



FINAL REPORT (FINAL DRAFT)

Independent Midterm Evaluation of Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project: Regional Report

**World Vision
USDOL Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-4-0057**

Prepared by: Karen Tietjen

Under Contract #: DOLU059K22577



**11785 Beltsville Drive
Calverton, MD 20705**

www.orcmacro.com

MARCH 2007

CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
A. Problem Statement, Background, and KURET Project Overview	1
B. Evaluation Objectives and Summary Evaluation Questions	3
C. Approach, Methodology, and Limitations of Evaluation	3
D. Organization of Report	4
CHAPTER II: FINDINGS ON OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES	5
A. Children Withdrawn or Prevented from Child Labor	5
B. Beneficiary Children's Educational Participation, Learning, and Perceptions	7
C. Learning Environment and Teacher Behavior	10
D. Awareness about Child Labor	11
E. System-wide Change in Policy and Practice	12
CHAPTER III: IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES BY OUTPUT	13
A. Output 1: Access to education for target children increased.	13
B. Output 2: Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of and to those who have been removed from, the worst forms of child labor.	16
C. Output 3: Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education.	18
D. Output 4: Support by government institutions, communities, and households increased.	19
CHAPTER IV: MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET	21
A. Regional Office Organization and Effectiveness	21
B. Management Structure and Working Relationships	26
C. Country Level Project Management Effectiveness and Issues	29
D. Faith-Based Issues	31
E. Budget	32
CHAPTER V: PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION	34
A. Partnerships with Communities, Governments, NGOs, and Donor Agencies	34
B. USDOL-Related Issues	35
CHAPTER VI: MONITORING AND EVALUATION	37
A. M&E System	37
B. PMP and Indicators	40
CHAPTER VII: DESIGN AND SUSTAINABILITY	45
A. Design	45
B. Sustainability	47

CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS LEARNED, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

	49
A. Conclusions	49
B. Lessons Learned	50
C. Recommendations	51

ANNEXES (in separate document)

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: KURET Beneficiaries Withdrawn or Prevented from Child Labor

Table 2: KURET Beneficiary Drop Out by Country

Acronyms

ABE	Alternative Basic Education
ADP	Area Development Program
AED	Academy for Educational Development
ALP	Accelerated Learning Program
ANPPCAN	African Network for the Prevention & Protection against Child Abuse & Neglect
CCC	Community Coalition Committee
CCF	Community Conversation Facilitators
CCPC	Community Child Protection Committee
CCT	Coordinating Center Tutor
CDA	Community Development Agents
CID	Child Identification Number
CIP	Child-in-Program\
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Confirmation of Removal
CORPS	Community Owned Resource Persons
CL	Child labor
COPE	Complementary Opportunity for Primary Education
CPC	Child Protection Committee
CRC	Child Rights Committee
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCLC	District Child Labor Committee
DCPC	District Child Protection Committee
DEO	District Education Officer
EFA	Education For All
EI	Child Labor Education Initiative
FVL	Functional Vocational Literacy
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act
HIV/AIDS	Human Immuno-deficiency virus/Acquired immuno-deficiency syndrome
ICDR	Institute for Curriculum Development and Research
IDP	Internally Displaced person
IGA	Income Generating Activity
ILAB	International Labor Affairs Bureau
ILO	International Labor Organization
IPEC	International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor

IRC	International Rescue Committee
KURET	Combating Exploitive Child Labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project
LC	Local Council
LCLC	Local Child Labor Committee
LOP	life of project
MDD	Music, Dance, and Drama
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MGLSD	Ministry of Gender, Labor and Social Development
MIFOTRA	Ministry of Public Service, Labor, and Skills Development
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOES	Ministry of Education and Sport
MOL	Ministry of Labor
MOLSA	Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOWA	Ministry of Women's Affairs
NCC	National Council for Children
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NOREF	Northern Regional Education Forum
OCFT	Office of child labor, forced labor, and human trafficking
ORACLE	Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent and Child Labor through Education
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PAVE	Pathways to Advancing Viable Education
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PRODOC	Project Document
PTC	Primary Teacher College
REB	Regional Education Bureau
SCREAM	Supporting Children's Rights through Education, the Arts, and the media
SRP	School Readiness Program
TOT	Trainers of Teachers
TOR	Terms of Reference
TPR	Technical Progress Report
UNICEF	United Nations Children Emergency Fund
UPE	Universal Primary Education
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development

USG	United States Government
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child labor
WFP	World Food Program
WV	World Vision

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the following people for their time and support during the Combating Exploitive Child Labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project (KURET) midterm evaluation:

KURET Regional Office—

Aben Ngay, Project Director/Chief-of-Party

Edreda Tuwangyee, Regional Education Specialist

Vachel Miller, Policy/M&E/Research Specialist

Patricia Kaleebu, Finance and Administration Director

KURET Country Managers—

Leah Kaguara, Kenya (World Vision)

Marjorie Lagen, Uganda (World Vision)

Gregory Acar, Uganda (International Rescue Committee)

Joy Gatera, Rwanda (World Vision)

Tesfaye Teshome, Ethiopia (World Vision)

Kassahun Assefa, Ethiopia (International Rescue Committee)

U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking—

Michal Murphy

Laura Geho

Kevin Willcutts

Macro International Inc.—

Lisa Slifer-Mbacke

Helene Jennings

Katharine Wheatley

Lara Cunanan

Executive Summary

This report presents the regional midterm evaluation of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project (KURET), examining project objectives and outcomes; implementation issues; management, budget, and partnerships; and design and sustainability. The purpose of the evaluation is to review project progress to date to determine: (a) whether and the extent to which KURET has achieved its stated objectives¹ and outputs and explain why or why not; (b) assess the impact of the project in terms of sustained improvements achieved; and (c) identify lessons learned and good practices. The evaluation was carried out by a two-person team from October to November 2006, with the participation of KURET country and regional staff.

FINDINGS ON IMPACT AND RESULTS

Direct Beneficiaries. KURET reports having withdrawn or prevented 23,509 direct beneficiaries, of which 12,575 children have been withdrawn, 5,191 prevented, and 5,743 withdrawn and prevented from engaging in child labor, achieving 77 percent of the life-of-project target. Many beneficiaries continue to work in child labor activities, although at a reduced level of effort. KURET has not strictly complied with U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) indicator criteria (i.e., Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA] indicators), which do not allow for measuring degrees of involvement in child labor. Persistence is high at 97 percent, although beneficiaries admit that they miss school frequently, often because of child labor. Student performance in academic programs is reported to be on par with or better than non-KURET-supported students, because of higher motivation and material support, project monitoring, and smaller class sizes in project-operated Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) centers. KURET beneficiaries were happy to be in school. The high demand for education among some KURET beneficiaries contributes to their continued involvement in child labor as they attempt to earn money for schooling expenses. Parents are grateful to KURET. Many still require their child to work, but they say that their requests are moderated. Students have formed an emotional relationship with KURET as their protector or surrogate parent, providing stability and normalcy in their lives.

Learning Environment and Teacher Behavior. KURET enrollment has added to already large class sizes and high student-teacher ratios are common in formal schools in KURET countries. The classrooms visited by the evaluators did not display many physical signs that learner-centered methods were being used; notable exceptions were some of the International Rescue Committee (IRC)-supported Alternative Basic Education (ABE) centers in Ethiopia. Teachers exposed to some form of KURET training appear to have made some positive, child-friendly behavioral changes. Enhanced teacher understanding of child labor and its effects has resulted in teachers who are more patient and willing to deal with student problems. There is no (overt) negative gender bias toward girls. Most students and parents say that the teachers are helpful and provide good instruction. Communities and parents particularly appreciate KURET-supported ALPs.

Awareness about Child Labor. KURET has raised awareness about child labor and associated issues among stakeholders at the household, school, community, district/sector, and national levels. KURET beneficiaries are active messengers, performing plays and songs for the community and talking to other children. Members of the Local Child Labor Committees (LCLCs) have been active in spreading the word about child labor. However, awareness does not necessarily lead to changed attitudes or behaviors of families. Some parents said that they did not require their children to work “beyond their capacity,” but their children indicated otherwise. In the target districts and sub-districts, all interviewed said that it was KURET activities, meetings, and trainings that had brought to their attention the issue of child labor and informed their understanding. At national levels, KURET has been identified as a major force in raising awareness about child labor. In Rwanda and Uganda, the Ministers of Labor indicated that KURET-supported events caused them to make child labor a priority issue.

System-wide Change in Policy and Practice. KURET advanced the child labor policy agenda in Uganda, Kenya, and Rwanda, where child labor policies have either been passed or are under

¹ Withdrawing and preventing children from the worst forms of child labor; and enrollment, retention and completion of educational programs.

development. In education, KURET is just beginning to address national-level policy, practice, and operations. In Uganda, KURET has used a multi-channel approach to include child labor in primary teacher training curricula and education operations and services, including Guidance and Counseling, Complimentary Opportunity for Primary Education (COPE), Teacher Education, Compulsory Education Policy, and revision of the Education Bill. In Ethiopia, the Regional Education Bureau in Benishangul has agreed to assume responsibility of the IRC-created ABE centers. In Rwanda and Uganda, KURET support resulted in the promulgation of district-level by-laws. District Child Labor Committees (DCLCs) have been reactivated and local-level committees are actively monitoring children.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES BY OUTPUT

Output 1 (Access to education for target children increased). KURET-supported students and their parents were generally satisfied with the education programs in which they had been placed, but the time and budget constraints KURET faced suggest that it should examine its current support policy to ensure that students acquire enough education to keep them out of child labor. KURET classroom construction and creation of ALP centers did not always fully consider the governments' policies and investment frameworks so that governments may not assume the support of some operations and teachers. The KURET student support package is largely sufficient to meet students' immediate educational needs, but it is not sufficient to ensure their full participation in school or meet their livelihood needs. Children need food, shelter, and medical care. The livelihood linkage strategy has proven unrealistic, although some KURET income-generating activities (IGAs) may be viable. Many KURET vocational education programs do not appear to offer quality training. Training-to-work plans for students appear ill-formed, may be insufficient, and have not been analyzed.

Output 2 (Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of and to those who have been removed from the worst forms of child labor). KURET has introduced new services to assist beneficiaries to adapt to the school environment. Extracurricular school club activities are the primary means of teaching students about child labor and the effect of HIV/AIDS on child labor. The School Readiness Program in Ethiopia is a major achievement with tremendous potential, but should be assessed and modified to be more effective. The design of the Functional Vocational Literacy Program should also be assessed. Although KURET has provided guidance and counseling training for select teachers, these teachers—and the LCLCs—request more. Additional services requested include: tutoring, remediation and make-up classes; holiday/break programs; and school feeding programs. Schools appreciate the school support package, but it is not robust enough to appreciably improve school quality and is not informed by analysis of the most cost-effective inputs. It is not apparent how the KURET-supported model schools are assisting or inspiring quality improvement at other schools or that any comprehensive plan has been made for them to do so.

Country project staff members were unable to articulate clearly the overall teacher training plan. It is imperative that KURET both understand and implement a coherent teacher training strategy and plan to ensure that a core number of teachers at each learning site have received the full package of the requisite training. Teachers were generally satisfied with KURET training, but said it was insufficient. The KURET multi-subject training syllabus is ambitious and may not be feasible given the duration of the project and its resources. Schools report that an effective Trainers of Teachers (TOT) model has not yet been rolled out. KURET has not developed a template for TOT rollout at the schools or guidance for TOT implementation.

Output 3 (Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education). Although effective, KURET's Phase 1 awareness-raising activities were largely ad hoc and took advantage of opportunities as they arose. KURET country projects have used several creative means of raising awareness. The draft Phase 2 Awareness Raising Strategy (July 2006) provides a coherent, rational discussion of awareness raising, but does not provide a template and concrete suggestions/examples for expanding and building on Phase 1 activities or for introducing new activities, tools, and materials to encourage and support behavioral change. Although many of the Phase 1 awareness-raising activities must continue, Phase 2 must also provide for additional approaches that direct awareness toward action, as well as address some of the issues that arose from earlier activities.

Output 4 (Support for the education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased). Except in Uganda, KURET has not worked specifically or directly with the central ministries of education to develop comprehensive plans for the integration of child labor issues into policy frameworks and operations. The Uganda experience offers a good model. Not all DCLCs have a clear idea of what their function is, and it is not clear in all countries that the training provided corresponds to the groups' different responsibilities or work programs. They lack a budget to fund their activities. While highly motivated, LCLCs lack material support (transport and stationery) and are not linked to any higher-level structure or authority which—in the absence of KURET—could continue to motivate them. Parents of beneficiaries are an untapped resource and their participation should be incorporated into activities. KURET capacity-building activities at the national and district levels have been constrained for the most part by the lack of personnel in the child labor units at the Ministries of Labor and recent administrative reorganizations in Uganda and Rwanda.

FINDINGS ON MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Management and Structure. The Regional Office is well located but not well staffed: technical areas exceed the number of regional specialists and the Regional Office Education Specialist does not have sufficient assistance. The value added by the Regional Office is significant. It ensures that the country projects are implemented as planned and on time, project procedures and protocols are followed, resources are budgeted appropriately, deliverables are produced, and targets and reporting requirements are met. In addition to overall planning and implementation oversight, the Regional Office provides technical direction in various areas, such as policy development, educational quality, awareness raising, monitoring and evaluation, and research. It develops such resources as materials, modules, instruments, and reporting formats. The Regional Office has been essential to KURET operations and meeting deliverables. It has put in place procedures and systems to ensure the quality and accuracy of deliverables.

A clear understanding of reporting roles and the goodwill of all parties involved have made KURET's multi-level, multi-organization structure workable and effective, but some weaknesses exist: insufficient collaboration between country project implementing partners (World Vision and IRC); exclusion of the Regional Office from personnel hiring and staff performance reviews; and some country offices' resistance to Regional Office intervention and defensiveness of their autonomy. KURET country projects have suffered from high staff turnover, delays in replacement of key staff, and difficulty finding qualified candidates. The organization of the KURET country offices and staffing patterns does not uniformly reflect the areas of KURET intervention. Some field sites are understaffed.

World Vision, the lead grantee for the KURET project, is a faith-based organization. There is no evidence or indication that KURET operations have been biased by religious orientation or that U.S. Government resources have been used directly for religious purposes, although many of the government and private schools which KURET supports include religious instruction in their curricula.

Budget. No immediate budget issues seriously impede project operations, although resources are scarce and not all project and beneficiary needs can be met. Budgets for some country projects are not sufficient to provide the basic KURET support package or ensure that it meets its results for Outputs 1 and 2. Funds must also be made available for the awareness-raising efforts. Nearly \$1.7 million in matching funds—derived from WV cash and gift-in-kind transfers—has been allocated to the Regional Office and country projects. Not included in this number is the value of the linkages created for KURET beneficiaries and other leveraged funds.

FINDINGS ON PARTNERSHIP

KURET Regional Office and country staff members have developed cordial and productive relationships with a wide range of partners, especially at the local levels with Community-level Child Labor or School Management Committees. KURET has also forged good relationships with District (or equivalent) Child Labor Committees, despite frequent government personnel changes. At the national level, KURET has built strong relationships with the Ministries of Labor in each country, with the exception of Ethiopia. KURET has provided or supported venues for bringing different government organizations, donors, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) together. KURET has established productive relations with other DOL-funded projects, sharing information, materials, and instruments; combining efforts to advance

policy goals; and providing joint funding for certain activities. KURET has established relationships with the U.S. Embassies, but has not been as successful in forging partnerships with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Missions or their education projects.

KURET and USDOL have developed a functional relationship. Both the Regional Office and country project staff have expressed appreciation for the flexibility USDOL has shown with several issues and its encouragement. USDOL has not always been able to respond to KURET requests, products, or decision needs in a timely manner. Changes in USDOL Project Managers in Washington have also caused delays.

FINDINGS ON MONITORING AND EVALUATION

KURET has developed multiple tools and systems to monitor project performance, but compliance with all USDOL requirements comes at a high cost and entails trade-offs for the use of KURET human and financial resources, which, in the project's and the evaluators' view, could be used more productively for other project activities. KURET's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system has enabled it to act on USDOL individual child-tracking requirements and report on project beneficiary indicators with a high degree of accuracy, although not in complete compliance with USDOL criteria for full withdrawal from child labor. The identification and selection process is sound and well-implemented. KURET has put in place a data quality control system, including a multi-tiered Data Quality Assurance Plan that subjects beneficiary and other project data to multiple reviews.

The data reporting requirements for children are time-consuming and will become more so in the future. Country projects spend at least four months per year on this work, and the Regional Office about three months. The data collection burden restricts their ability to deal with other quality-enhancing and M&E activities, and leaves little time to analyze the data. There are options for reducing the data collection, entry, and processing burden. The current child tracking system is not suitable for long-term use by government or local committees.

The Performance Monitoring Plan is outdated, and the log frame format is not suitable for KURET. Many indicators are inappropriate, no longer applicable, have little M&E value, or are poorly defined. They are not standardized across countries. The Technical Progress Report is an important document, but its utility is limited. The format does not easily accommodate KURET data. While KURET has met or surpassed some of its global targets for the GPRA indicators, the targets are not always appropriate nor do they always easily conform to field realities.

DESIGN AND SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

While the four output areas of KURET do provide logical building blocks for eliminating child labor, KURET experience so far has shown that key development hypotheses do not hold up completely. Education is not an alternative to child labor, but child labor is a barrier to educational participation. It is questionable whether children will have attained the required levels of schooling/training and skills to find employment outside of child labor. The student support package is not sufficient to keep children out of child labor. The 4-year time frame is insufficient to effect all the policy and institutional changes KURET desires or to have an appreciable effect on reducing child labor. The current KURET strategy is not sufficient to appreciably improve education quality and relevance. Success in Uganda with integrating child labor into educational services suggests that this is a more productive, cost-effective approach. Expectations for the treatment of HIV/AIDS are not clear in the KURET strategy, except as a background variable.

It was unclear which aspects of KURET are expected to be sustained. KURET has effected some changes in the policy arena that should have an enduring effect. While KURET has directed most of its education efforts at the school level, more promising prospects for sustainable change in the quality and relevance of education are at the national or regional levels. KURET's exit strategy is not specific about how it is going to put in place the actual conditions for sustainability. KURET's direct beneficiary support component, which consumes the largest proportion of project resources, may be inherently unsustainable, given the limited available resources in the countries where KURET works. The exit strategy unrealistically relies on linking beneficiaries to other programs.

CONCLUSIONS

KURET enjoys strong Regional Office management and well-run country programs. It can already boast several accomplishments: nearly 24,000 children, who would otherwise be working or in child labor, are now in school or training programs. The project has significantly advanced the development of national policy frameworks in three of the four participating countries, supported the promulgation of by-laws in two of these countries, engaged the material support of government for some of its interventions, and created LCLCs that play an active role in raising awareness of and monitoring child labor. The KURET Project is functioning on schedule and target and within budget, despite the implementation constraints caused by war, conflict, political unrest, and natural disasters in participating countries.

KURET faces two types of challenges that threaten its effectiveness and sustainability: 1) weaknesses in the conceptualization and delivery of some of its services, and 2) weaknesses inherent in the project design and endemic to child labor. The complex nature of child labor and KURET's limited resources mean that it is unlikely to fully meet USDOL's GPRA withdrawal and prevention indicator. The ambitious policy, capacity building, and behavioral change agenda which KURET has set is likely to exceed the duration and budget of the project.

KURET Strengths and Notable Practices

- KURET projects in all four countries are producing results in a remarkably short period of time. Student targets have been met and even surpassed. All output areas are being addressed.
- Nearly 24,000 children, who would otherwise be working or at risk of child labor, are in school or in training programs.
- Several innovations/good practices have been launched or are planned in the various countries:
 - The Alternative Basic Education (ABE) center model has been improved
 - School Readiness Program
 - Functional Vocational Literacy
 - Community Conversation Process developed
 - Mentor and Model Schools
 - Supplementary Reading Materials
 - Artisan Vocational Training Program
 - Mentor Program for Vocational Education Program Graduates
 - Peer Monitoring of Girl Dropouts and Advocacy
 - Peer Monitoring among Former Child Prostitutes
 - Radio Talk Shows and Broadcasts
 - Training of Lawmakers at the Local Level
- KURET has advanced the child labor policy formation process in Uganda, Kenya, and Rwanda. Uganda has recently approved the child labor policy, Kenya is close to adopting it, and Rwanda's child labor policy is under development. In all four countries, KURET is recognized as a major player in the child labor policy arena.
- At the district level, KURET has supported the promulgation of by-laws: the Girl-Child Education Bill (Gulu), the Child Labor Bill (Lira), the Child Labor Employment Penalty By-Law (Gicumba), and the Anti-Child Labor Tea Plantation Ordinance (Nyugururu).
- KURET has been able to engage material support from the District Education Offices for some of its interventions, notably ABE centers and teacher certification (Benishangul), vocational education (Wolkite), and school and teacher inspection (Gulu).
- Dormant District Child Labor Committees have been reactivated in all countries, and Local Child Labor Committees have been established. Many are actively involved in monitoring and preparing reports on KURET-supported students, as well as community awareness raising.
- Interactive, participatory learning techniques and training materials have been developed.
- KURET has attempted to meet the additional needs of students through other programs and linkages, such as Gifts-in-Kind and Child in Program (sponsorship) and income-generating activities.
- KURET has shown how practical and concrete action can be taken to address child labor as part of a child rights strategy: the beneficiaries are pleased with the services and support KURET provides. KURET's strategy of integrating child labor into education services in Uganda has proven productive and cost effective.
- KURET's management structures and systems (including required data collection and reporting) function well and include measures for quality control. In particular, the new database, which will flag or skip inconsistent entries, should be a useful management tool that could be emulated in other projects.
- KURET has demonstrated that it is a learning project by conducting peer learning events and by supporting the midterm evaluation.

Chapter I: Introduction

This report is one of five reports prepared as part of the Combating Exploitive Child Labor in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia Together Project (KURET) midterm evaluation. It presents a regional synthesis that assesses overall project objectives and outcomes; reviews project-wide implementation issues; examines management, budget, and partnerships; and addresses issues of design and sustainability. Individual country reports for Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia supplement this report.

A. Problem Statement, Background, and KURET Project Overview

In Sub-Saharan Africa, an estimated 40 percent of children—48 million—are engaged in child labor. In most African countries, children constitute an integral part of the household economy: they help around the house, care for siblings, assist with farm chores, and run errands. But millions of these children perform work that far surpasses their physical capacity, requires long hours, and endangers their health, safety, and well-being. Politics and poverty have placed many of these children either in, or at risk of, the worst forms of child labor (WFCL). They labor as soldiers and prostitutes, in unpaid servitude and illegal activities, and under abusive and hazardous conditions. The HIV/AIDS pandemic sweeping Africa has exacerbated the incidence of child labor, as millions of AIDS orphans and children with HIV-infected parents struggle to meet their own and their families' needs for survival. The work imperative often keeps children from enrolling in or attending school, prevents them from acquiring basic literacy and numeracy skills, and limits their future livelihood opportunities and their ability to escape poverty and exploitation. Education is recognized by the global community as a powerful intervention for combating child labor, as well as an essential ingredient for national social and economic development. Launched by the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking in 2001, the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI) seeks to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children in 50 countries around the world by increasing access to basic education for children either engaged in or at risk of child labor. EI projects are designed to withdraw or prevent these children from child labor by providing them with quality and relevant education opportunities, and ensuring that they persist in their schooling once enrolled. EI projects include four strategic elements: 1) awareness raising and mobilization, 2) strengthened education systems, 3) national policy development, and 4) sustainability. Following a needs assessment that identifies gaps and priorities to reduce child labor through education, USDOL awards cooperative agreements for technical assistance projects to a variety of implementing agencies, including international organizations and nongovernmental organization (NGOs).²

In September 2004, World Vision (WV), with its partners the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Academy for Educational Development (AED), was awarded a 4-year cooperative agreement for \$14.5 million to implement KURET. The KURET Project aims to sustainably reduce the engagement of children in WFCL in targeted areas in each of the four countries, specifically those with both a high incidence of child labor and HIV/AIDS prevalence, primarily through improved access to quality education. Its purpose is to educate 30,600 children aged 5 to 17 in HIV/AIDS-affected communities who have been withdrawn or prevented from WFCL.³ In addition to the International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention No. 182 working definition,⁴ KURET considers “productive, exploitative, and

² USDOL does not fund contractors directly through its EI program. EI grantees can, however, use sub-contractors to assist in implementing the cooperative agreement received from USDOL.

³ See Annex 2 for precise definitions.

⁴ As defined by ILO Convention No. 182, WFCL are: “(a) all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, (b) the use, procuring or offering a child for prostitution...pornography or pornographic performances; (c) the use, procuring or offering of a

household work that prohibits children from attaining a primary-level education through formal, vocational, or alternative learning programs to be a WFCL.” KURET defines “at risk” children as those affected by HIV/AIDS, conflict, or other extreme circumstances that may push them into child labor, as defined by the local community or those already engaged in WFCL⁵ (see Annex 2 for definitions).

The KURET Project operates at both the country and regional levels. It maintains offices in each country, as well as a Regional Office in Kampala. The KURET country strategy, executed by KURET national offices, comprises four output objectives that define project activities: 1) access to education of target children increased; 2) quality and relevance of basic education services available to target children improved; 3) awareness of key stakeholders about the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education increased; and 4) support for education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased. While there is some variation for country context, all four national projects follow the same parameters:⁶

- **To increase access**, KURET helps children access learning programs appropriate to their needs and interests, specifically formal schools, alternative/accelerated learning programs, and vocational/apprenticeship programs. KURET employs a three-pronged approach to address key supply and demand factors affecting enrollment and retention: 1) improving physical infrastructure and school availability; 2) providing direct material support (e.g., uniforms, books, supplies) and payment of school tuition or fees; and 3) linking children to other organizations/programs that can meet some of the livelihood needs of the children and of their families.
- **To improve educational quality and relevance**, KURET provides support to schools and learning sites that enroll target children. Interventions include 1) providing teaching/learning materials and sports equipment; 2) training teachers, school directors, and other education personnel in child labor/child rights, learner-centered pedagogy, life skills/HIV/AIDS, gender-sensitivity, and counseling, and psychosocial support; and 3) training School Management Committees.
- **To increase awareness**, KURET supports and conducts a variety of awareness-raising activities, including national publicity campaigns, contests/competitions, radio/television broadcasts, local events and workshops with community leaders and catalysts, and school-based child labor clubs.
- **To increase support**, KURET works with government institutions and organizations at multiple levels, as well as communities and families. It supports the promulgation of national child labor policies and local by-laws, as well as adoption of institutional practices and programs to address child labor and related issues. It assists with the creation or reactivation of national, district, and community groups to promote, develop, supervise, or implement anti-child-labor activities. It builds these groups’ capacity through training, visits, and exchanges.

The KURET regional strategy, executed by the Kampala-based Regional Office, comprises four regional outputs. Regional Output 1 (quality of KURET country programs assured) is implemented by the Regional Office, which supports program quality and field operations through a mix of interventions (e.g., design of systems and tools, technical guidance, troubleshooting). Regional Output 2 (body of knowledge related to child labor, HIV/AIDS, and education increased) is addressed through the conduct of baseline situational analyses and operational research studies. Regional Output 3 (promising practices shared with key stakeholders and decisionmakers) comprises newsletters, workshops/exchanges, Website postings, and research reports. Regional Output 4 (capacity of national and regional institutions to initiate policy and advocacy increased) is primarily accomplished at the country level (see Country Output 4), as no regional counterpart institution has been identified.

child for illicit activities, (d) work which, by its nature or the circumstances in which it is carried out, is likely to harm the health, safety or morals of children.”

⁵ Criteria used to identify such children include, among others, having siblings already engaged in child labor, living with parents/guardians who are chronically ill, and being a child mother.

⁶ As described in the Project Document (2005).

B. Evaluation Objectives and Summary Evaluation Questions

KURET is now entering its third year of operation. The scope of this midterm evaluation includes an assessment of both the country and regional activities carried out under WV's Cooperative Agreement with USDOL. Its purpose is to review project progress to date to determine: "(a) whether and the extent to which KURET has achieved its stated objectives and outputs and explain why or why not; (b) assess the impact of the project in terms of sustained improvements achieved; and (c) identify lessons learned and good practices to inform future USDOL projects."⁷ The evaluation addresses 49 research questions, subsumed under the following seven key questions:

1. Is the project achieving expected impact (objective) and results (outputs) and associated targets?
2. Are the current implementation approaches and activities effective, and if not, why not?
3. Are monitoring and evaluation tools and systems in place and providing accurate and timely information?
4. Have the project principals established productive relationships with each other, government and local partners, international agencies and NGOs, and USDOL?
5. Is the project management effective at both country and regional levels, and budget resources sufficient to achieve results and targets?
6. Is the design of the project logical and coherent, relevant to its goals, appropriate to its context, and realistic in its scope and targets?
7. Is the project's strategy for and approach to sustainability adequate and appropriate to promote sustainability of project services and interests?

C. Approach, Methodology, and Limitations of Evaluation

The evaluation was carried out by a two-person team from October to November 2006, with the participation of KURET country and regional staff. Approximately 10 days were spent in each country.⁸ The evaluation team initially met in Uganda to plan and prepare for the national program evaluations. Evaluation visits were conducted separately in Rwanda and Kenya and jointly in Ethiopia and Uganda (with each evaluator collecting data on a different implementing partner, either WV or IRC). In each country, the evaluator was accompanied by national and local project staff who made introductions, oriented the evaluator, facilitated appointments, and participated in interviews, as appropriate. The evaluators were assisted by interpreters and note-takers as necessary, depending on local language requirements. In all, 35 learning sites were visited and 1,786 persons interviewed.

Data collection methods employed include the following:

- Document review including Project Document and revisions; Cooperative Agreement; Technical Progress and Status Reports; Project Log Frames and Monitoring Plans; Workplans; Management Procedures and Guidelines; research or other studies undertaken (e.g., baseline studies, policy analyses); training materials, tools, and instruments developed; and project PowerPoint presentations.
- Comparative data tables for the different countries, with key quantitative impact and output variables. (Format was provided to project staff.)
- Individual and group interviews with partner organization staff (WV, IRC, and AED) at the regional and national levels.
- Individual and group interviews with stakeholders at the national and district (or sector) levels,

⁷ See page 4 of the Terms of Reference in Annex 1.

⁸ See Annex 1 for work plan and more detailed description of methodology.

including Ministries of Labor and Education and lower level offices; District Child Labor Committees (DCLCs); international agencies (i.e., ILO) and other funding agency partners; U.S. Embassy representatives; and partner institutions (e.g., universities).

- Individual or group interviews with direct and indirect beneficiaries at the local level (e.g., learning site), including school principals and teachers, parents, students, School Management or Local Child Labor Committees (LCLCs), and—when possible—children still engaged in child labor and their parents.
- Observations of class interactions, project environment, and general status of beneficiaries.

The same methodology and instruments (11 interview guides and 2 checklists) were used in each country.⁹ District and learning site visits were selected purposively to obtain a range of contexts and environments. Efforts were made to visit at least one type of learning site in each country, including formal primary and secondary schools, accelerated learning programs, and formal and non-formal vocational training.¹⁰ At the end of each national data collection exercise, a stakeholder meeting brought together the national implementing partners and other stakeholders to vet and validate the preliminary findings and emerging issues presented by the evaluators, solicit recommendations, and obtain additional information. The evaluation field work concluded with a day-long regional debriefing meeting in Kampala for all Regional Office and key country project staff.

As with any evaluation, the time and resource envelope informed methodology and entailed trade-offs. Neither the scope of the evaluation nor its time frame permitted a project-wide quantitative survey or visits to every learning site.¹¹ There is a variety of data that would have been helpful to the evaluation team, but it is not routinely collected or aggregated by KURET. Site selection for the evaluation team visits was made on the basis of purposive sampling (rather than random) to capture a range of KURET experience in a variety of situations. Qualitative methods—individual and group interviews—were primarily used to collect information about the program. The advantage of this method is that it provides insight into attitudes, perceptions, and reasons for behaviors from a wide variety of stakeholders in a short period of time. The major limitation is that behaviors are reported (rather than observed), respondents are not necessarily representative of the population, and responses are subject to interviewer interpretation. These shortcomings were substantially mitigated by using semi-structured interview protocols, requiring respondents to provide examples, and triangulating data from multiple sources. Numerous interviews—both individual and group—were conducted at each site with a variety of informants. The information from like sources at the various sites was compared and contrasted with information provided from other sources. Little variation was found and clear patterns emerged. Deviations are noted in the text. Accuracy of translation was addressed by having multiple English- and local-language speakers attend interviews. In addition to translators and note-takers hired by the evaluators, KURET personnel were present to provide corrections and clarification. Stakeholder workshops and the regional debriefing meeting were held to vet and validate the data. While their comments were taken into consideration by the evaluators, stakeholder opinions or “rebuttals” were not always found to be convincing. Annotated preliminary findings were sent to project management, who were invited to add additional comments and clarification.

D. Organization of Report

This regional report synthesizes country findings and discusses major design, implementation,

⁹ The instruments were developed to obtain information required to answer the TOR questions. They are included in Annex 4 of the Regional Synthesis Report.

¹⁰ See country reports for number of sites visited and groups/persons interviewed.

¹¹ This type of data is generally collected as part of the program M&E or as an empirical research study.

management, budget, partnership, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and sustainability issues from an overall project perspective.

The report is organized into eight chapters. Chapter I (above) introduces the evaluation, including its background, purpose, and methods. Chapter II presents finding on objectives and outcomes. Chapter III presents project-wide implementation issues. Chapter IV presents finding on management and budget. Chapter V assesses partnership and coordination. Chapter VI looks at M&E. Chapter VII discusses design and sustainability issues. Chapter VIII presents conclusions, key lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations. The annexes include the TOR (including detailed methodology), DOL definitions and reporting criteria of its “withdrawn” and “prevented” indicator under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA), documents reviewed and project materials consulted, and instruments developed and used by the evaluators. The annexes are included in a separate document.

Chapter II: Findings on Objectives and Outcomes

A. Children Withdrawn or Prevented from Child Labor

As of September 2006, KURET reports that 23,509 children have been withdrawn or prevented from engaging in child labor, achieving 77 percent of the life-of-project target. Approximately 50 percent of these children are female, achieving gender parity but falling short (at this point in the project) of the 60 to 40 percent desired female-male distribution KURET has set for itself. The initial beneficiary intake cohort was not disaggregated according to whether the child was withdrawn or prevented from child labor, but later cohort figures show that 12,575 (71%) of the children have been withdrawn and 5,191 (29%) prevented. KURET does not report on the type of labor a child was withdrawn from, which could be helpful given the expanded definition of WFCL KURET uses, so that the project’s effect on truly egregious cases is known and reports against KURET’s own ranking of WFCL.¹²

Table 1: KURET Beneficiaries Withdrawn or Prevented from Child Labor

	Female	Male	Total
Withdrawn	6,339	6,236	12,575 (54%/71%)
Prevented	2,622	2,569	5,191 (22%/29%)
Withdrawn or Prevented	2,713	3,030	5,743 (24%)
Total	11,674	11,835	23,509 (100%)

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006) and KURET, September 2006 TPR

KURET’s ultimate objective is to reduce the number of children engaged in WFCL (including those precluded from attending school because of work). The project uses enrollment or participation in school or training programs as a proxy for this measure, working on the assumption that if the child is in school, he or she has left child labor. (Its semi-annual formal follow-up of beneficiaries attempts to ascertain whether the children have engaged in child labor.) Unfortunately, it appears that many of the KURET beneficiaries continue to work in child labor activities to contribute to their and their families’ survival, although at a reduced level of effort because of their school attendance. Child labor among KURET-

¹² Such breakdowns do seem to be recorded in the KURET bimonthly reports, but do not appear in aggregated form in accessible KURET reports (e.g., TPR).

supported students has been reduced, but not eliminated.

Many beneficiaries interviewed—and some parents—report that KURET beneficiaries continue to engage in child labor after school, on weekends, and during school holidays because the income this work generates is valuable for family existence and often is essential to their survival. Moreover, many KURET-supported children explained that they missed school frequently because they had to labor at tasks that were inappropriate for their age and capacity.¹³ They are not simply running errands after school, shining shoes, or selling fruit. Instead, they are toiling in stone quarries, on tea plantations, in prostitution; fetching 20-liter jerry-cans of water; working late into the evening; or spending all day herding livestock without food or water. In short, they return to the same conditions which KURET felt justified their selection as beneficiaries.

KURET says it is focusing on ensuring that children are not involved in WFCL or working under hazardous or exploitative conditions. The LCLCs the project has mobilized appear diligent in following up on absentee children to bring them to school, but less effective in keeping them from child labor, a task that exceeds their mandate and capacity (i.e., they are neither police nor have the resources to provide livelihood support). Many beneficiaries are still involved in unacceptable work. These children do not appear to be reflected in the reported data, as the number of children withdrawn/prevented equals both the number of children enrolled in school (i.e., the number withdrawn/prevented should be less than those enrolled) and the number of KURET beneficiaries.

While KURET indicates that it adheres to a more nuanced, sliding scale definition of child labor, USDOL does not. USDOL is emphatic that “children working in exploitive child labor must no longer be working...” and “all types of work that prevent a child from obtaining an education (attending school regularly) should be considered exploitive work.” It even provides an example: “*a child who attends a DOL-supported non-formal education program in the morning and works under hazardous conditions in mining during the afternoon and evening should not be counted as withdrawn/prevented.*” This suggests that there is a serious disconnect between what KURET is reporting and what USDOL requires.¹⁴

KURET is aware of this discrepancy. It is planning two research studies that will examine the work children engage in when not in school and the effect of their being withdrawn on their families. The project recently instituted a child labor verification system requiring a “knowledgeable” person to confirm that the child is no longer working in child labor. The evaluators are sympathetic to the challenges KURET faces given the overwhelming poverty, few income-generating opportunities in the project target areas, and the complexities associated with eliminating child labor. Although KURET is working with only a tiny proportion of the number of children engaged in, and therefore in need of withdrawal from, WFCL, it cannot meet all the beneficiary needs or remedy the conditions that keep them in child labor. It is unreasonable to assume that it could. This is the quandary faced by KURET and other USDOL child

¹³ The evaluators took care to determine whether the children were simply “working” (i.e., engaging in non-hazardous activities appropriate to their age and capacity) or “laboring.” The children were able to distinguish between child work and child labor in their responses (a KURET accomplishment).

¹⁴ In its comments on the draft report, KURET cited the definition of withdrawal from child labor contained in “GPRA Questions and Answers for Education Initiative Grantees” (January 2006). KURET contends that USDOL clearly recognizes that “there are a number of gray areas regarding the issue of withdrawal,” specifically that USDOL—not just KURET—accepts a “sliding scale” with different degrees of involvement in child labor. KURET refers to page 9 where USDOL states, “*In some cases, the work conditions of children involved in hazardous work may be improved so as to make the work conditions acceptable for children. This may include, for example, reducing hours of work or changing the type of work children perform...*” While only USDOL can clarify its intention, evaluator interpretation of the definition put forth in this document is that withdrawal from child labor still precludes work 1) in hazardous occupations/situations, 2) that is exploitative, or 3) is inappropriate to a child’s age or capacity, even if the hours are reduced or the tasks lightened in comparison to the child’s previous engagement. This also appears to be the understanding of the USDOL Project Manager who cites the same document, but both KURET and USDOL should come to a mutual understanding of the definition. The differing views cannot be resolved in this report.

labor projects.¹⁵ The USDOL indicator on “withdrawn/prevented children” as currently defined does not appear to allow for the graduations or degrees of involvement of beneficiaries in child labor. It is predicated on an all-or-nothing assumption that deems anything less than 100-percent compliance with criteria to be a failure to report properly. Not only does this distort project accomplishments, it places grantees in the awkward position of having to decide between reporting figures that do not absolutely conform to USDOL requirements or reporting figures that conform absolutely and risk possibly disappointing the donor client when targets are not met.

The solution is not necessarily redefining a codified GPRA indicator, but rather developing additional indicators that capture the different degrees of engagement in child labor (e.g., fewer hours outside of school, better working conditions, age appropriate work) and better align with the reality that withdrawal from child labor is a gradual and uneven process. Additional indicators can be crafted to reflect KURET’s experience that “the removal from child labor is not a one-time event” and that “children may stop working completely for a time; they may reduce hours or improve conditions as they attend school. They may also step back into child labor periodically during weekends or school holidays to meet survival needs.”¹⁶ The trade-off is that even more effort will have to go into an already demanding and difficult data collection and reporting system, which may not be feasible. USDOL and KURET together will have to explore and consider the ramifications.

Less informative than creating additional indicators, but also necessary, is that the targets for withdrawn and prevented children be revised downward to reflect estimates of the number of children who are not likely to leave entirely child labor, arrived at through the KURET research noted above.

B. Beneficiary Children’s Educational Participation, Learning, and Perceptions

Despite the fact that some children continue to engage in child labor, the greatest effect of the project has been made on its direct beneficiaries—the children supported by KURET. Some 23,509 children who would otherwise be involved in or at risk of child labor are enrolled in KURET-supported schools or training programs. Persistence is extraordinarily high: fewer than 700 children have dropped out of the program, representing a 3 percent dropout—or 97 percent persistence—rate. Dropout is the result of a variety of factors, most often brought on by factors external to KURET, such as relocation because of conflict (Ethiopia, Uganda) and drought (Ethiopia, Rwanda). Only rarely was dropout attributed to dissatisfaction with the learning program, most often reported among vocational education students. Boys are slightly more likely to drop out (3.1percent) than girls (2.8 percent), a notable accomplishment given the generally higher barriers to girls’ educational participation. More than half of the KURET dropouts are found in Rwanda (53 percent), which accounts for only 21 percent of total KURET enrollments.

¹⁵ Other USDOL-funded EI grantees interviewed said that they too were unable to guarantee 100 percent removal from child labor.

¹⁶ KURET feedback on the draft Regional Evaluation Report (February 2007).

Table 2: KURET Beneficiary Drop Out by Country

Country	Female	Male	Total (%)
Kenya	53	44	97 (14%)
Uganda	31	22	52 (7%)
Rwanda	159	214	373 (53%)
Ethiopia	89	87	176 (25%)
Total	332 (47%)	367 (53%)	699 (100%)

Source: KURET, Evaluation Data Tables (November 30, 2006) and KURET, September 2006 TPR

KURET-supported student absenteeism is not regarded as a major problem by schools, but many students admit that they miss one or more days per month (maybe as high as one day per week). Primary causes of absenteeism appear to vary in severity by country, including disruption resulting from conflict, hunger, personal illness, and the need to take care of sick relatives. However, in all countries, child work and child labor were cited as causes for absenteeism by the students, parents, and community members interviewed. Child mothers and child household heads were most frequently reported to be absent. In some countries, punctuality is also a problem among KURET-supported students. Children are often expected to “labor” before coming to school. Beneficiary attendance is monitored by teachers and followed up by KURET field staff and LCLCs, but KURET does not appear to keep formal records on the frequency or reasons for beneficiary absences, nor does it calculate or report overall beneficiary attendance rates. Since USDOL withdrawn/prevented criteria also include work that prevents regular attendance, KURET student tracking systems should also include this indicator and factor it into their research.

Although no student performance data were available, school staff and parents considered KURET-supported student performance in academic programs either on par with or better than non-KURET-supported student performance. Reasons for this include the higher motivation of KURET-supported students; the material support they receive; the mentoring and monitoring provided by teachers, LCLCs and KURET staff; and—in the case of Ethiopia’s Alternative Basic Education (ABE) Centers and Uganda’s Complimentary Opportunity for Primary Education (COPE) Centers—the smaller class sizes. Although some KURET countries say they collect performance data (i.e., exam results) from schools, they do not report it. Despite the trauma that many KURET beneficiaries have experienced (e.g. abduction, rape, abuse, loss of parents, and displacement), teachers reported that there are relatively few manifestations in the classroom. A few disciplinary problems (e.g., rudeness) were reported, but have apparently subsided as students have become accustomed to school. The most common sign of stress is inattention and absent-mindedness, although many students said that school “relaxes their minds,” meaning it takes their thoughts away from their troubles. Teachers observed that younger students are less likely to suffer from trauma, and perform better than older ones.

KURET beneficiaries were universally happy—even thrilled—to be in school. They genuinely like school and value the opportunity. For many who had been forced to leave school, KURET gave them a “second chance.” Attending school has brought an unprecedented degree of stability and normalcy into many children’s lives. It also creates an opportunity for recreation, play, and fun—interacting with others, making friends, participating in school clubs—which seldom figures in their lives outside school hours.

The younger children interviewed said they liked “learning,” but older students see their schooling or training as an investment and an opportunity to build a future, advance their education, and earn a livelihood. One student said, “It’s good for our families because if we learn, then we can help them more.” Unfortunately, in some instances, the high demand for education among KURET beneficiaries contributes to their continued involvement in child labor. Some KURET beneficiaries—especially secondary school students—labor to earn money to maintain themselves in school (e.g., to purchase soap, pay house rent, supplies). In Uganda, KURET-supported students heading households work to sustain their families and pay for younger children’s schooling expenses, and they require their younger siblings to labor with them.

Parents of KURET beneficiaries were also pleased that their children were in school and were grateful to KURET, and—often—USDOL. Although they admitted that they have to work harder to make up for lost income, parents were sustained by the prospect of a better future for their child and the help the child will provide the household. Although many parents still required their child to work (and in many cases engage in child labor), they said that their requests are less arduous and they try to lighten their children’s work loads. Some parents also tried to provide additional assistance, such as supplies or lodging closer to the school. Parents had mixed reactions to the monitoring and follow-up by schools, LCLCs, and KURET staff. While School Management Committees and KURET-supported students in Ethiopia frequently reported that their parents/guardians were often angered by inquiries into a child’s absence from school, parents/guardians of KURET-supported students in Uganda were pleased with the attention and encouragement provided by the community monitors.

“We are grateful!”—Household Perspectives of KURET

Kenya: “Now I have peace as I know that my child is in school. I am so grateful—at one time my child was contemplating suicide. I was afraid that when I die he would have no future, but now I have hope,” said one ill aunt of her nephew who lives with her.

Uganda: “We are grateful,” declared a group of parents. “We may have to work harder to support the family now, but we rest easier knowing our child is in school.” Household quarrels have been eliminated: “I no longer have to say ‘wake up and go to work!’”

Rwanda: “It helped me psychologically and emotionally. I no longer worry about my child. May God bless KURET!” said one mother. “I am hungry, but happy!”

Ethiopia: “Long live America and the American people! Thank you. KURET gave our children a future. We are blind, deaf, and dumb, but our children are given an opportunity.”

The psychological effect of KURET support should not be ignored. Perhaps for the first time in the lives of many KURET beneficiaries, they are the subject of adult concern and attention. KURET has given them a positive identity: “We are not just street children, we are students!” It has raised their self-esteem: “It has made me special,” “It has given me hope,” “It makes us unique.” KURET-supported students feel “stable and supported.” Beneficiaries appreciate the attention they receive from teachers, LCLCs, and KURET staff, and say how just talking to one of these adults helped them deal with problems. In Uganda and Rwanda, in particular, students and teachers said that KURET has “really become a parent.” Beneficiaries have formed an emotional relationship with KURET as their protector or surrogate parent. (Some parents seem to feel the same way, and are ready to hand over responsibility for their children to KURET: “They are your—KURET—children now.”)

While KURET wants these positive effects emphasized, it is less willing to accept that for many children a dependency has been created. Students and parents have formed high expectations that KURET will

help them solve and confront problems and ensure that the child remains in school. While some staff members dismiss this as unwarranted “psychological dependence,” it is real. This, of course, raises issues of future support after KURET ends and underscores the urgent need to develop and put in place systems that will mitigate any sense of abandonment or emotional trauma. Such efforts are underway in Rwanda where the project is jointly piloting a mentor program with WV’s Area Development Program (ADP) with 10 child-headed households, in which the child head selects a local community member as a mentor to provide adult counsel, guidance, and support to reduce dependency on teachers and the project.¹⁷

C. Learning Environment and Teacher Behavior

KURET enrollment has added to already large class sizes, and high student-teacher ratios are common in formal schools in all KURET countries. By bringing so many students into schools without equal attention to classroom construction (and teacher hiring), KURET could be creating an additional problem. While schools say they “can always find room for more,” primary school class sizes nearly always exceed 50 and often approach 100 children. At more than one school, enrollment grew not just because of enrollment of KURET-supported students, but also because other students were attracted by the improvements KURET had made and hoped that they might be selected for KURET support. Research—although not conclusive—shows that teaching and learning quality diminishes after the student-teacher ratio exceeds 35:1. It is questionable to what extent interactive methods can be effectively applied in large classes. Training in large-class-size management—while clearly a need—has not been identified as a KURET training priority.

Although some countries report that the classroom observations they conducted showed teachers using learner-centered methods in class, the methodology and instruments used leave this open to question. For the most part, the classrooms visited by the evaluators did not display many physical signs that learner-centered methods were being used: the student benches were arranged in typical rows and student artwork was not displayed on the walls. Notable exceptions were some of the IRC-supported ABE centers in Ethiopia, where furniture was arranged for group learning activities. Teacher knowledge of learner-centered and gender-sensitive methods was variable, although not all teachers had yet received training either directly from KURET or through Trainers of Teachers (TOT). Most teachers correctly indicated that learner-centered methods focused on the child, but few were able to provide examples of actual techniques (e.g., group learning, project-based learning). Exceptions were found at the IRC-run ABE centers in Ethiopia and in Lira and Gulu classrooms in Uganda, where many teachers had received training from donor projects besides KURET. Students at these locations reported group discussions, debates, and other learner-centered activities.

Nonetheless, there were clear indications that teachers exposed to some form of KURET training—be it direct teacher training through TOT or as part of a LCLC—had made some positive behavioral changes that were child-friendly. Most notably, enhanced teacher understanding of the difference between child work and child labor, the effects of child labor on children, and the trauma they have suffered has resulted in teachers who are more patient with students and willing to deal with student problems. Teachers say that they now listen to students, appreciate their explanations, and “counsel” them, rather than beating or berating them for being late, not doing homework, or not listening in class. Although corporal punishment is still practiced, it appears to be less severe. Students confirm that their teachers are friendlier, and that they often confide their problems to them. KURET-supported schools in all countries reported having designated counselors for the KURET beneficiaries or teachers who have received training in counseling. According to the students interviewed, there is no (overt) negative gender bias toward girls. Students

¹⁷ World Vision developed the program with Tulane University and the University of Rwanda. Mentor “parents” receive training and meet monthly with other mentors to compare experiences and solve problems.

report that if anything, girls receive more attention and counseling from teachers because “they are more vulnerable” and “may fall into prostitution and bad practices.” While teachers did not exhibit any particular knowledge about the learning needs or instructional approaches for girls, they were aware of environmental needs. Following gender training for teachers, one school decided that the limited number of latrines would be allocated solely for use by girls. Some women teachers helped girls who needed sanitary products. Another school intervened to remove a girl student from a hut located near military barracks. At one school, teachers counseled girls in the Girls Club about how to convince parents to let them go to or stay in school, ask for time to study, and receive equal treatment with boys.

Most KURET-supported students and their parents say that the teachers are helpful and provide good instruction. “We are learning,” said the children. The school clubs, either created or enriched by KURET, make school “fun.” Accelerated Learning Programs (ALPs) supported by KURET were particularly appreciated. In Rwanda, some parents felt that the Catch Up program “is really a university, the children are learning so much.” In Ethiopia, parents with children at the ABE centers believed that the schooling at the IRC-run ABE centers is superior: “I have children in formal school in town, but I prefer this school because of the teachers and the way they treat us.” In fact, many families with children in formal school are asking to transfer them to the IRC-run ABE centers. Also in Ethiopia, the School Readiness Program (SRP) supported by KURET was particularly appreciated. Launched in July 2006, 1,867 children—including 1,417 KURET beneficiaries—participated in the SRP. It is reported to have significantly reduced the number of children who migrate to cities during the summer months in Guraghe. Teachers say that it helped the students adapt to school.

D. Awareness about Child Labor

KURET has not yet developed a project-wide methodology to measure increases in awareness levels, so evaluator conclusions are impressionistic and based solely on anecdotal data. Nonetheless, it appears that KURET has been very successful in raising awareness about child labor and surrounding issues in stakeholders at the household, school, community, district/sector, and national levels.

KURET-supported students demonstrate that they are well aware of the problem of child labor. They are able to explain why it is harmful and differentiate it from child work. They are active messengers in their own right, staging plays and skits about child labor for the community and talking to other children. Out-of-school children engaged in child labor are also aware of the issues, having seen their peers selected for KURET support and school club performances: “Everyone knows about child labor.” The children follow up with other children in peer monitoring programs in Rwanda and Uganda. At one sand harvesting site in Uganda, children have decided to return to school. However, some KURET beneficiaries experience difficulty reconciling what they know to be harmful with the reality of their lives. In Gulu, some children attempted to conceal their involvement in child labor from community and project monitors.

Parental and community awareness has also increased, notably among the parents/guardians of KURET-supported students. Some indicated that they did not realize how harmful child labor was before KURET, and others said that KURET provided the means for them to act on pre-existing knowledge. However, many parents said that they would not be able to guarantee that they could prevent their child from reverting to child labor when KURET ends, although those interviewed said they would try. Even non-KURET parents could distinguish child labor from child work. Members of LCLCs have been active in “spreading the word” about child labor. In Rwanda, some KURET parents reported that other parents (non-KURET) are withdrawing their children from child labor and putting them in school. “Now we can’t find a maid anymore!” exclaimed some teachers. However, awareness does not necessarily lead to changed attitudes or behaviors of families, particularly those living in extreme poverty, who continue to depend on their children’s labor. Some parents stated to the evaluators that they did not require their

children to work “beyond their capacity,” but their children indicated otherwise. Others flatly stated that they needed their child to engage in child labor and KURET expectations were unrealistic and—for some—annoying.

KURET has been successful in raising awareness of child labor in the target districts and sub-districts. Everyone interviewed said that it was KURET activities, meetings, and trainings that alerted them to the issue of child labor and informed their understanding of it. Numerous times, respondents indicated that until KURET they did not realize what child labor meant, and that they were now aware that they themselves had been victims of child labor. District officials interviewed indicated that KURET has made them acutely aware of their role in relation to children’s rights. In Lira (Uganda), key members of the district political elite, who had received KURET training, spoke passionately about child labor. In Gulu (Uganda), the private sector Stone Quarrying and Sand Harvesting associations have been inspired by KURET publicity to restrict school children’s labor to weekends only, an encouraging but insufficient action.

At the national level, KURET has been identified as a “major force” in raising awareness about child labor. The Ethiopian Human Rights Commission chairman stated that child labor has been a “forgotten” issue and KURET is one of a few projects addressing it. Both in Rwanda and Uganda, events—supported by KURET—celebrating the Day of the African Child were televised nationally. In both countries, the ministers of labor indicated that their participation caused them to make child labor a priority issue. Publicity also drew the attention of parliamentarians who have taken on the cause of child labor.

E. System-wide Change in Policy and Practice

KURET has advanced the child labor policy formation process in Uganda, Kenya, and Rwanda. It has successfully resuscitated work on national child labor policies in Kenya and Uganda, with the former nearing adoption and the latter recently approved by the Cabinet. Rwanda’s Ministry of Public Service, Labor, and Skills Development (MIFOTRA) has committed to formulating a child labor policy, and active development is underway. In each country, KURET is now mobilizing to strengthen the Child Labor Steering Committees, and develop or update Child Labor Action Plans to provide a national child labor agenda and further its integration into member ministry programs. The future of the development of a child labor policy in Ethiopia is less clear (see Chapter III).

In education, KURET is just beginning to address national-level policy, practice, or operations.¹⁸ Uganda, in particular, has benefited from the presence of Regional Office staff members who use the Uganda project as “a laboratory” for approaches to export to the other countries. KURET’s work with Kyambogo University promises large-scale effect in terms of including child labor in the primary teacher training curriculum. Also in Uganda, KURET has used a “multi-channel” approach to include child labor in education operations and services, including Guidance and Counseling, COPE, Teacher Education, Compulsory Education Policy, and revision of the Education Bill. In Ethiopia, the Regional Education Bureau in Benishangul has agreed to assume responsibility for the IRC-created ABE centers, employ qualified facilitators, and share the cost of facilitator certification training. Similar representations were made by Ministry of Education and Sport officials in Uganda about COPE centers at the Stakeholder Workshop (although the details were unclear). The SRP in Ethiopia appears to have a good chance of being adopted by some of the Regional Bureaus of Education. Although the SRP modules and materials have not been officially approved by the Ministry of Education (MOE), they are based on approved

¹⁸ This does not mean that KURET has not interacted with or consulted central- or lower-level education officials. In some cases, it has even conducted some joint activities. The assessment of KURET progress to date in affecting or effecting changes in policy, practices, or operations will be officially adopted or routinely followed by ministry offices and personnel after the conclusion of KURET.

textbooks and were developed by government education specialists who sit on regional curriculum boards, so they have tacit approval. The MOE's Institute for Curricular Development and Research is interested in adopting the program.

In Rwanda and Uganda, KURET support has resulted in the promulgation of district-level by-laws: the Girl-Child Education Bill (Gulu), the Child Labor Bill (Lira), the Child Labor Employment Penalty By-Law (Gicumba), and the Anti Child Labor Tea Plantation Ordinance (Nyugururu). Their enforcement promises significant effect, as large-scale employers of children will be subject to regulation and punishment.

DCLCs or their equivalent have been reactivated by KURET in every country. Most have received training and developed work plans or are in the process of doing so. KURET works with an array of local-level committees. The local-level committees (including ABE School Management Committees in Ethiopia) appear to be most active in child labor, given that their role is the most direct and focused (i.e., they monitor the children). The LCLCs stand out in Kenya and Uganda, where they appear to be more organized and motivated. They observe a regular child monitoring schedule, and prepare written reports, in some cases the KURET follow-up reports.

Chapter III: Implementation Issues by Output

This section highlights key implementation issues, which are more fully discussed in the country reports.

A. Output 1: Access to education for target children increased.

Education Program Selection and Placement

As a final step in the intake process, students are matched with the educational program considered appropriate to their needs, interests, and attributes (e.g., age, level of education). KURET-supported students—and their parents—were generally satisfied with the programs in which their children had been placed. KURET frequently struggles with supply-side constraints (i.e., appropriate programs are not available in the beneficiaries' locale). In some instances, KURET beneficiaries face long commutes, are enrolled as boarding students at considerable expense, or KURET must start a program on its own (e.g., vocational training), whose post-project sustainability is questionable.

KURET policy is to support children in the academic program of their choice up to the age of 18 (and beyond in Rwanda) or through the end of the project (whichever comes first). Most KURET-supported students opt for an academic program and hope to complete secondary education and beyond. Many KURET-supported primary school students have already entered or will enter secondary school during the life of the project, which is expensive and strains the project's resources. Given that KURET is facing limited time and resources, several questions must be addressed about the feasibility of its current approach to student placement and support. Rather than simply allowing children to increase their years of schooling, KURET's primary goal should be to prepare them with basic skills (both literacy and vocational) that will enable them to earn a living and not revert to child labor. In some instances (depending on beneficiary age), this may mean that—with the non-exploitive employment goal in mind—a beneficiary is better placed in a shorter-term vocational program after primary or junior secondary school rather than in a four-year academic secondary school program.

At the very least, KURET should prepare analyses in the different project areas to determine how much schooling is needed to enable a child to earn his living without reverting to child labor. This would help KURET develop a policy to best use its scarce resources during the remainder of the project or if the

project is extended. KURET should also consider other options for dealing with this situation, such as reducing the support package at higher grades, getting government matching funds, and financing less expensive options. KURET should also develop a consistent policy: while project staff believe they should continue to support and monitor children in academic programs, they are less clear about those who graduate vocational programs and are still under age. Arguably, these young vocational training graduates are more in need of support and monitoring than those who are in daily contact with school staff.

School Supply/Slot Creation

The KURET strategy recognizes that the availability of school places is a key element of “increased access.” Consequently, it provides for “slot creation” by 1) providing for modest infrastructure expansion through the construction or rehabilitation of classrooms; and 2) the creation and operation of alternative learning programs, specifically ABE centers in Ethiopia, COPE centers in Uganda, and—to a lesser extent—Catch Up centers in Rwanda. In each instance, it appears that KURET may not have fully considered how these actions fit into the government’s policy and investment frameworks. For example, classrooms have been constructed without the assurance that a sufficient number of teachers is available (important in light of government restrictions on hiring and deployment). ABE and COPE centers are much appreciated by the community, as they provide opportunities for schooling not previously available. Catch Up centers provide more appropriate schooling for over-age children. In Benishangul (Ethiopia), the Regional Education Bureau has agreed to take over operations of the centers and hire the facilitators when the project ends, and it is already contributing to their certification training. However, in some instances, the KURET-supported centers have not been assured that their operating expenses and teacher salaries will be assumed by government at the end of the project. Not only does this place their future in jeopardy, it also caused (in Ethiopia) unease and disgruntlement among teachers that negatively affected school quality (e.g., teacher absenteeism). KURET should negotiate agreements with the proper authorities for integrating the centers into ministry of education operations and budgets before establishing the centers.

Student Support Package

KURET-supported students, parents, and teachers believe that the KURET student support package (i.e., school dues, materials, and uniform) is largely sufficient to meet their most immediate educational needs. It provides for the essential fees and costly uniforms so that students “can begin school life.” (Although in some cases, hidden costs—such as hostel or house rent, monthly exam fees, tutoring classes—are not met). However, the package is not sufficient to ensure beneficiaries’ full (i.e., regular attendance, concentration, and energy) participation in school, as certain essential needs are not addressed. These needs include food (both school lunch and take-home rations), medical care, and shelter. Clothing and shoes are frequently requested. Teen-age girls request assistance with sanitary products and soap. Some students say that they engage in child labor on the weekends and holidays to earn food money: “If I am hungry, I do child labor.”¹⁹

Although the core elements of the student support package include school fees/dues, uniform, and scholastic materials, the packages vary by country and type of education program the child is in. Inconsistent application—especially with uniforms—within districts causes disgruntlement among parents (students are not as vocal). In some countries, the school support package is provided once.²⁰ Many students’ uniforms show excessive signs of wear and will not survive or fit a growing child for more than a year. Replacement plans have not been developed.

¹⁹ The evaluators verified that they were not speaking about child work.

²⁰ In other countries, it appears that the entire package or certain elements of it (e.g. school supplies) are renewed periodically, but the evaluators were unable to ascertain established policy.

Without the student support package, students and parents say that the KURET-supported students would be forced to drop out of school and return to child labor fulltime. KURET beneficiaries who head households are especially liable to continue working in child labor along with their younger siblings to meet household survival needs *and* pay the school fees of siblings. The stated policy of assisting every child in the household has not been enforced in some countries, notably Uganda.

Linkages

Recognizing that its student support package would not meet all the livelihood needs of beneficiaries and their families, the KURET strategy calls for linking children to other organizations/programs. So far, KURET has not been able to meet its targets for this intervention (also a Performance Monitoring Plan [PMP] indicator). The September Technical Progress Report (TPR) reports linkages have been created for 17 percent of its beneficiaries, or 3,328 linkages out of a total of 23,509 children, with most—57 percent—in Kenya. The linkages created have primarily been with the WV ADP, sponsorship and HIV/AIDS programs, or IRC livelihood, water, and refugee programs. The challenges of creating linkages fall into two categories. First, the needs of the exceptionally vulnerable KURET beneficiaries are so vast that they are impossible to fully address (e.g., food, shelter, health care, clothing, parenting), in addition to school-related needs. Second—and more operational—the programs available to address these needs are few, with their own target beneficiaries and mandates, and are located in different areas. Even the WV child sponsorship program uses different age criteria, so most KURET beneficiaries do not qualify. The project’s linkage strategy appears unrealistic as a means of meeting the needs of vulnerable KURET beneficiaries, given—as KURET points out—“the limited number of options existing within the project catchment area.” In the future, KURET and similar programs should conduct a thorough assessment of child livelihood needs and linkage options available (brokering specific agreements with other NGOs and programs) before relying on this as the major strategy. KURET has experimented with income-generating activities (IGAs) in Kenya and Ethiopia, with reportedly variable success. It has not put in place an assessment plan. It should review their viability and cost, and, if feasible, expand them.

Vocational Education

KURET faces particular challenges in dealing with the vocational education programs and the students it supports. Some programs do not appear to offer quality training, some appear to operate in unsafe environments, and some have been established simply to serve KURET beneficiaries, with no intention of continuing once the project ends. (Some suffer from all three disadvantages.) While many—though not all—of the programs (ranging from three months to two years) may have transferred marketable skills to these students, the plans that KURET has made for the future follow-up and support of these beneficiaries require additional thought. In Rwanda, Kenya, and Ethiopia, KURET plans to help students create cooperatives²¹. In Uganda, it will place students in a three-month mentoring program. All students are supposed to receive a “starter kit,” which will provide tools of trade, although some students are expected to jointly own equipment (e.g., sewing machines). KURET hopes to “throw” business their way in the form of uniform contracts, and other procurements that are associated with its program. For example, Project Managers explained that if KURET was building a classroom, it would endeavor to hire the carpentry or masonry graduates, or because it provides uniforms for beneficiaries, it would contract with groups of graduates to produce them. Many of the students will still be under-age (less than 18 years old), and would benefit from—even require—on-going counseling and guidance. KURET must ask itself whether these arrangements are sufficient to ensure the safety and well-being of the vocational training program graduates and whether these young people will have the skills and maturity required to run a

²¹ The KURET Regional Office says in its comments on this report that its policy is to “place” beneficiaries in government-run cooperatives. This differs from what was presented in the various countries during several different instances and was never corrected in the stakeholder meeting. KURET project managers said that they intended for a cohort of students to work together to form a joint business, specifically termed a “cooperative” or (in Rwanda) an “association.”

successful business.

The KURET-supported students express confidence that KURET will help them get established in their trades, but the “safety-nets” noted so far—the hope for assistance by local authorities and micro-credit programs—are not convincing. KURET must consider how responsible it is for helping these young people and preventing them from falling back into child labor or unfair labor situations. Rwanda’s Project Manager states, “We cannot ensure the children have all skills to run a business....” If this is true, then KURET should reconsider its investment in vocational training and its promulgation of a cooperative development approach. No follow-on plans for students, special research, evaluation, or scrutiny of the various training-to-employment options has been planned, although WV in Rwanda is looking into the issue. Vocational training students are completing their programs, so the need is urgent.

B. Output 2: Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of and to those who have been removed from, the worst forms of child labor.

Educational Services

To make educational services more relevant to the needs of children who have engaged in or are at risk of child labor, KURET has supported the development and introduction of new services to assist children to adapt to the school environment and equip them to better deal with the problems that confront them. These include:

Child Labor and HIV/AIDS Instruction: With the exception of social studies and moral/ethics classes, lessons about Child Labor/Child Rights are not yet being integrated into classroom teaching. (HIV/AIDS is addressed in science classes.) Extra-curricular activities are the primary means of teaching students about child labor and the effect of HIV/AIDS on child labor. KURET has worked with teachers to introduce child labor topics into existing clubs (HIV/AIDS, Child Rights, Civics, Drama, and Girls’ Clubs) and create child labor clubs if no clubs exist. Children are enthusiastic about the club activities and are eager to perform poems, songs, and plays about child labor. Teachers and facilitators would appreciate a handbook on developing activities for these clubs. They also asked for guidance on how to integrate child labor into their lessons. KURET should consider making use of some of its materials (e.g., the pamphlet “Carrying Heavy Loads”) to show how they can be used for reading or other lessons. In the absence of any national curriculum partner, this might be the most realistic approach until such partnerships are instigated.

School Readiness Program: The two-month SRP was developed by KURET/Ethiopia (initiated by WV) to academically and emotionally prepare children who had left school to re-enter formal primary school in the new academic year. Student placement in SRP is not based on a competency test, but on the last grade attended, which may not be the best for students’ learning needs. No post-test of the students is conducted to determine appropriate grade placement in school or to serve as an assessment of the effectiveness of SRP itself. However, SRP is a major achievement with tremendous potential. Materials should be reviewed and revised based on this past summer’s experience, a student assessment plan should be developed, materials should be printed on more durable paper stock, a module on large class size management should be included, and teacher training should be extended from four days to ten days to optimize its effectiveness.

Functional Vocational Literacy: In February 2007, KURET/Ethiopia will launch a Functional Vocational Literacy Program (FVL) at a few IRC-run ABE centers, aimed at older children, which will integrate basic literacy and numeracy skills with selected vocational skills and life skills. The design should include measures to assess and document its feasibility from the start (unlike SRP), so that this potentially promising program can be evaluated, revised if necessary, and credibly marketed to other donors and the government.

Counseling and Guidance: Counseling is a pressing need among KURET beneficiaries traumatized by war, violence, physical and sexual abuse, loss of their parents, and crushing poverty. It is a key factor in ensuring a high persistence rate and is appreciated by students and parents. KURET has provided training in this for select teachers. Counseling appears to be mostly uni-directional advice or provides information on life in general, sexuality, and reproductive health. Teachers, as well as LCLC, feel this is a training priority.

Teachers and students identified several school services that they would like KURET to help provide, including incentives for teachers to provide tutoring, remediation, and make-up classes for school closures resulting from unrest; holiday and school break programs to keep children out of child labor; school feeding programs; student and teacher exchanges with other KURET schools; and some vocational skills training for primary-level students (e.g., baking) “if they should fail academically.”

School Support Package

KURET provides school support packages—consisting variably of textbooks, teaching/learning materials, basic supplies, sports equipment, musical instruments, costumes, and tee shirts for teachers—to schools, tailored to the particular program and school needs. Vocational training programs receive equipment and materials. The school support package is intended to be used to improve and support instruction for all students, not just KURET beneficiaries. While appreciated by the schools, the school support package for formal schools is not robust enough to appreciably improve school quality. There are not enough books, materials, and construction resources to serve student and school needs. (In contrast, some vocational education programs have received equipment and materials that have allowed them to strengthen and expand their programs, such as the Polytechnics in Kenya, and training centers in Rwanda and Uganda.) There is a wide variation in what the different country programs provide to the schools. It would be useful to review and analyze the most cost-effective inputs to isolate those interventions that appear to hold the most promise and then to revise the support packages accordingly.

Model/Mentor Schools

Each country project has a model or mentor school program. These schools are expected to demonstrate a variety of best practices, and it appears that they may receive more inputs from KURET (e.g., more teachers trained, construction) than other schools that serve KURET beneficiaries. It is not apparent, however, how these model schools are assisting or inspiring quality improvement at other schools or that any comprehensive plan has been made for them to do so.

Teacher Training

Improving teacher skills is a major means of improving the quality of education. KURET has supported training of teachers (including school directors), teacher trainers, and other education personnel in a variety of areas: child labor, child rights, learner-centered methods, gender, HIV/AIDS, peace education, psychosocial, and counseling. However, in every country, project staff experienced difficulty with or were unable to present in written form or articulate clearly the overall teacher training plan (e.g., what different training packages include, who would receive them, their scope and sequence). Instead, they explained the process of how the program was developed (through a national-level stock-taking workshop), who developed supplementary materials, and who delivered it. Teacher training is difficult to implement, and considerations must be given to such issues as the training teachers have already received, the time frame available, staggering teachers from different schools, and trainer schedules. Nevertheless, it is imperative that KURET both understand and implement a coherent teacher training strategy and plan, so that it ensures and can show that a core number of teachers at each learning site have received the full package of the requisite training. It is also important that it be realistic. Although teachers were generally satisfied with KURET training, they all said it was not enough. The KURET multi-subject training syllabus is ambitious and may exceed what is possible given the available time and resources. KURET

should re-examine its teacher training priorities and focus on those most essential to its purpose. Currently, it does not provide specific training to school directors, although they are included in teacher training. It should consider developing a course specifically for school directors.

KURET relies on a cascade approach, using TOT to reach classroom teachers with training. Schools report that an effective TOT model has not yet been rolled out, and no structured training has been delivered by TOT. So far, “training” generally consists of information sharing at staff meetings. Some TOT said they have not sufficiently mastered the skills to be able to impart them to other teachers. Others said that there is no time during the school week for training. Weekend or holiday training sessions would require transport and lunch money for the participants. TOT said that they do not have sufficient materials to share with the other teachers. KURET has not developed a template for TOT roll-out at the schools or guidance for TOT implementation. TOT training must include a practical training plan, a schedule, sufficient materials, and schools must agree to set a specified amount of time and funds aside to support the training.

C. Output 3: Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education.

Awareness-Raising Program

KURET is seen as a major force in raising awareness of child labor issues among its collaborators at the national, district, and local levels and among its beneficiaries. The challenge KURET faces is to continue to widen and deepen the reach of this awareness raising, so that awareness can be transformed into attitudinal and behavioral change. KURET divides its awareness-raising activities into two phases: those initiated in the first two years of the project and those to be undertaken in the second two years of the project. It is now embarking on Phase 2.

Phase 1 activities do not appear to be guided by any specific plan, either provided by the Regional Office or developed at the country level. Although effective, KURET awareness-raising activities have largely ad hoc and taken advantage of opportunities as they arose. KURET country projects have variously used several creative means of raising awareness: nationally broadcast television segments and radio call-in shows, Art and Essay Competitions, performances by children at public events, and a photo essay project. In particular, KURET has used the national celebrations (Day of the African Child, World Day against Child Labor) to spread the word about child labor. It has also contributed to Education for All campaigns. Since the country projects have employed a variety of means to raise awareness, it would be helpful if KURET compiled a how-to guide on how to launch and organize these different activities (authored by the different countries) for use by the other country projects.

KURET is looking at a considerably different landscape for its Phase 2 activities, because of the “buzz” it has already created about child labor. The draft Phase 2 Awareness Raising Strategy (July 2006) provides a coherent discussion on the elements of awareness raising, but it does not provide a template and concrete suggestions/examples for expanding and building on Phase 1 activities or for introducing new activities, tools, and materials to encourage and support behavioral change. More specific guidance, examples, and templates are needed. While each country is different, there is no reason that an overall detailed plan cannot be developed for adaptation. KURET has not yet developed a systematic approach, which will be increasingly necessary as it moves to consolidate and extend previous successes. Although it must continue to conduct many of the awareness-raising activities it did in Phase 1 to keep the issue in the public discourse, especially among influential groups that might not have been fully sensitized or “activated” (e.g., religious leaders), Phase 2 activities must also provide for additional approaches that direct awareness of child labor toward action by parents and community members, as well as address some of the issues that arose from earlier activities.

For example, it must address the issue of appropriate child responsibilities to avoid a “backlash” effect from communities accustomed to children working. It should devise means to deal with the costs of using broadcast media, by aggressively exploring ways to partner with either government (at least use its influence to negotiate favorable rates), other donors, or NGOs, as it did with the USDOL-funded Opportunities for Reducing Adolescent and Child Labor through Education (ORACLE) Project in Uganda. Less traditional partnerships (in addition to IRC or WV) should be explored—with groups working in different topic areas (e.g., girls’ education, HIV/AIDS). In areas where such media are not widespread and communities are isolated (e.g., Ethiopia), other options should be explored.

KURET should also support and strengthen its most valuable awareness-raising agents: its students and local committees. KURET-supported school clubs are ubiquitous and effective in attracting attention, and their performances can be scheduled at local markets, festivals, and other events. LCLCs have been active in raising awareness, but they say they need both training and materials to help them conduct more effective campaigns. KURET should consider preparing a training module, handbook, and awareness materials that can be adapted to the local language and context. Other local groups can be partnered with to raise awareness, such as mothers’ clubs and religious leaders, and other venues can be used, such as KURET/Kenya did with the Chiefs’ *Barazas* (community or village meetings).

KURET should focus more on enabling others to conduct awareness-raising activities, rather than conducting them itself. It should help its partners at the various levels develop their own awareness-raising plans and then provide modest funding and support (calibrated to reflect the level and scope of coverage). KURET should also focus on other means of ensuring sustained awareness raising, such as integrating child labor into the music, dance, and drama curriculum, as is done in Uganda.

KURET should include helpful advice and guidance to households about how to deal with the loss of income or resources resulting from their children’s withdrawal from child labor. Despite declaring that their children will not return to child labor, most parents/guardians indicated that if KURET ends the children would return to labor.

Issues related to HIV/AIDS have been included in most training programs, but it is not clear how these issues have been incorporated into KURET’s awareness-raising efforts. Although KURET’s association with child labor is compelling, the operational objective is not immediately apparent to the evaluators. It is unclear whether KURET’s objective is to alert authorities to the increased risks to certain children of engaging in child labor or whether it is prevention. It is also unclear whether the subject of HIV/AIDS confuses or clarifies the child labor message. The project also needs to consider if the population already receives enough public messages (not necessarily training) about HIV/AIDS from other sources. Uganda, in particular, has been internationally recognized as a leader in the fight against HIV/AIDS. These and similar questions should be answered and addressed in not only the awareness raising strategy, but other components as well.

D. Output 4: Support by government institutions, communities, and households increased.

National Policy and Strategy

While KURET has made exemplary progress in advancing child labor policies in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda, it faces special challenges in Ethiopia. The government has recently decided to promulgate a “holistic” Child Policy, addressing the multiple problems faced by children, which would subsume the Child Labor Policy. This comprehensive Child Policy will take “at least two years” to develop. Both the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (MOLSA) and the Ministry of Women’s Affairs (MOWA) claim the mandate for developing and passing the policy. The issue is further complicated by the recent move of the Child Affairs/Child Labor expert from MOLSA to MOWA. KURET should explore other opportunities

for addressing child labor at the national level—through the MOE and Human Rights Commission.

KURET's major strategy for reducing child labor is to ensure enrollment of these children in school. However, with the exception of Uganda, it has not yet worked specifically, directly, or extensively with the national ministries of education at the central level to develop a comprehensive plan for the integration of child labor issues into their policy frameworks and operations. The Uganda experience offers encouraging evidence of how KURET can affect national-level policy, practice, and operations for sustained support of child labor issues. KURET/Uganda has benefited from the presence of the Regional Office staff which uses the Uganda project as "a laboratory" for approaches to export to the other countries. Given the time it takes to effect change, such work at the national level in the other countries needs to be done soon. Guidance to the other countries should include a list of promising "windows of opportunity" that should be tried.

The Poverty Reduction Strategy—particularly in education—also presents a major opportunity to not only put child labor on the agenda, but also to include it among programs that may receive both government and funding agency (i.e., World Bank) resources. KURET staff and its national child labor partners in some countries sit on various working groups. KURET has developed rationales for the inclusion of child labor, and more concrete suggestions from KURET—especially in terms of how to include child labor issues in education—would be helpful to share with the working groups.

Districts, Sub-districts, and Communities

Not all DCLCs have a clear idea of what their function is, with some confusing KURET's activities with their own mandate (e.g., Ethiopia). Others have a clearer idea of their role (Uganda). None of the DCLCs reports that it has a budget to fund its activities, although in some cases—Uganda—these activities may be included in the district budget.

In some countries (Rwanda and Ethiopia), the approach to forming local-level committees is not always easy to understand, as the committees are tailored to take advantage of local structures. Sometimes, the LCLCs (or equivalent) are derived from existing WV ADP structures (Kenya and Rwanda), which may run the risk of excluding a wider range of community members. While highly motivated at this point, LCLCs lack material support (transport and stationery) and are not linked to any higher level structure or authority which—in the absence of KURET—could continue to motivate them after the project ends.

For the most part, parents of KURET beneficiaries are not actively involved in KURET activities, although some are LCLC members. The exception is in Ethiopia, where parents of KURET-supported students in ABE Centers are required to participate in center construction, and they do so willingly. This is a tangible activity that yields immediate rewards, and is within their capacity. Parents of KURET beneficiaries are an untapped resource and similar activities should be incorporated into the programs. This is especially important to combat the apparent lack of responsibility some parents (e.g., in northern Uganda) seem to exhibit toward their children. Good parenting skills should also be included in the KURET capacity-building agenda.

Capacity Building

KURET capacity-building activities at the national level have been constrained by the lack of personnel in the child labor units at the ministries of labor. As an alternative, KURET has pursued opportunities to support various activities at the national level to increase knowledge. Perhaps the best avenue for building capacity at this point is to establish a training program for the functional National Steering or Advisory Committees on how to advocate for and introduce child labor into their respective institutions' work plans. The better staffed and organized ministries of education are well suited for capacity building.

In each country, KURET has undertaken policy reviews and document development under the

supervision of the Ministry of Labor (MOL) or its equivalent. It does not appear that these studies are used as a way of building institutional expertise or capacity by involving ministry staff, in part because no child labor counterparts exist (although other ministries could be used). Instead, these studies are prepared in-house by KURET consultants and presented to the government.

Recent administrative reorganizations in Uganda and Rwanda have complicated district-level capacity building, as personnel are shifted and new districts created. (Elections and political issues have also affected work in Ethiopia.) These complications mean that many activities such as training and establishing DCLCs have to be repeated. Nonetheless, KURET has been effective at capacity building at the district, sub-district, and community levels, providing training to the various committees. However, it is not clear that in all the project countries the training provided corresponds to the groups' different responsibilities or work programs.

Chapter IV: Management and Budget

A. Regional Office Organization and Effectiveness

Regional Office Staffing and Location

The Regional Office is staffed by three key positions: the Project Director/Chief-of-Party (COP), the Policy/M&E Specialist, and the Education Specialist, in addition to professional positions of a Finance and Administration Director and an M&E Associate. The professional staff at the Regional Office are employed by different implementing organizations—the KURET Director/COP and Finance Director by WV, the Policy/M&E Specialist and M&E Associate by AED, and the Education Specialist by IRC. The current Regional Office team has been in place since June 2005. Only one key staff member changed²² (i.e., Policy/M&E Specialist) early in the project, which occurred with no deleterious effect on project operations or morale. The timing allowed the first Policy/M&E Specialist to effectively complete the major activity (i.e., baseline surveys) planned for the period, and to allow the replacement specialist to launch the policy development work. Since the Regional Director/COP did not arrive in-country until February 2005, it could be argued that his earlier presence may have resulted in a more coherent and uniform PMP, but given its development so early in the project, this is purely speculative.

The Regional Office is optimally situated in Kampala. Not only does it have easy access to the other KURET countries by air, but it is also able to support the only country programs (in Gulu and Lira) that are located outside the capital city (more than four hours away). KURET/Uganda staff is not able to engage in policy development/support efforts directly or on a regular basis with the central Kampala-based ministry offices. These tasks are conducted by the Regional Office, and the Uganda country program has been used as a “testing site” for policy work in child labor and education with the idea that innovative approaches will be exported to other countries. KURET/Uganda has benefited from this setup, as its policy work in Uganda has had a wider focus (including MOL and MOE).

The Regional Office, while effective (see below), may not be optimally staffed, particularly as the project advances and the substantive work increases. There are more technical areas than there are regional specialists, which means that they bear heavy workloads and may not have the time to focus their full attention on the individual KURET areas of intervention. For example, the Policy Specialist also serves as the M&E Specialist (including research), both of which require full-time professional attention.²³ This specialist noted that he is not able to maintain the degree of presence he would like in all four countries,

²² The Education Specialist initially proposed by IRC was never installed in the role, and was immediately replaced by the current incumbent.

²³ USDOL reports that other USDOL-funded EI projects have a specialist devoted exclusively to M&E.

particularly where the policy process is lagging (e.g., Ethiopia). The Regional Director/COP has served as de facto Awareness Raising Specialist, but with the installation of Awareness Raising Coordinators in each country, the demands of the job will increase—the new staff will need to be oriented and trained, new approaches elaborated, and tools and instruments developed. These demands will compete heavily with project management duties. Other cross-cutting areas not specifically covered that require support include school availability and access, community development, and training and capacity building. To some extent, the Regional Office has been able to deal with this by adding locally hired professionals to assist with M&E, budget, administration, and logistics, assistance which is financed through WV and AED budgets. However, the Regional Office Education Specialist does not have the necessary assistance to deal with the heavy workload and increasingly important demands on this position, as the IRC budget for this position is limited. The suggestion that a “volunteer” or “intern” could help is not a viable solution, as both reliability and accountability are required. KURET should consider hiring/engaging an assistant education specialist, either by re-allocating the budget or by using WV matching funds. The Regional Director/COP explains that KURET has been careful to avoid becoming staff-heavy, preferring to direct resources to beneficiary support, which is laudable. However, the trade-off may not be a sound one, given the short time frame that KURET has to develop/perfect approaches, build capacity, and effect sustainable policy and institutional changes. KURET should re-examine whether the Regional Office is sufficiently staffed and configured to meet its workload during the remainder of the project with the degree of quality it desires.

Regional Office Effectiveness and Quality Assurance

KURET’s Regional Office is responsible for overall project strategy, management, technical guidance, and quality control. The value added of the Regional Office is significant. It ensures that the country projects are implemented as planned and on time, project procedures and protocols are followed, resources are budgeted appropriately, deliverables are produced, and targets and reporting requirements are met. In addition to overall planning and implementation oversight, the Regional Office also provides technical direction in various areas, such as policy development, educational quality, awareness raising, M&E, and research. This work includes such activities as developing materials, modules, instruments, and reporting formats. The Regional Office has been essential to KURET operations and meeting the grant deliverables. It has demonstrated its effectiveness and contributions to quality in the following major areas:

Foundation/Groundwork and Design: The Regional Office guided the conceptualization and development of the overall project strategy and approach—captured in the Project Document (PRODOC)—which sets the parameters for implementation. It also prepared the KURET Exit Strategy, which outlines its overall approach to sustainability. It developed the design for, guided implementation of, and oversaw analysis of the four country baseline surveys and situational analyses that informed interventions and served as a point of entry into and provided credibility for KURET involvement in the policy development process in each country. The Regional Office has taken the lead in establishing initial relations with key partners in each country, at the ministries of labor and education, and among the donor and NGO community. The Regional Office Director/COP, Policy/M&E Specialist, and Education Specialist are well-known to the key stakeholders in the KURET countries, indicating the presence they maintain in-country despite being located in Kampala.

Output Strategies, Approaches and Tools: In addition to the project strategy, the Regional Office has elaborated sub-strategies and approaches for the different project output areas. It was responsible for the development of the Awareness Raising Strategies (Phase 1 and Phase 2). In the area of policy, the Policy/M&E Specialist has developed the templates for (e.g., policy review, action plan, lateral policies, enforcement) and approaches to (e.g., baseline and policy review presentations, advisory/steering committee support) policy development. The Education Specialist developed and guided the approach to teacher quality improvement and training through the stock-taking process—aimed at identifying gaps,

prioritizing needs, avoiding duplication of efforts, and building on existing materials. The Regional Office has informed key decisions shaping country programs (e.g., how to address ABE centers in Ethiopia and what support to provide students and schools). The Education Specialist has taken the lead in developing several key interventions, such as the FVL Program—its curriculum, facilitators’ guide, and learners’ book—and the Model School Program.

To complement and complete these approaches, the Regional Office has developed tools and materials to support KURET work. Some examples include the expanded and revised Pathways to Advancing Viable Education (PAVE) approach and guidance; the Supporting Children’s Rights through Education, the Arts, and the Media methodology; the trainers’ guide on child labor; a teacher performance monitoring tool/report card; a policy review methodology and guidance; policy briefs/brochures; and rationales for inclusion of child labor into poverty reduction strategies. These approaches and tools have been readily implemented and used in the KURET countries, and serve as references for both project personnel and other stakeholders. The Regional Office also conceived of and helped guide the development of minimum standards in education, sustainability, and monitoring that became a model for KURET interventions and activities. The participatory development process helped deepen country staff understanding of KURET’s program. The expertise afforded by the two technical specialists at the Regional Office—the Policy/M&E Specialist and the Education Specialist—is particularly necessary, as the KURET country offices are generally staffed by strong Project Managers (not technical specialists) and relatively junior personnel in the roles of Education and M&E Coordinators (with the exception of Ethiopia). As the project evolves, the Regional Office should continue to develop and revise guidance and resource materials for both new areas and those that need reinforcements, such as policy and strategy development work with ministries of education and actionable training-of-trainer roll-out guidance.

Technical Assistance and Training: Regional Office staff members are in frequent contact with KURET country offices via e-mail to respond to questions, and they maintain a frequent—if not regular—schedule of visits to the countries. KURET countries receive visits from one or more Regional Office staff members at least once every quarter. Regional Office staff members have either led or participated in workshops and training sessions. For example, the Education Specialist conducted the stock-taking and master trainer workshops in the KURET countries, and the Policy/M&E Specialist has planned policy review presentations and associated workshops. As a rule, the Regional Office staff members help orchestrate and attend seminal meetings and events in-country in their respective areas of expertise. For example, the Policy/M&E Specialist will guide agenda and program development for the multi-country child labor policy meeting that will be hosted by MIFOTRA in Rwanda in January 2007. KURET country staff indicated that the technical assistance has been essential to their work, and are satisfied with the assistance provided by the Regional Office. Nonetheless, they are eager for more Regional Office field visits to help them as the KURET program progresses in policy development, teacher training, and awareness raising.

In addition to the technical areas that involve other stakeholders, the Regional Office has designed and conducted in-house KURET staff training workshops on such issues as PAVE, M&E, reporting, and planning/budgeting both in-country and for KURET staff as a whole and in various groupings (e.g., M&E coordinators). The Regional Office staff members, particularly the Regional Director/COP, have fostered the idea of KURET as a learning project, organizing opportunities for staff exchange, discussion, and consolidation of lessons learned. An annual conference is held each August for core country staff. In May 2006, it held a week-long Peer Learning event for 50 country staff (including field personnel) to share experiences, which resulted in the development of minimum standards for the quality of project implementation approaches. In November, a week-long annual planning and budgeting exercise was organized to coincide with the midterm evaluation debriefing. Attendees included core project staff from

all four countries and implementing partner backstops²⁴ from Ethiopia, Uganda, and Washington, DC. Trips to the host KURET country field sites are usually included, so other country staff can see first-hand innovations and operations. Staff members have noted how useful these meetings are. The KURET Regional Office has tried to develop a spirit of inquiry in its country staff, and they are willing to discuss the challenges and problems they experience in project implementation in-house.²⁵

Information Sharing and Communications: Information sharing and exchange are not only conducted in-house. The Regional Director/COP has introduced issues concerning child labor and KURET to international audiences, having presented two papers at a symposium on HIV/AIDS held in Toronto. The Regional Office has prepared, published, and disseminated to a wide array of stakeholders several informative publications, such as a quarterly newsletter, project descriptions, and baseline survey summaries. It also compiled into a small booklet, *Carrying Heavy Loads*, a result of the Rwanda photo-essay activity in which children presented their experiences and views of child labor. These publications appear to be effective awareness-raising tools. They are found in the various project stakeholder offices, and are frequently referred to by them. One high school in northern Gulu particularly praised the publications, keeps them in its library, and asked for more to share and use as teaching tools. KURET should prepare some guidance for teachers about how these materials could be used for and integrated into classroom instruction (e.g., as material for reading class).

KURET maintains a Website, but it could make more use of Web-based or electronic tools for sharing information, such as discussion lists, chats, and weekly digests. With two years of experience, KURET could develop useful how-to guides, manuals, or primers on a variety of its interventions, such as how to conduct a community conversation, how to establish an LCLC, how to identify and select children for withdrawal from child labor, and how to raise community awareness. These would not only be useful for KURET country and field staff, they could also be used by other stakeholders (including other USDOL EI grantees) and serve as reference materials after the end of the project.

Knowledge Creation (Research): The major research activities conducted to date are the baseline surveys and situational analyses on child labor in each of the four countries. The data has served as a basis for planning KURET interventions, but also as an awareness-raising tool to capture the attention of key stakeholders and decisionmakers. KURET has planned two interesting research studies (i.e., child labor during holidays and impact of withdrawal of beneficiaries from child labor on families) that should provide useful information for program implementation, especially in terms of the student support package. Additional research should focus on actual project interventions to assess their viability and effectiveness, including the feasibility of IGAs, the most cost effective school support inputs, the effectiveness of educational services (e.g., SRP, FVL, model/mentor schools), the viability of the TOT model, the cost and effectiveness of the different vocational education training models and approaches, various employment and earnings opportunities according to education level, and employment and work status of beneficiaries who have completed their educational program.

Quality assurance, monitoring and supervision: Although country-level implementation (specifically beneficiary support and tracking) is the responsibility of the KURET country office, the Regional Office is responsible for ensuring overall quality of project interventions and deliverables, as well as monitoring and accurately reporting the progress and results of the country projects. As noted, the Regional Office provides technical guidance and training to KURET staff and stakeholders to give them the information and tools to implement the KURET program. The KURET Regional Office has also put in place the

²⁴ Implementing partner “backstops” refer to the WV and IRC personnel that oversee the KURET project for their organizations, but are not directly involved in day-to-day operations.

²⁵ Staff members are, perhaps, less familiar with the idea of an external evaluation. It was clear to the evaluators that some staff were uncomfortable with the exercise, resented the demands it placed on them, and interpreted observations as criticisms.

following procedures and systems to ensure quality and accuracy of deliverables and products:

- **Frequent contact:** KURET Regional Staff are in daily e-mail and phone contact with KURET country staff about various activities. Regional Office staff members indicate that the country project offices receive on average one Regional Office visit per quarter, although this is mostly confined to country project headquarters rather than to field sites (and interaction with beneficiaries).
- **Regular reporting:** In addition to the semi-annual TPR prepared for USDOL according to its format, KURET requires bimonthly reports from its country offices. The reports, prepared by the M&E Coordinators, include both quantitative and qualitative data about beneficiaries and other project activities, such as teacher training and policy development progress. The reports are first reviewed by the KURET Project Manager in country, and then by the KURET Regional Office staff. Any problems or anomalies are followed-up by Regional Office staff.
- **Systematized data collection:** The KURET Regional Office has developed forms for collecting and reporting KURET beneficiary data and other project data and information. This ensures that data is presented in a standardized format according to standardized definitions that allow for easy aggregation and summary. Data collection instruments are similarly standardized and data collectors follow strict protocols for completing them. Beneficiary data is primarily in the KURET intake form and KURET follow-up form. Each child is assigned a child identification number (CID) so that he or she can be tracked individually and file data can be amended if necessary. These forms have been modified several times for improvement. Guidance on definitions, protocols, and procedures have been detailed in the handbook, Guidelines for Project Monitoring. Data collectors—education counselors or their equivalent—also receive training on completing the forms.

Sample of Monitoring and Data Collection Tools from KURET/Uganda-WV

Output 1: Pre-intake Form, Intake Form, Formal Follow-up Form, Informal Follow-up Form, Confirmation of Withdrawal Form, Beneficiary Support Form, Parental Education Plan Commitment, Work Status Forms.
Output 2: School Support Form, Teacher Training Tracking Tool, Teacher Observation Form/Report Card, School Inspection Form.

Output 3: Activity Tracking Form (meetings and training), Child Labor Quiz for Children.

Output 4: Activity Tracking Form.

- **Data Quality Assurance Plan:** KURET has introduced a series of “check points” in its data collection and reporting system. The data collected goes through a multi-tiered review process both before and after it is entered in the database. Before data entry, 100 percent of beneficiary data forms are checked by site facilitators (or equivalent) for completeness and accuracy. KURET country M&E Coordinators housed at the country project headquarters then review all the files for consistency and clarity and work with data clerks to double check before data entry and issuing a CID number. Country Project Managers and M&E Coordinators conduct random cross-checks to ensure that data entry reflects the data form. Once the data is aggregated, it is sent to the Regional Office and reviewed for consistency. Evidence that the system is working (and that the data collectors, reviewers, and entry persons are not perfect) is that the Regional Office and M&E Coordinators report that data forms are frequently returned for correction and completion.
- **More reliable database:** KURET is developing a more reliable database, designed to facilitate a more comprehensive analysis of the children and their situations. The Policy/M&E Specialist reports that the new database program will also be able to flag skipped or inconsistent entries. Once completed and tested, KURET’s database could be usefully adapted by other USDOL projects.
- **Data quality assessment and spot checks:** KURET has developed a data quality assessment instrument to be implemented by the Project Manager and M&E Coordinator, which is used to flag

problems with data and also with the data collection system. Spot checks randomly conducted by Project Managers and Regional Office staff in the field are supposed to be used to determine whether beneficiary files are complete and accurate.²⁶

- **Informal follow-up and triangulation:** Triangulation of the data is obtained through informal follow-up conducted by LCLCs and through the new Confirmation of Removal (COR) Form. The LCLC provides information about the problems a child is experiencing (and the reasons behind them) that is not readily captured in the forms. Informal follow-up also allows for immediate intervention by the school, LCLC, or KURET field staff. The COR Form, in which a knowledgeable person in the community certifies that the child is no longer engaged in child labor, is another way of ascertaining whether and the extent to which the child has been withdrawn from child labor. The evaluators found that some children still engaged in child labor are reluctant to admit this and may provide inaccurate information to the data collector for the follow-up form.
- **Self-Assessment Checklist and Minimum Standards:** KURET has developed these two tools for project staff to review country project and their own performance. The Self Assessment Checklist—aimed primarily at Project Managers—focuses on putting basic KURET systems and activities in place. The minimum standards elaborate indicators of quality associated with KURET work, and in some cases appear to exceed the scope and reach of KURET activities (and resources). While these two tools set out helpful criteria, it is not clear how they are being used by project staff or by the Regional Office to monitor quality. To date, it appears that their greatest value has been in the collaborative nature of their development, which served as a heuristic exercise to get staff to reflect on their activities. KURET should institutionalize usage of these tools.

Regional Office staff members say that now that the basic operating systems have been put in place, they—and the entire project—will turn their focus to strengthening quality. This includes analysis of the services they deliver (e.g., school support) and strengthening local capacity at both the community and district levels. This will entail not only more country visits by Regional Office staff, but also more visits to field sites to see what is occurring on the ground.

B. Management Structure and Working Relationships

The management and administrative structure under which KURET operates not only involves three partner organizations, but also the individual country headquarters for the implementing partners (WV and IRC), which, along with the Regional Office, have a supervisory claim on the KURET country staff. This multi-level, multi-organization structure could have led to confusion and disputes, but a clear understanding of reporting roles and the goodwill of all parties involved have made this a workable and effective structure that benefits KURET.

Relations between Partners Organizations (WV, IRC and AED)

Although the professional staff members at the Regional Office are employed by different partner organizations, they work as a team. They derive their current professional identity and shared agenda from the KURET project, not the organization that issues their paychecks. None of the three principal advisors had a long history with their respective employing institutions. They were engaged specifically for the KURET project. They have developed collegial and collaborative working relationships, and have amicably worked out early misunderstandings about specialist placement. For example, IRC's expectation that the Education Specialist would work out of its Kampala offices and specifically advise IRC's KURET work was swiftly resolved through a three-way discussion among implementing partners mediated by the WV Headquarters in Washington, DC.

²⁶ See KURET draft M&E Guidelines (May 2006).

Regional Office activities, regardless of the intervention area, are jointly planned and frequently jointly implemented. KURET's Project Director/COP says, "Nothing goes out of the Regional Office without a three-way agreement." They are knowledgeable about each others' activities, and have used their respective budgets to finance KURET activities that fall outside their immediate areas, to move the project agenda forward. Specifically, WV and AED project grant funds have been used to underwrite KURET education activities for which IRC has a limited budget at the regional level.²⁷

At the country level, implementing partner relationships are not as close. Both in Ethiopia and Uganda, the relationships between IRC and WV KURET projects are collegial but not collaborative. Regular, joint meetings are not scheduled and opportunities for collaboration (such as training of certain district-level stakeholders) are not exploited. This is, in part, the result of their individual work program schedules, but there are a number of opportunities for a more formal interaction, which could be mutually beneficial and resource efficient. In Ethiopia, both IRC and WV are responsible for Output 4 activities, specifically in terms of central policy and capacity building. However, it appears that neither is assigned to take the lead in this area or on specific tasks. The risk is that neither will take responsibility nor be held accountable for carrying out this work.

Relationship with WV Headquarters

The Project Director/COP reports to the WV HIV/AIDS Coordinator, based in Washington, DC. The WV HIV/AIDS Coordinator provides project backstopping and interacts with the implementing partners and donor client (USDOL) on an official basis. Initially, it was planned that the KURET Project Director/COP would report to the WV/Uganda country headquarters, but this was deemed unworkable, as WV/Uganda had no authority over the WV country headquarters in other countries. The WV HIV/AIDS Coordinator is in regular contact with the Regional Office, reviews reports and submits them to USDOL, and prepares the Project Director/COP's annual performance review. She makes annual field visits (and attended the Midterm Evaluation Debriefing Workshop in Kampala) and participates in overall KURET planning. Both the Project Director/COP and partner organizations believe that WV has shown great flexibility in allowing inter-communications among the different groups without an overall coordinating role.

However, in the course of vetting the various country evaluation reports, some issues emerged that indicate WV headquarters may not be as responsive as project partners suggest. In response to criticisms expressed by the KURET country projects, USDOL has indicated that delays attributed to it are sometimes caused by dilatory action at WV headquarters. For example, the outstanding KURET/Rwanda budget request approval and the KURET/Uganda desire to shift sub-targets for student enrollment among different educational programs appear to require action by WV headquarters.

Relationship with Country Implementation Organizations (WV and IRC)

The Regional Office shares management and oversight responsibility of the KURET country projects with the implementing organization country headquarters: WV/Uganda, WV/Rwanda, WV/Kenya, WV/Ethiopia, IRC/Uganda, and IRC/Ethiopia. The general template followed by KURET is that the Regional Office provides supervision over technical operations, and the implementing organization country headquarters provide supervision over administrative matters, such as personnel hiring, performance reviews, logistics, and accounting (although overall project budgeting and accounting reports are reviewed and aggregated by the KURET Regional Office).

This division of responsibility has worked well. The implementation organization country headquarters have not impeded Regional Office oversight, directives, or operations. The evaluators found that the

²⁷ In some cases, these funds were specifically included in either the WV or AED contracts, although the lead technical specialist is attached to IRC (e.g., FVL).

various implementing organization country headquarter Directors were aware of and interested in KURET activities, were proactive in considering KURET beneficiaries in plans for their organizations' other programs, and, in several cases, had adapted or were planning to adapt KURET procedures (e.g., M&E). WV and IRC Country Headquarter Directors expect to receive KURET reports and be informed of its activities and in return, the country implementing organizations provide overall support to the KURET country projects. Since each country implementing organization views the KURET country project as an integral part of its overall country program, and not just an alien project it is hosting, KURET has benefited from strong and generous support. Country implementation organizations have provided resources (e.g., gifts-in-kind, linkages) and support (e.g., logistics, motor pool). The KURET project probably could not be as productive without this support or the foundation that the existing organizations' infrastructure has provided (e.g., ADP, IRC refugee and disaster programs). However, the potential exists for KURET operations to be caught up in IRC or WV operational decisions or confusion. For example, when WV/Uganda placed a hold on ADP funds for its programs in Gulu and Arua, KURET funds were also stopped. Fortunately, there were few such reports.

While the relations between the KURET Regional Office and country implementation organizations have been productive, collaborative, and collegial, the balance is a delicate one. The Regional Office occasionally feels restricted by having overall "responsibility for KURET but no authority" in certain administrative areas that can affect KURET operations and for which the Regional Office is accountable, such as personnel hiring/firing and performance reviews. Country implementation organizations appear to guard their prerogatives in these areas, and do not include—and may even deliberately exclude—the KURET Regional Office in the decisionmaking process. Hiring decisions are made by country implementing organizations, with limited input from the KURET Regional Office. (The Regional Office prepares the TOR.) On occasion, this has resulted in inappropriate hires. For example, in Ethiopia, the WV Country Headquarters was dilatory in responding to Regional Office concerns about project management (but did ultimately replace an unsuitable Project Manager). More recently, it did not consult with the Project Director/COP about hiring a new KURET Project Manager, despite KURET requests that it be included in candidate review and selection. Surprisingly, staff performance reviews are entirely conducted by the hiring organization, whether it is AED, IRC, or WV. The Project Director/COP is not consulted about the other regional specialists. The Regional Office is not included in the annual performance review of KURET country staff, although it is well-placed to offer feedback on performance and may often have the best and most immediate knowledge of the staff performance. It has even developed some performance assessment tools specific to KURET. Including the Regional Office in hiring and performance reviews would ensure better quality and consistency across KURET country operations. While the evaluators do not suggest that administrative authority be transferred to the Regional Office, it is recommended that these issues be resolved to the benefit of KURET operations.

Relationship with KURET Country Staff/Offices

KURET Country Offices and staff, employed, housed, and administratively supported by the country implementation organizations, are charged with implementing KURET activities in Kenya, Rwanda, Ethiopia, and Uganda, under Regional Office technical direction and coordination.

The Regional Office has forged strong relationships with the KURET country offices through regular communication, frequent field visits, project-wide meetings, and responsive support and guidance. The Regional Office has successfully built a team across institutional and geographic boundaries. During evaluation interviews, country staff knew about other country projects and greeted colleagues warmly at the midterm evaluation debrief. The KURET country offices appreciate the assistance provided by the Regional Office, saying it "complements, not complicates" country operations. They, in turn, are responsive to Regional Office requests (e.g., TPR data, evaluation team support), although a few staff ventured that the Regional Office was too demanding and its requests for information were always needed "urgently" (usually in an attempt to respond to USDOL). The KURET country staff view the Regional

Office as a source of technical expertise, turn to it for assistance and guidance, and would like more field visits from the technical specialists to help with policy and education quality. It is likely they will also need technical assistance to deal with the Phase 2 awareness-raising strategy. In principle, KURET Regional Office staff provides quarterly travel schedules to the country managers, but this has not been done recently because of the unusual work schedule. The Project Director/COP plans that staff visits, particularly to field sites, will be more frequent in the second half of the project. Country Project Managers suggested that annual Regional Office travel plans be provided so they could incorporate them into their work plan and budget.

KURET Country Project Offices and staff tend to see the KURET Regional Office in more of a coordinating, technical assistance, and troubleshooting role, than in a supervisory role (because it does not do performance reviews). Country Project Managers believe that their first reporting responsibility is to the country implementation office. One Project Manager expressed concern about the Regional Office “interfering” in personnel matters. Other Country Project staff members feel that it is their responsibility to report to the Country Project Manager, with the possible exception of some of the Country M&E staff who interact closely with the Regional Office and whose work (i.e., data) is reviewed at the regional level. Regional Office dissatisfaction with the data provided serves as a proxy for M&E staff performance, and is easily communicated to the Country Project Manager, unlike some of the other country staff positions.

Some KURET Country Project Offices appear to be a bit resistant to Regional Office intervention and defensive of their autonomy, insisting they are a country implementation organization project first and foremost. “KURET has no identity,” declares one KURET Country Project Manager, “it’s a WV project.” Many KURET Project Managers have served in other positions within the country implementation organization, and have developed institutional ties and loyalty to the country implementation organization that are not automatically transferred to the Regional Office or the KURET Project. These staff members tend to be more critical and questioning of Regional Office actions, and possibly unintentionally obstructive. The line between regional and country-specific activities is not always clear. Some activities (e.g., workshops, consultancies, studies) are conceived and funded out of the Regional Office but of course conducted in-country. At times, Project Managers’ sensitivities have complicated decisionmaking and implementation, although the Regional Office admits they are not always without merit. For example, KURET/Kenya refused to allow a non-Kenyan consultant to take part in a Kenya-based activity as part of a multi-country study. Country Project Managers may also decide to deviate from the “master plan” without informing Regional Office staff or giving them a chance to comment. The Regional Education Specialist was surprised to learn that KURET/Kenya had decided that different TOT should be trained in each topic area, an approach that deserved discussion. The Regional Office’s approach so far has wisely been to avoid confrontation and learn how best to proceed. Nonetheless, these issues should be openly vetted at the annual staff retreat, so that the Regional Office is not forced into a defensive position or the quality of KURET programming is undermined by uninformed decisions.

C. Country Level Project Management Effectiveness and Issues

The management of the KURET country projects is effective.²⁸ Activities are progressing under each output. Country project staff members are readily able to answer detailed questions about the project and provide information, documentation, and explanations in their area of responsibility. The Country Project Managers are knowledgeable about all aspects of the project, and aware of field-level details. Moreover,

²⁸ USDOL has raised a specific question about project management for WV in Ethiopia, under the impression that it is weak. Regional Office dissatisfaction was resolved early on in the project with the replacement of the first Project Manager. The Regional Office indicates that the replacement was a strong manager (an impression shared by the evaluators). He has recently been promoted to another position within WV, and the new Project Manager had not yet assumed his position.

all the project staff interviewed displayed a good understanding of the project in general. Issues specific to each country are discussed in the individual country reports, but many of the same management issues are faced by all country projects.

KURET has suffered from high staff turnover and delays in replacement of key staff at the country level. Project Managers have changed in Uganda-IRC and Ethiopia-WV; Education Coordinators have changed in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda-WV; and M&E Coordinators have changed in Kenya and Uganda-WV. While the KURET Country Project Offices have been able to deal with these changes, they have complicated project operations. Remaining staff members have to assume additional workloads until a replacement is hired, which often results in a slowdown in some project areas. For example, in Kenya the Project Manager assumed the role of the Education Coordinator for a prolonged period and reportedly the teacher training component is not as strong as it could be. Staff turnover also means that new staff requires orientation/training (consuming resources) and are on a steep learning curve. Although the control that organizations can exercise over staff movement is limited, in some cases it appears that the organization contributes to the problem. WV, in particular, appears to allow staff to apply for other in-house positions with no time commitments to their current job. Many organizations require a 2-year time commitment. The KURET Regional Office should discuss this issue with WV management.

The Regional Office and KURET Project Managers also say it is a challenge to find professional staff members that have the necessary experience and qualifications. On-the-job training and support consumes a considerable amount of the Regional Office staff time and often they must intervene at the country level to ensure activities are implemented correctly when technical coordinators are weak. The Education Specialist, in particular, reports that this has been a challenge for the activities under Output 2 (education quality). Although the pool of candidates may be limited and competition for staff strong (e.g., northern Uganda), a more refined set of criteria may help vet the better candidates. KURET Regional Office staff, especially the technical specialists, should be included in the final candidate review and selection.

Finance is another area of staffing problems. The Regional Office Finance and Administration Director reports that there are often long delays in recruitment and it is not treated as a priority. In some countries, the finance/accounting staff members are part-time (i.e., KURET “purchases” time from existing country implementing organization staff). Although Country Project Managers seem satisfied with this arrangement, the Regional Office says that a staff member who devotes 100 percent of his or her time to the KURET grant would ensure more reliability and timely information.

The organization of the KURET Country Offices and staffing patterns does not uniformly reflect the areas of KURET intervention, such as policy, education, M&E, awareness raising, and even research. KURET has decided to add a country-level Awareness Raising Coordinator (who will be directed by the Project Director/COP), which Project Managers hope will advance progress under Output 3 (awareness raising). However, policy is one of many tasks assigned to the KURET Project Managers, and research does not figure in at all. Project Managers indicate that they are able to deal with national-level policy issues, but it is more of a challenge to push the policy agenda at the lower levels (such as districts or sectors). The IRC KURET Office in Ethiopia collapses Project Manager, Policy, Education, and M&E functions into the one-person Project Manager position. Because the Project Manager receives strong support from the IRC/Ethiopia education back-stop, the combination of Project Manager/Education Coordinator is feasible, even desirable, given the IRC emphasis on ABE centers. However, additional staff members are recommended for M&E and Policy Coordination. In fact, it is suggested that a single Policy Coordinator, assigned to either WV or IRC in Ethiopia, be recruited to work with the Regional Policy/M&E Specialist (currently a consultant is fulfilling this role.)

There is no uniform KURET country management (and personnel) structure across the KURET countries. While different needs may make these variations necessary, in some cases one wonders why, when the

programs are essentially the same, the structure varies so notably (e.g., IRC Uganda vs. WV Uganda). KURET explains that these differences are largely the result of the specific conditions/structures of each implementing agency and negotiated at the beginning of the project. It may be time to assess which structures or aspects of structures, particularly at the field level, are most efficient, and to make adjustments in all four countries.

Rwanda, Kenya, WV-Ethiopia, and WV-Uganda country projects indicated that they required more Site Facilitators (i.e., district implementation facilitators) to cover the vast areas in some of the districts or to deal with the districts that had been divided/newly created. Site Facilitators have multiple duties, encompassing the management and implementation of all project activities in their geographic area, but also the monitoring and evaluation functions. The creation of new districts or administrative divisions requires the development of additional DCLCs and LCLCs and consumes much of the time Site Facilitators have available. Site Facilitators are also responsible for checking each student form, which often number more than 1,000. Additional Site Facilitators should be added and/or other staffing configurations should be considered with attention paid to the more robust field-level staffing patterns developed by IRC, particularly in Ethiopia.

At the same time, KURET has employed a large number of local-level personnel (i.e., education counselors, community-owned resource persons, community development agents, and community conversation facilitators) in whom they have made a substantial investment. KURET's Exit Strategy should explore ways that these human resources are not lost after project completion.

KURET field site implementation is heavily dependent on volunteer efforts and manpower, which has advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are that this does not drain resources away from the children and it establishes a local awareness and function that may endure beyond the project's life. The disadvantages are that the work may be unreliable and of inadequate quality to meet either KURET timelines or standards, the motivation may diminish over time, and in the absence of KURET attention, the local resources are not sufficient to support their work. Many local committees have asked for modest support in the form of stationery and transport to follow-up with the beneficiaries. KURET must deal with the immediate problem of resources and the longer term challenge of continued support of and action on the part of these volunteers.

At the local level, many LCLCs were derived from the existing WV ADP structures or—at least— many of the committee members are also members of other WV ADP committees. In Kenya, it appears that the LCLC membership was highly co-linear with pre-existing ADP committees, and consequently may have inadvertently concentrated authority in the same group of people (despite selection by the community), thereby limiting the participation of other community members or groups. Although this did not appear problematic in other countries, the arrangements are often the same. KURET should review these arrangements to ensure that LCLC membership is open to all community members.

D. Faith-Based Issues

WV, the lead grantee, is a faith-based organization. The motivation and impetus for its work around the world is founded on Christian spiritual and moral obligation, but it is not a missionary organization. The evaluation team found no evidence or indication that KURET operations have been biased by the religious orientation of WV or that U.S. Government resources had been deliberately or directly used for religious purposes. The profile of beneficiaries appears to reflect the demographic profile of the district or area where KURET is working, although no data are collected on the religious background of the KURET beneficiaries to confirm or refute this impression. In Ethiopia, for example, only 20 percent of one group of beneficiaries interviewed in Kombolcha, a predominately Muslim area, was Christian. KURET supports public and private schools, some of which are religious and include different denominations.

KURET staff in the WV offices participate in the 30-minute opening prayer and an administrative update session with the rest of the WV staff (8-8.30 am). Scheduled daily prayer does not diminish or interfere with the staff working hours. Both the work schedule and timesheets demonstrate that at least 8 hours per weekday are devoted to KURET operations. Moreover, non-WV staff, non-Christian staff, and/or those who do not wish to participate are not forced to attend these sessions. On occasion, Regional Office AED or IRC members say they do opt to attend the opening sessions, and are not made to feel uncomfortable if they do not. Some country offices (e.g., Kenya, Rwanda) do give preference to hiring Christians at headquarters, but this is not necessarily a policy carried out at the local or community levels. The Regional Office employs staff of all religions, including Islam.

There was no evidence that any religious materials had been purchased with KURET funds either by the project or by the schools.²⁹ Confusion may derive from the fact that WV may provide such materials to schools (e.g., Bibles) under its other non-U.S.-funded programs. Nonetheless, both USDOL and a July 2006 audit report express concern that KURET resources (and consequently U.S. funds) are indirectly being used for religious purposes, as many of the governments and private schools KURET works with (and its beneficiaries attend) include religious instruction in their curricula. For example, the national curricula in both Uganda and Kenya include religious studies. USDOL reasons that if a “formal school teaches religious education during the school day (even if religious instruction is mandated by the national government), then technically, USDOL/U.S. funds have been used for religious purposes” and concludes that “from a legal perspective, it would count as a misuse of U.S. Government funds.” The evaluator does not share this opinion and neither, apparently, does the U.S. Government in the countries mentioned, as it provides support to government schools through its U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) education programs. Moreover, elsewhere in the world, USAID programs have legally provided support to religious schools of different denominations (e.g., Haiti) with clear direction about resource use. Given that most national curricula in the world (including many developed countries) include religious instruction or promote a religious orientation, a reasonable standard should be applied. It is strongly recommended that USDOL obtain both an expert legal opinion and official guidelines for grantees before it proceeds to “work with World Vision to determine an appropriate resolution to the issue.” In the end, there may not be an issue.

Although in many countries, a high degree of religiosity exists among the population (including local staff) and may be expressed in their appreciation of and in interactions with KURET (“God bless KURET”), there is no evidence that KURET or its staff have engaged in proselytizing. Nonetheless, to avoid the appearance of impropriety, it may be prudent to take measures to demonstrate that no religious-based structural biases have been introduced into KURET interventions. Demographic data (including religion) on the areas, beneficiaries, and learning sites should, if possible, be collected at time of intake and reviewed to ascertain that different groups are equitably represented.

E. Budget

While there are no immediate budget issues that seriously impede project operations, resources are scarce and not all needs can be met. The major budgetary problem experienced by the project resulted from the delay in the approval of the PRODOC by USDOL, which delayed the start of many KURET activities and disbursement of resources available for project operations. Because KURET did not burn the funds at the rate expected in Year 1 of the project, USDOL allowed the funds to be rolled-over to Year 2.

²⁹ It should be kept in mind that this was an evaluation, not an audit.

The life-of-project budget for KURET is more than \$20.2 million (including \$5.27 million in matching funds from WV). KURET reports that it has spent \$6.3 million so far, nearly one-third of its budget midway through its program. According to KURET's Regional Office Finance and Administration Director, KURET did not expend the full amount of funds available in the Year 2 budget because of the Year 1 fund rollover, which was occasioned by delays in the start up of project operations (and costly beneficiary support). While KURET is on track with its work program (including the number of beneficiaries served), it may find that it has—at least in theory—a budget surplus because the beneficiary-years (not the number of beneficiaries) are less than originally planned resulting from time lags. This could be good news, as the budgets for some country programs are simply not sufficient to provide the basic KURET support package or ensure that KURET meets its results for Outputs 1 and 2. For example, the insufficient WV budget for KURET/Ethiopia has resulted in an uneven coverage of the student support package. For KURET/Uganda, the lack of construction budget undermines the viability of some of the learning sites it supports, and even though WV match funds will cover the salaries of the new country Awareness Raising Coordinators, funds must also be available for a new and expanded activity portfolio. KURET should re-examine its budget, including an analysis of beneficiary demands both in terms of student years and needs, to determine the extent to which and how funds can be reprogrammed. There is little or no operational budget over which the Regional Education Specialist exercises direct control. The IRC budget for the Regional Office is largely limited to specialist salary and travel. Both WV and AED have been fully cooperative in assisting with the funding of education-quality-related activities and workshops. Although funds may not be easily shifted among partner organization contracts (e.g., from AED and WV to IRC), it would be helpful if KURET detailed long-term education-quality-related budget requirements so that they are incorporated into the budget plans of the partner organizations. This is particularly important if more attention is to be paid to quality issues, such as teacher training.

Insufficient resources to meet both the livelihood needs of students and to ensure their full participation in schooling negatively affects KURET's ability to completely withdraw or prevent its beneficiaries from engaging in child labor. The KURET design had initially pinned a great deal of hope on the creation of linkages with both its own implementing partners and other organizations to fill the deficits. Given the challenges to creating linkages and the deep needs of the beneficiaries and their families, it appears that this strategy was unrealistic. However, this does not mean that no supplementary resources have been tapped to support beneficiaries. WV has pledged a match of \$5 million over the life of the project. As of September 2006, nearly \$1.7 million in matching funds—derived from WV cash and gift-in-kind transfers—had been allocated to the Regional Office and country programs. Some of these funds have been used to supplement the student support package.

Matching Fund Allocations

a) Regional Office	\$532,410
b) Kenya Office.....	\$449,016
c) Uganda Office.....	\$220,956
d) Rwanda Office.....	\$299,298

Not included in the matching fund figures is the value of the linkages KURET has created for its beneficiaries. For example, if WV provides a goat for a family as part of its ADP (not funded by KURET), its direct dollar value has not been calculated or reported to USDOL as leveraged funds. Similarly, the funds leveraged by IRC in Ethiopia from Band-Aid and the Debner Foundation also do not appear in KURET reckonings. Consequently, more funds have been leveraged than reported. KURET should monetize the linkages, and report their value along with other funds leveraged.

Chapter V: Partnerships and Coordination

A. Partnerships with Communities, Governments, NGOs, and Donor Agencies

Both the Regional Office and KURET country staff have developed cordial and productive relationships with a wide range of partners, although the relationships vary by country. For example, KURET/Ethiopia is notable for its work with the regional and woreda (i.e., district) education officers in Benishangul and West Harage, while KURET/Uganda stands out for its partnership with the national teacher training institute, and KURET/Rwanda with the MOL.

A common factor in all country programs is their success in building effective partnerships at the local level with Community-level Child Labor Committees and School Management or Child Labor Committees. These groups have been active in carrying out KURET work in identifying, selecting, monitoring, and reporting on KURET beneficiaries and raising awareness about child labor. It is at this level that project success is most evident. Community members are motivated by being able to make an immediate difference in the lives of neighboring children. Many parents of KURET beneficiaries, as well as the children themselves, have entered actively into partnership with KURET. While in some countries, few parents have been able to completely remove their children from child labor, it does appear that they have attempted to minimize it and to support their children in school with the resources they have available. Children are eager to share with others what they have learned about child labor, and through club activities they are a vocal and visible means of raising awareness.

KURET has also forged good relationships with District (or equivalent) Child Labor Committees in all countries, who display a great deal of enthusiasm and energy (though sometimes misdirected). Committee members represent a broad range of government offices, extending KURET association to education, labor, health, police, and other groups. Major constraints to deepening partnerships at this and lower levels have been administrative re-organizations that create new administrative divisions and shift personnel (e.g., Uganda, Rwanda), elections that cause uncertainty, stasis or result in personnel re-assignment (e.g., Ethiopia, Uganda), and simply being able to capture busy bureaucrats' time and attention.

At the national level, KURET has built strong relationships with the ministries of labor in each country, with the exception of Ethiopia where both the institution and the child labor representative have proved elusive. In Kenya, Uganda, and Rwanda, the ministry representatives view KURET as a "member of their team" and rely on the project for guidance, expertise, and assistance in moving the child labor agenda forward. With the exception of Uganda, KURET has not yet established productive ties with the national ministries of education at the central levels. (This does not mean that it has not worked with education officials at lower levels.) In part, this is because KURET has focused its initial attention on pushing child labor policy issues. In some countries, the decentralized structure makes working with national ministries at the central level less urgent (e.g., Ethiopia). However, developing relationships with the central offices of national ministries of education should be a KURET priority.

In each country, KURET has provided or supported venues for bringing different government organizations together. At the national level, it has supported meetings of the National Child Labor Steering (or Advisory) Committees in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda; Child Labor Partners Forum in Uganda; and the Ad Hoc Committee on Child Labor in Ethiopia.

A large number of international and national agencies and NGOs (other than the implementing partners themselves) were proposed as partners in the KURET proposal. KURET has primarily interacted with these groups through Child Labor Steering or Advisory Committees, Partners' Forums and Poverty

Reduction Strategy working groups, and regional or district-level NGO sector groups, such as the Northern Regional Educational Forum in Uganda. KURET's approach with these organizations has been to band together to influence policy change, rather than to use their programs as a way of extending KURET services or outreach. However, in some instances it has partnered with other NGOs on joint activities. For example, in Rwanda, beneficiary linkages have been made with Caritas, and in Uganda, KURET works with the African Network for the Prevention & Protection against Child Abuse & Neglect to provide technical assistance on child labor to Arua District authorities. The biggest challenge when partnering for joint activities is that each organization has established its own roster of activities (with donor client deliverables) that command its attention and resources. Different geographic target areas also constrain joint activities.

KURET has worked closely with and established productive relations with USDOL-funded projects in Uganda, Kenya, and Rwanda, including the ILO International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (IPEC) Timebound Project in Kenya, the ILO/IPEC HIV/AIDS Pilot Project in Uganda, the IRC ORACLE Project in Uganda, and ILO/IPEC in Rwanda on the Inter-regional Prevention and Reintegration of Children Involved in Armed Conflict Project. In Ethiopia, it has collaborated with the ILO Sub-Regional Office on the policy development process (although ILO does not have a USDOL-funded project operating in Ethiopia). The USDOL-funded projects share information, materials, and instruments, combine efforts and influence to advance policy goals, and on occasion provide joint funding for certain activities, such as radio programming in Lira District in Uganda.

KURET has established relationships with the U.S. Embassies in all four countries. In Kenya and Rwanda, the U.S. Embassy representatives actively keep abreast of KURET activities (and attended the National Stakeholder Workshops), whereas in Ethiopia and Uganda relatively new Embassy representatives are just getting acquainted with KURET. KURET has not been as successful in forging partnerships with USAID Missions or their education projects. In some cases, this is because they are operating in different target or thematic areas, and in others, KURET has not yet organized to meet them. In Rwanda, it was at the urging of the evaluator that USAID was invited to the National Stakeholder Meeting (and its representative attended). KURET WV staff members have just met with the USAID Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) program representatives in Ethiopia but have not yet engaged in substantive discussions, in part because it reported that the USAID OVC program has not been fully developed. KURET reports that USAID is difficult to work with (an observation shared by other USDOL-funded projects), and has therefore focused on "strategic partnerships." However, USAID is frequently a major player in education policy and reform, and could be a valuable partner for introducing child labor into its activities (e.g., teacher training, planning, education policy).

B. USDOL-Related Issues

The official communications link between the USDOL and the KURET project is the WV back-stop officer based in Washington, DC, particularly on contractual and budget issues. However, on urgent technical issues and project operations, USDOL may on occasion directly contact the KURET Regional Office. KURET country project offices rely on the KURET Regional Office to communicate with USDOL (generally via WV/DC). Most often, KURET-USDOL communications and exchanges are oriented around the semi-annual TPR, which overtly raises issues and flags problems for USDOL consideration and feedback. (The project is characterized by a high degree of transparency. The evaluators noted that little attempt was made to hide or "white wash" project weaknesses or problems, while in the field.) Other opportunities for interaction include USDOL field visits and an annual courtesy visit by the Project Director/COP to USDOL offices when he is in Washington.

KURET and USDOL have developed a functional relationship. Both the Regional Office and country project staff members have expressed appreciation for the flexibility USDOL has shown on several issues and its encouragement. KURET welcomes USDOL staff field visits, so that they can get a better idea of the context, challenges, and time it takes to effect change. On occasion, staff members at all levels express the sentiment that USDOL may not fully understand the many factors outside the control of the project that impede progress. More flexibility with sub-targets (e.g., allocation of children within overall target in terms of program enrollment) would allow KURET to better deal with field realities. USDOL indicates that these types of adjustments are acceptable with USDOL approval as long as the number of beneficiaries withdrawn or prevented remains the same.

USDOL has not always been able to respond to KURET requests, products, or decision needs in a timely manner or even within USDOL's own time parameters. These delays affect KURET implementation. Lags include approval of the PRODOC, PMP revisions, and responses to TPRs. For example, the PRODOC presented in March 2005 was not approved until August 2005, which delayed project operations and budget draw-down. The response time for a TPR sometimes takes two to three months rather than the designated 30-day turnaround. Country projects in Rwanda and Uganda noted that they have been waiting for decisions about PMP and budget issues since last May or July, although USDOL responds that it has either communicated its decisions to WV headquarters or has never received the requests, which suggests some WV field-office-headquarter miscommunications. Delays have in part been attributable to the frequent changes in USDOL Project Managers in Washington. The project is now working with its fourth. Each new USDOL Project Manager has had to master the complexities of the project, which takes time and results in a duplication of efforts by KURET staff (e.g., responding to the same question). Decisions made by one USDOL Project Manager have been rescinded or put on hold by the next, and previously settled issues require re-explanation and are re-opened for debate.

KURET indicates that it faces two major challenges in working with USDOL. The first is that the four-year time frame for the project is not sufficient to meet all USDOL expectations, particularly in building a foundation to ensure that child labor is included in the policy and investment framework. For example, the GPRA requirement that policies "be adopted" may not be feasible within the project time frame or that circumstances preclude that children are totally withdrawn from all forms of child labor. USDOL counters that its expectations are based on what KURET itself proposed in the PRODOC, albeit with USDOL input and approval into the project design and strategy. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to determine exactly which organization is ultimately responsible for either the ambitious goal or targets, but USDOL sources indicate that, as a rule, it is the U.S. agency that sets the objectives, purpose, and parameters that frame a project (generally articulated in the solicitation requests), while the grantee proposes the targets associated with the objective- and purpose-level results and develops the approaches and activities that will realize these results and their associated quantified targets. Successful bidders are usually those that are most responsive to most of the donor clients' requirements and desires, which frequently results in proposals that exceed capacity. Arguably, both organizations are complicit.

The second challenge is meeting USDOL requirements for monitoring children. Although KURET appreciates that USDOL reduced its quarterly reporting requirement to semi-annual, the staff time and effort it takes to monitor KURET beneficiaries to produce the data required is considerable (estimated 30 to 50 percent). Most staff members feel that it is excessive, and that staff effort could be better spent improving the services offered to children, households, and schools. (See M&E for further discussion.) USDOL provided valuable assistance in developing the PMP at the beginning of the project, which was essential for ensuring common staff understanding of the project and charting the way forward. (Unfortunately, relatively few staff members were in place at the time—late 2004 and early 2005.) The annual conferences USDOL organizes for grantees are also seen as an important and helpful means of information exchange, idea sharing, and problem solving with other USDOL child labor projects. It does not appear, however, that USDOL always listens to problems and complaints raised by the grantees. For

example, the USDOL Project Manager stated that no other grantees at the USDOL Africa Regional Grantee Consultation Workshop in April 2006 had so strongly voiced concerns about the USDOL data demands and reporting requirements, in direct contradiction to what KURET participants report, and USDOL rejected requests from multiple grantees to discuss revisions of the TPR format.

KURET staff suggests that it would have been helpful had USDOL provided a start-up package for procedures, guidelines, tools, and instruments, gleaned from similar projects it had supported elsewhere. (This is in contrast to ILO, which provides its projects with these tools, some of which KURET has found helpful.) Many of the KURET management systems, including M&E, had to be developed from scratch, and continue to undergo revisions. Existing templates would have been helpful.

Chapter VI: Monitoring and Evaluation

A. M&E System

KURET has developed multiple tools and systems to monitor project performance. However, compliance with all USDOL requirements comes at a high cost and entails trade-offs for the use of KURET human and financial resources that could arguably be used more productively for other project activities.

Most of the M&E system, including resources and staff effort, is designed to respond to USDOL common indicators on beneficiary withdrawal/prevention, retention, and completion. Both the rationale and effectiveness of the project rests on the proper selection and support of beneficiaries that fit the child labor criteria promulgated by USDOL and refined and expanded by KURET. The identification and selection process is sound and well implemented. KURET prepared clear definitions and detailed criteria to guide the selection of children either engaged in or at risk of child labor. It has also developed guidance on how to prioritize these children. It has successfully trained its local partners (e.g., School Management Committees, Child Labor Committees, and even communities at large) in the identification and selection of KURET beneficiaries. All local partners interviewed were able to identify correctly the eligibility and selection criteria for beneficiaries (as were children and parents). The respondents agreed with the criteria and thought they were appropriate for their locale. A pre-intake Form completed by committees or schools provides an initial round-up of eligible children. The intake form completed by trained KURET staff or locally hired education counselors (or the equivalent) provides a triage and ensures that the data collected is accurate. Intake data are checked by KURET site facilitators for veracity (i.e., that the children are eligible) and accuracy, and at higher levels for accuracy. Beneficiary selection is conducted jointly by KURET staff with the LCLC. This serves a dual purpose: 1) local knowledge of the neediest children informs selection, and 2) community involvement endows legitimacy and ensures agreement with beneficiary selection. KURET, however, makes the final determination so that the possibility of special interests or favoritism is minimized. The evaluators did not hear any reports of community disapprobation with the beneficiaries selected, and there were no accusations of ineligible children. The few complaints involved other children not selected but who were also eligible, which is a function of KURET's limited resource availability and not flawed procedures.

KURET's M&E system has enabled it to act on USDOL individual child-tracking requirements and report on project beneficiary indicators with a relatively high degree of accuracy, although not in complete compliance with USDOL criteria for full withdrawal from child labor. KURET has put in place a data quality control system, described in Chapter IV, including a multi-tiered Data Quality Assurance Plan that subjects beneficiary and other project data to multiple reviews from the field sites to the Regional Office. The Project Director/COP says that KURET enjoys a good reputation for M&E among other USDOL-funded EI grantees because it "has embraced USDOL technical requirements" for M&E. The Regional Office scrutinizes country data and is "very severe" when unacceptable data is presented:

“The Regional Office won’t let go.” By the time beneficiary data reaches USDOL in the TPR, it has gone through multiple reviews and corrections.

Per USDOL requirements, KURET maintains both physical and electronic files on each beneficiary, complete with code numbers (it has also prepared guidance on how to assign numbers to avoid duplication). [The evaluator notes that these code numbers could be linked to other project inputs or activities (such as LCLCs or schools) and used in effectiveness analysis.] The physical files examined by the evaluators contained the pre-intake, intake, and multiple follow-up forms (depending on when the beneficiary started with KURET). In some instances, the latest follow-up form had been sent for data entry. The evaluators found in a random and cursory series of spot checks that there were no discrepancies between KURET beneficiaries’ verbal responses and the data on the intake and follow-up forms. KURET’s Data Quality Assurance Plan also calls for spot checks to be conducted by Project Managers and Regional Office staff to determine whether beneficiary files are complete and accurate.³⁰ In reality, this does not appear to occur with any frequency. Project Managers were startled when the evaluators asked for files and Regional Office staff members do not often make field site visits. As part of its Data Quality Assurance Plan, KURET should provide a simple protocol for field spot checks.

The follow-up form and Beneficiary Support Forms record the assistance provided to the child, although it is not clear that the support provided is based on and compared with any standard or minimum support package. These forms are not, however, necessarily kept in a single file. The lack of dedicated KURET computers at field offices means that KURET field staff may have to consult multiple files to access a child’s complete information. For example, the follow-up form does not indicate whether the child or his or her family has been linked with another program. It is possible that the new database would allow KURET to generate basic (e.g., one-page) child records that consolidate key data for use by the field staff. Aggregation of the background and descriptive data would be helpful in developing student profiles and needs.

The follow-up form also records information obtained from the child about current work status, and if the work involves hazardous or abusive conditions. However, the form does not appear to deal with the nuances of the “sliding scale” (e.g., informed by age, capacity) that KURET contends should be used to determine whether a child is engaged in labor or simply work. Other than a useful chart depicting the gradations of child labor, the evaluators did not see any tools that delineated appropriate work according to age or other variables, which could be used to ensure that data collector responses are less subjective. These data are necessary to support KURET contentions that its beneficiaries have shifted from exploitive labor to less onerous, more acceptable types of work.

KURET has designed a new COR Form to verify the working status of children with a second credible source in the community (i.e., a knowledgeable person). This form has not yet been tested in terms of its utility, and it is not clear how KURET will deal with any discrepancies both in terms of conflicting responses and local-level beneficiary interventions. KURET should conduct a study of the form’s viability once it is in place. It should conduct a discrepancy analysis between information sources (i.e., follow-up form vs. COR), investigate further the reasons for any discrepancies, and provide additional guidance to the data collectors on how to elicit honest information. KURET should also institute a system for checking the veracity of the “confirmation,” as community members may also want to conceal that children are still involved in child labor.

As KURET has developed its child tracking system and responded to both field and USDOL exigencies, the intake and follow-on forms have gone through several iterations. While quality and efficiency of the

³⁰ See KURET draft M&E Guidelines (May 2006).

forms has improved, the changes have required constant staff re-orientation and training. In some cases, data has had to be re-entered. The various KURET country programs have developed or used a number of forms for quality control and M&E. With the development of the new database, it may be time to review all the forms being used, eliminate redundancies, and settle on a standard set.

The data reporting requirements for children are extraordinarily burdensome, and will increase through Year 3 of the project as new beneficiaries are added (with few that are scheduled to graduate from KURET support). It is unusual that such massive data collection, primarily beneficiary formal follow-up, needs to be done on a semi-annual basis.³¹ KURET Country Projects report that they spend at least four months per year on this, and the Regional Office about three months. Other USDOL grantees interviewed also point to the exceptionally burdensome USDOL reporting requirements. All agree that USDOL grants risk “becoming data collection projects, not development projects.”

KURET staff says that the data collection burden greatly restricts its ability to deal with other quality-enhancing and M&E activities. “We do all ‘M’ all the time, and very little ‘E,’” admits the Policy/M&E Specialist. This sentiment is understandable. Once the TPR data are collected, aggregated, reviewed, and reported, there is little time left to actually analyze the data (other than compare the indicators with targets) or make full use of the project’s rich database. More data is collected than reported in the TPR, and such data could be used to analyze trends, develop child profiles, and examine relationships among different variables (e.g., what are the factors that seem to explain child retention). Because of the emphasis on monitoring KURET activities, less attention has been paid to evaluating them. For example, no control groups, schools, or teachers have been established for comparative data analysis. Several indicators require baselines (e.g., teacher behaviors) which have not yet been adequately established. Rigorous operational research plans to assess the effectiveness of KURET innovations (e.g., SRP, IGAs, Apprenticeship and Artisan vocational training programs) have not been developed.

There are options for reducing the data collection, entry, and processing burden. For example, formal student follow-up (i.e., completing the follow-up forms) could be done once a year, with individual student follow-up scheduled to coincide with program completion. Few of the indicators currently used are so time sensitive that they require reporting every six months. KURET could easily report on a few simple output indicators (e.g., beneficiaries enrolled, teachers trained) that would give the USDOL Project Manager a better sense of whether they are adhering to the work plan, and are on time and target. Alternatively, mid-year follow-up could be based on a scientific sample to provide an idea of key student trends (proportion of beneficiaries that have truly been withdrawn) using an abridged form. More systematic informal follow-up by LCLCs could ensure that “problem” beneficiaries are not neglected. On the data input side, KURET could experiment with the use of hand-held data devices (PDAs) for immediate, on-the-spot entry of data that can be downloaded into the country database.³²

If mid-year reporting is intended more to ensure that KURET beneficiaries receive the support and counseling they need to avoid child labor and prosper in school, then project resources should be used for

³¹ It is typical in development projects to collect beneficiary data no more than one time per year. Similarly, education projects (and education systems) typically collect student data once per year.

³² It should be noted that the USDOL Project Manager has requested that these suggestions be deleted from this report, stating that “USDOL simply cannot allow reporting on beneficiaries or other project indicators to take place less frequently than on a semi-annual basis” and that USDOL has no flexibility on this. However, the evaluator is unaware of the USDOL guidelines that require semi-annual formal follow-up of all beneficiaries. It is not cited as a requirement in response to Question 7 “*How extensively do we need to monitor children’s working status?*” in the GPRA Questions and Answers for Education Initiative Grantees (January 2006) or in any of the referenced documents. Moreover, even if USDOL officially requires its EI grantees to perform semi-annual formal follow-up of beneficiaries, it is the responsibility of any midterm evaluation to address an important issue that has been found by the evaluators to exert a negative effect on project operation, quality, and, probably, results, and to offer suggestions for alternatives. It is incumbent on USDOL, as a reflective organization, to compare the experiences of the various EI projects and to consider options that may more efficiently net the same desired results in beneficiary monitoring.

counseling sessions. Ostensibly, the child tracking system serves a dual purpose—reporting against indicator targets and providing the opportunity to “counsel” KURET beneficiaries—but it seems to be more heavily weighted toward the former. The intake and follow-up data collectors, be they education counselors, hired or focal point teachers, or Community Development Agents, have heavy “case-loads” and little time. Most report that they spend 30 minutes per child, probably inadequate for true counseling and mentoring purposes, however “expert” they may be. Several KURET staff members observed that LCLCs do an effective job of monitoring and counseling children. This suggests that KURET should train LCLCs for the counseling function.

KURET’s current child tracking system is not feasible for long-term use by either government or local committees. However, in some project countries, the LCLCs and focal teachers do complete either the formal child follow-up form or prepare a written report. In other countries, the local community reports are verbal and no records are kept. KURET’s time might be more effectively spent making the child tracking system more appropriate and user-friendly so that it can be adopted by the local structures and help local governments track children. As it is, the current M&E system will leave a poor legacy compared with the resources expended.

B. PMP and Indicators

PMP

The PMP (specifically the log frames) is KURET’s major tool for management and planning implementation. One staff member joked that it was the “KURET bible.” It establishes the key results that are the basis for project activities and sets targets that inform resource allocation. It is the primary tool USDOL uses for monitoring project performance and grantee compliance. However, the PMP is outdated and out-of-sync with many project activities. It requires revision.

The log frame format is not suitable for KURET, even though it is a USDOL convention. Results frameworks are better able to express the multi-tiered results and linkages that comprise a development project. The World Bank, USAID, and other development organizations use the results framework tool to plan their strategies and projects and later monitor them. KURET’s log frames³³ were developed early in the project, in a useful group workshop that helped KURET country projects define how they would measure results. However, besides being outdated, the KURET log frames do not provide a clear blueprint for what the project is doing. One of the challenges of the midterm evaluation was to tease out a hierarchy of results (with associated activities) under each of the outputs. Now is the time for KURET to re-examine what it is actually doing, and select and define the best indicators. Without changing the objective/goal, purpose, or outputs,³⁴ KURET should engage staff in developing a results framework. Once results are identified, the current set of indicators (except for the USDOL–mandated GPRA indicators) should be examined for utility and replaced or redefined as necessary, in consultation with USDOL.

Concurrently, an M&E Plan should be developed. The PMP is not an M&E Plan. The PMP presents in summary form the indicators, cursory definitions, and targets, and it is primarily designed for use by the donor client (USDOL), not the implementing organization. It is not sufficient to guide overall data collection and analysis. An M&E Plan should include the project’s logic, development hypotheses, and critical assumptions; operational indicator definitions, disaggregation specifications, baselines, and

³³ Each country project developed its own log frame. While the indicators differ somewhat, the outputs do not.

³⁴ Log frames consist of three main levels of causality (in descending order): goal, purpose, and outputs. In summary form, KURET’s goal is to reduce the engagement of children in WFCL. Its purpose is to educate children at risk of or removed from WFCL, and its outputs are 1) increased access to education, 2) improved educational quality and relevance, 3) raised awareness about child labor, and 4) increased support by government, communities, and households.

targets; instrument specification; and a plan and schedule for data collection (including sampling), tabulation, reporting, and quality control. Critical research questions, anticipating those by USDOL and other constituents (e.g., other donors, governments, NGOs), should be articulated, and analyses or studies named and programmed. KURET has developed useful draft M&E guidelines and other materials that could form the basis of the M&E Plan.

PMP Indicators

Many of KURET's PMP indicators are inappropriate, no longer applicable, and ill-defined and have little M&E value. Other indicators not currently included in the PMP may be more useful and better capture project results.

KURET uses the number of beneficiaries it has enrolled in school or other training programs as its proxy for the number of children either withdrawn or prevented from engaging in child labor. This is an inexact measure, as many beneficiaries appear still to be engaged in child labor, although to a lesser extent, insofar as school often takes up a major portion of the workday. A more accurate definition of the indicator would be "the number of children under age 18 whose engagement in child labor has been reduced." In Uganda, for example, KURET staff explained that they do not include beneficiaries who continue to work in WFCL in their count, but the number of KURET-supported students is equal to the number reported to USDOL as withdrawn or prevented, suggesting that this does not always occur, particularly as the evaluator met and heard reports of some KURET beneficiaries who continue to work as prostitutes and in stone quarries.

Other compelling, additional objective-level measures should be developed, such as enumerating the children removed from WFCL by type (e.g., prostitution, illegal activity). Although data on beneficiary involvement in WFCL is collected and recorded by KURET country projects in the bi-monthly report,³⁵ it does not appear in the TPR or elsewhere in aggregated form. KURET should also develop measures that denote the changes in graduations of involvement in child labor (see Chapter 2: Impact). It should be noted that all KURET staff members are familiar with the official USDOL definitions for "withdrawn" and "prevented" from child labor. While the definitions are clear, their application is not, largely because of stringent criteria that are unrealistic in the environments where KURET operates. This is an issue that KURET and USDOL must revisit, and USDOL should be prepared for lower withdrawn/prevented figures, as well as a divergence between withdrawn/prevented and provided-educational-opportunities figures.

Enrollment in school also does not capture the extent of participation in school. Absenteeism is a major problem among KURET beneficiaries. Attendance/absenteeism rates should be calculated. The data are available at the schools and are even collected by the facilitators, but they are not recorded or reported. The PMP also does not appear to provide for the collection and reporting of longitudinal data of children that have completed a terminal cycle of schooling. This is especially true of those under 18 that have or will soon be completing their vocational training or vocational mentorship program. Moreover, KURET does not appear to have made plans for this.

The ultimate indication of improved quality and relevance in education is student learning and skill acquisition. KURET does not officially collect or report student performance data. Although KURET reports completion and retention rates, these have little utility as learning measures. The data do not allow for assessment of the educational attainment of KURET beneficiaries or comparison with non-KURET counterparts. The definition that USDOL uses for completion is different than that conventionally used in education programs to indicate a measure internal efficiency (i.e., the percentage of an enrollment cohort

³⁵ See Monthly [*sic*] Reporting Format for M&E Coordinators.

having successfully completed all grades in a schooling cycle or level such as primary education). Instead, the USDOL common indicator completion is defined as the percentage of children in a cohort, reported as withdrawn or prevented from exploitive labor and enrolled in an educational program, who complete the KURET-planned education program, rather than a cycle or level of education. Since the denominator used is the total number of KURET-supported students, not the annual number eligible to complete the cycle they are in, the indicator is meaningful only at the end of the project. Its interpretation will be further complicated if the same student completes more than one cycle or program (e.g., primary and secondary, primary and vocational education). KURET should consider adding another indicator that uses the conventional education definition of completion to show that the student has completed the school cycle as distinct from whether the student has completed or rather graduated from the KURET program and is no longer eligible for support.

Similarly, the retention rate indicator used by USDOL has little meaning from a learning standpoint because of automatic promotion policies in effect in primary schools, although the indicator is essential with respect to the project assumption that continued school enrollment is a proxy for withdrawing/preventing children from child labor. Country projects indicate that examination data (both annual and cycle leaving exams) are available, but these are not routinely collected by KURET or reported. While it is not recommended that KURET engage in testing children, it should be possible to find some proxy for learning in existing databases.

KURET PMP indicators suffer from several shortcomings. Some of the KURET indicators seem overly ambitious or beyond the reach of its current program, such as “the number of sub-countries with COPE centers” or “the number of ABE centers with class ratios less than 50:1.” These indicators are also misleading, giving the impression that these are the result of government action, rather than simply KURET building COPE centers or limiting enrollment in the ABE centers it operates. Some indicators are wasteful, in that they fragment activities that are better treated and more meaningful as a whole. For example, students receiving school supplies and students for whom school dues have been paid could simply be collapsed into the more meaningful “students who have received designated support package,” which may include dues, uniform, supplies, or other items. Likewise, teachers using gender-sensitive and learner-centered methods could be collapsed into “teachers using designated methods” (with gender and pedagogical criteria). Other indicators no longer reflect the project’s activities, as in the case of “the number of home-based day care centers.” These should simply be eliminated. Some indicators have little meaning either in terms of impact (changed behavior) or significant output (a key activity). For example, the “parents committing to actions to remove barriers to their children’s education” simply seems to be a repeat of the number of beneficiaries, whose enrollment requires parental agreement. Some indicators require very well defined criteria that were not readily evident to the evaluators. What constitutes a “policy action” or makes for a “functioning DCLC”?

The KURET indicators seem to mix measures of higher-level results (e.g., raised awareness) with inappropriately low-level inputs (e.g., school fees paid) that are best suited for internal accounting and management purposes. Oddly, there are some major omissions. KURET does not uniformly include many simple but key output indicators in its TPR, such as numbers of TOT and teachers trained, number of learning sites supported, number of classrooms constructed, number of LCLCs established and trained. Occasionally, these data are buried in the TPR narrative, but they should be routinely reported as they are the most straightforward means of monitoring whether the project is on track, on time, and has set the foundation for higher-level impact (e.g., changes in teacher behavior, increased awareness levels). The evaluators had to ask for these simple data, which KURET readily provided, although with some effort and errors.

Laudably, KURET has included indicators for changes in behaviors (e.g., teachers) and attitudes (community awareness). However, more thought needs to go into the means of measuring and collecting

these data. Teacher observations have been conducted in the various countries, but the instrument used is more a synthetic “report card” than an observation instrument. There is no clear sampling plan, description of the underlying hypotheses, or treatment of controls (e.g., baseline, non-KURET trained teachers) that could attribute results to KURET. KURET has not yet developed its plan for measuring community awareness. It indicated that it will use qualitative measures and methods, but it still requires empirical rigor in its sampling plan and instruments. Ultimately, the data will have to be quantified according to some scale (e.g., high or low awareness) and prevalence (e.g., percentage of those interviewed demonstrating high levels of awareness).

KURET indicators are not standardized across the countries. To a certain extent, this is understandable when the country programs vary. However, a core set of indicators for each output should be developed so that the overall achievements of KURET can be aggregated and stated numerically, and country results compared. While KURET may comprise four country activities, it was designed as a single project in its approach and therefore the data should be aggregated to give an overall view of progress, outputs, and accomplishments, as is done for the impact-level common indicators.

Reporting

KURET receives bi-monthly reports from the KURET country offices, but the official KURET progress report is the semi-annual TPR, submitted to USDOL every March and September. The TPR presents individual country progress reports; aggregates data on the common indicators (withdrawal/prevention, enrollment, retention, completion); and summarizes accomplishments, problems, and lessons learned. KURET has presented the TPRs on time and in line with USDOL requirements, and USDOL has generally been satisfied with KURET’s TPRs.

The TPR is an important document, but its utility is limited in terms of clearly communicating project impact and results. The TPR format is confusing and is not easily understandable to the non-initiated KURET reader. KURET staff members occasionally had difficulty interpreting the data presented. While the narrative is helpful, the tables are not. The column headings mix cohorts with time period, targets are not uniformly delineated, and denominators used for percentages are not readily discernable. Both Regional Office and KURET country staff say that they struggle with the format—required by USDOL for all its EI projects—because it does not easily accommodate KURET data. It does not appear that USDOL can easily make changes in the format. The USDOL Project Manager says that she is satisfied with the amount and type of information being presented, but stresses that USDOL would welcome receiving more in-depth information in the TPR and would check into easing the page limitation. In light of this, KURET might wish to augment this report with other, simplified tables that provide additional information already being collected, such as the number of children withdrawn from the different types of WFCL, teachers trained in various subject areas, and community committees established/trained.

Targets

With the critical exception of the targets set for the withdrawal and prevented GPRA indicator, KURET has met or surpassed some of its global targets for the GPRA indicators of enrollment and retention. (The completion targets are more problematic because of the indicator definition.) This suggests that the targets set by the project are realistic in terms of “project achievements to date and...for the life of the project.”³⁶ This does not mean, however, that the targets are always appropriate or easily conform to field realities.

The global figure of 30,600 direct beneficiaries withdrawn or prevented from child labor and enrolled in an educational program is a binding target, proposed by KURET and approved by USDOL in the PRODOC. As discussed previously it does not appear that KURET has fully met the target for this

³⁶ USDOL KURET Midterm Evaluation SOW, question 7.

compound³⁷ indicator, but the magnitude of the discrepancy between the number of beneficiaries withdrawn and prevented and the number of those enrolled in education programs (23,509) is unknown. Initially, WV proposed that it would withdraw or prevent about 50,000 children from child labor. After USDOL provided technical assistance on the definitions of withdrawn or prevented, WV reduced its targets to the current 30,600 beneficiaries with USDOL concurrence. In light of its two years of experience and the emerging indications that some beneficiaries are still engaged in child labor, WV may wish to consider proposing to USDOL a further reduction in the targets for beneficiaries “withdrawn or prevented and enrolled,” while maintaining the current targets for enrolled. USDOL indicates that while it can consider the reduction in targets, “it is not acceptable for projects to count children and report them to USDOL as withdrawn or prevented if they cannot verify children’s working status, after having made all reasonable efforts to do so.”

The entire KURET project is designed to meet this target, and makes trade-offs to do so. For example, in some countries it has had to reduce the student package to reconcile budget realities with beneficiary targets, with the result that some students may not be adequately supported to fully participate in schooling. Some Project Managers say that they are meeting their current beneficiary enrollment targets, but express concern about their ability to deal with the additional cohorts of targeted children. KURET country delivery and support structures will have to be expanded, and it is not apparent that this has been adequately planned for. The targets remain realistic only insofar as the project operation environment remains the same as when they were set. Operations in Uganda and Ethiopia are challenged by political conflict, which at times has caused suspension and delays in project activities. For example, Uganda was unable to meet its beneficiary targets, as reported in the September 2005 TPR.

The periodicity of beneficiary targets has also created some difficulties. Year 1 of KURET required that 25 percent of the total number of beneficiaries be enrolled in KURET. This meant that there was little time for developing approaches and methodologies, setting the foundation for working with the community, and establishing relationships with other stakeholders. IRC in Ethiopia reports that it was unable to meet the beneficiary targets because of the lead time it takes to conduct community conversations and establish ABE centers, which was the cause of great concern to Regional Office management. Several KURET countries have indicated that the reporting calendar and academic years are “out of sync,” which makes it difficult to meet designated reporting period targets. To do so, KURET has developed some promising innovations, such as the SRP in Ethiopia. While the results are laudable, the motivation is less compelling as a means of driving project initiatives.

Other targets and sub-targets (e.g., gender allocations) are also set by KURET and considered more flexible than those associated with the GPRA indicators, although still requiring USDOL approval. They are established by the KURET country project offices, according to guidelines provided by the Regional Office, budget parameters, and local context. At the country level, KURET may change certain targets, with the approval of USDOL, such as increasing the number of children enrolled in ALP rather than vocational education. Some of the targets for lower-level indicators have not been met and may be unrealistic. A notable example is that of creating linkages to other projects, which has proved problematic for the project. KURET may wish to revisit this and other targets in light of project experience and changing conditions.

³⁷ A compound indicator combines two or more indicators.

Chapter VII: Design and Sustainability

A. Design

The design of the KURET project is founded on four primary (albeit unstated) development hypotheses.³⁸ First, education is a viable alternative to child labor; second, education will provide the necessary skills for a child to earn his or her living outside of child labor; third, providing support to access school will be sufficient to ensure withdrawal from or prevention of child labor; and fourth, a donor project can effect systemic change in policies, institutional practices, and individual behaviors within a four-year time period. While the four output areas of KURET do provide logical building blocks for eliminating child labor, KURET experience has shown that the development hypotheses do not hold completely in the target countries.

Education is not viewed by project stakeholders as an alternative to child labor, as USDOL suggests (per the evaluation TOR), insofar as it represents a choice. Instead, child labor is identified as a barrier to educational participation, given family requirements that their children work to fulfill basic survival needs. KURET beneficiaries are liable to both attend school and continue in child labor. They are not mutually exclusive activities. The cause of child labor is primarily poverty, not ignorance, policy gaps, or even lack of education facilities. Education is not an immediate panacea to poverty on the personal level, that is, the act of going to school will not immediately increase income (unless a stipend is provided). In some instances, the opportunity costs of attending school further impoverish the family, as they forego income.

Moreover, for many KURET beneficiaries, it is questionable whether they will have attained the required levels of schooling/training and concomitant skills to find employment outside of child labor. Education rates-of-return research indicates that higher benefits accrue to cycle completion rather than simply years of education. While education improves the child's ability to navigate life and earn an income, schooling is no guarantee of employment or work outside of WFCL, particularly in areas where jobs are scarce and schooling is no longer a rarity. At most, KURET is able to provide an additional three years of formal schooling. Many children will not have even completed primary school in this time frame and will still be underage. Already, there are reports from Uganda that some KURET beneficiaries in Lira who completed primary school and could not get KURET support for further schooling have returned to child labor. The beneficiaries of a USDOL-funded project in Arua similar to KURET also returned to child labor at the end of the project.

The student support package provided by KURET has allowed nearly 24,000 children to access or remain in school, but it is not sufficient to keep children out of child labor, although it does reduce their participation by occupying a large number of hours in the day. Many children are unable to fully participate in schooling as they are absent or too tired to concentrate because they work after school, or suffer from hunger and illness. The student support package does not adequately address the other factors that impinge on their educational participation. For example, the lack of attention to the household/family and the role the child plays in its economy has been identified as a clear design gap by KURET and stakeholders. The KURET design did not ignore this, but its strategy of attempting to create linkages with other projects or donors to address livelihood needs has not proved feasible in the context where it works. The poverty is too deep, the children's needs are too many, and the opportunities for linkages are too scarce.

KURET has set an ambitious agenda for itself. Not only must it put in place a child labor policy, support

³⁸ Development hypotheses are distinguished from critical assumptions in that they are the foundation for project strategy, while critical assumptions generally apply to project approach and implementation.

action plan development, and strengthen enforcement capacity; it also needs to ensure that the education system is responsive and supportive of children involved in or at risk of child labor. Simultaneously, it must create a demand for prevention of child labor by raising awareness of stakeholders at all levels. The four-year time frame is not sufficient to effect all the policy and institutional changes KURET desires or that are necessary to have an appreciable effect on withdrawing or preventing child labor. KURET has developed a logical approach to addressing child labor policy issues and has enjoyed notable successes in advancing child labor policies, but it does not exercise control over the policy development process, which is subject to many factors (e.g., political, economic, social). Unless USDOL intends to fund a second phase of the project, it is not likely that KURET will be able to have sufficient impact on the labor-related policy and investment framework so that it is functional and capable of materially reducing child labor.

As it is currently implemented, the KURET strategy is not sufficient to appreciably improve education quality and relevance on a significant scale. It is not apparent that the KURET strategy was closely designed with reference to the national education policy and investment framework. In some cases, it appears that KURET interventions (e.g., creation of COPE and ABE centers, construction of classrooms) were undertaken without adequate attention to education system policies, budgets, and certification requirements. KURET also assumes that the delivery structures (e.g., schools) and systems (e.g., teacher training systems) are essentially sound and functional. Its approach is to build on these, but it is not always assured that they are providing the requisite foundations or can accommodate KURET teacher training needs (e.g., Primary Teacher Colleges and Coordinating Center Tutors in Uganda). Moreover, a significant amount of KURET effort and resources are invested in having to create from the ground up the schools and program for KURET beneficiaries to attend. The support of both schools and teachers is not robust enough to significantly improve the material wellbeing of the schools or affect overall teaching and learning quality to the extent that KURET desires. KURET does not have the resources to provide direct training to teachers in sufficient quantities, and the TOT approach suffers inherent weaknesses of all cascade models, as well as project-specific implementation gaps. Moreover, KURET assumes that teacher classroom performance and effectiveness is largely a function of skill acquisition, but it is not the only variable in determining teacher behavior. Teacher incentives, attendance, management, and other factors must also be considered. Although the KURET strategic framework encompasses policy and institutional changes in the education sector, KURET's emphasis has been at the school and local level. Its success in Uganda with integrating child labor into educational services suggests that this is a more productive and cost-effective approach, deserving more attention and resources. The education sector should also be a major policy focus.

KURET's success in raising awareness among its stakeholders has been considerable, from the national to the district to the community level. Awareness is the logical precursor to behavioral change. Increased awareness of policymakers and decisionmakers at the national, regional, and even district levels has paid off in policy advances. However, a breach in KURET's strategy is at the individual household, parent, and child level, where it does not bridge the gap between awareness and the wherewithal to act on that awareness. More attention needs to be paid to providing households with tips, guidance, and practical suggestions about how to deal with and mitigate child labor, but there are limits to what KURET can do to alleviate the household poverty that propels children into labor. Income generation schemes have proved difficult to develop and manage, and have a long history of failure. They constitute major projects in themselves and would compete severely with KURET resources dedicated to its strategy—education. The treatment of HIV/AIDS is not clear in the KURET strategy. Obviously, HIV/AIDS contributes to child labor. Districts or regions that are severely affected by HIV/AIDS are top candidates for inclusion in KURET target areas of operation because of this linkage. Children whose households are affected by HIV/AIDS are identified as at risk. However, it is not apparent how far KURET is expected to go in dealing with HIV/AIDS, beyond including it in community, teacher, and student awareness and training. Supporting education, which is considered a “social vaccine” against HIV/AIDS, is inherent in the

KURET strategy. KURET includes HIV/AIDS in its teacher training program, but the USDOL evaluation questions and other materials seem to imply that KURET is expected to do more, although it does not have the expertise, clout, or resources of other HIV/AIDS organizations to deal with policy or support its victims (e.g., beneficiaries or their family members who are living with HIV/AIDS). USDOL should be more specific about what it wants and whether KURET is complying. This confusion may be confounding some KURET interventions. For example, should a significant proportion of KURET teacher training resources go to HIV/AIDS training?

The design issues and strategic gaps noted above do not mean that KURET cannot perform and make significant in-roads against child labor. It has filled a critical gap in most countries by directing government attention to the issue and complementing other donor efforts. KURET's strategy and approach have operationalized treatment of child labor at the ground level, by dealing directly with communities, children, and schools. The KURET strategy and design are flawed to the extent that they are not likely to accomplish overly ambitious objectives on the scale desired within the time frame and budget available. In that many unrealistic expectations appear to derive from the USDOL EI strategy, this is an issue that exceeds the KURET grant, and requires USDOL and all its grantees to engage in frank discussion.³⁹

Child labor is an end result of and inextricably linked to a Gordian knot of political, social, and economic problems faced by developing countries. To eliminate or significantly reduce child labor, challenging and intractable issues of poverty, economic development, food security, social equity, political stability, good governance, educational opportunity, and many others must be addressed. However, one project cannot address them all, even if it limits itself to a modest number of beneficiaries. The USDOL EI-funded projects uses education as a major strategy, but during the course of this evaluation project principals both at KURET and USDOL have proposed interventions far removed from the main trajectory of the EI strategy. These include income-generation activities, micro-finance schemes, and enterprise training for parents of KURET beneficiaries. It should be remembered that each of the suggested areas of intervention often constitutes extensive and expensive projects in their own right. While these suggestions may have merit, they are straying from the essential EI strategy. Pursuing them could exceed project capacity and spread project resources too thin, so that focus on KURET's core mission—increasing access to education; improving educational quality and relevancy; raising awareness about child labor; and building national and local capacity, structures, and systems to deal with it—is obscured, diminished, or lost. If KURET attempts to do everything, outside the strategic parameters, then it is likely to do nothing well.

B. Sustainability

A goal of KURET (and any other development project) is to see its efforts and interventions sustained after the project is completed. Sustainability of in-country efforts to combat exploitive child labor has also been highlighted as a key USDOL priority for all EI grantees. It was unclear to the evaluators which aspects of KURET are expected to be sustained. USDOL indicates that it does not expect all project activities to be continued, but it does not specify which ones should. In the regional debriefing meeting, it appeared that this gave KURET permission to selectively choose its definition of project sustainability. Delineation of expectations is particularly important, as they should inform KURET design revisions and activities for the next few years. Moreover, they call into question KURET resource allocations. Should spending continue on project activities that are not likely to be sustained, such as direct beneficiary support? USDOL and KURET should confront the sometimes uncomfortable issues of sustainability together to ensure that KURET resources are used to optimal effect.

³⁹ The reader need only review the objective/goal, purpose, and outputs USDOL has set for EI projects that establish the parameters in which they develop activities and operate.

KURET has developed a five-point Exit Strategy that underscores many aspects of its design and strategy that have the potential of enhancing long-term sustainability, such as supporting child labor policy development, incorporating child labor issues in education, and capacity building of stakeholders to deal with child labor issues. The project is less specific about how it is going to put in place the actual conditions for sustainability. For example, how will LCLCs be supported once KURET is over? How will the training materials on child labor KURET develops be used? Who will be responsible for ensuring that schools know how to support school clubs? Who will assume the roles and resources of the local equivalents of KURET facilitators?

In the child labor policy arena, KURET has effected some changes that should have an enduring impact in the fight to eliminate child labor. Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda have passed or are actively developing child labor policies. Districts in Uganda and Rwanda have passed by-laws penalizing labor abuses against children. These are an excellent start, but are not sufficient to ensure a sustainable advancement of KURET's objective. Other elements also influence sustainability, such as political will as expressed by resources allocated, operationalization of policy (e.g., legal instruments, enforcement), and continuous training and capacity building (and even the creation of new institutions). Putting in place a viable foundation for sustained action is a complex and long-term effort. It will require persistent and uninterrupted support, probably exceeding KURET's current time frame and budget.

Most of KURET's efforts in terms of policy and institutionalization have been focused on the relevant child labor groups at the national level, mainly the ministries of labor, national child labor advisory committees, and child labor organizations. With the notable exception of Uganda, KURET has not yet focused on national education policy or other national policies dealing with children or related to child labor. While KURET has aimed most of its education efforts at the school level, the most promising prospects for sustainable change in the quality and relevance of education are at the national or regional levels (depending on decisionmaking authority). Including child labor in the pre- and in-service teacher training curriculum, in guidance and counseling services, and in classroom curricula promises more enduring and larger scale impact than training a relatively small number of teachers, no matter how good the training. Not all countries offer the same windows of opportunities. KURET should consider increasing its attention and staff resources in this area so that promising avenues can be pursued (e.g., institutionalizing the SRP and other innovations). Currently, some of KURET's investments in education are at risk of not being supported or continued after the end of the project, most notably some of the ABE and COPE centers it has established and the facilitators it has trained. Laudably, KURET has worked out these issues in Benishangul, which should serve as a model of how to proceed elsewhere.

KURET's Exit Strategy is heavily reliant on a large pool of motivated and competent individuals to enforce and act on policy directives. The most promising structures for sustained action are the DCLCs and the LCLCs (e.g., Community Coalition Committees, Child Rights Committees, Community Child Protection Committees, Child Protection Committees). KURET should be able to build their capacity over the next two years, but DCLCs have no budget to pursue action, even if their plans are improved. The LCLCs' futures are uncertain. They are not officially sanctioned or supported by government structures, nor are they linked to any government institution. This does not imply that LCLCs should become government institutions or paid employees, but their continued motivation and effectiveness will require some sort of oversight that provides recognition of their function and some material support. KURET's Exit Strategy needs to be more specific about how it is going to address these issues. Activating and creating these groups is not enough.

The 'elephant in the room' for KURET in terms of sustainability is KURET's direct beneficiary support component, which takes the largest proportion of project resources. The unanswered question is what will happen to the KURET beneficiaries who are under18 when the project ends. Who will provide for their

school expenses? Virtually all parents, students, and teachers interviewed were positive that the students would return to full-time child labor if KURET stopped supporting their schooling. Government officials interviewed are adamant that they will not be able to provide even a fraction of the KURET student support package to children. KURET's Exit Strategy hopes that its beneficiaries will be linked to other programs and organizations, including WV and IRC, but its experience during the past two years indicates that linkages with other NGOs are not a promising long-term option for sustainability. Even within the IRC and WV programs, there are limited opportunities for linkages. Continued NGO presence is also not assured. Conventionally, sustainability is defined as the national and local stakeholders in a country (primarily government) assuming complete or most responsibility for the planning, management, and financing of the intervention or program. Planning for continued donor or NGO support appears only to be an intermediate solution. Moreover, the Exit Strategy does not target any other partners with the ability to sponsor children, at least in the short-term (e.g., Compassion, Plan International, CARE, Save the Children).

It may be that this central KURET component, and the one most immediately responsive to USDOL common indicators, is inherently unsustainable, given the constrained resource availability in the countries where KURET works. To a certain extent, this component appears more to be charitable child sponsorship than the standard U.S.-development initiatives, though perhaps this was the intent.⁴⁰ If so, then established child sponsorship standards and ethics should be followed. A smaller number of beneficiaries could have served as demonstration projects in each of the countries, freeing up resources for more sustainable activities. KURET must confront two issues. First, since the direct beneficiary support component is likely to surpass the budgets that governments say they will have available, communities say they can raise, parents say they need, and WV, IRC, and other NGOs say they can absorb, it may not offer a viable model to combat child labor. Second, if the direct beneficiary component was intended as a one-off intervention to assist selected children and to be terminated with the project, then KURET will have brought them a few years of happiness and education, but may not prevent them from re-entering child labor. It may even induce emotional trauma and depression among those vulnerable children who have formed emotional attachments to KURET. None of the exit strategies proposed by either KURET or its stakeholders has presented a satisfactory solution to this problem. At the very least, KURET should provide a plan and budget for a scale-down that allows the child to finish the education cycle or program in which he or she is enrolled. KURET must start discussions with USDOL now.

Chapter VIII: Conclusions, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

A. Conclusions

The KURET project is distinguished by strong Regional Office management and well-run country programs. In operation for only two years, it can already boast several accomplishments, not the least of which is that nearly 24,000 children, who would otherwise be working or in child labor full-time, are now in school or training programs. It has been able to significantly advance the development of national policy frameworks in three of its four countries, support the promulgation of by-laws in two countries, engage the material support of government for some of its educational interventions, and create LCLCs

⁴⁰ USDOL states that its projects are intended to serve as "pilot projects" in these countries—to serve beneficiaries, but also to determine what interventions are successful in working with these populations and show governments the kinds of actions they can take to effectively fight child labor in their countries.

that play an active role in raising awareness and monitoring child labor. KURET has developed materials, guidance, and modules on policy development, child labor, teacher training, and child tracking. It has launched several innovative programs and interventions, including SRP, FVL, Artisan Vocational Training, Child Labor, Clubs and peer monitoring, that hold promise and have attracted government interest. KURET's management structure is effective and it has put in place systems to support program quality and accurate reporting. Overall, its work is in line with schedule, target, and budget parameters, despite the implementation constraints caused by war, conflict, political unrest, and natural disasters in its countries.

KURET faces two types of challenges that threaten its effectiveness and sustainability: 1) weaknesses in the conceptualization and delivery of some of its services, and 2) weaknesses inherent in its design and endemic to child labor. Among the former challenges, KURET has not identified optimal levels of educational attainment to keep children out of child labor, its student support package is not sufficient to allow full participation, its linkage strategy is unsuitable to the context, some of its vocational training programs are of poor quality, its training-to-work approach is questionable, its teacher training and TOT roll-out programs lack coherent strategies and support, its awareness raising program does not specifically promote behavioral change, it has not worked concurrently with ministries of labor and education on policy development and institutionalized practice, and the child labor networks it has activated/created at the local level are not integrated into official child labor plans and budgets. Among the latter challenges, the complex nature of child labor and KURET's resource limitations mean that it is unlikely to fully meet its targets for children to be withdrawn or prevented, given the all-or-nothing nature of USDOL's definitions under GPRA requirements. KURET will reduce child labor for many beneficiaries, but not eliminate it. The ambitious policy, capacity building, and behavioral change agenda that KURET has set for itself is likely to exceed its time and budget parameters. The direct beneficiary support component, while producing the appreciable impact in the short-term, appears to be the least sustainable, raising questions about its viability as a model.

KURET possesses some major assets to help it deal with these challenges: open communications with USDOL, strong relationships with its key stakeholders and partners, skilled technical support in the Regional Office, dedicated staff in the country programs, supportive country implementation organizations, and an overall commitment to eliminating child labor and improving the education opportunities for children involved in or at risk of child labor.

B. Lessons Learned

There are multiple lessons to be learned from a project as multi-faceted as KURET, many of which have been identified by its staff and shared in the TPR. Those that stand out for the evaluators are:

1. A four-year time frame is not sufficient to put in place the conditions for sustainable efforts to eliminate child labor. More time is needed for policy and institutional development; development and introduction of new knowledge, approaches, and services; and capacity building. More time is also needed to ensure that most direct beneficiaries acquire a meaningful amount of schooling.
2. While a well-considered, logical approach to national policy and institutional development is essential to serve as a roadmap, actual policy activities and outputs are not as amenable to schedules and plans. An external project often has limited control over the policy variables and process. It must be flexible and opportunistic in its approach. If one group of key players proves intractable, it should be prepared to work with another group. Multiple plans should always be available to the project.
3. Multiple policy, institutional development, and capacity building initiatives should take place at the same time. With education as a major strategy, work with the ministries of labor and education is equally important in dealing with child labor, and the synergies are appreciable (e.g., Uganda).

4. Interventions, services, and innovations whose sustainability will require government support and resources should be designed to conform to the government policy and investment framework and negotiated before significant project investment is made. In other words, do not start a significant service delivery activity the government will not finance at the end of the project.
5. Direct beneficiary targets should not be set for the first year. That time is needed to fully think through the approaches, develop partner relationships, and lay the groundwork with government and communities for future action. Too quick a start-up means paying later for mistakes.
6. Given the magnitude of children's needs, it is unlikely that a student support package will ever be able to fully address them, but it should enable their full participation in education. Linkages with other programs (even within the same organizations) cannot be counted on to fill livelihood gaps for large groups of children. An alternative strategy may be to support only as many children as can be linked with other programs or undertake IGAs directly.
7. A clear idea and shared understanding of what child support goals, rationale, and obligations are before start-up is required to align support, interventions, and investment decisions with expectations. Well-honed standards of practice for child sponsorship programs should be consulted.
8. The adult attention provided by active local child monitoring/mentoring groups affords powerful motivation and encouragement to children to remain in school. Adults also need encouragement. The LCLCs themselves need motivation, in the form of guidance, recognition, and feedback, more than resources to continue to play a proactive role in the fight against child labor.
9. Withdrawing a child from child labor is not a one-time proposition, but a gradual process. Recidivism is easy when hard times hit. After all, child labor is the only work a child knows to do. Reversion is possibly to be expected. Attending school is not sufficient to remove children from child labor. That children may continue to labor while in school does not mean their lives have not been improved (at least in the short term).
10. USDOL indicators do not provide for reporting the gradations of child involvement in child labor, and consequently reduce the opportunity for its projects to show their true impact and progress.

C. Recommendations

The following recommendations pertain to all KURET countries (specific recommendations are found in country reports). The emphasis is largely on actions that should be undertaken or coordinated by the KURET Regional Office.

Impact

- Reconcile KURET and USDOL interpretations of the GPRA definitions for “withdrawal” and “prevented” from engagement in child labor.
- Develop additional indicators that would provide for measure of gradations of involvement in child labor and vet them with USDOL.
- Consider and discuss with USDOL a downward revision of the targets for beneficiaries withdrawn and prevented from child labor.
- Develop detailed guidance, criteria, and standards for determining such factors as whether a child is completely withdrawn from child labor, has reduced working hours, or is involved in work appropriate for age and capacity
- Modify intake, follow-up, and COR forms to accommodate the additional data.
- Report on the type of labor a child was withdrawn from, the reduction in the number of hours worked, and the more acceptable forms of work/less severe labor he or she is currently involved in (if applicable) so that the project's impact on beneficiary engagement in exploitive work, including WFCL, is known.
- Modify the COR Form to reflect degrees of child labor. Develop protocol for random spot checks to ascertain that it accurately reflects beneficiaries' non-involvement in exploitive work or WFCL.

Output 1: Access

- Conduct analyses of the local labor markets in project areas to determine how much schooling and the type of training that is needed to enable a child to earn a living without reverting to child labor and develop clear policies to guide placement. (For example, it may be that a junior-secondary school completer with sound vocational training in a marketable specialty can find employment better than a high school graduate.) Consider other options to deal with increasing support costs, such as reducing the support package at higher grades or getting government matching funds (it pays school fees).
- Negotiate agreements for integrating the ALP centers into MOE operations and budgets with the proper authorities before establishing future centers.
- Review the student support package for optimal inputs to ensure full participation in school. Apply consistently. Enforce policy to include all children in child-headed households in KURET project.
- Evaluate the WV mentor program and adapt it for KURET.
- Review Kenya and Ethiopia IGA programs for viability and cost, and, if feasible, expand them.
- Review and assess different models and experience with vocational training. Conduct an analysis of success with training-to-work transition programs, including longitudinal analysis. Develop follow-on support approach for beneficiaries under 18.

Output 2: Quality and Relevance of Education

- Include training in large class size management in teacher training.
- Prepare materials and handbooks for teacher use on KURET-related activities: 1) prepare a teachers' handbook on child labor activities for clubs; 2) prepare guidance on how to integrate child labor into classroom lessons (other than science, social studies, or morals/ethics), including use of existing KURET materials (e.g., Carrying Heavy Loads).
- Develop more objective classroom observation instruments and tools, and an application plan.
- Explore ways to help schools meet other student needs, such as remedial training and holiday or break tutoring.
- Develop assessment plans for SRP and FVL to measure effectiveness and viability for expansion to other areas. Adapt them to other countries if they prove viable.
- Review and analyze the most cost-effective school inputs and services to isolate those interventions that appear to hold the most promise and then revise the school support packages accordingly.
- Devise a comprehensive plan for more effective use of model schools (or stop providing preferential treatment).
- Develop a more coherent teacher training strategy and plan, so that it ensures and can show that a core number of teachers at each learning site have received the full package of the requisite training. Re-examine its teacher training priorities and focus on those most essential to KURET's purpose. Develop additional training modules for school directors on such subjects as school management and creating child-friendly environments. Develop a template for TOT roll-out at the schools and guidance for TOT implementation, including a schedule, sufficient teacher materials and funds set aside to support it.

Output 3: Awareness Raising

- Compile a guide on how to launch and organize different awareness-raising activities (authored by the different countries) for use by the other country projects.
- Supplement the Awareness Raising Strategy with an annotated list of specific activities to undertake to move awareness to action.
- Develop practical guidance for households on subjects such as how to compensate for the loss of child labor or how to support a child's studies, and for communities (e.g., what you can do in daily life to address child labor, help the local school).
- Develop a training module/guidance for the local committees on how to put in place structured plans

for awareness raising and self-advocacy. Provide them with sensitization kits of materials (e.g., posters).

- Clarify USDOL expectations and KURET's role in campaigning against HIV/AIDS. Determine a plan of action that reflects its comparative advantages, but does not assume tasks better performed by other projects or organizations.

Output 4: Policy, Support, and Capacity Building

- Establish a training program and modules (including a step-by-step checklist) for the functional National Steering or Advisory Committee members on how to advocate for and introduce child labor into their respective institutions' work plans.
- Make working with national ministries of education at the central level a priority: 1) develop relationships with the central offices of ministries of education; 2) develop guidance on how to work directly with the ministries of education to incorporate child labor into its various operations—map out a strategy that includes a list of promising “windows of opportunity” that should be tried; 3) conduct one or more workshops with the head of MOE departments to acquaint them with child labor issues; and 4) provide a list of concrete suggestions on how to integrate child labor in education strategies with the Poverty Reduction Strategy working group.
- Include training and develop guidance for district and local committees on operational “how-to’s”: how to develop an action plan, how to set appropriate goals, how to budget and obtain resources.
- Review the status of LCLCs to determine options for linkages to higher level structures or authorities which, in the absence of KURET, could continue to motivate and support them. Provide a modest operating budget, and work to include it in the district development plan budget. Provide training on guidance and counseling, and linkages.
- Develop guidance on how to involve parents more in their children's education, addressing both support of the school, drawing on parental labor, and good parenting skills.

Regional Office Operations and Management

- Re-consider staffing needs: 1) hire an assistant education specialist to support the Regional Office Education Specialist; and 2) re-examine whether the Regional Office is sufficiently staffed and configured to meet its workload and project objectives over the remainder of the project with the degree of quality it desires.
- Continue to develop and revise guidance and resource materials for both new areas and those that need reinforcement, such as policy and strategy development work with ministries of education and actionable TOT roll-out guidance. Develop useful how-to guides, manuals, or primers on a variety of KURET interventions to share with others for use after the life of the project.
- Conduct operational research on actual project interventions (e.g., SRP, FVL, IGAs, peer monitoring) to assess their viability and effectiveness.
- Make more use of Web-based or electronic tools for sharing information, such as discussion lists, chats, and weekly digests.
- Operationalize usage of the Self-Assessment Checklist and Minimum Standards.
- Develop a plan to promote a closer working relationship between WV and IRC at country levels, including joint activities, regular meetings, and information exchanges.
- Develop clear protocols for Regional Office authority and interventions in country. Negotiate agreements with Partners Organizations and Country Implementation Organizations for Regional Office participation in personnel hiring and performance reviews. Also, negotiate an agreement limiting job transfer within the implementing partner organization (require a two-year commitment to KURET).
- Provide country offices with annual Regional Office travel plans, including field site visits.

Country Operations

- In Ethiopia, hire a full-time Policy Coordinator, assigned to either WV or IRC, to work with the Regional Policy Specialist.
- Conduct assessment and analysis of most efficient staffing structures, particularly at the field level. Depending on an analysis, add either facilitators or other field staff.
- Conduct a review to determine whether local committee membership is open to all community members and that no structural biases exist. Collect demographic data (including religion) on the areas, beneficiaries, and learning sites, and review the data to ascertain whether different groups are equitably represented.

Budget

- Re-examine the KURET budget, including an analysis of beneficiary demands both in terms of student years and needs, to determine the extent to which and how funds can be reprogrammed.
- Delineate and provide an operational budget for the Regional Education Specialist.
- Make sure an operational budget is available for awareness-raising activities.
- Track and monetize the linkages and leveraged funds to demonstrate the extent of additional resources.

Partnerships

- Review USAID education programs and re-activate discussion on how KURET can infuse child labor into its operations (such as working collaboratively on policy formation, curricula development), rather than viewing it as means of delivery and supplementing field operations.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Strengthen Data Quality Assurance mechanism: 1) provide a simple protocol for beneficiary file spot checks and the reporting form; 2) develop measures, criteria, and instruments for gradations of beneficiary involvement in child labor; 3) develop a matrix with criteria for appropriate work per age and other variables and incorporate it into follow-up form; 4) conduct a discrepancy analysis between information provided by a beneficiary and a knowledgeable person about the child's involvement in child labor; 5) institute a system for checking the veracity of the confirmation information; 6) generate basic (e.g., one-page) child records to summarize key data for field staff.
- Analyze existing data. Use new database to aggregate student background and descriptive data already collected to conduct analysis of students and potential needs.
- Review all data collection forms being used in countries, eliminate redundancies, and settle on a standard set of options for reducing the data collection, entry, and processing burden.
- Experiment with the use of hand-held data devices (PDAs) to expedite data entry.
- Institute discussion with USDOL about options to reduce child tracking data collection burden and how to make the child tracking system more appropriate and user-friendly for future use by the local structures and governments.
- Engage USDOL in frank discussion about how to deal with and report on withdrawal/prevention of child labor. Clarify the understanding of the USDOL definition of withdrawal. Propose options including additional indicators to capture gradation of involvement and revised targets to reflect estimates of the number of children who are not likely to entirely leave child labor.
- Develop an M&E Plan, complete with results framework and revised indicators: 1) develop complete plans for measuring/assessing teacher classroom performance and awareness levels, including revised instruments, assessment criteria and scales, sampling plan, and controls; 2) review and revise indicators to better reflect the project; 3) develop compelling additional objective-level measures, reflecting gradation of child labor engagement, student attendance and absenteeism, and student performance (e.g., cycle completion, exam results); 4) include basic output indicators, such as numbers of TOT and teachers trained, number of learning sites supported, number of classrooms constructed, number of LCLCs established and trained, standardized across countries; 5) revisit

targets of certain indicators in light of project experience.

- Develop with USDOL input additional tables and narrative conventions that can be appended to the TPR.

Design and Sustainability

- Prepare proposal for USDOL outlining realistic time frame for full KURET implementation and trade-offs. Determine options for project extension.
- Determine with USDOL its specific expectations for sustainability.
- Revise Exit Strategy to specifically address how KURET will put in place conditions for activities and interventions to be sustained (e.g., LCLCs).
- Develop a plan and budget for a scale-down of direct beneficiary support that allows the child to finish the education cycle or program in which he or she is enrolled and start discussions with USDOL now.
- Prepare with country implementation organizations specific plans for transferring beneficiaries to their programs at the end of the project. Put in place support mechanisms (e.g., community mentors) who will continue to provide some support for children.

USDOL

- Limit the turnover of Project Manager staff responsible for overseeing KURET.
- Provide prompt responses to KURET requests.
- Conduct a review of other EI project grantees' experience of child tracking. Consider options to reduce the child tracking burden.
- Consider modifications or additions to TPR tables to allow for better representation of KURET progress.
- Support revision of the PMP and indicators.
- Be specific about sustainability expectations.
- Seek legal guidance to determine whether KURET support of schools that include religion in their curricula constitutes a "misuse" of U.S. funds. Review other U.S. government-funded projects for established precedents and practices.

ANNEXES

MID-TERM EVALUATION

KURET REGIONAL REPORT

- 1. Terms of Reference (with detailed methodology & schedule)**
- 2. Definitions of Withdrawal and Prevented**
- 3. Documents Reviewed**
- 4. Evaluation Instruments (12)**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR
Independent Mid-Term Evaluation of
World Vision, “Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in
Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia”-KURET Project
October 10 - November 22, 2006

Cooperative Agreement Number:	<u>E-9-K-4-0057</u>
Financing Agency:	USDOL
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Mid-Term Evaluation
Date and Duration of the Evaluation:	124 days (including days for production of the final report)
Preparation Date of final TOR:	October 6, 2006
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US \$14,500,000
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	ORC Macro Headquarters, 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: 301-572-0200 Fax: 301-572-0999

ANNEX 1

I. Background and Justification

The U.S. Department of Labor's (USDOL) international technical assistance programs have grown quickly over the past decade. In total, the Congress has appropriated more than \$500 million to USDOL to fund international labor projects through its Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB). These funds are used in a wide variety of projects that cover a range of labor issues, including international child labor issues, and a wide geographical distribution.

In recent years, the work of the International Child Labor Program (ICLP), one part of ILAB, has expanded significantly to include research on international child labor; support for U.S. government policy on international child labor; administration of grants and contracts with organizations engaged in international efforts to eliminate exploitive child labor; and efforts to raise awareness within the United States and abroad about international child labor issues.

Since FY 1995, Congress has appropriated over \$300 million to ILAB, to administer international child labor projects. Of this amount, over \$200 million has been earmarked by the Congress to support the International Labor Organization's International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO/IPEC); \$148 million has been appropriated to support efforts to address child labor through the promotion of educational opportunities for children (the basis for USDOL beginning its Child Labor Education Initiative); \$700,000 has been allocated to support other technical cooperation efforts; and \$2.4 million has been allocated to support research and awareness-raising activities.

In FY 2001, ICLP began funding the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which seeks to improve the access and quality of basic education for children who either have been involved in the worst forms of child labor or are at risk of becoming involved. EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas of high child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor.

EI projects nurture the development, health, safety and enhanced future employability of children around the world by increasing access to basic education for children removed from child labor or at risk of entering it. Child labor elimination will depend in part 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.

The EI has the following four immediate objectives:

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

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

Evaluations of EI projects, which are funded through cooperative agreements with many different organizations, will be important to:

1. Help individual organizations identify areas of good performance and areas where project implementation can be improved;
2. Assist ICLP to learn more about what is or is not working in terms of the overall conceptualization and design of EI projects within the broad ICLP technical cooperation program framework; and
3. Assess the degree to which objectives relevant to the country-specific situation they address have been achieved.

KURET Project (Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia)

In September 2004, World Vision, in partnership with the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and the Academy for Educational Development (AED), received a four-year cooperative agreement in the amount of \$14,500,000 from USDOL to implement an EI project in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia. The goal of the KURET project is to sustainably reduce the engagement of children in WFCL in selected regions/districts in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia. The project's purpose is that 30,600 children aged 5 to 17 years in HIV/AIDS-affected communities who are at risk of, and/or removed from the worst forms of child labor, are educated. The project's direct action components of the KURET project are located in the following districts: Nairobi, Busia, Siaya, and Maragua (KENYA); Lira, Gulu, and Arua (UGANDA); Gikongoro, Kigali Rural, Kigali Urban, Byumba, and Umutara (RWANDA); and Addis Ababa, Benishangul, Oromiya, Amhara, and SNNPR (ETHIOPIA).

The project maintains regional headquarters in Kampala, Uganda. The Kampala office houses the regional management team, consisting of the Project Director/ Chief of Party, Education Specialist, and Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. The regional office is responsible for providing technical assistance to country program management, sharing resources related to child labor, HIV/AIDS, and education, sharing information on good practices among key stakeholders and among country program management, and building capacity at the national and regional levels.

The list below represents KURET's outputs at both the country (for all four countries) and regional levels.

Country Level Outputs:

- Output 1: Access to education for target children increased
- Output 2: Improved quality and relevance of educational services available to children at risk of, and to those who have been removed from, the worst forms of child labor.
- Output 3: Increased awareness of key stakeholders on the negative effects of child labor, the importance of education, and the relationship between HIV/AIDS and education.
- Output 4: Support for the education of target children by government institutions, communities, and households increased.

Regional Level Outputs:

- Output 1: Quality of KURET country programs assured by the regional management team

- Output 2: Body of knowledge related to child labor, HIV/AIDS, and education increased by the regional management team.
- Output 3: Promising practices shared with key stakeholders and decision makers by the regional management team.
- Output 4: Capacity of national and regional institutions to initiate policy and advocacy increased by the regional management team.

II. Scope and Purpose

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with World Vision. The evaluation should look at the project as a whole and assess its overall impact in relation to the objectives as outlined in the Cooperative Agreement and project documents, including an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of these efforts.

For the purpose of conducting this evaluation, ORC Macro will provide a highly skilled, independent evaluator to conduct this evaluation to: a) determine if the project achieved its stated objectives and explain why or why not, b) assess the impact of the project in term of sustained improvements achieved, and c) identify lessons learned and good practices to inform future USDOL projects.

The contractor/evaluator will work with the staff of USDOL's International Child Labor Program (ICLP) and relevant World Vision staff to evaluate the project in question.

The evaluation of this Child Labor Education Initiative project should seek to address the following issues:

Program Design

The program's original design should be assessed for its logic, coherence, effectiveness, and fit with the local situation and other, complementary projects. The PMP will also be examined.

Project Implementation

The evaluator should assess whether the project is likely to meet its goals, targets, and outputs; and evaluate the project's interventions for their effectiveness. Environmental factors should also be examined for their effect on project implementation. The evaluator should assess the effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation system, and the extent to which DOL common indicators are accurately tracked and reported.

Partnership and Coordination

This part of the evaluation should examine the relationships World Vision has with its subcontractors, partners, government and non-governmental organizations, and other donor agencies. An assessment should be made of whether these relationships effectively support the achievement of project objectives.

Management and Budget

(This section should be specifically addressed in the Regional Report; other sections may also be addressed in the Regional Report as appropriate)

The evaluators should assess the effectiveness of project management at the regional level, as well as the interaction between the regional office and headquarters office, and country offices. An assessment of the adequacy of the project budget should also be made.

Sustainability and Impact

The evaluator should assess the project's strategy for and steps toward ensuring sustainability of project interventions. In addition, an assessment should be made of project impact to date, along with lessons learned and notable accomplishments.

In carrying out an evaluation of the KURET project, the contractor/evaluator will conduct pre-evaluation consultations and meetings with USDOL and World Vision (with World Vision's Washington, D.C. office, with the KURET regional headquarters in Kampala, Uganda, and with each of the four project countries); conduct the evaluation; and write a draft and final evaluation report.

III. Deliverables/Outputs of the Evaluation
--

The contractor will carry out the following activities as part of this evaluation:

- a. Conduct briefing meetings at the beginning of the process with ICLP staff.
- b. Review documents related to the project being evaluated.
- c. Conduct a planning meeting with all members of the evaluation team to develop evaluation design methodology.
- d. Conduct interviews with key staff at the headquarters (by telephone) of the implementing organization and with key field staff.
- e. Conduct the evaluation in country with key informants, including children served by the project, government authorities, community groups, teachers, and parents to collect findings that answer the general questions provided in the evaluation terms of reference.
- f. Plan and conduct a stakeholders' meeting to present initial findings at the end of the evaluation.
- g. Summarize findings of the stakeholders meeting to insert into evaluation report.
- h. Write a draft evaluation report.
- i. Conduct debriefing of findings of draft evaluation report with field staff of the implementing organization.
- j. Conduct debriefing of findings of draft evaluation report with ICLP.
- k. Write a draft evaluation report and submit directly and solely to MACRO. The draft will then be provided by MACRO to ICLP and other key stakeholders for written comment.
- l. Produce a final evaluation report based on comments received and noting in a separate summary document the evaluator's response to each comment.

An evaluation report in the format prescribed by ILAB/ICLP, which includes at minimum the following sections, is to be submitted to ILAB/ICLP:

- a. Executive Summary
- b. Evaluation Objectives
- c. Methodology of Evaluation
- d. Findings
- e. Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- f. Conclusions
- g. Recommendations

Each country report and the report on regional management/ regional synthesis report are expected to be about 20 pages each—for a combined report length of 100 pages maximum.

IV. Evaluation Methodology:

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the independent evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/ICLP in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR. A first draft is due in two submissions: 3 country reports no later than 18 working days after return from an evaluation mission (December 19), and 1 country report and the synthesis report 8 working days after that (January 2). A final draft is due no later than 10 working days after receipt of comments from ILAB/ICLP. All reports including drafts will be written in English.

The following is the proposed evaluation methodology. While the evaluation team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by ILAB/ICLP provided that the indicated range of questions is addressed, the purpose maintained and the expected outputs produced at the required quality. The evaluation will include a desk review; an evaluation mission to World Vision, IRC, and AED project sites in the four target countries; consultations with stakeholders, including: ILAB/ICLP staff, policy makers in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia at the national (Nairobi, Kampala, Kigali, and Addis Ababa) and district levels [(Nairobi, Busia, Siaya, and Maragua (KENYA); Lira, Gulu, and Arua (UGANDA); Gikongoro, Kigali Rural, Kigali Urban, Byumba, and Umutara (RWANDA); Addis Ababa, Benishangul, Oromiya, Amhara, and SNNPR (Ethiopia)], World Vision project staff at the headquarters and field levels, IRC and AED staff (at the regional and district levels, and possibly headquarters), district officials, teachers, parents, community leaders, and with beneficiaries (including teachers, parents, and children); and direct observation of project activities, as much as possible.

Country Evaluation Teams

The two-person evaluation team will meet initially in Uganda to plan and prepare for the national program evaluations. The evaluation visits will be conducted separately for Kenya and Rwanda. Mid-way through the evaluation the two evaluators will regroup in Ethiopia. One of the three districts will be jointly visited by the evaluators, in order to check and harmonize application of prescribed data collection methods. In Uganda, each evaluator will be responsible for field visit to separate districts. In each country, the evaluator will be accompanied by project staff (whether national and local will be determined in-country). Project will make introduction, orient the evaluator and facilitate appointments. However, they will not participate in the interviews in order to ensure confidentiality. The evaluator will be assisted by note-take/interpreters as necessary, depending on local language requirements.

Data Collection

Although adjustments may be made following the evaluation team's field consultations, the data will be collected using the following methods:

- Document review including: Project document and revisions, Cooperative Agreement, Technical Progress and Status Reports, Project Logframes and Monitoring Plans, Workplans, Management Procedures and Guidelines, research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.), and project files (student dossiers, etc.) as appropriate.
- Comparative data tables for the different country program, with key quantitative impact and output variables. (Format to be provided to project staff.)
- Individual and group interviews with implementing partner staff at the regional and national levels.
- Individual and group interviews with stakeholders at the national level
- Individual and/or group interview with direct and indirect beneficiaries at the district and local (e.g. learning site) level
- Observations of class interactions, project environment, health and nutritional status of children, etc.

Field Visits

District and Learning Site Selection: The number of districts and site visits will depend on the time allotted to each country. Districts and sites will be selected purposively in order to obtain a range of contexts and environments, including urban/rural, close-in/remotely located (if accessible), economic and cultural status, and/or severity and type of child labor. In northern Uganda, district and site selection will be informed by security concerns and U.S. Embassy restrictions.

Learning sites will be selected to represent the range of services offered, such as primary and secondary formal schooling, formal and non-formal vocational education, and alternative learning programs. In each district, at least one of each type of learning program type operating in that district should be selected. (The type of learning programs will vary by both country and district.) The secondary site selection criterion is the number of beneficiaries: preferred site will include a robust number of beneficiaries. Tertiary site selection criteria will include best- and worst case examples (i.e. those site that demonstrate either extra-ordinary progress or problems), sites serving a particularly distinctive set of beneficiaries, and/or sites that are located in a distinctive context (e.g. particular vulnerability to child labor, natural disaster, etc.) An overriding consideration will be accessibility and proximity to fit within the time frame for the specific country.

A minimum of two districts and eight learning site visits will take place in each country. Currently planned are:

- Kenya: 3 districts, 12 learning sites
- Rwanda: 2 districts, 8 learning sites
- Ethiopia: 3 districts, 9-12 learning sites ¹
- Uganda: 2 districts, 8 learning sites

Site Protocol: Approximately two days per district are planned. Depending on arrival time, the evaluator will initially meet the local project staff and district officials to orient the work or conduct in-depth interviews. Two learning site visits will take place, one in the morning and one in the afternoon.

¹ In Ethiopia, the team will visit three regions and 1 woreda per regions. In the Guragi region, each evaluator will separately visit two leaning sites. In the two other regions (West Harage and Amara), it may be possible that only three site are visited due to travel conditions.

The learning site director will be interviewed individually and records checked. This will be followed by focus group interviews with students, teachers, parents and the school labor committee. Mid-day group interviews will take place with (separately) the Local Child Labor Committees, parents of the beneficiaries and families of children still involved child labor. Late afternoon meeting will be scheduled with project staff and district officials.

A typical schedule is:

AM—Learning site

8-9: interview director and tour site

9-10: interview students

10-11: interview teachers

11-12: interview parents and/or school labor committee

Noon 12-1pm: interview Local Child Labor Committee(s) in locality, parents of children and children involved in labor (or schedule latter on swing day)

PM—Learning site

1-2: interview director and tour site

2-3: interview students

3-4: interview teachers

4-5: interview parent or school labor committee

Evening 5-7: interview district officials (or schedule on swing day)

Data Interpretation, Validation and Feedback

At the end of each national data collection exercise, a stakeholder workshop will be conducted the evaluator(s) that brings together the national implementing partners and other stakeholders. The workshop will be used to present and vet the major finding and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain additional information from stakeholders, including those that were not interviewed individually earlier in the country visit. These national meetings will be preceded by a day in which the evaluator prepares a summary list of observations based on interviews and field visits and of issues that require clarification or additional information. Stakeholder workshops in Kenya, Ethiopia and Uganda will be conducted jointly by the evaluation team; in Rwanda it will be conducted by the lead evaluator. The stakeholder workshop in Uganda will include regional staff, as well. Logistical arrangements for the stakeholder meetings will be arranged by the country implementing partner staff. The meeting program and materials will be developed by the evaluators.

Timetable and Workplan:

The total duration of the evaluation process, including submission of the final report, should be 75 work days. The timetable is as follows:

Tasks	Work Days	Dates
Desk Review – Evaluators 1 & 2	5 days (x2 evaluators)	Oct. 2 - 6
International Travel (Evaluators arrive in Kampala)	1 (x 2 evaluators)	October 10
Field Work	35 (x 2 evaluators)	Oct. 11-Nov 20

Final De-Brief in Kampala	1 (x 2 evaluators)	Nov. 21
International Travel	1 (x 2 evaluators)	Nov. 22
Report writing (Lead evaluator) - 2 country reports - 1 country report & report on regional management/ regional synthesis	22	- Due December 19 - Due January 2
Report writing (Second evaluator) – 1 country report	5	Due December 19
Revisions (Lead)	10	TBD
Revisions (Second)	1	TBD
TOTAL (Lead)	75	
TOTAL (Second)	49	
GRAND TOTAL	124	

Sources of Information and Consultations/meetings

- Project Document
- Cooperative Agreement
- Solicitation of Grant Applications (under which the Cooperative Agreement was awarded)
- 2006 USDOL Management Procedures and Guidelines
- Progress Reports
- Technical Reports
- Performance Monitoring Plans (PMP) for Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia
- Workplan
- Project files, as appropriate (baseline survey, follow up survey to baseline research, tools developed during project implementation, and other background documents)

Consultations and Meetings: (tentative list to be provided by World Vision staff)

- World Vision, IRC, and AED staff engaged in the KURET Project
- ILAB/ICLP Staff
- Government Ministry officials
- Project Stakeholders
- Beneficiaries
- U.S. Embassy staff in Nairobi, Kenya

V. Inputs

ORC MACRO will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and sub-contractors, including travel arrangements (*e.g.*, plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing *per diem*) and all materials (*e.g.*, access to computers, telecommunications, office supplies) needed to provide all deliverables. ORC MACRO will also provide all in-country support for the evaluation team (*e.g.* translation services, note-taking services, etc.). ORC MACRO will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

ORC MACRO will closely coordinate with World Vision country staff (and IRC and AED staff if appropriate) to schedule meetings with beneficiaries and other stakeholders. ORC MACRO will also coordinate and organize the logistics surrounding the meetings and field visits to districts/ project sites in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, and Ethiopia (with the locations of site visits to be determined prior to the evaluation team's departure for the field, with few exceptions), and, in cooperation with World Vision/KURET, transport to field sites.

In cooperation with ICLP and ORC MACRO, World Vision/KURET project staff will coordinate the logistics surrounding the stakeholders' workshops in each of the four countries, as well as the regional debrief workshop to be held in Kampala, Uganda. World Vision will assist ORC MACRO in scheduling and finalizing meetings. World Vision will support the travel costs of participants involved in stakeholders meetings, focus groups, and individual interviews. World Vision will also cover the costs of the stakeholders' meetings. World Vision's portion of the cost of this mid-term evaluation should not exceed USD 135,177. ORC MACRO should contact World Vision's Project Director/Chief of Party, Aben Ngay in Kampala, Uganda, (direct office phone: 256-41-345311; cell phone: 078-814014; email: aben_ngay@wvi.org) to discuss logistical issues. ORC MACRO should also keep Jennifer Lee, World Vision Project Manager in Washington, D.C., apprised of developments related to this mid-term evaluation (direct line: 202.572.6300; email: jenlee@worldvision.org).

EVALUATION SCHEDULE

October 10 – arrival in Kampala
October 11 – team coordinates logistics and approach
October 12- orientation with project staff
October 13 & 16 – meetings with government officials and stakeholders in Kampala

Evaluator 1

October 17 – depart for Rwanda
October 18-24 - field site visits in Rwanda
October 25 – prepare initial findings for stakeholder meeting
October 26 – stakeholders’ meeting
October 27 – fly to Nairobi
October 30 – Kenya stakeholders’ meeting
October 31 – both evaluators depart for Addis
November 1-7 - field site visits (divided between evaluators)
November 8 – prepare initial findings
November 9 - stakeholders’ meeting
November 10 – return to Kampala
November 12 – depart for Northern Uganda
November 13-15 – field site visits (one district per evaluator)
November 16 – return to Kampala and prepare findings
November 17 – stakeholder meeting in Kampala

Evaluator 2

October 17 – depart for Kenya
October 18-26 – Nairobi meetings and field site visits
October 27 – prepare initial findings for stakeholder meeting (joined by lead evaluator)
October 30 - stakeholders’ meeting (joined by lead evaluator)
October 31 – both evaluators depart for Addis
November 1 -7 - field site visits (divided between evaluators)
November 8 – prepare initial findings
November 9 - stakeholders’ meeting
November 10 – return to Kampala
November 12 – depart for Northern Uganda
November 13-15 – field site visits (one district per evaluator)
November 16 – return to Kampala and prepare findings
November 17 – stakeholder meeting in Kampala

November 18 & 20 – prepare initial findings
November 21 – de-brief initial findings with Kampala and country representative staff
November 22 – depart Kampala

ANNEX 2

DEFINITIONS

Definition of withdrawal and prevention (*mutually exclusive categories*)

1.1. Children withdrawn from exploitive work:

This refers to those children that were found to be working and no longer work as a result of a project intervention. This category also includes those children that were engaged in exploitive/hazardous (see definition 1.3 below) work and as a result of a project intervention now work shorter hours under safer conditions. In both cases, in order to be considered as beneficiaries of the project/program under this category, children working in exploitive child labor must no longer be working and be benefiting or have benefited from educational or training opportunities, as defined above, provided by the project.

NOTE: Enrollment in school is not the sole consideration that defines a child as removed from or withdrawn from exploitive child labor. For example, a child who attends a DOL supported non-formal education program in the morning and works under hazardous conditions in mining during the afternoon and evening should not be counted as withdrawn/prevented. That is, if before program intervention, a child is not going to school and is working in a worst form of child labor and after program intervention the child is now enrolled in school but continues to work in a worst form of child labor that child is not, by definition, withdrawn from child labor and should not be counted in the withdrawn/prevented indicator. The process of withdrawing a child from exploitive child labor may take some time. Children should only be counted as withdrawn/prevented at the point at which the child is no longer working in exploitive child labor and is benefiting from the education program(s) provided by the DOL-funded project.

1.2. Children prevented from enter exploitive work:

This refers to children that are either siblings of (ex-) working children or those children not yet working but considered to be at high-risk^[1] of engaging in exploitive work. In order to be considered as “prevented” these children must benefit (or have benefited) from educational or training opportunities, as defined above, provided by the project.

1.3 Exploitive/hazardous work:

This refers to the conditions under which the child works and the safety, health, and environmental hazards to which the child is exposed as well as the duration of work. The worst forms of child labor outlined in ILO Convention 182 and all types of work that prevent a child from obtaining an education (attending school regularly) should be considered exploitive work (see R.190 accompanying C.182 for additional guidance on identifying hazardous work). Children intercepted or rescued from being trafficked may also be considered as withdrawn from an exploitive situation since the moment they become victims of trafficking (even though still in transit to the “place of work”) they have already entered an unacceptable situation bound to lead to exploitive/hazardous work.

ANNEX 3

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

USDOL

ILAB, International Labor Organization (ILO) Conventions,” *Undated*.

ILAB, International Child Labor Program: Projects Funded in FY 2005,” *Undated*.

U.S. Department of Labor, “Faces of Change: Highlights of the U.S. Department of Labor Efforts to Combat International Child Labor,” *Undated*.

U.S. Department of Labor, “Working to Eliminate the Worst Forms of Child Labor Worldwide through International Projects, Information, and Awareness,” (Information Package and Brochure) *Undated*.

U.S. Department of Labor, “NOTICE OF AWARD: COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT World Vision-USDOL (with Management Procedures and Guidelines,” July 2004.

U.S. Department of Labor, “Cooperative Agreement World Vision-USDOL,” September 27, 2004.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “Project Design Workshop for the KURET Education Initiative Project,” December 6- 10, 2004.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “Education Initiative Progress Report Request for Additional Information,” October 2005.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “ICLP Response: Education Initiative Progress Report Request for Additional Information,” October 2005.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “GPRA Questions and Answers for Education Initiative Grantees,” January 2006.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “Management Procedures and Guidelines,” January 2006.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “Education Initiative Progress Report Request for Additional Information,” June 2006.

U.S. Department of Labor, International Child Labor Program (ICLP), “ICLP Response: Education Initiative Progress Report Request for Additional Information,” June 2006.

ILAB, “International Child Labor Program (ICLP): Attestation Engagement of ICLP Cooperative Agreement: E-9-K-4-0057, October 2004 – May 2006, Task Order Number 3, Exit Conference Agenda,” (Preliminary Audit Report) 2006.

ILO

ILO, “Convention 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour, Convention 138 on Minimum Age, ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and Its Follow-up,” (Booklet) *Undated*.

ILO/IPEC, “Study of Good Practices in Interventions in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia – Synthesis Report,” Vol. 1, April 2002.

ILO/IPEC, “Combating Child Labour in Commercial Agriculture,” *Undated*.

ILO/IPEC, “No to Child Labour, Yes to Education – Information Pack,” *Undated*.

ILO/IPEC, “Child Labour and HIV Project in Uganda and Zambia– Brochure,” *Undated*.

ORC/Macro

CARE Mali, “Independent Midterm Evaluation of a Better Future for Mali’s Children: Combating Child Trafficking through Education – Final Report,” March 2006.

Joanne Capper; ORC, “Final Report: Independent Final Evaluation of Timebound Program on the Elimination of Child Labor in Tanzania,” May 2006.

KURET Regional

KURET, “Project Brochure,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Self Assessment Checklist Focusing on Selected Education and Related Activities,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Monitoring Guideline,” *Undated*.

KURET, “School Observation Tool,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Follow-Up Form,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Draft Monthly Reporting Form for M&E Coordinators,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Confirmation of Removal from Exploitative/Hazardous Labor,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Determining the Working Status of Children - Chart,” *Undated*.

KURET, “What is Child Labor?,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Minimum Standards Education Component,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Minimal Standards for Sustainability,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Minimum Standards for Monitoring,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET PAVE Cycle,” *Undated*.

KURET, “PAVE Methodology: A Trainers’ Guide (Pilot Copy),” *Undated*.

KURET, “A Customized SCREAM Methodology to Increase Children’s Participation towards Elimination of Child Labor: A Guide for Teachers,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Attachment 3: Collecting information on available resources...that specifically address learner-centered Methods and techniques to increase participation of learners,” (table) *Undated*.

KURET, “The TOT cascade through Coordinating/Model/Mentor Schools,” (chart) *Undated*.

KURET, “TOT Model 1: Teacher Training (an example of Trainer of Trainers Rolled out through 3 stages),” *Undated*.

KURET, “Contributing Towards Increasing Access and Improving Quality and Relevancy of Education – Familiarizing with the Education Component of KURET Project 2004,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Exit Strategy,” *Undated*.

KURET, “International Child Labor Program – Technical Progress Report,” (due in March and September).

- KURET, “International Child Labor Program – 2nd Technical Progress Report,” September, 2005.
- KURET, “International Child Labor Program – 3rd Technical Progress Report,” March 31, 2006.
- KURET, “International Child Labor Program – 4th Technical Progress Report,” September 30, 2006

KURET, “International Child Labor Program Status Report,” December 31, 2004.

Drew Lent, "Project Design Workshop for the KURET Education Initiative Project, Kampala, Uganda, December 6-10, 2004," December 2004.

Virginia Seitz, "Trip Report: KURET (Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Ethiopia) Regional HIV/AIDS Education Initiative, Kampala, Uganda, December 6-10, 2004," December 2004.

Virginia Seitz, "Regional Technical Assistance in Performance Monitoring to the KURET East Africa HIV/AIDS US DOL ICLP Education Initiative – Report," April 6, 2005

KURET, "Project Document under USDOL and World Vision Cooperative Agreement," July 18, 2005.

KURET, "KURET Regional Work Plan: October 2004 – September 2008," July 18, 2005.

KURET, "Regional Summary: Baseline Survey of the Situation of Child Labor and Education in HIV/AIDS Affected Communities in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda and Ethiopia," November 2005.

KURET, "International Child Labor Program Status Report," June 30 2005.

KURET, "International Child Labor Program 3rd Status Report," December 2005.

KURET, "Basic Training on Child Labor – For Teachers, Social Workers, Community Leaders, Civil Society Organizations and Teacher Education Institutions : A Guide for Trainers," 2006

KURET, "Data Quality Assessment" form, January, 2006

KURET in the Daily Monitor, "Combating Child Labour through Education – Newspaper Article," February 20, 2006.

KURET, "Guidelines for Project Monitoring – Draft," May 2006.

KURET, "Quarterly Newsletter," Vol. 2, June 2006.

KURET, "Awareness Raising Strategy for KURET – Draft," July 2006.

KURET, "Targeting Framework," March – August, 2006.

KURET, "Quarterly Newsletter," Vol. 3, September 2006.

KURET, "KURET Intake Form," Revised October, 2006.

KURET, "KURET Follow-Up Form – Revised," October 2006.

A. Ngay, "Brief Presentation on KURET for Evaluators," (PowerPoint), October 2006.

KURET, "Notes from KURET Regional Mid-Term Evaluation Debriefing," November 2006.

KURET, "Minutes for the workshop to share findings from the Mid-term evaluation and plan for Year 2 thrusts, held at Grand Imperial Hotel, Kampala (November 21 – 24, 2006)," November 2006.

KURET, "Evaluation Tables," November 30, 2006.

KURET Kenya

End Child Prostitution, Pornography and Trafficking in Kenya – ECPIK, "Help Protect Our Children From Sexual Exploitation - Brochure," *Undated*.

Mary Omosa, Edward Ontita and Helen Ombati; ILO/IPEC, "Combating Child Labour in the Domestic Sector in East Africa: A Rapid Assessment of the Situation of Child Domestic Workers in Kenya," March 2004.

Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development - Nairobi, "Draft National Plan of Action for Time Bound Programme on Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Kenya," August 2004.

KURET, "Performance Monitoring Plan Worksheet – KURET Kenya," July 18, 2005.

KURET Initiative Kenya, “Tuko Pamoja: Project Logical Framework,” July 18, 2005.

KURET, “Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labour and Education in HIV/AIDS Affected Communities in Kenya – Final Report,” November 2005.

Daniel Sifuna, “Child Labour Policy Review: Kenya Country Report,” June 2006.

Ministry of Labour and Human Resource Development - Nairobi, “Draft National Child Labour Policy – Draft No. 2,” July 2006.

KURET, “Building capacity to eliminate child labor: KURET’s technical support to the Child Labor Division, Ministry of Labor and Human Resource Development (Draft),” October 2006.

KURET Uganda

IRC, Organizational Chart for KURET/Uganda-IRC, *Untitled and Undated*.

IRC, Lira District Organization Chart, *Untitled and Undated*.

IRC, “KURET Monitoring Guideline,” *Undated*.

IRC, “Summary of Radio Program Activities Done By KURET/ORACLE,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Progress Report on Kyambogo University-KURET Partnership: Combating Child Labor through Education,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Initiative – Uganda, ‘WAN ACEL’ Project Logical Framework,” July 18, 2005.

KURET, “Performance Monitoring Plan Worksheet-KURET Uganda,” July 18, 2005.

IRC, “KURET Pre-Intake Form”, 2005.

KURET, “Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labor and Education in HIV-AIDS affected Communities in Northern Uganda,” February 2006.

WV, “Program for the Training of Teachers,” April 2006

KURET in the New Vision, “World Day against Child Labour, June 12th 2006 – Newspaper Article,” June 12, 2006.

Uganda Bureau of Statistics, “Report on the Labour Market Conditions in Uganda,” July 2006.

KURET, “Child Labor Policy Review: Uganda Country Report (Draft),” September 2006

KURET, “Building capacity to eliminate child labor: KURET’s technical support to the Child Labor Unit, MGLSD (Draft),” September 25, 2006.

IRC, “DCPC and LCV Councillors Workshop Report,” (Memorandum) November 7, 2006.

IRC, “Presentation on IRC UGANDA KURET Programmes,” (PowerPoint), November 13, 2006.

WV, “Overview of the KURET Project: World Vision Uganda,” November 13, 2006.

KURET, “KURET Mid-Term Evaluation Stakeholder Workshop Report, Kampala, Uganda,” November 17, 2006.

(Uganda Background)

National Council for Children, “Mission Statement,” (Uganda) *Undated*.

National Council for Children, “A Brief on the National Council for Children,” (Uganda) *Undated*.

World Vision, “Pawns of Politics: Children, Conflict and Peace in Northern Uganda (Second Edition),” 2005.

World Vision, “World Vision Uganda,” 2005.

IRC, “International Rescue Committee Uganda Program: 2005 Annual Report,” 2006.

World Vision, “World Vision Uganda Annual Report 2005,” 2006.

KIIE, Profile of KIIE Skills Training Centre,” November 15, 2006.

KURET Rwanda

KURET, “Carrying Heavy Loads: Child Labor in Rwanda,” *Undated*.

KURET, “Rwanda Major Achievements,” (PowerPoint), *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Initiative – Rwanda, ‘GUFATANYA’ Project Logical Framework,” July 18, 2005.

KURET, “Performance Monitoring Plan Worksheet-KURET Rwanda,” July 18, 2005.

KURET, “Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labor and Education in HIV-AIDS affected Communities in Rwanda,” November 2005.

KURET, “Laboring More than Learning? Key Findings from a Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labor and Education in HIV-AIDS affected Communities in Rwanda,” (Brochure) 2006.

KURET, “Rwanda Child Labor Policy Review Report (Final Discussion Draft),” May 2006.

KURET, “Child Labor: A Threat to the Realization of Vision 2020 (Draft),” September 5, 2006.

KURET, “Building Capacity to Eliminate Child Labor: KURET’s Partnership with MIFOTRA (Draft),” September 5, 2006.

KURET Ethiopia

World Vision-KURET Ethiopia, “Child Right Committee,” *Undated*.

KURET, “KURET Initiative – Ethiopia ‘Abren Bondelay’ Project Logical Framework,” July 18, 2005.

KURET, “Performance Monitoring Plan Worksheet- KURET Ethiopia,” July 18, 2005.

KURET, “Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labor and Education in HIV-AIDS affected Communities in Ethiopia,” 2006.

KURET, “Laboring More than Learning? Key Findings from a Baseline Study and Situational Analysis of Child Labor and Education in HIV-AIDS affected Communities in Ethiopia,” (Brochure) 2006.

IRC-KURET Ethiopia, “Quality Data Collection and Child Monitoring Systems Through Formal and Informal Ways,” 2006.

World Vision-KURET Ethiopia, “School Readiness Concept Paper,” February 2006.

World Vision-KURET Ethiopia, “Guraghe ADP: From Exploitative Child Labor to School,” September 2006.

KURET, “Child Labor Policy Review: Ethiopia Country Report (Draft),” September 2006.

KURET, Building Capacity to Eliminate Child Labor: KURET’s Partnership with MOWA (Draft),” October 10, 2006.

World Vision-KURET Ethiopia, “KURET in Guraghe Progress Report,” (PowerPoint) November 2006.

World Vision-KURET Ethiopia, “Response to Country Manager and Program Staff Interview Questions,” November 2006.

World Vision-KURET Ethiopia, “KURET Mid-Term Evaluation Briefing,” (PowerPoint), November 1, 2006.

IRC Ethiopia, “IRC-KURET Ethiopia Presented to Mid-term Evaluation Team,” (PowerPoint) November 1, 2006.

Other

African Network for the Prevention and Protection Against Child Abuse and Neglect – ANPPCAN; ILO/IPEC, “Towards Combating Child Labour in Commercial Agriculture: A Training Guide for District Child Labour Committees,” June 2004.

African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Child Abuse and Neglect – ANPPCAN, “Towards Social Mobilization in Combating Child Labour through Education and Training – Documentation of Good Practices,” 2005.

ANNEX 4

INSTRUMENTS

Country Manager and Staff Interview Questions

1. Tell us about the KURET Program in this country.
 - How is your office organized (how many staff centrally and in field, institutional affiliations, etc.)?
 - How many districts?
 - How many learning sites?
 - How many KURET children?
 - Other (infrastructure, etc.)

(Design)

2. What is your strategy and approach?
3. Are there any gaps in the logic or design that you can identify or that cause you problems in implementing the project? Describe.

(Partnership)

4. Who are your major partners among donors, government agencies, NGOs, other?
5. How do you interact with them? How do you coordinate? (Specifically with other DOL projects.)
6. What is your relationship to the various government ministries with whom you work? Why did you select certain government partners and not others?
7. How have you enhanced collaboration among implicated government institutions?
8. Does the project complement other efforts already underway in child labor, children affected by HIV-AIDS, and EFA? How? Is there redundancy? Explain.
9. Who are your local partners? What have been some of the challenges in working with them? Describe.
10. What are your recommendations for improving all your partnerships?

(Impact and Implementation)

11. Do you think the project has been successful in removing and preventing children from work and providing them with future opportunities? Explain.
12. Is the project meeting its purpose- and output-level goals and associated targets?
 - How have you improved access? What are you doing?
 - How have you improved educational quality and relevance? What are you doing?
 - How have you increased awareness? What are you doing?
 - How have you increased capacity and support? What are you doing?

13. Are the targets realistic and "meetable"? What is their impact on your work?
14. Have any "external" factors impacted project results, effectiveness and operations? (E.g. IDP, natural disaster, conflict, DOL?)
15. What has been the biggest challenge to implementation here? Describe. How should this be addressed?
16. Of the four output areas, which are you finding most difficult to manage? Why? (Resources, personnel, etc.)
17. What are the project's biggest accomplishments to date?
18. Has your project contributed any innovations, knowledge or lessons learned to the overall KURET program?

(Management)

19. What reporting lines of authority do you follow? Do you experience problems?
20. What system do you use to report progress, problems, etc.?
21. How have you collaborated with World Vision? Have you had any problems or challenges? (E.g. personnel promotions, internal promotions, especially in Ethiopia)
22. Has World Vision as a faith-based organization affected project implementation? (in prayer time, hiring practices, religious content in training or materials, etc.)
23. What tools are you actively using to manage the program?
24. What is the heaviest demand of the project on your and/or your staff's time?
25. How do you balance among competing demands?
26. What management and staff issues have you had to deal with?
27. Have you been able to leverage any matching funds or other resources?
28. What district or local level linkages have you been able to effect? What are the challenges?
29. Have you experienced any budgetary or financial flow problems? Describe.
30. As project manager, what is your biggest head ache? What are you most proud of?
31. What would help you and your staff to do your job better?

(Regional Office Support)

32. How do you interact with the KURET regional office? With whom? How often?
33. What type of support do they provide you ...overall, in policy, in education, in M&E, other? Give examples.
34. Are you satisfied with the support? (Ask about each area)
35. In what areas are the regional staff most helpful? Least Helpful? Explain.
36. How does the regional staff ensure program quality?

37. What is your relationship with regional staff? (KURET director, technical, financial, etc.)

(Policy and Capacity Building)

38. What are you doing in the area of national policy in Child Labor, HIV-AIDS-affected children, Child Trafficking, Education, etc.? What have you achieved so far? What do you plan to do?

39. How have you built capacity at the national level? Whose capacity have you built?

40. What are you doing to strengthen support for Child Labor at the district level? What have you achieved so far? What do you plan to do?

41. How have you built capacity at the district level? Whose capacity have you built?

16. Describe how you work with the different partners in policy and capacity building.

42. How have you increased capacity and support? What are you doing?

(Monitoring and Evaluation)

43. Describe your M&E system.

- What are its components and instrument?
- What process do you follow? (data collection, entry, consolidation, verification)
- What is the data collection and reporting schedule?

44. Do you find reporting on any specific indicators difficult? Explain.

45. What do you think about the M&E and reporting system the Project uses?

46. What are the problems you face?

47. Describe the KURET child identification, monitoring and tracking system.

- What are its components and instruments?
- What process do you follow? (data collection, entry, consolidation, verification)
- What is the data collection and reporting schedule?
- What are the challenges? (time, resources, accuracy, IDP, etc.)

48. Have you developed an exit strategy? How will the KURET interventions be sustained (for the child, at the school, in the community, in the district, centrally)?

49. Is capacity sufficient to sustain KURET interventions and/or effectively address Child Labor, HIV-AIDS, etc.?

50. What do you appreciate most about KURET?

51. What would you like to see improved in KURET?

52. What other areas need to be addressed to reduce child labor and keep children in school?

53. What recommendations would you make to KURET to ensure or improve its chances of sustainability?

Project Site Facilitator Interview Guide

1. Describe your work and activities with the KURET project to date? Have you been with the project from the very beginning?
2. In which project activities (outputs) have the sites in your districts been especially successful? Why?
3. In which activities (outputs) have the sites in your districts been especially unsuccessful? Why?
4. How and how frequently do you interact with the KURET project staff at WV headquarters and KURET regional headquarters in Kampala?
5. Were you trained by KURET to do the work that you are now doing in the project?
6. Are you satisfied with the support that you receive from National KURET staff?
7. Who do you report to and who reports to you in the KURET project?
8. Who have been your most valuable project partners/collaborators to date? Why do you consider them valuable?
9. How long have you worked with these partners?
10. In your opinion do you think they (partners) understand CL issues now better than they did when the KURET Project started?
11. How have their opinions on CL changed? How do you know?
12. What about community members' opinions including parents of KURET And non KURET children on CL? Have these changed? Have these changes been because of the project?
13. What do you think about the KURET approach and package for reducing child labor?
14. Have community members' learned about HIV-AIDS and how it is related to Child Labor? Describe.
15. Do you think that the project is meeting the most important needs of the withdrawn or prevented children and their households/families?
16. Do you think that what the KURET project is providing children/families is sufficient to keep the child in school and away from child labor?
17. Are parents and community members happy with the way the project operates? How do they react when their child is selected or not selected to join the program?
18. How has KURET helped to improve the quality of schooling/training for KURET students and/or all students?
19. What do you like most about KURET?
20. What would you like to see changed in the KURET project activities or its approach?
21. Do you think that the activities of the project will continue after the project ends in 2008? How and why?
22. Who is most likely to continue providing the services that you (KURET) now provide? Why?

District Officials or DCLC Focus Group Guide

1. What has changed at the district level in terms of structures, actors, or level of activities to deal with Child Labor since the KURET program has started? Describe. (note that actors could include the MOL, MOE, MOH, police, etc.)
2. Describe how the issue of Child Labor is addressed at the district level.
 - What structure(s) exist to deal with Child Labor?
 - Who is implicated or involved in these structures?
 - What are individual institution roles and responsibilities?
3. What is the role of the District in the KURET program? Describe.
 - What is the role of the Child Labor officer (or equivalent)?
 - What is the role of the District Education Officer?
 - What is the role of...the District Health Officer, police, etc.
4. To what extent and how is the district involved in the identification and monitoring of children engaged in and at risk of child labor?
5. What is the district's relation to and interaction with the LCLCs (or equivalent)?
 - How do you learn about their activities?
 - Do you have a role in the guidance, supervision or monitoring of their activities?
 - If so, how do you go about this?
6. How has KURET assisted you work at the district level?
7. What type of training have you received? Describe.
8. Are you more aware of the issues of Child labor, Child Trafficking and HIV-AIDS?
9. Have your opinions or understanding changed about child labor? How?
10. How are district-level authorities dealing with these issues? Have new policies, practices and/or programs been implemented in addition to KURET? Describe.
 - Have the different ministries incorporated Child Labor into their action plans/budgets?
 - Have the police taken any action about Child Labor?
 - What other district structures have acted to incorporate Child Labor as part of their plan/ program/activities?
11. Are you satisfied with the assistance KURET has provided at the district level?
 - Has KURET been easy to work with?
 - Has it been responsive to your needs, requests and recommendations?
 - Has it involved you in decisions about its activities?

- Have you received progress reports or other documentation about its work?
 - Has it facilitated your participation in other information-sharing meetings?
12. What would help you do your job better to combat Child Labor?
13. What do you think about the KURET approach and package for reducing child labor?
- Is it meeting the priority needs of the child and his household/family?
 - Is it sufficient to keep the child in school and away from child labor?
 - Are parents happy with it? How do they react when their child is selected?
 - Do you think that the schools and teachers are supporting KURET children?
 - Has KURET helped to improve the quality of schooling/training for KURET students and/or all students?
14. What do you appreciate most about KURET?
15. What would you like to see improved in KURET?
16. What other areas need to be addressed to reduce child labor and keep children in school?
17. Have plans been made or considered at the district about how to continue the program's effort after its 2008 completion? If so, what are they? If not, why not?
18. Once KURET is over, what can be done to continue removing and preventing children from child labor?
19. Will the KURET model be sustained/continued by the district or locally?
- What changes do you foresee? What elements will be retained? What will be done differently? Why?
 - Will the effort work as well? Explain.
20. What recommendations would you make to KURET to ensure or improve its chances of sustainability?

KURET LCLC (or equivalent) Focus Group Guide

1. Did your Child Labor group already exist when the KURET program started?
2. Describe your group.
 - Who created your Child Labor group? When?
 - How members are there? Who are they? Describe general characteristics.
 - How are you organized? Officers?
 - How often to you meet?
 - Do you receive payment or compensation of some kind?
 - What is your motivation? Why does your group continue to operate?
3. What is the role of your group in the KURET program? Describe.
4. How do you identify (i.e. what criteria do you use) children engaged in child labor?
5. How do you identify (i.e. what criteria do you use) children at risk of child labor?
6. How many of the at-risk children come from HIV-AIDS-affected households? How do you know?
7. Describe the process for enrolling children in the KURET program?
 - What is the general profile of KURET children here? (E.G. sex, labor form, religion)
 - How do you prioritize among the eligible children?
 - How many are World Vision ADP- sponsored children?
8. Describe the process for monitoring, follow-up, and reporting on KURET children?
 - Do you monitor every child? How often?
 - Who does the monitoring? Is there an assigned case-load?
 - How do you deal with problems?
 - Who do you report to? In what form?
9. What is your group's relationship to the District Officials (DLO, DEO) and the school? Describe your interactions.
10. How has KURET assisted your group?
11. What type of training have you received? Describe.
12. Are you satisfied with the assistance KURET has provided your group?
13. What other support does your group need to be effective? From KURET? From others?
14. What do you think about the KURET approach and package for reducing child labor?
 - Is it meeting the priority needs of the child and his household/family?

- Is it sufficient to keep the child in school and away from child labor?
- Are parents happy with it? How do they react when their child is selected?
- Do you think that the schools and teachers are supporting KURET children?
- Has KURET helped to improve the quality of schooling/training for KURET students and/or all students?
- Are there other NGOs or programs helping children get out of child labor in this community? What do they do differently than KURET? Are they as effective as KURET?

15. What has been KURET's impact on your group and the community?

- Has your group's opinion about the type of work children should do changed? Why?
- What is the community's perception of child labor?
- Have parents withdrawn or prevented children from engaging in child labor, even if not part of the KURET program?
- Have you learned about HIV-AIDS and its relation to Child Labor? Describe.

16. What do you appreciate most about KURET?

17. What would you like to see improved in KURET?

18. What other areas need to be addressed to reduce child labor and keep children in school?

19. Have plans been made or considered about how to continue the program's effort after its 2008 completion? If so, what are they? If not, why not?

20. Once KURET is over, will your group continue to operate? Will it work as well? What will it do differently? Why?

21. What recommendations would you make to KURET to ensure or improve its chances of sustainability?

KURET Parents Focus Group Guide

1. Why was your child selected to participate in the KURET Program?
2. Why did you agree to let your child participate?
3. Are you pleased that your child is in school? Is it a priority for your family?
4. Has your child's enrollment made it harder or easier for your household? Explain. (Note difference for fathers, mothers, siblings.)
5. How has your household been able to deal with the loss of your child's labor (income, etc.)? Explain.
6. What assistance has your household received from KURET? Is it sufficient to keep your child in school? What else would you need to ensure your child remains at school and out of labor? Has KURET helped your household or child to receive services from other programs?
7. Are you happy with the school/training program your child is in? Was it your preference?
8. Is your child learning things/skills that will make his future better? What and how? Describe/explain.
9. Are you satisfied with the school, teachers and quality of education/training your child is receiving?
 - Do think the teaching is good at the school?
 - Do you think that your child learning his/her lessons?
 - Is your child treated well at the school? Is he/she ever punished? How?
 - Does he/she receive the help needed?
 - Have you ever received feedback or information about your child from the school? From whom? Why?
 - Have you ever visited the school? Why?
10. Has anyone associated with KURET program, visited your home? ...Counseled you? ...Helped you? Describe.
11. How have you been treated? How do you feel about the visits, monitoring, etc.?
12. Has your opinion about the type of work your child and other children do changed? How? Explain.
13. What about others in the community?
14. Do you see other children in the community leaving child labor and/or hear other parents talking about it?
15. What about families affected by HIV-AIDS? Are their children more likely to be in child labor? Why?

16. Would you let your child go back to the type of work he was doing? Explain.
17. What kind of work does your child do now ...after school? ...on weekends? ...during school breaks? Describe.
18. What do you like best about KURET? What aspects of KURET are most important and/or helpful to you and your child?
19. If the KURET program ends, what will happen to your child? Will he/she leave school?
20. How can the best parts of the KURET be continued?

KURET Student Focus Group Guide

1. Why were you selected to participate in KURET? (note: find out named used locally)
2. Who decided about your participation? Your parents, family, others? Explain.
3. Tell us about the type of work you did before the KURET Child Labor Program.
4. What have you received from KURET? What help is most important to keeping you in school?
5. Do you need anything else (to stay in school, learn better, and help your family...)?
6. Is this the school/learning program you want to be enrolled in? What do you prefer?
7. Did you transfer from a different school/program (as a KURET student)? Why?
8. Are you happy to be in school/training? Would you rather be somewhere else? Explain.
9. Are your parents or family pleased that you are in school/training?
10. Is it harder or easier for your family now that you are in school/training? Explain.
11. What type of work do you do at home now ...after school? ...weekends? ...school breaks?
12. When do you sleep? (hours for older kids, darkness/lightness for younger)
13. Do you have time to... play? ...for school activities? ...for homework?
14. Are you able to attend school regularly? How many of you missed one or more days last week? How many? Why?
15. Who comes to check on you? How often? How does it make you feel (special, annoyed, policed...)? Do they help you? How?
16. Have you received counseling? By whom? Why?
17. Are you happy with the education you are receiving? Explain.
18. Are you learning at this school? Are you learning as well as other students?
19. Girls, are you happy in this school? Are girls treated differently than boys? How? Describe.
20. Boys, what do you think? Are girls treated differently? How? Describe.
21. Are you or others ever punished at school? What is the punishment?
22. Do your teachers help you? How? Describe.
23. Do they treat you differently than other children? How? How does it make you feel?
24. What would you need to learn better? (Materials, tutoring/coaching, time, food, etc.)
25. Have you learned about Child Labor and HIV-AIDS in class? Describe.
26. Do you participate in school clubs or activities? Describe.
27. Have you made friends with other children at school? Explain.

28. Do plan on remaining in school/training? If not, why not?

(For Vocational Education Students—Formal and Non-Formal)

29. Are you learning the skills that will help you find a job?

30. Is it the type of job you want to do?

31. Will there be jobs available in this community after you finish the training?

32. How many hours a day do you work here?

33. Is the time spent here mainly learning or working? Do you learn while you work?

34. Is your vocational teacher skilled at his job? Is he/she a good teacher?

35. Do you think it safe here? Are you provided with protective gear?

36. [Functional Vocational Literacy Program has not yet begun, but ask if vocational program includes literacy and numeracy.]

- Do you have literacy and numeracy classes? How often do you have them?
- How is the teacher?
- Are you learning to read and do sums?
- Who thinks that they are now at the point of being a good reader? Explain how you know.
- Do you attend any other classes with academic subjects?

(For ALP Students)

37. Do you think that this program gives you the same skills that a regular primary school does? Will you be ready to pass the leaving exam and enter the next level of schooling?

38. How is it to deal with the rapid pace? Explain, describe.

(For School Readiness Participants)

39. How many of you participated in the School Readiness program?

40. Has it helped you? How? Explain.

Principal or School Director Focus Group Guide

1. When did your school start participating in the KURET program?
2. How many KURET students do you have enrolled?
3. How did your school manage to accommodate these additional students?
4. Overall, has drop-out (and repetition) decreased? Has performance on end-of-year tests increased? Give figures.
5. How are the KURET students doing?
 - Are KURET students learning as well as other students? Explain.
 - Has drop-out (and repetition) decreased? Has performance on end-of year tests increased? Give figures.
 - Assess the probability that the KURET students will return to child labor? Do you think that they will finish school? Progress to higher levels?
 - What helps keep these children in school?
6. What has KURET provided to the school in terms of... infrastructure (classrooms, latrines, etc.), materials, stipends, and/or other?
7. Do you or your school participate in the selection and identification of the KURET students? Do you ever meet with parents of KURET students? Describe.
8. How do you and your school interact with the LCLC (or equivalent)? Describe.
9. How many teachers in this school have received training directly from the KURET program (to serve as master trainers)?
10. Did the master trainers conduct training for other teachers at this school? If not, why not?
11. How many teachers have they in turn trained at the school? In what areas?
12. What arrangements have you made to facilitate this training? (e.g. time, space, etc.)
13. Do you notice that they are teaching or treating children differently since you received the training? Please provide examples.
14. How do teachers discipline or punish students in this school? Describe.
15. Did you receive any training directly from KURET or from the master teachers?
 - In what areas? (child labor, HIV-AIDS, gender, learner-centered methods)
 - How many training sessions? When? Where? Describe.
 - Were you satisfied? Explain.
16. Did you learn anything new about...child labor, HIV-AIDS, gender, learner-centered methods, other?
 - Have your opinions changed about child labor?

- What do you understand about how to identify a child engaged in or at risk of child labor? How is it different than child work? Who is most at risk?
 - Why is it important for these children to be in school?
17. What are you and this school doing differently to deal with these issues? Describe.
 18. Have you noticed any peculiarities or experienced special problems with KURET students? (E.g. psycho-social, disciplinary, cognitive, health, etc.)
 19. How have you dealt with these? (E.g. methods, counseling, tutoring, parental conferences, referrals, etc.)
 20. Who provides counseling at this school? Have they received special training? When do they counsel students? How do they go about it?
 21. How has KURET contributed to improving the quality of the school and the instruction it provides and making it more supportive for children, including girls? Give examples.
 22. Do you think that the KURET students have benefited from the KURET program? How?
 23. Have other students also benefited from KURET? How?
 24. What has been KURET's impact on you, your school, your student and the community?
 25. What do you appreciate most about KURET?
 26. What would you like to see improved in KURET?
 27. What other areas need to be addressed to reduce child labor and keep children in school?
 28. Once KURET is over, will your school continue to enroll and assist KURET students and other children removed from child labor? Will it work as well? What will it do differently? Why?
 29. What recommendations would you make now to KURET to ensure that schools like yours continue educating this group of children?

Teacher Focus Group Guide

1. How many teachers in this school have received training directly from the KURET program to serve as master trainers?
 - In what areas? (child labor, HIV-AIDS, gender, learner-centered methods)
 - How many training sessions? When? Where? Describe.
 - Were you satisfied? Explain.
 - Have you had any government in-service training? Is KURET training different? How?
2. Did the master trainers conduct training for other teachers at this school? If not, why not?
3. If so, how many of you received training at the school from the KURET-trained master teachers? If not, why not?
 - In what areas?
 - How many sessions? How were they organized?
4. Did you learn anything new about...child labor, HIV-AIDS, gender, learner-centered methods, other?
5. In what area has KURET training been most helpful to you?
6. Are you teaching or treating children differently since you received the training? Please provide examples.
7. Have your opinions changed about child labor, HIV-AIDS, gender, etc.?
8. What do you understand about how to identify a child engaged in or at risk of child labor? How is it different than child work? Who is most at risk?
9. Are you aware of whether you have any children in your class who were engaged in or at risk of child labor?
10. How did you learn that you had KURET students in your class?
11. Did you receive any background briefing or meet with the child initially?
12. Are KURET students learning as well as other students? Explain.
13. Have you noticed any peculiarities or experienced special problems with KURET students? (E.g. psycho-social, disciplinary, cognitive, health, etc.)
14. How have you dealt with these? (E.g. methods, counseling, tutoring, parental conferences, referrals, etc.)
15. How do you discipline students who misbehave in your class? At this school?
16. Do you think that the KURET students have benefited from the KURET program? How?

17. Assess the probability that the KURET students will return to child labor? Do you think that they will finish school? Progress to higher levels?
18. What are you doing in class and at this school to teach your students about... child labor, HIV-AIDS, and gender? Describe.
19. Have you started any clubs or special activities to deal with these issues? Describe.
20. Has overall quality of the school improved?
21. Have other students also benefited from KURET? How?
22. Is it only better for KURET students? Have they received an unfair advantage over other students? Explain.
23. As member of the community, have you participated in any events, meetings, activities, etc. about Child Labor? Describe.
24. Are you a member of the LCLC?
25. What has been KURET's impact on you, your school, your student and the community?
26. What do you appreciate most about KURET?
27. What would you like to see improved in KURET?
28. What other areas need to be addressed to reduce child labor and keep children in school?
29. Once KURET is over, will your school continue to support KURET students and other children like them? Will it work as well? What will it do differently? Why?
30. What recommendations would you make now to KURET to ensure or improve its chances of sustainability?

Parents of Working Children Focus Group Guide

1. Is your child currently working?
2. How old is your child? Is he a boy or a girl?
3. What type of work does your child do?
4. What are the reasons your child is working?
5. Do you think the type of work your child is doing is harmful to your child? If yes, in what ways? If no, why not?
6. How does the work your child is doing affect his future?
7. Could your child be doing some other easier or better type of work? Explain.
8. If your child were not working, what would you prefer that your child do?
9. What would you or your family need to permit your child to stop working?
10. Has your child ever attended school? If not, why not? If so, why did your child stop?
11. Would you like your child to be educated? Explain why or why not.
12. Would education make a better future for your child? Explain.
13. What type of education do you prefer for your child? What type best fits your family's needs?
14. What would you or your family need to send your child to school?
15. What costs associated with schooling are most difficult for you or your family to bear?
16. What other reasons would make it difficult to send your child to school?
17. Have you heard about or seen any publicity about child labor?
18. What did you think of the messages? Did you think that they were applicable to your situation?
19. Has your opinion about the type of work your child does changed? How? Explain.
20. Have you or your family ever been visited by someone in the community or district who was concerned about your child working?
21. If so, how did you react? Were you pleased or annoyed? How were you treated?
22. Have you heard of the KURET program or been approached by someone associated with it?
23. What do you think of it?
24. Do you think it could help families like yours? Explain why or why not.

Working Children Focus Group Guide

1. Are you currently working?
2. How old are you?
3. What type of work do you do?
4. What are the reasons you are working?
5. What do you think of the work? Is it hard? Does it hurt you or make you suffer in any way? Are you happy doing this work?
6. Is it possible for you to find a better or easier job?
7. What would you prefer to do?
8. Who decides whether you work or not?
9. What would you or your family need to permit you to stop working?
10. Have you ever attended school? If not, why not? If so, why did you stop?
11. Would you like to be educated? Explain why or why not.
12. How would education help you? Explain.
13. What type of education would you like to have?
14. What would you or your family need to send you to school?
15. What costs associated with schooling are most difficult for you or your family to bear?
16. What other reasons would make it difficult for you to go to school?
17. Have you heard about or seen any publicity about child labor?
18. Do you know what it means? Define.
19. What did you think of the messages? Did you think that they were applicable to your situation?
20. Has your opinion about what you do changed? How? Explain.
21. Have you or your family ever been visited by someone in the community or district who was concerned about the work you do?
22. If so, how did you react? Were you pleased or annoyed?
23. Have you heard of the KURET program, been approached by someone associated with it or know any children participating in it?
24. What do you think of it?
25. Do you think it could help children like you? Explain why or why not.

Project Partners Interview Guide

1. How have you worked/collaborated with the KURET project to date?
2. How frequently do you interact with the KURET project/its staff/etc?
3. How long has your institution/organization/Ministry etc worked with the Project?
4. Who else/which other institution does your institution/organization/Ministry work with to achieve goals similar to those that KURET is aiming to reach? Please explain.
5. Did KURET play any part in your collaboration with these other institutions?
6. Do you think that the goals that the KURET project is pursuing are relevant in this country/district/community? Please explain.
7. What do you think about the way that the project is going about reaching its goals?
8. How does the work that you do complement what the project does and/or vice versa?
9. What is the nature of co-ordination of the work that you do with KURET and others in the area of child labor of HIV/AIDS affected children?
 - a. Do you have regular meetings?
 - b. Who attends these meetings beside yourself (your organization) and KURET?
 - c. Where are these meetings held?
 - d. What is the purpose of these meetings?
 - e. Have you organized any joint activities/activities jointly?
 - f. Do you plan to organize any joint activities/activities jointly?
 - g. What was (will be) your organization's contribution to this joint activity?
 - h. What was (will be) KURET's contribution?
 - i. Has the collaboration with KURET been successful i.e. has the purpose been achieved?
10. What part of your collaboration with KURET have you liked best?
11. Will you continue this collaboration after the project ends? Who with? To what end?
12. What have been the best aspects/practices of the KURET project?
13. Have you changed any/some of your practices in the light of these KURET practices? If not why? If yes, which ones?
14. What have been the challenges that you have experienced in working with KURET as a partner?
15. What plans do you (or your organization) have for maintaining the successes that you and/or KURET have made in the issues of child labor especially for HIV/AIDS affected children in the country/district/community?
16. What would you recommend that the KURET project does to sustain its good practices at the district/community or country level?

School/Learning Site Check List

Please check what the KURET project has provided and note relevant number of beneficiaries (if applicable)

District Name: _____	Learning Site 1		Learning Site 2		Learning Site 3		Learning Site 4	
Description								
	Y/N	# Beneficiaries	Y/N	#Beneficiaries	Y/N	#Beneficiaries	Y/N	# Beneficiaries
<i>Infrastructure</i>								
Constructed classroom/s								
Upgraded classroom/s								
Latrines constructed								
Latrines upgraded								
Other (Pls specify)								
<i>Fees</i>								
School fees								
Exam Fees								
Other								
<i>Materials/Supplies</i>								
Text books/manuals for students								
Textbooks/teacher guides/materials for teachers								
School Kits								
Uniform								
Medication								
Food								
Other Pls specify								
<i>Teacher training</i>								
How many trained?								
In child labor?								
In HIV-AIDS?								
In child-centered methods?								
<i>Other</i>								
Psychosocial Support/Counselling								
Better home/work condition								
Support for family members (pls describe)								

NFE Site Observation Check list
Please check what you see in the Centre

District _____

Name of Centre _____

Type of Centre (Hair dressing/Motor Garage/ etc.) _____

Date of observation

Observer

Description	Observation			
	Y	N	U	Comment/Remark
<i>Environment</i>				
Is the immediate environment clean?				
Does it look safe?				
Other Pls specify				
<i>Interaction</i>				
How many trainer-instructors do you see?				
How many trainees? Men? Women?				
Who gets more attention?				
Do/es the trainer-instructors spend the same amount of time with both men and women trainees?				
Are the trainees (M/W) doing the same/similar tasks?				
Other Pls specify				
<i>Materials</i>				
Does it look safe?				
Are trainees wearing/using/showing safety awareness				
Do the machines look used?				
<i>Other</i>				