of the project?</td>
<td>32–33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What additional steps need to be taken in order to promote the sustainability of project components?</td>
<td>32–33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

PROJECT DOCUMENTS


Midterm Evaluation, 2009

Presentacion del Proyecto EpC y EpE Mayo 09


Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP).


Project Revision, October 22, 2009.


ADDITIONAL SOURCES

Constitución de la República Dominicana. Santo Domingo, proclamada el 26 de enero del 2010.


## ANNEX D: EVALUATION SCHEDULE

### Combating Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic Project

**Collaborative Agreement IL-16574-07-75-K**

#### Final Evaluation Detailed Itinerary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>ETD*</th>
<th>ETA**</th>
<th>EAT***</th>
<th>Destination/ Province/ Municipality/ Locality</th>
<th>Subcontractor and Coordinator’s Contact Information</th>
<th>Zone (Urban or Rural) and Type of Labor</th>
<th>Program and Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 8, 2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>EDUCA’s Office</td>
<td>EDUCA, INTEC and DEVTECH- Key staff-Greetings, general questions and updates regarding itinerary and meetings</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 9, 2010</td>
<td>8:45 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>EDUCA’s Office</td>
<td>Meeting with Project staff</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Key staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 9, 2010</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>ENTRENA Office</td>
<td>Meet with ENTRENA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>6:30 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>2.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Travel from Santo Domingo to Samaná</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA) (Director and Coordinator)</td>
<td>Urban and rural</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Santa Bárbara de Samaná/Samaná/Lo s Robalos/ Escuela Los Robalos</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA)</td>
<td>Urban/Tourist Area</td>
<td>EpE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>11:30 am</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Santa Bárbara de Samaná/Samaná/ Escuela Eliseo Demorizzi</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA)</td>
<td>Urban/Tourist Area</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ETD*</td>
<td>ETA**</td>
<td>EAT***</td>
<td>Destination/ Province/ Municipality/ Locality</td>
<td>Subcontractor and Coordinator’s Contact Information</td>
<td>Zone (Urban or Rural) and Type of Labor</td>
<td>Program and Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>11:30 am</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>As per coordinator recommendation</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA)</td>
<td>Urban/Tourist Area</td>
<td>As per coordinator recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Lunch and travel to rural area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Santa Bárbara de Samaná/El Limón/ Escuela Básica El Limón</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA)</td>
<td>Rural/Tourist Area Illegal</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Santa Bárbara de Samaná/El Limón/ Escuela Rosa Anderson</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA)</td>
<td>Rural/Tourist Area Illegal/Services</td>
<td>EpE (Note: morning in the database/ currently operating in afternoon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 10, 2010</td>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td>5:30 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>As per coordinator recommendation</td>
<td>Asociación de Samanenses Ausentes (ASA)</td>
<td>Urban/Tourist Area</td>
<td>As per coordinator recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
<td>7:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Duarte/San Francisco de Macoris</td>
<td>Universidad Católica Nordestana (UCNE) (Coordinator)</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural (WFCL)</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Duarte/San Francisco de Macoris (SFM)/ Villa Riva/Escuela El Abanico</td>
<td>Universidad Católica Nordestana (UCNE)</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural (WFCL)</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Duarte/Villa Riva/ El Indio/Community Center</td>
<td>Universidad Católica Nordestana (UCNE)</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural (WFCL)</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>2:30 pm</td>
<td>45 min.</td>
<td>Lunch and Travel time to SFM</td>
<td>Universidad Católica Nordestana (UCNE)</td>
<td>Rural/Urban</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ETD*</td>
<td>ETA**</td>
<td>EAT***</td>
<td>Destination/ Province/ Municipality/ Locality</td>
<td>Subcontractor and Coordinator’s Contact Information</td>
<td>Zone (Urban or Rural) and Type of Labor</td>
<td>Program and Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
<td>2:30 pm</td>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>2.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Duarte/San Francisco de Macorís/27 de febrero/Escuela Divina Providencia</td>
<td>Universidad Católica Nordestana (UCNE)</td>
<td>Urban/Services</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 11, 2010</td>
<td>5:00 pm</td>
<td>5:45 pm</td>
<td>45 mins.</td>
<td>Travel time to Santiago de los Caballeros</td>
<td>CRS/Fundación Educativa Acción (Director and Coordinator)</td>
<td>Urban/Services</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12, 2010</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Santiago de los Caballeros/Escuela Rafey</td>
<td>CRS/Fundación Educativa Acción Callejera</td>
<td>Urban/Illegal/Services</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12, 2010</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Santiago de los Caballeros/Escuela Rafey</td>
<td>CRS/Fundación Educativa Acción Callejera</td>
<td>Urban/Illegal/Services</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12, 2010</td>
<td>12:30 pm</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Lunch and travel time to Santo Domingo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15, 2010</td>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>ILO-IPEC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15, 2010</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>11:30 am</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15, 2010</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Attend Coordinator Retreat</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15, 2010</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>INTEC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15, 2010</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>INFOTEP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ETD*</td>
<td>ETA**</td>
<td>EAT***</td>
<td>Destination/ Province/ Municipality/ Locality</td>
<td>Subcontractor and Coordinator’s Contact Information</td>
<td>Zone (Urban or Rural) and Type of Labor</td>
<td>Program and Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 16, 2010</td>
<td>7:00 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Travel time to Azua</td>
<td>Plan International (Director and Coordinator)</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 16, 2010</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Azua/Los Tramojis/ Community Center</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 16, 2010</td>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>Travel time and lunch to San Juan de la Maguana</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 16, 2010</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>San Juan de la Maguana/Sábana Grande/Vallejuelo/ Community Center</td>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 17, 2010</td>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Travel time to Azua/Padre las Casas/Ludoteca</td>
<td><em>Fundación Sur Futuro</em> (New Partner-Self Sustained) (Coordinator)</td>
<td>Rural/Agricultural</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 17, 2010</td>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>2:30 pm</td>
<td>4 hrs.</td>
<td>Travel time and lunch to Haina</td>
<td>World Vision (Director and National and Local Coordinators)</td>
<td>Urban/Services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 17, 2010</td>
<td>2:30 pm</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>2.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Distrito Nacional/Haina/Barrio Km. 18/Local del Gremio y la Ayuda Mutua</td>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>Urban/Services</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2010</td>
<td>8:15 am</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>45 mins.</td>
<td>Travel time to Boca Chica/Andre/Los Botaos</td>
<td>CRS/Caminante (Director)</td>
<td>Urban/Rural/ Tourist Area (WFCL)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ETD*</td>
<td>ETA**</td>
<td>EAT***</td>
<td>Destination/ Province/ Municipality/ Locality</td>
<td>Subcontractor and Coordinator’s Contact Information</td>
<td>Zone (Urban or Rural) and Type of Labor</td>
<td>Program and Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2010</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>3 hrs.</td>
<td>Santo Domingo/ Boca Chica/Andre/ Los Botaos/Colegio Centro Psicológico Divino Tesoro</td>
<td>CRS/Caminante</td>
<td>Urban/Rural/ Tourist Area (WFCL)</td>
<td>EpC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2010</td>
<td>12:00 pm</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Travel time to Santo Domingo and Lunch</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2010</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Santo Domingo/ Barrios/La Zurza</td>
<td>Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral (IDDI)</td>
<td>Urban/Services (WFCL)</td>
<td>EpE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 19, 2010</td>
<td>8:30 am</td>
<td>9:30 am</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>EDUCA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 19, 2010</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 19, 2010</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 19, 2010</td>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>INFOTEP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ETD = Estimated Time of Departure
** ETA = Estimated Time of Arrival
*** EAT = Estimated Available Time

Note: As per evaluator’s request interviews will include Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labor, INFOTEP, Associates’ Representatives (Board of Directors representatives), Subcontractors’ Directives/Representatives, ILO-IPEC, and USAID Education Officer, among others.
ANNEX F: LIST OF STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Representatives from the following organizations:

- Plan
- INTEC
- Caminante
- UCNE
- EDUCA
- MINERD
- ENTRENA
- Save the Children Dominican Republic
- IDDI
- Acción Collegia
- INFOTEP
- ASA
- Sur Futuro
- SET
- Visión Mundial
- Catholic Relief Service Dominican Republic
- MT
- DevTech
- DRA Dominica
- USDOL
- DGEIB
- Ministry of Labor