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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This was an evaluation on the Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Working Children (BEHTRUWC) Project 2nd Phase which complements and was a continuation of the 2008 midterm evaluation (MTE). BEHTRUWC was designed to educate 166,150 poor working urban children, ages 10 through 14, and to further train 20,130 children in livelihood skills after successful completion of their basic education (BE). It also advocated at city and national levels for policies in favor of working children and their families and for protecting children from hazardous working environments and increasing awareness in the elimination of child labor.

Situated in the six divisional1 urban cities of Bangladesh, BEHTRUWC for the first time, tried to reach this hard to reach population. Unlike their rural brothers and sisters, this population is not bound by community or culture and are a difficult but extremely needy population to reach, as every day more and more rural people migrate to the urban areas in search of work and opportunity. These children become a difficult burden and are pressed into the labor force as soon as they can earn a living to bring more income home for their family.

The Government of Bangladesh (GoB) has a legal obligation to educate all children, but these children are elusive to serve. BEHTRUWC was a way forward and the most significant effort to reach them to date. Joined by United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) as financial partners, the GoB developed and implemented this project. Other local non-government organizations (NGOs) joined as local implementing partners to deliver BE and livelihood skills programming.

Methodology

This was a mixed methods evaluation which drew on a combination of desk research, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and site observations. Because the BE program ended October 2011 and the livelihood skills training (LST) December 2013, it was very hard for the evaluation team to locate learners, teachers, supervisors, employers, community members, etc. in the field as this population by necessity, is a very mobile population. Consequently, the fieldwork took a more qualitative turn and reports, key interviews, and other documents became the basis of the team’s data collection. The instruments developed and piloted, although not used for their original purpose, became excellent talking points as the team conducted interviews in Dhaka, Sylhet, Chittagong, Rajshahi, Khulna, and Barisal.

Findings

Basic Education

For the BE program, which was the key component of BEHTRUWC, most of the respondents stated it has been the most relevant project in Bangladesh to educate urban slum working children and adolescents. Community members and parents are clamoring for its next iteration.

---

1 When the project was planned and initially implemented, there were six divisions. Rangpur became Bangladesh’s 7th division on 25 January 2010 and was not factored into the project.
Children and adolescents who got the opportunity to be part of this program were highly enthusiastic, particularly girls who were serious about education and believed it was a way out of early marriage and poverty.

The curriculum, and teaching, and learning materials (TLM) were developed by a materials development team with significant experience in child-centered teaching methodologies. The curriculum for Bangla, Mathematics and English are closely based on the GoB National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB) competencies. The curriculum for Life Skills Basic Education (LSBE) was based upon World Health Organization (WHO, 2003) material, but was closely focused on the Bangladesh working children’s environment. For both models (basic and life skills), the approach was logical since it made the materials relevant to the national and the local context. What was lacking was a more gender-centered viewpoint and this left this project lacking in role models to challenge the cultural norms and to empower them, even though there was a focus on girls’ enrollment.

Education was the most effective tool for gender empowerment. To achieve gender equity in accessing basic education in the BEHTRUWC project, the gender ratio was 60% girls and 40% boys with the majority of them in the 10 to 14 years of age group. However, nearly 90% of the teachers recruited for the project were female. On the other hand, males were recruited more often to supervise the learning center (LC) activities and less than one third of them were women.

Girls performed better in all the subjects which proves that given the opportunity, they can succeed. Girls’ performance was equally good in assessment tests. As more girls were targeted, the girls’ enrollment (62.5%) was higher than the boys in all divisional cities. Similarly girls’ attendance (97.65%) was higher than the boys as well in all divisions. Sixty-six percent of girls and 67% of boys passed performance and knowledge tests successfully and 90% of both girls and boys completed Livelihood Skills Training (LST) successfully. It was encouraging to note that positive discrimination was made in some cases to provide skill training to more girls.

Girls faced uneven obligations in attending LCs as they also had to do household jobs or look after their smaller siblings. Sometimes they brought young siblings to school. Sometimes employers did not allow them to attend schools. No separate toilets for teachers or girl learners were provided. Poor physical facilities in LCs and environment also discouraged the adolescent girls. Although the curriculum included some orientation on gender and dowry in life skill education, they had trouble applying these skills in their real lives. It was surprising to note that although the majority of girls in this project were Child Domestic Workers (CDWs), the curriculum did not include their issues. Information on security, social injustice, legal rights, sexual abuse or violence by the employers were also not included, even though it was critical to these girls’ lives to know these. It was observed that the project has addressed the hardware issue and not the software.

**Livelihood Skills Training**

BRAC, MAWTS, Underprivileged Children’s Educational Program (UCEP), and five other NGOs: Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha (TMSS), Nari Maitree (NM), Bangladesh Development Service Center (BDSC), Surovi, and Samaj Kallyan O Unnayan Shangstha (SKUS), were involved with LST delivery using four different modalities. The apprenticeship model implemented by BRAC is felt to be more replicable as compared with other models and is currently being piloted in Shatkira with funding from UNICEF. This model involved a 6-month apprentice approach in
which skilled practitioners/artisans taught their trade to learners. Many of the trainers hired their graduates when the apprenticeship ended or have maintained mentoring relationships with them.

MAWTS, who are known for their skills training programs, integrated the learners into their own programs, but their lack of job placement facilities meant that jobs were not available to graduates. The five NGO model had some of the flaws of MAWTS, but they had two components, evaluation and follow-up, which are highly critical for implementation of livelihood interventions and they were missing from the other models. The duration though, of these follow-up measures was too short to ensure long-term sustainability. The UCEP model was excellent, with a complete learning and skills package and placement options, but they require their learners to complete Level 8 before they can take skills training. Placement tests showed that many of the BEHTRUWC BE graduates were placed at Level 3 and so consequently, their education will last longer than if they started at the beginning of UCEP program. It is a good model and only six months longer than BEHTRUWC so should be considered, but students should be placed there directly.

There was also a gender-segregated distribution of LST. The trend shows clear affinity towards gendered roles that keep the girls tied at home. Overwhelmingly, the majority of the girls took home-centric livelihood skills such as hand embroidery, tailoring and dress making, etc. These are low profit occupation and do little to increase the mobility of girls within the market, challenge cultural norms, or to empower them.

The LST, even though in a small way, has been able to demonstrate that girls are willing and able to take up livelihood professions traditionally thought to be that of boys, if they are provided with the right conditions. For instance, it was interesting to note that all the children under Modality 2 who received training in mobile repairing were girls.

Advocacy, Communications and Social Mobilization

Advocacy, Communications, and Social Mobilization (ACSM) consists of three linked, overlapping, and complementary components now recognized as essential elements in development programming and should be the entry point for all development interventions. ACSM needs to have a strong communication strategy and action plan in place at the beginning of a project and have it team up with community action groups: (i) to be an integral and cross-cutting theme in all social change/action projects; (ii) ACSM working groups need to be formed to facilitate the process; and (iii) initiatives to promote mobilization need to be developed.

BEHTRUWC, in order to sensitize the policy makers in favor of disadvantaged/excluded children and urban working children in particular, supported key international days, e.g., International Literacy Day, Education for All (EFA) Week, World Day against Child Labor, UN Convention on Rights of the Child (CRC) Week, Meena Day, and the National Children Day. Community members, learners, parents, teachers, supervisors, etc. participated in these events organized by the Partner NGOs (PNGOs). This type of one-time event failed to make lasting a impression in the daily lives of poor communities who are struggling to meet their basic needs.

There was no major marketing plan developed with interlocking components, no staff hired on a consistent basis to make a plan go forward, no field level facilitators to integrate and manage these plans in the field, no follow up on what was done, and
result oriented project facilities were absent at ground level. Teachers who were already overloaded were engaged in social mobilization (SM). Too much dependency on the teachers affected their performance in teaching.

One of the major weaknesses of the project was inadequate institutional capacity of Project Implementation Unit (PIU) and PNGOs to lobby and advocate for child rights and child labor. Mass scale sensitization program for employers or duty bearers was absent. The project lacks strategies to instill accountability on the part of duty bearers. Unless the duty bearers are sensitized enough to take the responsibility and strong monitoring systems against child labor are introduced, the exploitation of cheap labor will continue.

It was not all bleak though. As education and the elimination of child labor has a direct correlation, the project focused on basic rights for education of poor urban working children and elimination of hazardous child labor through SM and advocacy. It was a first stepping stone for these children to access educational opportunities. BEHTRUWC undertook birth registration as one of its key responsibilities. Significant improvement has been made regarding the birth registration as compared to preceding years. By December 2011, birth certificates were issued to a total of 135,484 learners, accounting for 98.99% of the applicants and 83.11% of the learners.

Apart from documenting lessons learned and good practices, ACSM also included the collation of human stories, in order to support national level advocacy, video documentation, radio spots, drama for TV and radio, production of documentaries on livelihood skills, interactive popular theatres, posters, printing, painting of walls, publication of supplementary materials, production of MEENA cartoon films, photographs for communications materials, display boards, etc. Also, six video documentaries, six docudramas, and 78 episodes of drama series, “Banafuler gan” (Song of the Wild Flowers) were produced. TV serials are still being telecast by Bangladesh Television (BTV) every Tuesday. Very effective in terms of SM were the 1,132 interactive popular theater (IPT) shows which were well attended.

ACSM was difficult to evaluate as there was no marketing plan to act as its engine. Individual NGO SM plans either did not exist or were unavailable. There were huge data discrepancies in regard to the reporting of SM events as submitted by different PNGOs. Many did not play a proactive role in community mobilization. There was a lack of strategic direction and inadequate resource availability. Only 3.9% of the total budget was allocated to ACSM and it was observed that till December 2013, only 81% of this total allocated budget had been spent.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

The project consisted of four overlapping multilevel streams of centralized monitoring system. At one level, this made regular cross-checking of information possible. Yet at other levels due to its centralized nature, providing the right information at the right time was difficult. The first stream was led by the PIU, which was the main stream. The second stream had to do with Bureau of Non-formal Education (BNFE) central, which was headed by Director General (DG). This system was responsible for monitoring all the projects under BNFE’s remit. The PIU system was also subordinated to this mechanism. The third stream monitoring was conducted independently by the NGOs. The fourth stream led by UNICEF was basically a feedback system to the funders, but it also functioned as a safe-gap system and
facilitated needed external inputs such as tiffin, which was not central to the project but was needed by the learners who needed supplemental food.

One of strongest element of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system in this regard, was Government (GO)-NGO meetings where the reports by Monitoring Officers (MOs) were collated and feedbacks were given to NGOs. These meetings were participated in by all BNFE key staff inside and outside PIU and occasional UNICEF observers. However, with four streams of M&E in existence, there was definitely room for further integration of these streams into a more holistic and integrated system. Further investigation was needed in this domain.

The GoB is attempting to transform its M&E system from a conventional one into a more effective and efficient one within the context of Results-Based Management (RBM). Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (RBME) serves a facilitative role in installing meaningful RBM system. They have already started to progressively implement RBM into their primary education governance. Therefore, it makes sense to attempt at transforming the non-formal education (NFE) interventions like BEHTRUWC, to be managed through RBME. The following narrative highlights the potential for making such a change.

The project did not start out with a results framework (RF) or log frame so did not have any key indicators with which to assess progress. Although the project had a baseline, it was really a research report finding out what the needs were and what existed in the field. It was not a baseline which measured indicators at the beginning of the project that can be measured at other key junctures, midterm and final evaluation to see change and progress.

There was no way to use data to manage the project as it was not collected in a method which allowed this and as it was not ‘right now’ or ‘almost right now,’ data, activities which showed needed interventions was long past the needed time when available.

Key Recommendations

**Basic Education**

1. That a cost benefit analysis of the overall program and components of the project, such as models implemented by different NGOs, is undertaken.
2. That a longitudinal study of at least one year is conducted to measure the success of the basic education component.
3. That a stipend program be developed to support working children to continue their education.

**Livelihood Skills Training**

1. That the children and community should acquire the skills to carry out rapid market assessment on the basis of simple action research principles as the market changes through time and can quickly change with the elimination or addition of some external element as even though a market assessment was conducted by a professional firm, this is not sustainable in the long-run.
2. That seed money should be commensurate with the minimum amount needed for business start-up for self-employment.
3. That after a specific period of successful demonstrated business, the graduate-entrepreneurs should get access to micro-credit facilities (current finances are not sufficient for start-up business capital).

4. That further investigation is done into how apprenticeship models could be used to facilitate the process of bringing non-traditional livelihood traditionally thought to be in the male purview to girls. This is because under this model, it is possible for government and NGO staff to track the apprentices and provide institutional support against any form of abuse in the workplace.

5. That at least one year of post training support is given to ensure that the livelihood intervention have become sustainable.

6. That entrance into skills training should be available as soon as a learner completed their basic educational training.

7. That seed money is available immediately upon completion of training as it is key to helping learners in their new occupations.

8. That more girls should be trained in other non-conventional areas like computer training, packaging, electronics, etc.

**Advocacy, Communications and Social Mobilization**

1. That a massive ACSM campaign on child rights, CRC, and other conventions be designed and geared up at both the local and national levels. Public figures or celebrities should be liberally engaged in those campaigns. Community Mobilization Committees should be trained on LC management to create ownership. They should play proactive role. In this regard, periodic training on roles and responsibilities should be organized. They should be trained on participatory monitoring.

2. That children be trained to act as change agents to advocate for their rights.

3. That more coordination and linkage with other Ministries and NGO networks be established so that efforts are maximized.

4. That sharper advocacy strategies be developed. They could include innovative activities such as publicity by celebrities, children’s concerts, etc. Corporate sector involvement like Dutch Bangla Bank’s scholarship program to poor meritorious would have created added enthusiasm. Public-private partnerships (PPPs) should have been explored. Along with the BTV, private TV channels could be approached to telecast the TV serials to cover a wider audience.

5. That priority is given to mainstreaming gender in policy and program design.

6. That the gender strategy document recommended in the MTE and worked on during the last half of the project be finalized.

7. That the recommendations of MTE be revisited and an action plan developed accordingly to include gender.

8. That evidence-based advocacy be undertaken.

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

1. A comprehensive M&E system is the backbone of sustainable project performance. A strong M&E system starts at the planning stage. First, the beneficiaries have to be carefully identified – which beneficiaries exactly the project will impact. Next, a strong RF needs to be developed in which the activities lead to the outputs which shows the behavior change at the intermediate results (IR) level. This shows what will be accomplished at the strategic objective level and finally lead to the goal being accomplished. Without this, it is difficult to know if programs have succeeded or failed, if the expected results are not clearly articulated. The RF serves as a key tool in the development landscape, enabling practitioners to discuss and establish strategic...
development objectives and then link interventions to intermediate outcomes and results that directly relate to those objectives. A strong RF captures the essential elements of the logical and expected cause-effect relationships among inputs, outputs, intermediate results or outcomes, and impact and facilitates in the writing of the proposal.

At implementation, both of these need to be revisited to see if they still apply. When they have been revised, the M&E Operational System needs to be immediately developed. This is usually developed in a workshop which includes all of the key primary and secondary staff and M&E managers. Key in this is a stakeholder analysis which determines which stakeholder needs to be identified about what and in what order and when. Next is a mapping of each IR or a data flow map which shows each key activity in the IR, helps determine what kind of data needs to be captured to make sure it is working well. This leads to the development of the tool to capture that data and by whom and then to whom it is sent. This allows to see the flow of data-gathering and report forms and how they relate to each other. It also makes sure the correct data is captured at all points in the project, e.g., baseline, training, evaluation, etc. This further results in the development of reporting instruments which allow close observation of all the project activities and immediate access to key inputs, outputs, and indicators.

2. If a similar project was undertaken in the future, it needs a robust RBM&E system, according to the very basic guideline provided above. This was expected to significantly help the cause of effective and efficient implementation of the project.

3. Rather than entering huge amount of data centrally which takes time, data entry could be initiated at the field level. Currently, field information is being collected and delivered electronically by NGOs. This apparently has not reduced the workload at the central management information system (MIS). Therefore another data-entry level should be introduced at the program officer (PO) level at the district. The volume of data collection ought to be reorganized to ensure timely information flow to the relevant decision-centers. This would create a system of having ‘right now’ or ‘almost right now data’ from which the project could be managed. The collected information then could be fed into central system and processed subsequently for reporting and feedback. Collecting data at the field level will provide opportunity for the field offices to partially analyze information and take action. This decentralized arrangement could serve the necessity for timely interventions quite well.

4. Selecting centers based on computer generated random tables for monitoring can cut down workload to a considerable extent and still ensure that the findings are representative.
1. Introduction

According to the 2011 census, Bangladesh has a population of 149,772,364 people, of which 39.7 percent are under 18 years old. The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) has reported that “In Bangladesh, around a third (34 percent) of pre-school age children are not in school. The rate of exclusion was lower for primary school-age children at 16.2 percent but rises sharply for lower secondary school-age children at 30.7 percent. Literacy rates for girls stand at 80.4 percent, compared to boys at 77.1 percent in the 15 to 24 year olds. Many girls and boys who work do not have access to education and become trapped in low skilled, low return work, which further cements them into the vicious cycle of poverty. The working children are involved in many different types of work, many of them with little or no pay, and some of them hazardous. The picture was particularly bleak for working children and adolescents in urban slums. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), 4.7 million children work in Bangladesh, 19.1 percent of them are in the slums. In Dhaka alone, “the number of working children aged 5-17 was estimated at 750,000, or 18.6 percent of all children.”

To address the problem of out-of-school children (OOSC), the Government of Bangladesh (GoB) developed strategies aligned with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Education for All (EFA) Dakar Framework (particularly Goals 2, 3 and 6) which utilize non-formal education (NFE) opportunities. The Reaching Out-Of-School Children (ROSC) and Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Working Children (BEHTRUWC) Project 2nd Phase are two GoB projects executed by the Directorate of Primary Education (DPE) and the Bureau of Non-formal Education (BNFE) respectively.

The BEHTRUWC Phase 2 project was designed as an intervention to address the educational needs of poor urban working slum children. As a follow up to Phase 1, it was also an attempt to accelerate the Bangladesh National Plan of Action for Education for All.

The project was supported by the GoB, UNICEF, the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and implemented by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) of BNFE under the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MoPME).

The project had two primary areas of intervention – Basic Education (BE) and Livelihood Skills Training (LST). Advocacy and Social Mobilization (with a focus on capacity building, gender considerations) and Program Management, including monitoring and evaluation (M&E), were components of both of these areas.

---

8 Phase 1 was implemented between 1997 and 2004.
The BE component was implemented in the six divisional capitals by 20 non-government organizations (NGOs) through four stages starting between June 2006 and July 2008. Each stage was comprised of 40 months divided into five cycles. The last stage ended in October 2011. 166,150 hard to reach urban working children attended classes at 6,646 Learning Centers (LCs) that passed through the BE portion of the project. The gender balance was at least 60% female throughout the project, with higher passing rates for girls than for boys. The five subjects covered were Bengali, Mathematics, English, Social Science and Life Skills up to between the equivalent of Bangladesh Primary Grades 3 and 5. The students were taught by 6,563 teachers who were in turn were supported by 657 supervisors. Each teacher received short-term basic training (pedagogical skills, primary school subject matter, monitoring, evaluation and reporting) before they entered the classroom and refresher training sessions.

The Livelihood Skills Training (LST) component was implemented in three stages, starting from July 2010 and ending in December 2013. To be included in the skills training program, a student had to have graduated from the BE program and received a high academic score on their national test, were 13+ years of age, unmarried, and their parents or guardians were willing to let them participate. 20,130 of the BE learners qualified and entered skills training programs following 4 different modalities: Modality 1 through five partner NGOs and modalities 2, 3 and 4 following the UNICEF Program Cooperation Agreements (PCA) model. In Modalities 1 through 3 students were trained at training centers, while in Modality 4 (administered by BRAC) the students were apprenticed to Master Craft Persons (MCPs). After completing the training 99% of students were given seed money in order to support their employment or self-employment options.

With a total budget of US$42.157 million, UNICEF provided US$5.000 million; Sida, US$23.922 million; and CIDA, US$11.399 million. The financial contributions of both Sida and CIDA were channeled through UNICEF to the GoB. CIDA funding ended 30 April 2012 and Sida ended 31 December 2013. However, the project will officially close on 30 September 2014.

The project had to undergo multi-staged review and scrutiny before it could be implemented. It conducted a baseline survey and developed a results framework, which are instrumental for carrying out meaningful M&E activities. It also developed a multi-layered monitoring system with predefined monitoring information to collect and analyze. From that standpoint, the M&E system along with its overall mode of operation was well-structured.

The implementation was delayed on numerous occasions. First, there was delay in NGO selection. The MoPME was initially responsible for NGO selection, and therefore the selection was effectively not in the Project Implementation Unit's (PIU) hand. The NGO selection was later expedited through UNICEF, who were delegated the responsibility of selecting NGOs by the Ministry.

As the project was being implemented, it stalled in different stages. Firstly, there was a time gap between basic-literacy and livelihood training. This gap was particularly negative for the project since the target population was movable in nature. Therefore, it made it more difficult to reorganize the children for livelihood activities. There was also a time lag between livelihood training completion and receiving of seed money. This created problems for children who were keen to apply their skills gainfully in the shortest possible time. In between, there were reports from NGOs of inputs not provided to the training centers on time by BNFE. At times, the materials...
were reported to be insufficient and of sub-standard quality. However, these complaints were not frequent and for a large project such as BEHTRUWC, it appears that these inconsistencies were within acceptable limits. Since M&E was input oriented, it was able to follow-up these discrepancies and take necessary measures for rectification.

The M&E system was weak in monitoring qualitative dimensions like teaching/learning, quality of interaction between teacher and learners, as well as the nature of participation and commitment by the communities.

The four monitoring streams were carried out independently, with little integration between each stream to share information and take action on a regular basis. One of the strongest elements of the M&E system in this regard was Government-NGO (GO-NGO) meetings, where the reports by Monitoring Officers (MOs) were collated and feedback were given to NGOs. These meetings were attended by all key BNFE staff, both inside and outside PIU. UNICEF occasionally participated as observer members. However, with four streams of M&E in existence, there was room for further integration of these streams into a more holistic and integrated system.

A number of NGOs informed the team that their internal M&E reports were not accepted by the PIU which caused delays in the disbursement of operating money. This delay was widely prevalent in the project management system of the government. Even though this problem was reported through M&E mechanism, the system did not have sufficient flexibility to take swift action to redress the issue.

1.1. Theory of Change

Figure 1:
BEHTRUWC Results Framework

The project's objective (Figure 1) was to enhance the life options of the urban
working children and adolescents to access their rights to education, protection, and development participation by:

- Providing quality non-formal, life-skills-based BE to 166,150 urban working children and adolescents ages 10 to 14 years, of which at least 60% were girls;
- Providing 20,130 (out of 166,150) urban working children and adolescents (13+) with livelihood skills training and access to support systems to ensure optimal use of life-skills-based BE to improve their lives;
- Advocating at City and National levels for education, social, and economic policies in favor of working children and their families and for protecting children from hazardous working environment; and
- Increasing the awareness of all relevant stakeholders to act in favor of progressive elimination of child labor.

Initially, the project contracted 20 NGOs to provide 40 months of BE which included literacy and numeracy to 166,150 (Table 1) hard-to-reach, urban working children, 10-14 years, in the six divisional9 urban cities of Bangladesh (Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna, Rajshahi, Sylhet, and Barisal), but it ultimately reached 166,150 children and included additional sites in Narayangonj, Gazipur, Keranigonj, Savar, Sitakunda, and Hathazari. It was recognized that BE was not enough to fully support working children and so 20,130 children who had completed the BE component and passed the selection test at a high level were given six months of LST provided by five partner NGOs, as well as MAWTS, BRAC, and UCEP. The learners in both the BE and the skills components were 60% girls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th># of LCs</th>
<th># of learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>August 2007</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>32,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>51,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>31,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>166,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This final evaluation will document good practices, note gaps, and lessons learned since the 2008 Midterm Evaluation (MTE) so the GoB and particularly the BNFE and development partners (UNICEF, Sida, and CIDA) would be able to plan future programming for education of OOSC and to promote inclusive education sector development within the ongoing Third Primary Education Sector Development Program (PEDP3).

### 1.2. Purpose of this Evaluation

BEHTRUWC Phase 2 was implemented between 2008-2014 and will officially end on 30 September 2014. Both of the two major activities - BE and LST - ended earlier, October 2011 and December 2013 respectively.

---

9 When the project was planned and initially implemented, there were six divisions. Rangpur became Bangladesh’s 7th division on 25 January 2010 and was not factored into the project.
The main purpose of this evaluation is to assess the overall impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability of the BNFE-implemented BEHTRUWC project, funded jointly by UNICEF, Sida, and CIDA so as to provide the implementers and funders with appropriate policy directions and tools for the development of a further iteration permanently housed with the GoB. The results are also intended to have a global applicability to inform similar projects in other countries.

The lessons learned will help the Bangladeshi government and funders to review the merit and worth of this strategy and to determine a way forward. In addition, the answers to the evaluation questions will enable the funders to fine-tune their future education programming in Bangladesh.

1.3. Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are to measure and examine the outcomes, outputs and strategies of the project in terms of quantity and quality against the set project targets and intended results. It will also evaluate the project results at output and outcome level, particularly in terms of its contribution to BE, livelihood skills, social mobilization (SM) and communication, gender equality and project management in the context of Bangladesh.

With 60% of the target group of beneficiaries of children aged 10-14 years being girls, the evaluation will assess if the benefits of the BEHTRUWC project reached the intended target group with adequate gender sensitivity and created knowledge on strategies to deal with inequities in effective coverage of education for this age group, especially girls. The lessons learned and good practices documented in this final evaluation were used to support the MoPME, particularly the BNFE, in evidence-led adjustments to increase the equity focus of the BEHTRUWC project in urban areas under the second chance education component of PEDP3 for reduction of OOSC.

The lessons learned from the BEHTRUWC strategy will also inform UNICEF’s emerging multi-sectorial focus on urban poor areas which includes promotion of NFE and livelihood skills and provide an opportunity to refine the strategy further. Together with the UNICEF’s study on OOSC, this evaluation will provide paired evidence for advocating with the Government and expanding partnerships for more inclusive strategies and interventions to tackle the adolescent development challenges in the country.

1.4. Scope of Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project; as well as its key strategies and major components – BE, livelihood skills, SM and communication, project management (including monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, and GO-NGO partnership). It will pick up from the MTE and will focus on the program from 2008 to 2014.

1.4.1. Target Group

The main target group for the BE program was OOSC, 10-14 years old, who live in urban slum areas in the six Bangladesh Divisions (See Map 1, page vi for the locations of Dhaka, Chittagong, Khulna, Rajshahi, Sylhet and Barisal) who were working in the informal sector and in their homes. The skills training target group were those learners who had graduated from the BE program and received a high academic score on their national test, 13+ years of age, unmarried, and parents or
guardians were willing to let them participate. The makeup of both groups was 60% girls and 40% boys.

1.4.2. Cross-cutting issues

1. As the project aimed to cover 60% girls, the evaluation will assess the physical coverage and equity dimensions, analyzing girls' participation across the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) criteria.

2. Given that the project was designed specifically for children out of school, and based on the findings of the on the ROSC\textsuperscript{10} study, the evaluation will assess the strengths and weaknesses of this strategy and recommend ways in which the successes can be upscaled, and the gaps filled to address the issue of out of school children in more sustainable terms.

3. As the project was predominantly led by the MoPME's BNFE, the evaluation will assess the extent of integration, harmonization and alignment that the project's processes imbibed into the government's own system in terms of results-based management, risk management and accountability. The extent of ownership of the strategy in terms of mainstreaming and government budget allocation and internal capacity of the government to promote the BEHTRUWC strategy into sector development policies and program will be addressed.

4. The Evaluation at all times kept in mind the rights of the claims holders, working within the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) to ensure that the focus of the evaluation is on furthering and upholding these rights.

1.4.3. Participation

The evaluation sought response to the evaluation questions under the different criteria from the children, implementing partners and the stakeholders of the project in the urban areas of the six regions where the project was implemented.

1.4.4. Key stakeholders

The key stakeholders of the project are the GoB in general and MoPME’s BNFE in particular, donor agencies Sida, CIDA, and UNICEF, the children of age 10-14 years in the urban areas of the six regions of the country, and the other implementing institutions affiliated to the BEHTRUWC project, as well as education sector partners.

\textsuperscript{10} Dilip Parajuli, (2004), Bangladesh - BD: Reaching Out of School Children II: P131394 - Implementation Status Results Report : Sequence 01, 02, and 03, World Bank.
2. Methodology

The team was charged with responding to the overall evaluation objectives listed above and looking at a set of evaluation questions, developed by UNICEF Bangladesh (BCO) and its partners, to assess the BEHTRUWC project. The evaluation questions formulated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) asked the team to both look back to form judgments about the value of BEHTRUWC and look ahead to recommend approaches for future Non-Formal Hard to Reach Children’s education interventions in Bangladesh.

2.1 Approach

The team applied a mixed-methods evaluation approach to best answer the evaluation questions. This included, but was not limited to:

- Review of key project documents (annual plans and progress reports, component strategies, research and review reports) to understand the objectives, activities, and reported progress of BEHTRUWC, and identify data related to the evaluation questions;
- The collection of primary and secondary information from the key informants (implementing partners and duty bearers), claims holders (BEHTRUWC graduates, parents, teachers and others related to the delivery of the project) through qualitative methods – Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).
- Wherever possible, quantitative analyses of project documentation were added to complement the findings from the qualitative data collection.

Figure 2 shows the framework that was developed to guide the process of undertaking the evaluations.

Ethical considerations are of the utmost importance and the Evaluation team conducted themselves with integrity and sensitivity, showing the highest level of respect to all participants. The team obtained informed consent from all participants prior to their involvement in the data collection process and are protecting their
identity as much as possible. Participants are referred to by role/job title and location, if necessary.

2.2 Evaluation Process

The team began work on 14 May 2014 in Dhaka, undertaking a preliminary document review, identifying key data sources, extrapolating and refining the evaluation questions, and preparing the conceptual framework and work plan. While in Dhaka, the team met with the Project Reference Group to present their data gathering methodology and find out more about what role each Reference Group member played in the project. Following on from this meeting, the team began to gather and analyze the key documents and to hold KIIs with reference group members to support the preparation of the inception report and evaluation tools. The team also met with a wide variety of stakeholders, ministries, BE and skills training NGOs, and NGOs who are doing parallel work to better understand the project and collect additional data. The Draft Inception Report was submitted on 1 June 2014 and the final Inception Report was submitted on 2 July 2014.

The team piloted their evaluation tools in Dhaka between 1 to 5 June 2014. Once these had been refined, the team divided into two field teams. Team 1 (Sandra Basgall and Zia-Us-Sabur) undertook the data collection in Dhaka, Khulna, and Barisal while Team 2 (Muhammed Nazmul Haq and Yasmin Ahmed) took Sylhet, Chittagong, and Rajshahi. In each city, the team met with BNFE and UNICEF officers and with their help they worked with partner NGOs who further identified various learners, teachers, supervisors, trainers, and other stakeholders who participated in interviews and FGDs. Each team was supported by a field assistant, who prepared detailed notes on interactions with stakeholders and provided translation/interpretation if necessary.

The team returned to Dhaka on 26 June 2014 to collate and analyze the data which in turn was used to prepare the Final Evaluation Report. Based on field findings and observation notes from various consultation and information gathered from primary and secondary sources, all the qualitative and quantitative data was compiled into a prescribed format. Outcomes of this compilation were analyzed using the DAC Framework for the reports with assessment of progress, achievement and recommendations based on the main project components within an evaluation rubric that covers relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

A draft report was submitted for Reference Group feedback on 13 July 2014. At the request of UNICEF, the team agreed to extend the deadline for submission of the Final Report to allow for feedback from other stakeholders, particularly Sida.

The following methods were used to undertake this evaluation:

2.2.1 Desk Review

A desk review of past reports including progress reports, previous evaluations, work plans, and meeting minutes was conducted (see Annexure 4 for a complete list). This included examination of other projects being implemented or planned in the NFE sector in Bangladesh and by UNICEF, particularly PEDP3, to ensure that the

11 The team started work on 1 May 2014, working from their home offices while waiting for the visa processing for the team leader.
12 The project reference group consisted of representatives from UNICEF’s Education and SSPME teams, CIDA, SIDA and the BNFE Project Director.
evaluation questions were well targeted to identify relevant lessons. The team gathered information related to each of the four main components of the project – quality BE, livelihood skills education, advocacy, social mobilization and communications (ACSM), and capacity building - which was complemented by assessment of interview data, to ensure a robust assessment through triangulation.

Data gathered through the desk research was used to inform and amend the evaluation plan and develop the literature review.

2.2.2 Key informant interview

Semi-structured KIs were used because of their ability to reveal insights and views about a project's performance from a range of stakeholders. For each KII, the team developed a unique interview guide to ensure that each Key Informant (KI) responded to the evaluation question for which he/she had been identified as a KI. By using a semi-structured format, the team balanced the requirement for ensuring respondents speak to all areas of importance to the evaluation, while allowing the respondent to make broader observations about BEHTRUWC’s performance that the team did not anticipate. Furthermore, whenever possible, the team took KIs one step further by including closed-response, survey-type questions. This permitted descriptive quantification of KI responses such as “seventy-three percent of KIs said the project was effective,” rather than “most” or “some” said.

2.2.3 Focus Group Discussions/Group Interviews

Group Interviews and/or FGDs were used with members of the community and project beneficiaries in different BEHTRUWC sites. The main goal of the FGDs was to gauge how different aspects of BEHTRUWC were perceived by beneficiaries and how perceptions from beneficiaries align or do not align with perceptions of the service providers including NGOs, BEHTRUWC project staff, and documents. Furthermore, the semi-open nature of the team’s focus group guides allowed beneficiaries to voice their opinion about important aspects of BEHTRUWC not anticipated by the team. FGDs were facilitated by a Bengali-speaking team member who followed semi-structured focus group guides. These FGDs helped the team validate project reports and to triangulate results identified through other methodological tools. They also explored best practices and issues related to BEHTRUWC’s sustainability as a component of the BE under BNFE and other institutions for the skills trainings, or be integrated into future projects.

2.2.4 Direct Observation through Site Visits

The team conducted field visits to different program sites to assess and validate the impact the program had on the learners, their families and community, and employers. By observing each different BEHTRUWC site, the team gained first-hand understanding of what worked or did not in different locations and why this may be the case.

13 Of the six Division Administrative Capital cities, the team visited four basic education learning centers and one livelihood skills NGO. This was 18 sites.
2.3 Sampling

Figure 3 shows the ‘Methods Map’ that was developed to guide the KII/Interviews and FDGs in the field visits. Drawing on assistance from UNICEF and BNFE field staff and BEHTRUWC NGO staff, the team planned to organize in each of the six Divisions:

1. Two focus groups (BE and Livelihood Skills) made up of 2 community members, 1 local elite, 1 employer, 1 local government member, 2 parents, and 1 local primary teacher.
2. Two BE NGOs (one with a strong program and the other with a weak program).
   - From each NGO, 2 LCs where 1 supervisor, 4 teachers, and 5 graduates could be interviewed.
3. One Livelihood Skills NGO
   - Teacher/trainer and 5 graduates.

This would have resulted in six each of interviews with UNICEF and BNFE field staff and BEHTRUWC NGO staff; 12 focus groups; interviews with 24 supervisors, 48 teachers, and 120 graduates across 12 NGOs involved in the BE component; and
interviews with 6 project managers, 6 teacher/trainers, and 30 graduates across six NGOs involved in the LST component.

This is a reasonable sample size given the time available and the expected outcomes of the evaluation. Based on this sample size, adequate qualitative and quantitative results could have been extrapolated. This approach to sampling was selected to ensure sufficient data was collected at each of the urban centers and from a range of NGOs and learning centers. The methods and the tools were developed to ensure consistency between locations.

2.4 Limitations

As with many research and evaluation projects, it was necessary to modify the original evaluation plan to better reflect the situation in the field and to take into account unanticipated constraints. The following section highlights a number of the limitations that this evaluation faced that were beyond the control of the team:

- **Unable to achieve expected sample size for either project component due to program closure** – the urban working poor by nature, are a transitory population and the time lapse between the end of project activities and the evaluation meant that it was difficult for the team to identify any of the primaries in the program as the learners and their families were no longer in the area. Similarly, NGOs who no longer had projects in the area had closed their offices, and project officers, teachers and supervisors had taken other jobs or moved away. The smaller sample size of respondents means that the evaluation team was not able to make any statistically definitive judgments.

- **Recall bias** - as there was a significant time period between the evaluation and the last BE, class the learners who were surveyed did not remember much of what they learned, other than subjects and the titles of a few of the books they used. Neither the teachers nor supervisors who could be found had any of their attendance ledgers or other files. With the Skills Training ending December 2013, there were participants available who had not yet received their seed money that the team was able to meet with, but again in too small a number to make any definitive findings.

- **Selection bias** - given the small number of respondents available in each location and that they had not been tracked following the end of the project, the team had to rely on a ‘snowball’ technique to find graduates, teachers, supervisors, parents, employers, community members. This involved finding one or two respondents who were willing to then refer the team on to their own contacts. This resulted in a self-selecting sample and not a broad representation of participants. There is also a risk that this resulted in a response bias, with only people with positive experiences with BEHTRUWC responding. All participants provided the team with positive responses, with the majority wanting to know why BEHTRUWC could not be extended and what and how soon a similar program would take its place.

- **Time constraints** – the evaluation was originally planned to be 16 weeks but was reduced to 12. This gave the team limited time in each location to identify hard-to-reach participants and to undertake the interviews and FGDs. Additionally, because most of the potential respondents were at work, the short timeframe meant that many could not be available due to work constraints. Connected to this, the evaluation was ambitious and had a wide-ranging set of evaluation
questions (32 questions in all, each with sub-questions). The 12-week timeframe meant that in order to address all of the questions, the team was not able to undertake an in-depth investigation into any one area.

- **Personnel constraints** – the evaluation was conducted at a time when each of the donor partners and BNFE had competing demands and priorities, including annual and midterm reviews for a large primary education sector programme. This made it difficult for them to provide feedback to the team within the very tight timeframes that the overall project timeline demanded. The team did have one meeting with the donor partners and a few Reference Group Meetings. Also, given the lapse in time between project activities ending and the evaluation taking place, there were a very limited number of stakeholders, both in Dhaka and in the field, who had been involved in all aspects of BEHTRUWC, through inception, implementation and finalization. Many had not been involved in the implementation at all. This, combined with the unavailability of key stakeholders, meant the team was receiving critical information after it was needed.

To accommodate these constraints, the evaluation became more qualitative in nature than was originally planned. The team has relied on secondary data obtained through reports, and documents provided by UNICEF, BNFE, Sida, CIDA, and a number of NGOs who worked on the project to undertake quantitative analyses.
3. Basic Education

The objective of the BE component under BEHTRUWC was to provide quality non-formal, life-skills-based BE to 166,150 urban working children and adolescents ages 10-14 years, of which at least 60% were girls.

146,942 learners completed the 40-month BE project. Of this number, 59.77% were female and all fitted within the targeted age bracket. The evaluation of the BE component of BEHTRUWC aimed to capture learner achievement, curriculum, teaching learning materials, and pedagogy. Besides these, learner's attendance and dropout information were also sought. The findings in this section draw on 12 interviews with more than 30 graduates and about six focus groups with more than 20 individuals. The observations and conclusions are drawn from available documents, previous evaluation reports, and sporadic information obtained from casually collected samples throughout the term of the project. The evaluation was done on a priori judgment on the basis of certain change effects and relevant prior documentations.

3.1 Relevance

The evaluation team looked at the relevance of BEHTRUWC in terms of its alignment to the priorities, policies and obligations of the GoB, as well as how it addressed the constraints and needs of the learners.

3.1.1 Alignment with GoB objectives

The BEHTRUWC project appears to be firmly grounded with national EFA goals number 2: “Ensuring that by 2015 all children, particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities, have access to, and complete, free and compulsory primary education of good quality” and number 3: “Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life-skills programmes.” Goal 2 addresses children in difficult circumstances. The urban working children operate under very difficult socio-economic conditions. This makes them ‘hard to reach’ as the title of the project suggests. In addition, Goal 3 addresses the needs of the young and adult people. Considering the reality of the situation, realizing that perhaps it is not possible to withdraw children from work due to abject poverty, the project has resorted to a realistic compromise, by providing BE in a non-formal setting. Providing education to all, including the under privileged and working children, is a constitutional obligation of the government and the BEHTRUWC was an appropriate project to support the government in this area.

As per the national NFE Policy Framework, all BE should be a continuous process, i.e., after each education course, children and youths should get an opportunity to continue to the next logical level. The design of BEHTRUWC did allow for this type of option for the children. Any future project should consider a long-term continuing education scheme that enables learners to continue their education following any short-term NFE project.

Mainstreaming some of the NFE graduates was one of the objectives of this project, but it was not a simple task because their age was significantly higher than the learners who started their education within the mainstreamed system. New policy and mechanisms would be needed to bring all learners of different age groups into the same class to study in the same grade and to include NFE learners in the
mainstream. This is also likely to require additional training for teachers to support them in the classroom.

Like formal education, NFE was also a constitutional education stream. Different streams like primary, secondary and college education have separate cadre of people managing the programs and it was equally important to have separate cadre of people to run the non-formal education in the country. Supporting an NFE stream requires specifically trained and skilled officers to fulfill the obligations of the government in this area. Currently, civil servants from other ministries are assigned to accomplish the senior managerial tasks within BNFE.

### 3.1.2 Addressing the needs of learners

BEHTRUWC, the team was told by the majority of the respondents, has been the most relevant project in Bangladesh to educate urban slum working children and adolescents. Before BEHTRUWC, 36% of the working children never attended school and of those who did, there was a 52% dropout rate from primary school and only 6 percent went beyond the primarily level\(^\text{14}\) (Figure 4).

The majority of these urban working children failed to obtain education and did not have skills that would help them to escape extreme poverty. Under the BEHTRUWC 2\(^\text{nd}\) Phase project, over 166,000 of children obtained BE equivalent to Grades 3 to 5. Previous research shows that unless a learner attains at least this level of BE, no skill training was effective.\(^\text{15}\)

![Figure 4: 2005 Literacy Levels and Progression of Urban Working Children.](image)

The project’s success emerged from the integration of basic and livelihood skills education together. All parents, teachers and community leaders unanimously appreciated the design of the project. Some highlighted aspects of the education project were:


\(^\text{15}\) Judith O. Wagner and Michael E. Wonacott, (2007), Basic Skills Deficient Youth, No. 36, Youthwork Information Briefs.
• The BE responsibility was given to a limited number of NGOs instead of the large number that were used in Phase 1. This made management of the NGOs and their services easier and they covered more students so they could exploit economies of scale.
• Curriculum was centrally designed and adopted on the basis of CRC, ILO conventions and consistent to the national curriculum competencies.
• Educational activities were provided in times and locations that worked around children’s working hours.

3.1.3 Gender mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming is an institutional and cultural transformation process which should eliminate gender biases at all levels and areas of society: incorporating gender awareness into policies, programs and institutional reforms, developing gender sensitive tools to monitor progress and ensure accountability, involving men to end gender inequality are all necessary. The gender dimensions and inequalities that exist within the household and in the community are deeply rooted in the social settings and need to be explored using gender analysis. How far this analysis was done before designing BEHTRUWC is not clear. As it appears, the only gender component was an artificial higher attendance rate 60:40 for girls than boys, but considering when the project was planned, gender analysis and planning was in its infancy and it is logical that a full complement of gender action was missing. If the project is to be replicated, gender analysis needs to be started at the planning stage and make front and center of the project through to the final evaluation.

Except for deliberate targeting girls, mainstreaming gender was not planned systematically. During project formulation, gender analysis was not done. The project failed to address the strategic needs of the girl child workers who face sexual abuse and discrimination in terms of wage, hours, working conditions, terms of employment, sexual exploitation, etc. No gender indicators were set to monitor the progress of gender relations and gender status of the project. As the situation of working girls living in urban slums is rapidly changing, so are their needs and aspirations. Due to the rigidity of the project, it was not responsive to those changing needs. The project activities should have been reviewed in the light of mainstreaming gender and recommendations of MTE and should have been taken into consideration.

3.2 Effectiveness

The evaluation focused on how the BE component had improved the learning outcomes for hard-to-reach urban working children, particularly girls. The children and adolescents who got the opportunity to be involved in the BE program were highly enthusiastic about the program, particularly the girls who were serious about education and believed it was a way out of early marriage and poverty. Boys were involved in various strenuous occupations so it was more difficult for them to give more attention to education. However, the achievement results show a uniformity in scores, signifying the effectiveness of the program in improving children’s educational outcomes.

3.2.1 Curriculum

The BEHTRUWC curriculum which was specifically designed for the program was delivered by teachers, supported by supervisors, over five consecutive Cycles of 8 months. The curriculum, teaching, and learning materials (TLM) were developed by
a materials development team with significant experience in child-centered teaching methodologies and the curriculum was developed on child-centered CRC-based approaches. Five basic subjects, Bangla, English, Mathematics, Life Skills, and Social Studies, followed the formal education curriculum, Bangla and Social Studies were taught to Grade 5 level, while the other subjects followed curricula between Grades 1 and 4. The total curriculum was prepared to attain the intended competency level in a 40-month period. In addition to these studies, learners were given some life skills competencies which were relevant to their life style. These five subjects were common for all the five cycles in order of increasing difficulty up to the expected level. The curriculum for Bangla, Mathematics and English were closely based upon the GoB National Curriculum and Textbook Board (NCTB) competencies. The curriculum for Life Skills Basic Education (LSBE) was based upon UNESCO (2003) material, but was closely focused on the Bangladesh working children’s environment.

For both models (basic and life skills), the approach was logical since it made the materials relevant to the national and the local context. The curriculum and TLM were initially tested in a small number of pilot schools then modified as necessary before undergoing an approval process. Bangla was taught to the equivalent of Government Primary School (GPS) Grade 5, Math and English to Grade 3. Looking at the competencies, this provided an adequate level of literacy and numeracy and was probably reasonable for the Math curriculum as the teacher base was drawn from a pool only educated to Secondary School Certificate (SSC)/Higher Secondary Certificate (HSC) level. Math above Grade 3 starts to become significantly more difficult to teach.

Perhaps because of this type of multi grade competency level, the status of BE, though it claimed to be up to Grade 5, was not accepted by the mainstream primary schools. Those who want to continue their education after completing this BE were admitted either in Grade 3 or 4, depending upon their level of achievement.

A detailed matrix of the curriculum was given in the following Table 2. The matrix provides the general design of the curriculum, types of learning materials and options for teachers. All are indicated in the table so as to give an idea of its equivalence with the national curriculum for the mainstream school education. On the basis of this information, the similarities in contents that are used in both formal and NFE in the project can be ascertained.

---

### Table 2:
Curriculum matrix of the BEHTRUWC Basic Education Course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Cycle 1</th>
<th>Cycle 2</th>
<th>Cycle 3</th>
<th>Cycle 4</th>
<th>Cycle 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangla</strong></td>
<td>2 Text Books</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Core Readers</td>
<td>8 Core Readers</td>
<td>8 Core Readers</td>
<td>8 Core Readers</td>
<td>8 Core Readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 story books</td>
<td>13 Supplemental story</td>
<td>10 Supplemental story</td>
<td>10 Supplemental story</td>
<td>9 supplemental story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
<td>Teacher guide and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
<td>teaching aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Supplemental story</td>
<td>4 Supplemental story</td>
<td>3 Supplemental story</td>
<td>4 Supplemental story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics</strong></td>
<td>2 Text Books</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
<td>1 Text Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Supplemental materials</td>
<td>3 Supplemental materials</td>
<td>3 Supplemental materials</td>
<td>3 Supplemental materials</td>
<td>3 Supplemental materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Activity kit</td>
<td>6 Activity kit</td>
<td>4 Activity kit</td>
<td>4 Activity kit</td>
<td>No Activity kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life Skills</strong></td>
<td>No text book</td>
<td>1 Activity Book</td>
<td>1 Activity Book</td>
<td>1 Activity Book</td>
<td>1 Activity Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 discussion pt. on self,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>family and surrounding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 discussion pt. on rights,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 discussion pt. on manner,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>environmental justice,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>drug, health etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Activity kit</td>
<td>10 Posters and a</td>
<td>4 Posters and 4</td>
<td>2 Posters and 2</td>
<td>3 Posters and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supplementary books</td>
<td>supplementary books</td>
<td>supplementary books</td>
<td>supplementary books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Studies</strong></td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>1 Activity Book</td>
<td>1 Activity Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 discussion pt. on country,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people, environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Science etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 discussion pt. on country,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>history, culture, human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resource, special day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Posters and 2</td>
<td>2 Posters and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supplementary book</td>
<td>supplementary book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2.2 Learning materials

The MTE evaluated all the learning materials and found them to be very good based on the NCTB curriculum. There were eight or more supplementary learning materials
for each cycle. The purpose of these supplementary materials was to increase the learners’ motivation to learn and develop their reading and comprehensive skills. As per the MTE, these materials were developed and pre-tested prior to final printing and distribution. After the MTE, the same materials were used by the project without any change. This final evaluation team also did a rapid scan of the learning materials and found them to be well targeted, both in terms of text and context for the targeted population. Their analysis corresponded to that done in the MTE.

The review of textbooks and supplementary readers that the material found cover appropriate areas of knowledge, skills and understanding, and follow a logical development in skills. The LSBE material addresses the learning paradigm in the sequence of:

**Knowledge ➔ Attitudes ➔ Skills ➔ Behavior Change**

Stakeholders including teachers, supervisors and NGOs interviewed, mentioned that the quality and quantity of material was just right and very suitable for the working children. The basic books were written in interactive mode with lots of illustrations and exercises. These materials developed were a deviation from the regular formal school materials. The curriculum and teaching learning materials were developed in such a practical manner that only five teachers and supervisors that the team interviewed, found them to be difficult to use. Moreover, the contents and teaching styles were rigorously practiced in the regular refreshers training for teachers so that the outcomes of teaching remain equivalent throughout all the LCs over the country. However, the equivalence of this education with the mainstream was not done.

Design of the materials was child-friendly, though in Bangla and English reading books, the context of some stories were not always relevant to the working children’s environment. The English readers in particular were designed for a developmental age of 4-7, not the 10-14 age range of BEHTRUWC learners. Yet the learners seemed to enjoy the books and other teaching learning materials. Text and supplementary reading books had colorful pages with simple illustrations and vocabulary, and book-based materials were supplemented with participatory “hands-on” materials like flash cards, games, and posters in all subjects.

The above observation was made on the basis of available documents and comments made by teachers, supervisors and project personnel from UNICEF and BNFE.

### 3.2.3 Attendance

Attendance of learners as well as teachers is a salient feature of effectiveness in any educational program. As all the LCs and project activities in the field were closed prior to the evaluation with the last class taught in 2011, the team had to rely on the available project documents. On the basis of documented information, learners’ average attendance at each stage was appears to be satisfactory, as shown in Table 3.
Table 3:
Stage wise attendance rate of learners in the project’s learning centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Mean attendance</th>
<th>Range of attendance of NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>65.00 – 89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>73.83</td>
<td>20.84 – 90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>83.23</td>
<td>75.00 – 91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>73.77 – 90.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than at Stage 2, the mean attendance rates seem to be satisfactory given that for working children, attending LC regularly was quite difficult. The rate varies according to NGO and stage. Except in a few cases, the majority of PNGO reported their attendance rates to be satisfactory. Two PNGOs expressed dissatisfaction in this area in an FGD held in Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE). Interviews of parents, employers and teachers suggest that the reasons for absenteeism were migration or shifting work place, family poverty, unwillingness of the child, and unattractive teaching in the center.

3.2.4 Gender

The status and opportunities for working children are particularly bleak for child domestic workers (74% of which are girls) who work with little or no pay and often work from dawn late into the night. They are deprived of rest, recreation, playing, or fun. More than 50% of them have never been to school. They are the most vulnerable sections of the society in terms of exploitation, sexual abuse, and violence. Multiple deprivations affect their physical and mental development. This disguised form of hazardous child labor has not been recognized and there is no legal protection for these girls.

Tremendous efforts in the past decade have been successful in getting more girls into school, resulting in gender parity in enrolments in primary and lower secondary schools, but the dropout rate is still very high.

Education is the most effective tool for gender empowerment. To achieve gender equity in BEHTRUWC, the gender ratio was 60% girls and 40% boys. This deliberate choice brought high premium for girls. Approximately 88,161 girls received BE and 7,239 received LST. Girls performed better in all the subjects which proves when given opportunity, they will succeed. The girls’ performance was equally good in assessment test. As more girls were targeted, the girls’ enrollment (62.5%) was higher than the boys in all divisional cities (Table 4). Similarly, girls’ attendance (97.7%) was higher than the boys as well in all divisions. Sixty-six percent of girls and 67% of boys passed performance and knowledge tests successfully.

Table 4:
Stage completion rate of the working children in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>No. of boys</th>
<th>% of Boys</th>
<th>No. of girls</th>
<th>% of Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>15,313</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>24,312</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>39,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>10,840</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>17,440</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>28,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>22,917</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>42,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>16,735</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>28,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is encouraging to note that positive discrimination was made in some cases to provide life skills training to more girls. Life skill curriculum included some topics on gender, early marriage, dowry, and other areas important to girls. It was very effective and popular. The girls also received information on early marriage, dowry, health and hygiene during puberty. During in-depth interview of girl learners in Subidbazar, Sylhet, the girls commented that through life skill education, they are aware of gender and dowry issue, but 50% of the girls reported that they found it difficult to apply this knowledge to their own lives. It is worth noting that although the majority of girls in this project were child domestic workers (CDWs), the curriculum did not include these issues. Information on critical issues like security, social injustice, legal rights, sexual abuse or violence by family, community members, or employers were not included. The project has addressed the hardware and not the software issues.

In Stage 1, 30% of girl learners were also doing home-based work as compared to 7% boys. In Stage 2, 26% girls and 6% boys were involved in home-based work. It shows that the gender division of labor is strong in society. Also, more girls were involved in hazardous work such as domestic workers. In work outside of the home, gender parity was reversed with 48% girls and 52% boys. This creates more gender disparity as more boys receive LST than girls. Also, there is a gender imbalance in the amount of money girls working outside the home receive compared to boys.

### 3.2.5 Teachers

Gender disparities was observed in teacher recruitment. Mostly women teachers were recruited. In Stage 1, out of total 1,659 teachers, 1,448 (87%) were female. This picture is reversed in the case of supervisors, out of a total 200 supervisors, 71% were male. In Stage 3, out of total 2,071 teachers, 82% were female and supervisors, 69% were male. Although female teachers work for two and half hours, six days a week, they received only TK2,000 whereas supervisor's salary was increased to TK4,000, in recognition of the increased responsibility level. Perceived gender discrimination in terms of wage, extra work, and other facilities resulted in a significant teacher dropout.

Teachers were the backbone of the BE component. They were committed, hard workers. Sometimes they worked in two shifts. For good performance of the learners, their contribution was unparalleled.

The female trainees accounted for around 81%, owing to an overwhelming share of female teachers. The supervisors accounted for less than 18% of the trainees. In the case of the teachers, the share of female trainees exceeded that of the male with a 90:10 ratios in favor of the former. The reverse was true in the case of the supervisors training, as more than 62% of the supervisors were male.

Gender training was not organized for teachers or supervisors. One-hour session on gender and development failed to bring about the desired result. It was observed that conceptualization on gender was poor. Most of the teachers could not recall the content of the training. Even outsourcing of training was problematic in terms of quality as PNGOs reported.

Orientation training was not conducted for the teachers, supervisors or parents which was very vital.
### 3.3 Efficiency

In order to fully evaluate the efficiency of the BE component of this project and the specific activities within that, a cost-benefit analysis would be necessary. This is beyond the scope of this evaluation, which has focused on the management aspects and challenges of this project.

#### 3.3.1 Teachers and supervisors retention and performance

The role of teacher and supervisor are key to the effectiveness of an education program. In this project, different numbers of teachers and supervisors were recruited in different stages. Their numbers according to stage was shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>90.49</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>90.24</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>87.76</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>89.28</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>36.64</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.97</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 90% of teacher recruited in the project were female in all the stages while about one quarter to one third of the supervisors were female. The teachers, predominantly women, were paid half as much as the supervisors were, predominantly men. On the other hand, males were recruited more often to supervise the center activities. One reason for this is that travelling was prominent in supervision activity and therefore, male individuals were taken as supervisors.

The team’s investigations revealed that large number of teachers were HSC pass though some were college and university graduates. All of the supervisors were college and university graduates. The teachers’ and supervisors’ performance and attrition was found closely connected with their academic qualification. Those who had college degree performed better than the less educated people. However, the dropout rate among teachers was reportedly high among the more qualified teachers as they could get better paying jobs when they became available. Another reason for teacher attrition was their poor salary in the earlier stages. Later in the program, the salary amount was raised and the attrition rate decreased to the minimum, but teachers were still paid significantly less than supervisors. Dropout rates of the teachers and supervisors are shown in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>% dropped</th>
<th>No. of supervisors</th>
<th>% dropped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>40.22</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>43.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>32.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>41.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>36.21</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows that significant numbers of teachers dropped out during the cycles of each stage. The highest dropout rate of teachers was found in Stage 3 and lowest in Stage 2. The highest dropout of supervisors occurred in Stage 1 and lowest number in Stage 2. Overall, Stage 2 is found to be less affected by this rate of teachers and supervisors dropout than during other project periods. It is interesting to note that there was a higher percentage of supervisor dropouts in Stages 1 and 2 and teachers in Stages 3 and 4. This problem was dealt with by the PNGOs by recruiting new teachers. There were no options for the newly recruited teachers to obtain the previous trainings so newly recruited persons were attached to a more experienced teacher or supervisor for approximately a month as an apprentice to overcome the problem. However, the overall dropout rate needed to be more sustainably addressed.

### 3.3.2 Teachers and supervisors training

At the beginning of each stage, teachers and supervisors were recruited and 21 days of basic teachers training was given to teachers followed only by a 7-day refresher before starting each new cycle. It was mentioned by the PNGO staff that the supervisors did not receive the 21 days of basic training given to teachers but that they undertook other training along with the teachers. Excluding supervisors from basic training (21 days) was problematic because it created a deficiency in the supervisory skills as teachers and supervisors were not aware of each other’s responsibilities. BNFE sources do not agree with this finding, which suggests that teachers and supervisors were to receive the same training.

### 3.4 Impact

This evaluation looked at the impact the project had on retention and learning outcomes of learners, as well as the wider consequences on graduates, family and communities, and educational scenario of the country in particular.

#### 3.4.1 Learner’s Achievement

A total of 166,150 hard-to-reach urban working children aged 10-14 in the six divisional urban centers of Bangladesh received BE through 6,646 LCs for 40 months in five cycles of eight months each beginning with Stage 1 in July 2006 and ending with Stage 4 in October 2011. The education was provided to the targeted children in four stages from 2004 to 2011 (second phase of BEHTRUWC project). The distribution of LCs across the six project sites is shown in Table 7. The project achievement in terms of learning in the LCs and learners completion rate is shown in Table 8.

---

17 When the project was planned and initially implemented, there were six divisions. Rangpur became Bangladesh’s 7th division on 25 January 2010 and was not factored into the project.
Table 7: Learning Center (LC) Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>LC Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylhet</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barisal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khulna</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Number of LCs, learners’ enrollment and completion rates in all cycles*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One:  20*</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>44,195</td>
<td>5,805</td>
<td>11.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two:  16</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>32,750</td>
<td>28,778</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three: 24</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>51,775</td>
<td>45,815</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four: 17</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>31,625</td>
<td>28,154</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,646</td>
<td>6,629</td>
<td>166,150</td>
<td>146,942</td>
<td>19,208</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure indicates number of PNGOs involved in that Stage.

Table 8 shows that out of the targeted number of learners, slightly less than 90% completed all the five cycles. This was a very encouraging success rate. In the absence of actual center based documents, the enrolment figures were taken from different stage completion reports. However, authenticity of the figures could not be ascertained.

Table 9: Subject wise passing rate (%) of learners in different stages of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Range of all stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangla</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>56.49</td>
<td>76.97</td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>53 – 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>69.11</td>
<td>38.49</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>38 – 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>76.20</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>54.31</td>
<td>53 – 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>68.47</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>42.13</td>
<td>38 – 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>76.23</td>
<td>53.64</td>
<td>53.31</td>
<td>53 – 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>42.19</td>
<td>68.80</td>
<td>38.26</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>38 – 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>56.81</td>
<td>76.46</td>
<td>52.49</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>52 – 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>67.93</td>
<td>38.41</td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>38 – 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>56.96</td>
<td>75.83</td>
<td>52.09</td>
<td>54.37</td>
<td>52 – 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>68.40</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>41.15</td>
<td>37 – 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the passing rate of the learners (Table 9) was compiled from completion reports. In the absence of actual testing of learners, previously reported achievement rates in different subjects were used. It was assumed that if the
previous assessment was correct, then the conclusion derived from those results would be appropriate.

**Figure 5:**
Comparison in subject by gender and stage.

Table 9 and Figure 5 show that overall performance of girls was comparatively better than the boys. The passing rates of girls in all subjects in four stages ranged between 52% and 76%, while the comparable ranges for boys were 38% to 69%, which was relatively low. Research in development psychology shows that girls mature intellectually faster than boys and this may be the result of these differences, but without real research, no true explanation can be given.

The performance of learners shows that they did comparatively better in Stage 2 and relatively worse in Stage 4. Without actually being able to measure the student’s knowledge on a standardized test, the reason for this is unclear. Based on the evidence available to the team, such variations in different stages are perhaps due to teacher attrition rate, enthusiasm of the PNGOs, or just difference in how teachers graded. In earlier stages, staff of the PNGOs were highly vigilant and enthusiastic but enthusiasm gradually decreased over time.

### 3.4.2 Retention and dropout of learners

The overall student dropout was recorded as 11.56% and it ranged between 10.97% and 12.13% across the four stages. The figures are positive, but through the team’s discussions with PNGO personnel about student dropout it, was revealed that in the initial cycle, dropout positions were replaced by fresh learners and in the later cycles, dropout positions were filled up by learners moving from other PNGOs (whenever possible). As these were not reported in the attendance rates, it was difficult to verify the overall accuracy of the student dropout figure. It can be said that the rate of dropout in BEHTRUWC project was lower than the national average of 45%.
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In Stage 1, out of a total 7,286 dropouts, 4,093 were girls (56.2%). In Stage 3, out of 6,646 dropouts, 3,637 (54.7%) were girls, and in Stage 4, out of 3,503 dropouts, 1,776 (50.7%) were girls. Dropout rates were high in some areas due to change of location, high migration, early marriage, reluctance of parents, and distance to the LC. Due to social, religious, and cultural barriers, girls failed to complete the full course. In Sylhet for instance, three girls dropped out due to early marriage during one stage. It was reported that one teacher in Sylhet and another in Tongi, took the initiative to stop early marriage. There were probably more interventions, but they were not captured in the monitoring data nor were the reasons for dropping out. This needs to be tracked in the future.

3.4.3 Changes to lifestyles and families

Regarding individual and family life, it appeared from various interviews that a big qualitative change was brought about in the personal and familial life of the learners. Their individualistic change was reflected through their dress, talking style and attitude towards life. When invited for interviews, all of the learners, particularly girls, came in clean, modest clothing, were articulate and expressed a vision of their future. These young people expressed their desire not to be burden of their parents.

Similarly, discussions with family members showed that parents now:
- are more open about children’s freedom,
- wish to allow their children to continue their education so far it was possible,
- have less favorable attitude towards early marriage and traditional medicine, and
- have a desire for their younger children to be educated.

Girls faced uneven competition in attending LCs as they also had to do household and/ or look after their smaller siblings. Sometimes they brought young siblings at LC so they could attend school. Sometimes employers would not allow them to attend. No separate toilets were provided and this was a detriment to girl students and women teachers. Poor physical facilities in LC and the environment also discouraged adolescent girls.

The impact of BEHTRUWC will take time to be fully realized, yet there are signs from the parents and learners interviewed that most of the youngest children in the family will now go to either GPS or neighboring kindergarten. Interviewees were certain that should there have been no such project as BEHTRUWC, the graduates interviewed would have remained illiterate and an economically challenged member in the family. The 40-month long BE at least created an option for a child to continue education in the mainstream or choose LST for improving their life style and the economic position of the family. Even though the BE component only brought learners to the equivalent of Grade 3, a demand for BEHTRUWC graduates was
created among employers because of their ability to read, write and keep accounts to a minimum level compared to other workers who were illiterate.

3.5 **Sustainability**

The evaluation investigated the conditions under BEHTRUWC for sustaining the outputs and outcomes achieved under Phase 2.

3.5.1 **Sustainability of learning outcomes**

BEHTRUWC is somewhat different from previous NFE projects in that it had two components: BE and LST. The extended duration (40 months) of BE is a positive step in improving the sustainability of the learning, as research suggests that unless a child completes their primary level of education, they will not sustain their literacy or math skills.\(^\text{19}\)

In this project, Bangla and Social Studies were taught up to Grade 5 level. Other subjects, including English and Math, were only taught up to Grade 3 level. Therefore, it is expected that the competence of Bangla and Social Studies will be sustained longer than the other three subjects. However, the question of sustainability has close link with the practice of the subject in later life.

Slightly more than 166,000 children and adolescents were educated through BE, but only over 20,000 received LST. It is expected that sustainability of functional literacy would be higher among the graduates who obtained the additional six months of training, but those who did not receive the chance of additional training will be more prone for their learning to decay. Within 40 months, they will forget half of what they learned unless they continue reading or educating themselves by any other means. This hypothesis is supported by ‘literacy half-life’ theory.\(^\text{20}\) While evaluating the program activities, the team observed that around one third of the interviewed BEHTRUWC graduates had started to lose their reading and writing proficiency in the absence of practice.

The evaluation team conducted short written and oral tests in the interview process and found that the BEHTRUWC graduates who were selected for the skills training have better reading skills than those who only completed the BE part of the project. Those working in their skills development area had better reading and writing skills than graduates who are still unemployed. Moreover, those graduates who took the opportunity to teach their younger siblings what they had learned have better literacy skills than the graduates who did not. This finding signifies that sustainability of BE or literacy skills would be challenging for the children and adolescents who are not connected to any type of pro-education activities or constructive education work afterwards.

Sustainability of mathematical skills has some added benefits in that numeracy and math is a survival skill in the society and these skills are reinforced through everyday use. Graduates who need to calculate and measure are likely to retain their math skills.

\(^\text{19}\) Arran Stibbe, (2009), The Handbook of Sustainability Literacy: Skills for a Changing World, UIT Cambridge Ltd.
English sustainability was at high risk because there was very little opportunity for the graduates to use it. LST graduates were unable to carry on even a minimal conversation with the American member of the team and they have had the most exposure and perhaps will need it in the future. Merely remembering the English alphabet and some words was not useful for practical purposes. Therefore, English knowledge up to Grade 3 would have a shorter ‘half-life’ than Bangla knowledge, which is more applicable to their everyday life. The team’s experience with the BEHTRUWC graduates’ English skills does not differ with the hypothetical proposition. If the purpose of teaching English was to mainstream the graduate in primary school, then the subject should be taught at the Grade 5 level and maintain the equal difficulty level as it was for Grade 5.

The innovative life skills subject introduced in the program for the first time provided BEHTRWUC graduates with skills and knowledge applicable to their everyday lives. As a result of this course, the BEHTRUWC graduates behavior has changed to a great extent. It is likely that these skills will be sustained because they will be largely practiced in the graduates’ daily lives. Similarly, the information gained through the Social Studies, though it was included in the program from the fourth cycle, will be sustained because the subject deals with community, environment, and societal matters that graduates will face.

Learner assessment in the BEHTRUWC project was done through teacher-developed examination, which was not a reliable method. Formal evaluation is possible when a standardized achievement test is used for proper assessment. The development of a standardized achievement test should be applied to all so that any learner across the country can be evaluated and compared for further project or for mainstream inclusion.

3.5.2 Accessibility of project documents and learning materials

When the evaluation team began their work in May 2014, they found that all the LCs and their cycles had finished in 2011 and the offices of the working NGOs in the respective areas were closed. Under these circumstances, it was very difficult for the team to obtain the learning materials. After completion of the project, the unavailability of learning materials in BNFE and NGO offices tends to suggest that the issue of sustainability had not been planned for and no agency or individual has taken the responsibility of carrying over the result of the project and influencing the future plans in the same field. Thus the idea of creating an archive for all the relevant materials at the BNFE office is necessary.

3.5.3 Funding of future initiatives

Stakeholders within the GoB and their partners are undertaking discussions on how to take the lessons learned through BEHTRUWC and institutionalize them within a regularized educational program. Although these discussions are continuing, the planning and more importantly, the funds needed to support such a project have not been allocated. As there are real differences in the needs of non-formal working children, both urban and rural, than mainstream learners, these differences need to be addressed and planned for in the next iteration. Budgeting should take into consideration costs associated with learning resources, such as transportation, tiffin, books, stationery, that are often barriers for poor families.
3.6 Recommendations

3.6.1 Relevance

1. That any curriculum and TLM prepared are cognizant of and well targeted to the context of urban working children.

3.6.2 Effectiveness

1. That gender analysis is integrated into the planning process for NFE programs and strategies and is continued through the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.
2. That further investigation is done into the reasons that children dropped out of the BEHTRUWC program so that the lesson learned from this can inform strategies for GoB programs moving forward.
3. That emphasis is given to identifying and enhancing delivery mechanisms that promote appropriate gender inclusion.
4. That issues that particularly affect girls’ attendance and participation are further investigated and addressed.

3.6.3 Efficiency

1. That the possibility of using mobile networks to promote life skills, including gender awareness, sexual health rights, and other sensitive issues, is investigated.
2. That a cost benefit analysis of the overall BEHTRUWC program and components of the project, such as models implemented by different NGOs, is undertaken to inform strategies for GoB moving forward.
3. That future projects have mechanisms in place to collect accurate data regarding attendance and drop out rates.
4. That BEHTRUWC curriculum and TLM are made available to BNFE for reference and to inform future program activities.

3.6.4 Impact

1. That a longitudinal study of at least one year is conducted to measure the success of the BE component of BEHTRWUC to identify wider lesson learned.
2. That parental training on gender rights be included in programs.
3. That the possibility of resources such as local reading facilities and/or libraries be investigated to improve the sustainability of outcomes for NFE graduates.

3.6.5 Sustainability

1. That GoB looks to provide a pathway for continuing education for NFE learners, including options for mainstreaming.
2. That sustainable mechanisms are identified to support the retention of teachers and training of new teachers in NFE programs.
3. That a stipend program be investigated to support high performing children from poor backgrounds to continue their education.
4. Livelihood Skills Training

The objective of the LST component was to provide 20,130 (out of 166,150) urban working children and adolescents (13+) with LST and access to support systems to ensure optimal use of life-skills-based BE to improve their lives. LST was an experiment conducted within the BEHTRUWC project. The purpose of the LST intervention was to see whether the lives of the working children could be improved through appropriate child friendly and gender sensitive interventions and the theory was that an intervention such as this would break the cycle of poverty permanently.

LST was provided to 18,630 children, maintaining the gender balance in favor of girls across each of the four modalities. All of the children were over the age of 13 and there is some evidence that young people outside of the target age range for BEHTRUWC were also involved. There are four components of the project and among them LST is considered a major component. As per 2nd Revised Development Project Proposal (RDPP), there was an initial provision to provide LST training to 12,360 BE graduates. This was further extended to 20,130 according to RDPP.

This evaluation draws on 43 interviews and six focus groups across the six project sites. The sustainable livelihood framework (Figure 6) provided the basis for this evaluation. The framework shows that meaningful livelihood system are designed through implementation of multi-staged processes.

The sustainable livelihood framework provides a critical guide towards understanding how the livelihood intervention was conceptualized, designed and implemented. This framework is all the more relevant since sustainability it was identified as one of the core elements of the project and indeed, as far as the evaluation could tell at this point, was the element that really helped the graduates to overcome poverty. More longitudinal research though, is needed to confirm this assertion.

Livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks to maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets (while not undermining the natural resource base). For the purposes of the evaluation, dealing with environment was not within the scope of the project and therefore has not been dealt with. It is understood that the BEHTRUWC project was primarily interested to break the vicious cycle of poverty and lack of awareness about the significance of primary education. From that respect, it has done reasonably well considering resource constraints in reaching 166,000 learners within the context of prevailing governance related challenges.

Sustainable livelihood model could be further understood through five key elements. The first three focus on livelihoods, linking concerns over work and employment with poverty reduction with broader issues of adequacy, security, well-being and capability. The last two elements add the sustainability dimension, looking in turn at the resilience of livelihoods and the natural resource base on which in part, they depend. For the purposes of evaluation, only the first three elements were considered by keeping in view the projects original mandates.

The livelihood outcomes hinge on the following factors: creation of working days; poverty reduction; capabilities; and institutions. These factors have been used as guidelines for determining the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and outcomes.
Figure 6: Sustainable Livelihood Framework

1. **Creation of working days:** This relates to the ability of a particular combination of livelihood strategies to create gainful employment for a certain portion of the year. Sen\(^{21}\) notes three aspects of employment—income (a wage for the employed), production (employment providing a consumable output), and recognition (where employment provides recognition for being engaged in something worthwhile). In terms of the income/production aspects, various target levels have been suggested, but 200 days a year appears to be widely used as a minimum level to create a livelihood.\(^{22}\)

2. **Poverty reduction:** The poverty level is a key criterion in the assessment of livelihoods. Various measures can be used to develop an absolute 'poverty line' measure based on income or consumption levels.\(^{23}\)

3. **Capabilities:** Sen\(^{24}\) sees capabilities as "what people can do or be with their entitlements," a concept which encompasses far more than the material concerns of food intake or income. This may result in a range of sustainable livelihood outcome criteria, including diverse factors such as self-esteem, security, happiness, stress, vulnerability, power, exclusion, as well as more conventionally measured material concerns.\(^{25}\) In essence, the capabilities framework suggests that we consider what it is that people are free to do, as
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well as what they actually do.\textsuperscript{26} This aspect was investigated through individual interview and FGD.

4. **Institutions:** Institutional processes allow the identification of restrictions/barriers and opportunities (or ‘gateways’) to sustainable livelihoods. Since formal and informal institutions mediate access to livelihood resources and in turn affect the livelihood strategies, an understanding of institutions and organizations is therefore key to ensure effective and efficient delivery of livelihood interventions.\textsuperscript{27} Within BEHTRUWC, the investigation explored how the formal institutions (BNFE, UNICEF, and NGOs) interacted with informal institutions (communities, families, and marketing networks) in order to achieve expected livelihood outcomes (increased number of working days, increased capability, poverty reduction, i.e., increased income).

The BEHTRUWC urban livelihood scenario involved combination of employment and self-employment. In cases of self-employment, consideration of the children’s access to natural, physical, social, and financial capital becomes relevant for developing a meaningful livelihood strategy. It is perhaps a misconstrued perception that children who have migrated from the village do not have access to any form of capital. Upon investigation, it was found that many children’s parents go once or twice in a year to villages they belong, to recover money from paddy harvest, sell trees, or sell fish from jointly owned ponds. The financial amount earned from these small efforts are low or they would not have migrated, but provide further help in sustaining the family. They also accumulate social capital during the process of struggle for survival in the urban area where they work. An assessment of the access to and level of this capital should be used in developing viable livelihood strategies.

4.1 **Relevance**

Like with the BE component, the evaluation looked at the alignment of the design of the LST component to GoB policies and objectives, and the how the four models used addressed the needs of learners.

4.1.1 **Alignment to GoB objectives**

As with the BE component, LST is aligned to national EFA goals Numbers 2 and 3. Goal 3 in particular, addresses the needs of the young and adult people. Considering the reality of the situation, realizing that perhaps it is not possible to withdraw children from work due to abject poverty, the project resorted to a realistic compromise by involving adolescent children in their transition to adulthood, and by engaging them in safe vocational activities.

Section 6 of the National Education Policy and objectives mentions that the education system should address the socio-economic realities of the country and it should emphasize innovation, applicability, and economic productivity of the citizens. The provision of BE itself is not a guarantee for social and economic emancipation. BE enables children to develop the capacities to acquire greater capacities of


knowledge at a later stage leading to social and economic well-being. Even though under current reform, Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) system Pre-Vocational Levels 1 and 2 have been introduced where Grade 5 completers will get opportunity to enroll. Yet if the children get a compressed Grade 8 equivalent education recognized by the state, it enhances the capacity of children to immediately enroll in vocational education at Level 1. This will take them one step further in getting higher pay job in the formal sector.

The NFE section of the National Education Policy also links literacy to a means to acquire necessary life skills. The technical and vocational section of the policy provides a number of clear strategies. These include introduction of pre-vocational and IT-enabled education in primary education and that primary education will be extended to Grade 8. Pre-vocational education will begin at Grade 6. Those who are unable to continue their education will receive vocational education for six months, which will be equivalent to pre-vocational 1 education. The completion of pre-vocational education will then set the stage for acquisition of higher skills.

In addition, in order to give NFE and vocational skills initiatives a more meaningful and comprehensive direction, separate policies on NFE and skills development have been adopted. The NFE policy is grounded on the concepts of continuing and life-long education. It entails responsive and flexible contextual education delivery modes, involving all the concerned stakeholders including NGOs, communities, and wider participation of civil society. The Skills Development Policy seeks to “empower all individuals to access decent employment and ensure Bangladesh’s competetiveness in the global market through improved knowledge and qualifications that are recognized for quality across the globe.” The policy also identifies “skills development system to address the needs of a huge population by providing skills to enhance employability and secure safe and decent work.” The Skills Development Policy and NFE policy are complementary and mutually supportive, since both the policies are foregrounded on the principles of life-long learning.

The BEHTRUWC project vision is consistent with the policy statements and validates its relevance to national aspirations. It also embodies innovative and pragmatic compromise by engaging destitute underage children in safe jobs that could contribute to poverty reduction. Neither the families of these children nor the State currently have sufficient resources to provide education to these children by withdrawing them from the job market. However, by making this exception, the project has created the possibility of taking the children out from the poverty cycle. The strategy adopted by BEHTRUWC makes even more sense since by the time the children are provided with BE and livelihood skills, they have already reached their adulthood or are at the very least, at the threshold of adulthood.

### 4.1.2 Relevance of design

An investigation into how the project was conceptualized and what its strategic direction was provided insights into the processes and outcomes of the project. Table 10 shows the recommendations based on market analysis by USAID funded project
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entitled as JOBS. To the extent the project has been able to respond to these recommendations provide an understanding about the project’s ability to set the right conditions from the outset.

Table 10: Strategic Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Dimensions</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The technical training must be demand-driven.</td>
<td>The models have determined the livelihood skills based on market demand assessment by JOBS, a USAID funded project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be significant private sector involvement in technical LST.</td>
<td>The LST has been well represented by NGOs who are non-profit organizations. Private for profit organizations were not involved in the training as the target children cannot afford private training. Private sector representatives were involved in identifying competencies in selected trade courses and in developing Competency Skills Log Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The private sector should be engaged to provide actual trainings for adolescents in factories to provide immediate income generating opportunities to adolescents while ensuring their protection.</td>
<td>The conditions were not favorable to engage children in factory setting. The kind of livelihood training provided was more suitable for employment in small business and self-employment. This strategy appears to be more replicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trainings must be designed by an organization that has significant experience in developing similar workplace trainings for adolescents and is comfortable working with the private sector to understand its needs.</td>
<td>The project has done a good job on NGO selection. It has learned the significance of NGO selection from previously implemented NFE 3 project. All the NGOs involved had credible track record in livelihood training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More advanced business skills such as basic accounting and entrepreneurship should be taught to them in order to increase their general knowledge and marketability.</td>
<td>There were some basic elements related to general knowledge and marketability – including soft skills on financial management and communicative English in the apprenticeship model. However overall, this component was less pronounced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LSTs should include basic workplace education including basic hygiene and safety training.</td>
<td>This was one of the stronger points of the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.3 Learner Selection

Learner Selection Criteria for Technical Livelihood Skills Education were as follows:

- **Should be 13+ years of age:** According to the education policy, children are required to complete Grade 8 before they are eligible to receive vocational training. The expected age of Grade 8 completers is 13 years. Therefore, determining minimum age for BEHTRUWC children to receive LST was consistent with national education policy.

- **Should be unmarried:** This criteria, as revealed through investigation, had positive gender fall out, especially for girls. This precondition enabled girls to delay marriage and become more self-reliant. It could be further assumed that girls having received LST will be in a better bargaining position during marriage negotiation.

- **Should be able to show the completion certificates up to Cycle 3:** This was necessary to ensure minimum literacy skills. The livelihood trades selected did not require high literacy skills. As a result, the literacy requirement was downgraded to Cycle 3.
• Should have acquired Competency Level 1 at the end of Cycle 3 of BE course: This selection criteria is complementary to the criteria number 3.
• Should pass the pre-test to qualify for enrolling in to skills training course: This screening was done to select the most competent children possible within the above criteria.
• 60% should be girls: The ratio of girls and boys was 60:40 during basic literacy. Therefore, it made sense to maintain the same ratio during LST.
• Parents/Guardians/Employers are willing to permit the learner to enroll in the skills training course simultaneously with BE course up to Cycle: The consent of parents/guardians/employers was important since children are dependent on them. Their engagement in LST required their support. The evaluation team has not come across any instance where children were barred by parents/guardians/employers from joining LST.

4.1.4 Trade training provided in LST

The following table lists the LST provided to the children. These were selected through market demand assessment carried out by JOBS, a USAID funded project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Industrial Sewing</th>
<th>9. Refrigeration &amp; Air Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Jori Chumki and Embroidery</td>
<td>10. Plumbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hand Embroidery</td>
<td>11. Basic Masonry and Pipe fitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Block-Batik and Screen print</td>
<td>12. Electronics and Mobile Phone Repairing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jute and Paper bag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Beautician</td>
<td>13. Tiles Fitting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Electrical House Wiring</td>
<td>14. Mobile Phone (only hardware training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Motorcycle Service Mechanics</td>
<td>15. Servicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Tailoring and Dress making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranges of trades appear to combine both traditional and non-traditional aspects, but girls tended towards traditional, lower paying skills where they could stay at home and boys tended towards higher paying and traditional areas in which men work.

4.1.5 LST Models

The brief introduction of the NGOs involved in the implementation of LST through four models was as follows:

• Modality 1 – NGOs Model
Five NGOs - TMSS, NM, BDSC, Surovi, and SKUS – who collectively participated in Modality 1 are reputed NGOs who have long experience in literacy and skills development. Under BEHTRUWC, they provided low-level skills training to participants.

• Modality 2 – MAWTS Center-Based Training
MAWTS is a vocational training provider with a national reputation. It is a sister concern of Caritas, a faith-based NGO with global coverage. Since its inception in 1973, MAWTS has been imparting market oriented vocational and technical training to rural and urban youth. In addition to their elaborate training setup in Dhaka, MAWTS is responsible for eight Technical Schools located in eight districts.
Under the LST component of BEHTRUWC, MAWTS provided technical skills training to learners through their center-based training.

- **Modality 3 – UCEP Education-Skills Training**

  Underprivileged Children’s Educational Programs, UCEP-Bangladesh, is working with the distressed urban working children. Through the UCEP model, a child can complete 2 grades in a given year enabling him/her to complete Grade 8 in four and a half years, including six months’ of pre-technical schooling after completing Grade 8. Underprivileged children (girls above the age of 10 and boys above 11) with diverse abilities and backgrounds have access to UCEP schools.

  UCEP model apparently did not fit well with BEHTRUWC project. The UCEP BE is of a 46 months cycle equivalent to Grade 8, whereas BEHTRUWC is of 40 months cycle equivalent to Grade 3 in some subjects and Grade 5 in others. After placement testing, UCEP found that the BEHTRUWC BE graduates did not place at a high enough competency and were admitted again to Grade 3. As a result, the BEHTRUWC project will have to spend more than six years in total instead of the four and a half, had they entered directly to UCEP instead of BEHTRUWC. The BEHTRUWC graduates at UCEP have yet to finish their BE and have not yet started their skills training. They will receive no seed money as they will finish their program long after BEHTRUWC closes. Based on these issues, the UCEP model was excluded from the subsequent phases.

- **Modality 4 – BRAC Apprenticeship Model**

  BRAC, the largest NGO in the world, started in Bangladesh and early on targeted women and girls in their anti-poverty approach. Employing over 100,000, roughly 70% women, and reaching more than 126 million people in 14 countries, they are 70% to 80% self-funded through a number of commercial enterprises they have engaged. BRAC operated an apprenticeship model under BEHTRUWC, whereby students were placed in businesses and received on-the-job training.

### 4.2 Effectiveness

Within the Sustainable Livelihood framework, the evaluation focused on how effective the LST models were on improving the lives and livelihood options for learners and their families.

#### 4.2.1 Sustainable Livelihood Framework

Within the sustainable livelihood framework, the following aspects have been observed related to the effectiveness of the project.

1. **Increased number of working days:** Most of the children provided with LST are in their teens. It made sense to inquire about their working days. The more days worked, the more their chances of improved socio-economic well-being. Previously, more of the learners were either unemployed or employed in physically challenging, hazardous work with low income. The project facilitated the process of breaking this vicious cycle by creating provision of better working environment. It has not only resulted into slightly higher income, but also resulted into better well-being of the children, as well as better prospects for future enhancement of income. The children will be engaged in a minimum 200 days in the LST provided according to the minimum international standard required for moving out of poverty cycle.

2. **Poverty reduction:** The project did not necessarily result in poverty reduction in a decisive manner. The exception was the LST which certainly has helped to
Begin to alleviate poverty by helping the children to earn around US$2.25 per day or more. This has poverty reduction effect not only on children as individuals, but also an overall effect on the poverty of families to which they belong. Some of the graduates reported that previous to BEHTRUWC, they were employed in the shrimp industry cutting the heads off of shrimp. They reported that they were making slightly more money than currently, but that their parents did not want them to return to this harder, dangerous occupation and were happy about their current situation. The investigation revealed that the project has contributed to alleviating non-tangible aspects of poverty which manifests into isolation, vulnerability, and powerlessness.

3. **Capabilities and well-being:** The project has also had a positive impact on the capabilities and well-being of the children. Through acquisition of safe livelihood skills they have improved their chances of sustainable livelihood with higher income. They are more aware about their rights. They have become more gender sensitive. Their parents in particular, and the communities at large have become more aware of children’s education. Both children and parents have now chosen to not work in hazardous conditions and gain entry to safer livelihoods with higher income potentials.

4.2.2 **Choice of livelihood by parents/guardians and children**

The evaluation provided insights into the way the children and parents perceive and choose particular livelihood activity. A widely held assumption regarding choice of a particular livelihood activity has to do with strong positive correlation with the rate of earning, meaning that given options, children will choose livelihood activities that yield the highest rate of income. However, the field investigation consistently proved otherwise. It was found that in Khulna, like the other urban areas of Bangladesh, sufficient economic momentum has been generated to provide labor-intensive work for unskilled labor. On many occasions it was found that children have foregone widely available, but physically demanding and exploitative work with shrimp industry, van pulling, daily labor in the construction industry, with slightly higher income, for a more comfortable, lower wage, humane working environment, such as tailoring, mobile repair, refrigeration, etc.

In one particular slum area in Khulna, all the girls interviewed stated that they could earn approximately TK200-250 per day in the shrimp industry, but have now settled for lesser income at the rate of TK60-100 per day through tailoring and embroidery. Similar sentiments were shown by boys who were also engaged in the shrimp industry, and other menial jobs such as van pulling, brick breaking and other physically demanding hazardous activities.

4.2.3 **Gender participation**

The trend of gender participation was consistently in favor of the girls. The project from the very outset decided to positively discriminate in favor of girls with a 60:40 ratio throughout the project. As the following series of table suggests, this trend was maintained during the entire project. However the 60:40 ratio in favor of girls could not be maintained consistently. The ratio in case of Modality 1 (five NGOs) Round 2 was as high as 68:32 in favor of girls and it was as low as 56:44 in favor of girls in case of Modality 4 (BRAC) Round 1. There was no occasion where the ratio of boys were higher than that of girls.
Out of total number of enrolment of 18,630 learners in LST, 7,981 (61.6%) were girls and 7,239 completed their course with only 295 dropping out, which was less than 5%. Ninety percent of both girls and boys successfully completed LST.

6,479 girls were enrolled in traditional skills such as embroidery (2,889), tailoring (1,926), block boutique (882), and industrial sewing (782) (Table 11). In contrast, only 23 in electrical house wiring, 15 were in masonry, and 13 in motorcycle repairing. Only 12 and 38 boys were enrolled respectively in embroidery and tailoring and those thought they would have an economic advantage as they wanted to manage these type of manufacturing. Gender biasness was observed in selection of trades by both girls and boys. For girls, these are mostly low earning skills and add little to increase the visibility of girls in the male dominated market.

The project was able to demonstrate that given the right opportunity, girls are willing and able to take up challenging livelihood professions which are traditionally in the male domain. For instance, it is interesting to note that all the children under Modality 2 who received training on mobile repair were girls.

After finishing their LST, many girls bought sewing machines with their seed money and are independently tailoring or taking orders from big shops. Socio-cultural barriers act as barrier for girls. A limited choice of supply driven trades were offered to girls. Sometimes, trade selection for girls was done jointly by parents and learners or only by parents. More study is needed to explore traditional preference by girls and how to encourage more high paying, status jobs.
Table 11: Girls enrollment by trade through 3 Modalities\textsuperscript{32,33}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled by Trade</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embroidery &amp; Jori-Cumki</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Embroidery</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Masonry &amp; Tiles Fitting</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jute &amp; Paper Bag</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Sewing</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Boutique &amp; Screen Print</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical House Wiring</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycle Service Mechanic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring &amp; Dress Making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics &amp; Mobile Repairing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Servicing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>3,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Sylhet, some girls were trained for home electrical repairing, but as market was not yet developed and societal outlook towards girls has not changed, they could not find jobs. Some potential employers are reluctant to employ the girls which result in girls taking lower paying jobs. Some disabled girls could not fit in skills training because they could not accommodate their special needs. Overall, the girls’ performance was better and 90% of the learners completing began jobs or were self-employed.

Through education and LST, girls are now more empowered to make their own decisions. They are aware of the value of education, basic hygiene, hazardous work, and child rights. Their outlook and perception about life has changed. They are now more confident and their self-esteem is quite high. Many girls have left hazardous works like tedious domestic work, and other heavy work. Girls are now more motivated to stand on their own and many are continuing their education by taking admission in primary schools. In Sylhet, many girls were admitted to UCEP schools. Some of them are teaching other children in the community or their younger siblings. Parents are slowly recognizing the value of girls’ education. The demand is being created for education. Girls’ education has also led to the prevention of early marriage.

In a male-dominated slowly changing society like Bangladesh, where social norms and culture determine the gender roles, it is difficult to make changes quickly. With limited viable economic opportunities for girls and a female insensitive business environment, the project has created some space and freedom for the girls to choose non-traditional occupations. This deserves prior attention to create more opportunities for girls by enabling business environment through LST.

4.2.4 Effectiveness of the LST Models

- **Modality 1 – Five NGOs Model**

  This model was implemented by five NGOs: TMSS, NM, BDSC, Surovi, and SKUS. These NGOs are of national repute. However, they do not have specialization at the same level as MAWTS, UCEP, or BRAC. This model apparently had a number of

\textsuperscript{32} The blue cells show where girls’ enrollment was more than 500.

\textsuperscript{33} Modality 3 is not included as those BEHTRUWC graduates at UCEP have yet to finish their basic education and have not yet started their skills training. They will receive no seed money as they will finish their program long after BEHTRUWC closes.
Important components related to effectiveness and sustainability. It had three months of baseline survey, six months implementation, six months evaluation and three months follow-up. The last two components (evaluation and follow-up) were absent from the other three models. These two dimensions are highly critical for sustainable implementation of livelihood interventions. However, the duration of follow-up was too short to ensure long-term sustainability.

- **Modality 2 - MAWTS Center-Based Training**
According to the senior trainers from MAWTS, the vocational training proved to be life-changing experience for most of the children. This was especially noticeable for girls since through this training intervention, many girls were introduced to skills traditionally considered as male occupations. For instance, more girls acquired training on electrical equipment and according to the trainers, the girls have proven to achieve slightly higher than the boys.

In addition to the provision of skills, children also were provided very limited orientation on business plans for both employment and self-employment. This did not prove to be very effective. The self-employment required more elaborate business plan since children were required to manage the entire business process by themselves. Helping children to make business plan (including how to make customer bill, maintain petty cash, plan future actions with specific timelines, etc.). The trained children are able to earn somewhere between TK3,000 and 10,000 per month with an average of TK5,000-6,000 per month. In case of electronics, beginning salary is approximately TK4,500 per month and it can go to TK15,000-20,000 in five to 10 years. Some earned TK50,000, who were especially talented. Approximately 10,000 children dropped out due mainly to migration/marriage.

The MAWTS model has a number of limitations. The MAWTS model in essence is purely technical in nature. MAWTS did not address the issue of marketing. It only provided technical support. As such, the number of children received MAWTS training is much higher than the BRAC model. However, the percentage of children getting entry to the market is supposedly much less than BRAC. The actual percentage of children is very difficult to ascertain since there is no tracking system. In the case of BRAC however, the children being tracked were easily found since in most cases, the children have been employed by the MCPs themselves. Therefore their contact number and location is recorded with the project office and the concerned NGOs.

- **Modality 3 – UCEP Education-Skills Model**
The UCEP model did not fit well with the BEHTRUWC project as the BE component did not bring BEHTRWUC learners up to the level required for entry into UCEP’s skills program. The BEHTRUWC children at UCEP have not yet finished their BE nor started their skills training. They will receive no seed money as they will finish their program after BEHTRUWC closes. Therefore it is too early to reflect on the UCEP LST model.

The UCEP model challenges the BEHTRUWC model to upgrade their BE from Grade 5 to Grade 8 model as this is done by UCEP with only six additional months. Currently, BEHTRUWC’s BE is an uneven version of national Grade 5 where a number of subjects are in fact below Grade 5. By taking the lead from the UCEP model, a compressed version of Grade 8 could be introduced with similar duration if similar projects are to be financed in the future.
• **Modality 4 – BRAC Apprenticeship Model**

The MCP program was based on win-win situation in which the MCP received financial benefit from the project (TK1,500 per person per month) along with free services of their apprentices. The apprentices on the other hand developed their skills through on-the-job training. This provided an additional advantage to children in acquiring skills since they were exposed to real market situations. This enabled them to have a better understanding about how business is transacted and what kinds of issues they will have to deal with their clients.

The apprentices have been largely employed by the MCP themselves after completion of their apprenticeship. Perhaps due to the young age of the apprentices, a substantial number of MCPs have developed a fiduciary relationship with the apprentices. Many MCPs were keen to help the apprentices in cases they are interested to start their own business.

The MCPs did not consider their child apprentices as competitors. When asked whether the increase in the number of tailors will cause market share loss to the MCPs, they invariably replied that there will be no dearth of market in the foreseeable future. Similar responses were also observed in case of mobile repairing and other livelihood activities related to electrical appliances.

What they suggested implied that in the urban areas in particular, a strong economic momentum has been generated. This has given them the confidence that the market demand for their product will continue to expand. They are instinctive in understanding how the market corresponds with the market demands and the formal assessment conducted by JOBS, a USAID funded initiative that specializes on market, supports their knowledge. A substantial part of this emerging market consists of new segment of people who are coming out of poverty. These people are still poor but not as poor, and cannot afford to pay the high cost of clothes and other essentials in the regular market outlets. These people rely heavily on low cost and low quality products and services. According to the MCPs, this low price and low profit market is ever expanding as more poor are migrating from rural areas to urban areas for a better life.

Similar sentiments were demonstrated by boys engaged in mobile repairing profession. This claim requires further investigation. Following similar trends, the apprentices and MCPs informed the team that the multitudes of low-income people are gradually buying consumer durables like television, fridge and mobile sets. However they are not in a position to frequently replace them. Therefore there is an ever increasing market for repairing and maintenance.

The MAWTS and UCEP models are effective for skills training of higher competencies with higher income. While the BRAC Apprenticeship Model provides a ‘quick-fix’ approach to employment issue, it does not offer children the opportunity to get into higher pay in a better job environment in the formal sector. Even though MCPs are currently employing the graduates in their own business, it is too early to tell whether this arrangement will be sustainable in the long run. It will however, give them a leverage compared to those without market experience.

In comparison with the MAWTS model, the apprenticeship model could be termed as a model for the ‘present’, while MAWTS, as well as UCEP (which is even an improved version of MAWTS combining BE and vocational skills) are models for the ‘future’. The latter models need further work since in order to make them meaningful, particularly in case of MAWTS, market and business management skills need to be added. In addition, MAWTS and UCEP also need to sharpen further the role of
communities in support of children. To this end, much needs to be done to institutionalize community initiatives so that they can play a facilitative role with some kind of financial return. The principle of pure volunteerism has failed to yield results in ensuring community’s role in the last few decades.

4.3 Efficiency

As with the BE component, a full cost-benefit analysis will be required to fully assess the efficiency of the LST component particularly the comparative efficiencies of each of the different models. The evaluation focused on the management aspects of the component.

4.3.1 Seed money distribution

The distribution of seed money was problematic. Due to long gaps, it was reported that NGOs lost financial documents. This created problems in fund disbursement after appropriate verification of the previous expenditures made by the NGOs. This led Sida to temporarily suspend seed money funding. From discussion with the implementing NGOs, it transpires that it was more of a case of incompetency and lack of capacity rather than potential embezzlement. Within the professional experience of the team, the lack of ability and willingness of NGOs to maintain records and sound documentation is well known. This is an area where NGOs need to be trained on documentation as a part of their capacity building.

Seed money was provided in cash initially during the first phase. This created problems in control of money. The children’s parents usually decide to use it for family expenditures and children had little say. This caused the money to be diverted to other unintended use. Based on these findings during the MTE and as a result of implementing NGOs reporting this phenomenon, the children were given their seed money in the form of bank cheques based on Sida’s recommendation in the second phase. In this way it was expected that the children would be able to exert more control over the money received. This also introduced the children to formal banking, to which many children were not familiar. Since the seed money was provided this way comparatively recently, it is too early to suggest how well it worked and what has actually happened with the money.

Use of seed money was problematic since the same amount of money was provided for all forms of trade. This was thought to be inappropriate in circumstances where different kind of skills acquisition requires different kind of financial investment. Therefore seed money should be adjusted according to the amount of initial investment needed to start a business for a particular type of profession. In a few cases where children found the cost of tool beyond their TK16,000 limit, they were planning to pool their money with their peers and share tools. This is a good example of collaboration in overcoming resource limitations.

Seed money has created the opportunity for both employment and self-employment. In addition, the provision of seed money has given an additional leverage to the girls by enabling them to buy sewing machines, allowing them to cater to the needs and demands in their neighborhood. This model helps the girls to be employed and self-employed at the same time, plus stay at home, which is considered more proper by their families.

This was also found to be true but to a lesser extent for the boys, who are pursuing mobile repairing and repairing of electrical appliances. For instance at Tongi, in one
of the shops that provided repair and maintenance of television and refrigeration, two boys were working as apprentices. These boys bought basic tools from their seed money. After their work is through with the MCP, they are also providing door-to-door service in their community on their own. This suggests that the boys, like the girls, were engaged in both employment and self-employment, thereby broadening the horizon of additional income with limited resources. However, despite such efforts, their income is yet to surpass TK5,000 per month mark in general.

4.3.2 Efficiency of the LST Models

The apprenticeship model offers an innovative solution by bypassing the role of communities in creating market linkages and in providing post training support. The efficiency of the apprenticeship model can be understood in comparison to the training model where due to the absence of such strategy, the success of training model is still contingent on long-term community involvement.

In this regard, the community appeared to be very much willing to extend their support to the children. Upon further inquiry, it was revealed that the community strongly felt that they could surmount the employment challenge if the project would support them to create market outlets in the form of shops in strategic locations of the cities. This would help the trained children especially the girls, to sell their produce. In that case, the community people could help graduates to sell their produce thereby turning the entire marketing process right from the process of collecting raw materials, producing, transporting to selling, into a collective community supported initiative.

How this framework would actually workout is a matter of further investigation and experimentation. This process appears to be more complicated than that of apprentice model, but if successfully implemented will provide much better employment opportunity in much greater numbers. The potentials of active participation of the community within this context could provide positive externalities of empowering and engaging the communities in question. The direct entry of the apprentices in the market through BRAC model has created dynamism, which works in favor of children.

The apprenticeship model has demonstrated potentials for rapid replication despite being the most expensive model. The adjusted BRAC model was subsequently undertaken with support from UNICEF. It has a number of features that apparently have further increased the potentials for success. This initiative was implemented with surplus funds from UNICEF in Shatkhira. In addition, BRAC is implementing its own adjusted version of apprenticeship in all divisional cities and plans to use it in Africa and elsewhere. For the purposes of the evaluation this has not been elaborated on further.

Business Opportunities

- One of the children has already established his small-scale business with his brother who owns a cosmetic shop in his locality. His brother has given him a free space within his shop. That gives the boy readymade entry to the market and according to him the business is running well.
- Others are pooling their seed money to open a cell phone repair shop.
- One girl was offered her own beauty shop, but as she was young, she felt she was not ready to manage her own shop. The owner said that when she feels ready, she will help her get started.
4.3.3 Partnership Arrangements

At the initial stage, the MCPs were not acquainted with the skills logbook or competency-based training. They were also not aware about job related hazards. This trend was recorded in the early stages of the apprenticeship implementation and continues. However due to technical inputs provided by UNICEF/ILO consultants, they are progressively developing a better awareness about the issues. This was confirmed through the investigation carried out by the evaluation team, but is an area in which more knowledge needs to be incorporated into the MCP training.

The disbursement of management fee for training provided by MAWTS was delayed by PIU. Children received the money after completion of their training. This created hindrance in the application of skills by the children specifically those children who are interested in self-employment. There were also alleged mismanagement in the money provided by donors and as a result Sida at one point had stopped funding. This explains the partial reason for the delay of disbursement since Sida has now removed the restriction. This needs to be further investigated.

The nontechnical nature of monitoring from the PIU could be modified and improved upon. While it was necessary for PIU to monitor the progress of skills training, it requires a number of adjustments. The monitoring intervention ought to ensure that the skills training time is not lost to monitoring. Also, the capacity of the BNFE monitors to be able to monitor the technical aspects of monitoring needs to be enhanced.

4.4 Impact

The evaluation looked at the initial achievements of the project and the identified changes within the lives of the participants and their families.

4.4.1 Quantitative achievement of the project

The following four modalities have been followed for implementing the LST program.

**Modality 1:** Planned to provide LST to 4,775 BE graduates through five partner NGOs namely: TMSS, NM, BDSC, Surovi, and SKUS.

**Modality 2:** Planned to provide LST to 11,100 BE graduates by MAWTS following UNICEF PCA Modality.

**Modality 3:** Planned to provide LST to 755 BE graduates by UCEP following UNICEF PCA Modality.

**Modality 4:** Planned to provide LST to 2,000 BE graduates by BRAC following UNICEF PCA Modality.
Table 12: Planned and Actual Number of children LST (Source: BBNFE, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementing NGOs</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Seed Money Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Partner NGOs</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>4,664</td>
<td>4,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAWTS</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>11,838</td>
<td>11,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEP</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the outputs of the project in terms of learners having completed the LST and received seed money. In terms of target achievement, 95% received LST. Out of children having completed LST, 99% received seed money and 1% did not. Therefore in terms of target achievement, the project was successful.

UCEP only took one group of learners and it was discovered it was neither cost effective for UCEP or the project nor time effective for the learners as they were placed into UCEP’s regular program and will take longer than all of the other learners to graduate as they are educated to Level 8 and then have their skills training. Because these learners will finish after the project closes, they will not be receiving seed money. MAWTS took an additional 1,000 learners and they were probably those who were already scheduled for UCEP.

Table 13 shows the rate of children ending up getting jobs in the market. The subsequent investigation will show that the rate of employment had direct linkage with the different LST model designs implemented by a total number of eight NGOs.

In terms of job placement, the apprenticeship model has been demonstrably the most successful. A positive aspect of apprenticeship model is that the children can be tracked. However in the case of other Modalities, it is difficult to track graduates. It is not known how the children were traced in the other modalities.

Table 13: Current Job Placement Status (Source: BNFE, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>Partner NGOs</th>
<th>Total enrolled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Five Partner NGOs</td>
<td>4,775</td>
<td>4,664</td>
<td>Total 471 job placed against 906 learners (1st round)</td>
<td>51.49%</td>
<td>Study on job placement of 2nd and 3rd will be conducted following the current AWP-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAWTS</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>10,233</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>67.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UCEP</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>98.18%</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,630</td>
<td>17,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 Gender Impacts

Table 14 shows the gender-segregated distribution of LST by boys and girls. The trend shows clear affinity towards gendered role that keeps the girls tied at home. The highlighted rows in the table shows that overwhelming majority of the girls are provided with home-centric livelihood skills like hand embroidery, tailoring, dress making, etc. These are low profit occupation and do little to increase the mobility of girls within the market. In a number of livelihood skills which are traditionally thought to be for girls, some have been taken up by boys who consider them to be more profitable like embroidery and jori-chumki, block boutique, screen paint, and can lead to management positions.

Twenty-eight hundred eighty-nine girls were enrolled in traditional skills such as embroidery (2,889), tailoring (1,926), block boutique (882), and industrial sewing (782) (Table 14). In contrast, only 23 in electrical house wiring, 15 were in masonry, and 13 in motor cycle repairing. Whereas only 12 and 38 boys were enrolled respectively in embroidery and tailoring and those thought they would have an economic advantage as they wanted to manage these type of manufacturing. Gender biasness was observed in selection of trades by both girls and boys. For girls, these are mostly low earning skills and add little to increase the visibility of girls in the male dominated market.

Beautification apparently had an empowering effect on the girls. Beautification is an all-women’s trade in Bangladesh where all beauticians and customers are women. Despite beauty shops’ location being in the market, the girls work in a secluded environment. As a result, girls who are conservative, tend to shy away from male dominated market environment and find it convenient to work in this environment. Therefore, beautification trade provided relatively conservative girls to take one step towards becoming market operators.

The project even though in a small way, has been able to demonstrate, if provided with the right conditions, girls are willing and able to take up livelihood professions, which are traditionally thought to be that of boys. For instance, it is interesting to note that all the children under Modality 2 who received training on mobile repairing were girls.

![Table 14: Enrollment by trade through Modality 1 (Phase 1, 2 & 3), Modality 2 (Phase 1, 2 & 3), and Modality 4 (Phase 1 & 2).](table14.png)
With basic learning and LST, remarkable progress was achieved. Some girls who used to work as maids are now working in the beauty parlor as apprentice and earning between TK2,000 to TK3,000. They contribute to the family income. Parents are also happy as they all get benefits. Some of the girls were very enthusiastic with their economic actives and thrilled to contribute to the family income which ultimately has contributed in delaying the marriage. Skill training has definitely contributed to better income opportunities for girls.

This project has opened a new horizon for the working children. Girls to some extent have been empowered through education and skills. The project has created the opportunities for the first generation urban working girls to penetrate the market and be visible in non-traditional areas such as mobile servicing, and electric house repairing. The project has been able to unlock the potentials of working girls who otherwise would have continued working in the hazardous work and lived in untold miseries.

The result could have been more pronounced if the education plus model with gender integration was adopted. However as the process is evolving, progress should continue to be made.

4.4.3 Challenges

The MAWTS program personnel have stated that a few children were older than project requirement. Their literacy skills were also better than what could be expected from BE completers from BEHTRUWC. There was concern that the proper learners were entering the program. In looking for explanation, first set of reasons have to do with the fact that many children had completed their basic literacy course under BEHTRUWC between two and three years ago before receiving vocational training and continued their education.

The other scenario could be that due to high demand of the training, a number of children with higher competency level not directly involved in BEHTRUWC have found their way in the training. Since the project has been completed and it is not possible to have a comprehensive cross-checking to validate the findings, the team could not conclude for certain which were the reasons for the unexpected level of higher competency of basic literacy among a few children or whether it was due to a combination of both factors stated. From the project management perspective, the project should take necessary measures to ensure that only children from BEHTRUWC get the benefit of training.

4.5 Sustainability

Each of the four models presents challenges and opportunities for replication for sustainability of the outcomes. The evaluation has made an initial assessment of these.

4.5.1 Advantages and Disadvantages of the LST Models

Table 15 is an attempt to show the comparative advantages and disadvantages of the four modalities of LST in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

This shows that in designing future modalities, the designers need to take into consideration critical issues like opportunity for placement, accessibility to market,
provision of tracking system, provision for follow-up support, etc. From the field findings, it appeared that the apprenticeship model could become an important strategy for LST. It had never though, been tried on a national scale before. Among the center based model, the UCEP model even though costly, is more meaningful since it ensures employment through placement, but students should enroll there from the beginning of their educational program as the time they spend from BE to skills training is too long. All the models involved have their advantages and disadvantages. There is a need for further exploration before they can be nationally replicated.

Without some form of long-term post training support, sustainability is difficult to achieve. This is especially true for LST, which is complex by nature. The involvement of community is necessary, but not sufficient to ensuring sustainability of the intervention. The apprenticeship model has shown some potential for sustainability. However it seems to be more applicable for the low earning informal sector without much possibility of upward mobility. In order to ensure an impressionable shift in livelihood strategy, a well-designed initiative needs to be undertaken combining the comparative advantages of the communities, as well as institutions.
Specifically for employment purposes, certification is necessary to validate claims to skills for the employers. This is to enhance the possibility of employment for the children. The project provided certificates to the children after successful completion of skills training. The children working in apprenticeship model got their certification from MAWTS. UCEP has its own certification regime in place. This implies that it is necessary to involve nationally reputed organizations in skills delivery to give credibility to certification. It is in the long-term interest of the children to ensure that appropriate certification procedures are followed rigorously. The reliability of certification is expected to play a critical role since employers’ acceptance to such certification will depend on its reliability in the long run.

---

**Table 15:**
Comparisons of 4 skills training modalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation factors</th>
<th>Apprenticeship model (BRAC)</th>
<th>Training-based model (MAWTS)</th>
<th>Training-based model (UCEP)</th>
<th>Training-based model (5 NGOs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Minimum dropout</td>
<td>Minimum dropout</td>
<td>Minimum dropout</td>
<td>Minimum dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational qualification of trainers not an issue</td>
<td>Educational qualification of trainers an issue</td>
<td>Educational qualification of trainers an issue</td>
<td>Educational qualification of trainers an issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No placement services needed</td>
<td>No placement services provided</td>
<td>Placement services provided</td>
<td>No placement service provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No follow-up mechanism</td>
<td>No follow-up mechanism</td>
<td>No follow-up mechanism</td>
<td>Follow up exists but for a very brief period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seed money not sufficient for all livelihood skills. More suited for informal sector involving lower skills</td>
<td>Seed money not sufficient for all livelihood skills. More suited for formal sector involving higher skills</td>
<td>Seed money not sufficient for all livelihood skills. More suited for formal sector involving higher skills</td>
<td>Seed money not sufficient for all livelihood skills. More suited for formal sector involving higher skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More suited for informal sector involving lower skills</td>
<td>More suited for formal sector involving higher skills</td>
<td>More suited for formal sector involving higher skills</td>
<td>More suited for formal sector involving higher skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rapid acquisition of skills due to hands-on training</td>
<td>Rapid acquisition of skills due to hands-on training</td>
<td>Children still undergoing BE</td>
<td>Slower but effective acquisition of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High per learner cost</td>
<td>High per learner cost</td>
<td>High per learner cost</td>
<td>Medium per learner cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate application of skills in market situation</td>
<td>Immediate application of skills not possible</td>
<td>Immediate application of skills not possible</td>
<td>Immediate application of skills not possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to track</td>
<td>Difficult to track</td>
<td>Easy to track</td>
<td>Difficult to track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to market certain</td>
<td>Access to market uncertain</td>
<td>Access to market certain</td>
<td>Access to market uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market entry possible without intense institutional and community support</td>
<td>Market entry without further institutional and community support difficult</td>
<td>Market entry through institutional support built into the model</td>
<td>Market entry without further institutional and community support difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>High potential for sustainability without institutional support</td>
<td>Potentials for sustainability unknown</td>
<td>Institutional support for sustainability exists</td>
<td>Potentials for sustainability unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No business risk coverage</td>
<td>No business risk coverage</td>
<td>No business risk coverage</td>
<td>No business risk coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>Too early to decide</td>
<td>Too early to decide</td>
<td>Too early to decide</td>
<td>Too early to decide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4.5.2 Certification
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In addition, MAWTS is working with BTEB (Bangladesh Technical Education Board) to develop a certification for prior learning widely known as RPL (Recognition of Prior Learning). RPL certification is a complex process requiring elaborate institutional arrangement for children to have information and access to such a process. Also in case of children failing to pass RPL test, there ought to be an immediate and necessary arrangement in filling the skills deficiencies through appropriate complementary training arrangements. The project has played a pioneering role in this regard but a lot of work needs to be done in the future to transform these into a credible national certification system.

4.6 Recommendations

4.6.1 Relevance

1. That advanced business skills training are included in LST programs to support self-employment options for graduates.

4.6.2 Effectiveness

1. That strategies are prepared to support more girls being trained in non-conventional areas like computer training, packaging, electronics, etc.
2. That LST programs take a wide view of the skills necessary to improve earning potential e.g. learning both hardware and software aspects of mobile repair.
3. That the training-based model is interfaced with NGOs/institutions which specialize in implementing demand-driven, market-oriented livelihood strategies.

4.6.3 Efficiency

1. That seed money is commensurate with the minimum amount needed for business start-up for self-employment.
2. That entrance into skills training is available to participants immediately after completing basic educational training.
3. That seed money is available immediately upon completion of training as it is key to helping learners in their new occupations.
4. That further investigation is done into the development of a viable tracking system of graduates engaged in employment and self-employment so there will be longitudinal data.
5. That the children and community should acquire the skills to carry out rapid market assessment on the basis of simple action research principles as the market changes through time and can quickly change with the elimination or addition of some external element as even though a market assessment was conducted by a professional firm, this is not sustainable in the long-run.

4.6.4 Impact

1. That further investigation is done into how apprenticeship model could be extended and used to facilitate the process of bringing non-traditional livelihoods that are traditionally thought to be in the male purview to girls.
2. That further investigation is done into how in center-based training models, could better engage the communities to provide support to the children in having access to marketing outlets, procuring raw materials, transportation, etc.
3. That an impact evaluation on BEHTRUWC is conducted one to three years after completion to identify long-term impacts and lessons.
4.6.5 Sustainability

1. That the possibility of drop-in/support centers in each divisional town is investigated to provide reading, counseling, and further business training experience, etc. It could also be further expanded into a small-business support center for the community.

2. That a reasonable post-graduate support period be built in to LST programs so that the skills applied by the children for gainful employment become sustainable.
5. Advocacy, Communications and Social Mobilization

The objective of the Advocacy, Communications, and Social Mobility (ACSM) activities under BEHTRUWC was to raise awareness of and bring about multi-level change in policies to address the situation of working children and their families. Focus was specifically on protecting children from hazardous working environments and progressively eliminating child labor.

ACSM consists of three linked, overlapping, and complementary components defined as follows:

- **Advocacy** denotes activities designed to place action high on the agenda of political and development, foster political will, and to increase and sustain financial and other resources.
- **Communication** is concerned with informing and creating awareness among the general public or specific populations and empowering people to take action.
- **Social mobilization** is the process of bringing together all feasible and practical intersectoral allies to raise awareness of and demand for a particular program, to assist in the delivery of resources and services, and to strengthen community participation for sustainability and self-reliance.

ACSM is now recognized as an essential element in development programming. ACSM needs to have a strong marketing plan in place at the beginning of a project and have it team up with community action groups; to be an integral and cross-cutting theme is all social change/action projects; ACSM working group need to be formed to facilitate the process; and initiatives to promote mobilization need to be developed. Figure 8 shows how change happens over time. First, the idea enters the culture and begins to be talked about. At this point, it tends not to be popular and those advocating the change are seen as radical and not taken seriously. The second stage is when it begins to enter the mainstream of the culture. The third stage is when it is part of the culture and taken as the new norm. The feedback mechanism shows the continual change of culture and there is a continual shift in cultural norms and expectations.

![Figure 8: Advocacy, Communications, and Social Mobility](image)

Due to the limitations of this evaluation, the team had to depend mostly on available reports. Consequently, some of the data is not reliable and difficult to verify.
5.1 Relevance

The evaluation examined the relevance of activities conducted under ACSM to the global and national obligations and programs that Bangladesh is implementing.

5.1.1 Alignment to international events

An ACSM strategy and specific set of activities should be an integral part of program’s plans. BEHTRUWC strategically used key international days/weeks, e.g., International Literacy Day, EFA Week, World Day against Child Labor, CRC Week, Child Rights Week, Meena Day, and the National Children Day, were observed and celebrated at the national level, but linking these events to gender issues and child rights was often overwhelmed with the other celebrations planned during these events and the message was lost. These and other program activities were not enough for interventions to achieve their full potential, the central strategic challenge needed to be one of advocacy, communication and empowerment shaped by a strong marketing plan. It must go beyond the routine interventions and stand on its own to address the many social and political dimensions.

Advocating for sufficient resources, promoting behavior and attitude changes, and engaging communities in the fight for changes in gender issues and child rights are essential to sustaining and increasing the gains that have been made recently.

5.1.2 Alignment to GoB Objectives

Bangladesh is one of the first signatories among 20 countries to sign and ratify the 1989 CRC, which obligates states to protect and promote the rights and interest of the child, such as the right to a compulsory and free education (Articles 28 and 29), the right to be protected from exploitative work or performing any work that may be considered hazardous, interferes with the child’s education or is harmful to the child’s development (Article 32), and the right to an adequate standard of living (Article 27).

Bangladesh is also the first South Asian country to ratify the Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention (No. 182) which imposes an obligation upon Bangladesh to “take immediate and effective measures to secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labor as a matter of urgency” (Article 1), such as all forms of slavery or practices similar to slavery, child prostitution, child pornography, using children for illicit activities and work, which would harm the physical, social and moral development of children (Article 3).

The Ministry of Labor and Employment has recently adopted the National Child Labor Elimination Policy 2010, which provides a framework to eradicate all forms of child labor by 2015. Although GoB is a signatory, the implementation of CRC has been slow. Child Labor Ward Committees have not been formed at all levels. No legal provision has been made to safeguard the rights of child domestic workers. The United Nations Review Committee on CRC has also raised concerns about the lack of mechanisms to enforce child labor laws or monitor working conditions, and insufficient public awareness about the negative effects of child labor. As the vast majority of children (93%) work in the informal sector, it makes enforcement of the relevant legislation challenging, exploitative cheap labor and mindset of the employers, insensitiveness of the society, and lack of awareness about child rights and hazardous child labor, all contribute to the perpetuation the child labor.
In looking at this context, BEHTRUWC is a right step. It offered a unique opportunity to the working children who do not have options. As education and the elimination of child labor has a direct correlation, the project focused on basic rights for education of poor urban working children and elimination of hazardous child labor through SM and advocacy. It was a first stepping stone for these children. Most of the students had never been to any school except for some who studied in Madrashas/ village schools.

5.1.3 Addressing Gender Considerations

The recommendations of MTE were not implemented and no time bound action plan was developed. The draft “Gender Equality Strategy Document” was prepared to address the issues of access, equity, and quality of education and focuses on (a) quality life skills based non-formal BE; and (b) livelihood skills education. Six years later, this MTE suggested policy has not been yet finalized. Key gender indicators were not set in the monitoring system to measure the progress of integration of gender in any of the components.

Except closing the gender gap in education and LST by an artificial designation of more girls than boys, no significant visible effects regarding gender were demonstrated in the project. The relationship between girls and boys, as well as women and men in the household remains traditional and this also includes the workplace. A huge number of girls continue working in households as CDWs for insignificant remuneration under exploitative conditions and deprived of the opportunities for having a better life. The market does not yet appear ready for the girls in non-traditional skill with the exception of a few.

5.2 Effectiveness

ACSM is the entry point for all development interventions, especially for the hard to reach out of school working children who do not have access to education.

The evaluation looked into the effect that BEHTRUWC had on relevant policies and approaches as a move towards the progressive elimination of child labor.

5.2.1 Social Mobilization

The ACSM activities included policy level dialogue, media mobilization, sensitization meetings at national/sub-national levels, and coordination/collaboration with relevant Ministries and donors. BETHRUWC, in order to sensitize policy makers in favor of disadvantaged/excluded children and the urban working children in particular were asked to participate in key international days/weeks. Community members, learners, parents, teachers, supervisors, etc. also participated in these events organized by the PNGOs.

During Stage 4, 11 types of SM events were conducted as against 12 and 11 during Stages 3 and 2, respectively. Five major SM events were conducted (Independence Day, World Day against Child Labor, Victory Day, IPT, CRC Week and IPT) which accounted for 87% of total activities. In Stage 3, a total 277,010 participants (learners, parents/guardians, employees, and Center Management Committees (CMC) members) attended the different SM events of which 156,443 (56.48%) were female and 120,567 (43.52%) were male. It is encouraging that there were more female participants than male. In terms of participation, the employers accounted for...
only 4.5% of the total (Stage 3). Almost at a similar percentage was the participation of other stakeholders.

The PNGOs conducted 12 types of SM events against 11 during Stage 3. A total 186 activities\(^\text{34}\) (Figure 9) were conducted by the PNGOs at different levels of which only 106 were reported, although reporting on SM events was a part of PNGOs reporting system.

![Figure 9: Social Mobilization Events](image)

There was one observation made in the compilation report of Stage 3 “TMSS conducted only one activity during Stage 2 (National Independence Day 2010) with the participation of 2,164 participants,” while some others conducted many of those with much larger participation. Discrepancies among the PNGOs with similar number of LCs and learners seem to be quite unusual, which need appropriate verification.\(^\text{35}\)

Apart from documenting lessons learned and good practices, ACSM also included the collation of human stories, in order to support national level advocacy, video documentation, radio spots, drama for TV and radio, production of documentaries on livelihood skills, interactive popular theatres, posters, printing, painting of walls, publication of supplementary materials, production of MEENA cartoon films, photographs for communications materials, display boards, etc. Also, six video documentaries, six docudramas, and 78 episodes of drama series, “Banafuler gan” (Song of the Wild Flowers) were produced. TV serials are still being telecast by Bangladesh Television (BTV) every Tuesday. Very effective in terms of SM were the 1,132 interactive popular theater (IPT) shows which were well attended.

### 5.2.2 Awareness of Child Rights

Awareness on the child rights was created through: Mass mobilization and advocacy programs; observance of special days; rallies where parents, learners, teachers,
CMC members, and employers participated; communication materials such as videos, television serials, MEENA animation films. They encouraged worldwide appreciation for advocacy work for girl child education and the end of discrimination.

In some cases, CMCs were instrumental in SM and raising awareness within the community. It was reported that some LCs with proactive CMCs functioned well in preventing learner dropouts, elimination of child brides, and community-led initiatives.

Although IPT shows have been effective and popular in disseminating messages and instilling social responsibility, the commitment through practice is far from the desired goal.

The PIU highlighted gender issues in some communication materials and IPT was also effective in raising awareness among some parents, community, and employers about child rights and issues of girl in the situation of domestic workers. The MEENA documentary and drama serials have been very popular. It is encouraging to note that through BEHTRUWC and other resources and voices, the process has evolved and it will continue to do so provided the right elements are included.

5.2.3 Policy Effects

GoB enacted the Birth and Death Registration Act, 2004, which became law on 3 July 2006 and planned to register everyone by 2010. BEHTRUWC undertook birth registration as one of its key responsibilities (Table 16). Significant improvement has been made regarding the birth registration as compared to preceding years. By December 2011, birth certificates were issued to a total of 135,484 learners, accounting for 98.99% of the applicants and 83.11% of the learners.

Table 16: Birth Registration Status by PNGO until December 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PNGO</th>
<th>LCs</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SC Received</th>
<th>BC Not Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>7,880</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>7,725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAR</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4,899</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>7,728</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>7,728</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>7,573</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCF</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDSC</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDPF</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>8,147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,147</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPK</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6,969</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>7,525</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIVDB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,397</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISDJA</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,246</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRAC</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,771</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCM</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7,825</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prodist</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARD</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7,338</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>106,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chittagong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunobi</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMSS</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,725</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,213</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,266</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,766</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khulna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCF</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>12,725</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>12,211</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12,211</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>509</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,725</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,211</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,211</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylhet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIVDB</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>5,534</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,125</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>90.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,980</strong></td>
<td><strong>554</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prodist</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajshahi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASB</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>5,675</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,462</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>227</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,675</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,462</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,462</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,643</strong></td>
<td><strong>163,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>136,868</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>135,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,384</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.2.4 Capacity Building

Further capacity building include tapping best practice, strengthening skills for designing, and implementing a range of action strategies, including collecting and disseminating best practices and lessons-learned, building capacity for evidence-based advocacy, internalizing results-based assessment (RBA), leadership development, information-gathering, media work, education efforts, joint planning and agenda-setting processes and public accountability. UNICEF and PIU are now jointly taking initiatives to document the best practices and disseminate to all the stakeholders.

After the 2008 MTE, capacity development activities, project management, M&E, financial management and planning, were undertaken at institutional and human resources development level of BNFE, PIU, MoPME, implementing NGOs, the community, and in the field. In the second phase, a number of capacity building activities were undertaken involving CMC orientation programs in different cities around financial management training. There were also in-country visits, and five overseas study tours. During Stages 2 and 3, 1,153 trainees participated in more than one capacity building program. Major among these were Orientation on M&E Reporting (MER), followed by In-Country Study Tour, and CMC Orientation. The surveys and studies were conducted by two individual consultants and a database on MER was developed by Technology and Business Solutions Ltd (TBS).

Third party agencies were engaged to provide support to the PIU officials in carrying out technical and financial training which continued through 2012. Team work between PIU officials and these agencies have resulted in enhancement of the capacity of PIU officials in monitoring and reporting and in the management of actions and decisions for effective implementation of the project. The financial database and learners’ related database are now being used for programmatic follow-up actions. These activities will continue in 2014 to ensure financial management, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting on the project activities continue to be documented.

5.3 Efficiency

The RBA approach shifted focus from development of servicing needs to building the capacity of individuals and communities to understand, claim, and fulfill their rights by:

1. Conscious and systematic integration of rights and principles into development work,
2. Putting emphasis on meaningful participation of all stakeholders,
3. Empowering marginalized working children to voice their demands,
4. Encouraging local ownership of development programs leading to greater accountability from all actors at all levels, and
5. Providing tools for dialogue and engagement with duty-bearers.

5.3.1 Social Mobilization Programs

The above SM programs though, were poorly conceived and weakly designed. It was difficult to reach a very ambitious goal with such low-key activities. One-shot event failed to create lasting impression on child rights which were confined to the celebration of special days/weeks without having meaningful participation of the
community. The total conscientization process was weak. Lack of community level activities failed to sustain the enthusiasm and the continuation of the advocacy.

These one-time events failed to make lasting impression in the daily lives of communities who are struggling to meet their basic needs. Some parents could not recollect messages regarding child rights or child labor. IPT workshops were successful to some extent, but did not make any impact on the ground. Community initiatives such as protest march, rallies or human chain against any injustice to working children, exploitation, low wages, discrimination, violence against children, using children during strikes were not part of the plan. No trace of activism on child rights was observed.

Community participation was weak due to the lack of budgetary provision for travel allowances for learners and parents, improper planning, inadequate time for organizing events, incentives for the community members, and lack of time of community members due to their need to work. The events could have been organized in a more structured manner. Poor participation of the social leaders, local government, and ward commissioners affected those events. Stakeholder consultation was not properly carried out at the designing phase.

5.3.2 Center Management Committees

CMCs were formed in non-transparent way. The PNGOs in some cases, involved their own people in the CMCs including the chairman, instead of qualified and efficient community leader, which eventually made it ineffective. CMCs were formed to play an active role in LC management, including attendance of learners, motivating the parents and employers, insurance of teachers’ attendance, follow ups of dropout and creation of awareness on issues relating to child rights and preventing child labor in hazardous works. CMCs did not play their role as expected as they were not aware of their responsibilities, not trained, and therefore did not have the capacity to function in the manner in which they were planned. In fact, community mobilization did not start at the beginning of the project as it should have, but in the latter stage an orientation workshop about their roles and responsibilities were organized. According to the completion report of Stage 3, only 10 out of 20 PNGOs and in Stage 4 only three out of 17 PNGOs conducted CMC orientations. This lack of attention reflects lack of importance to provide active CMCs by the PNGO.

Most of CMCs played passive role, either due to improper composition of the forum or lack of incentives. Organizing CMC meetings were difficult in most cases and ineffectual when they did meet, as there was no guidance on their role. Management issues like learners/teacher dropout, SM, creation of learner-friendly LCs, local level management, accountability, and governance issues pertaining to the LCs were seldom discussed in meetings. Many of the CMCs were ineffective and incompetent to make any, let alone appropriate decisions.

5.3.3 Performance Monitoring and Reporting

As there was no provision for field-level facilitators in the project, no follow-up was done. Result oriented project facilities were absent at ground level. Teachers, who were already overloaded, were engaged in social mobilization. Too much dependency on teachers affected their performance in teaching.

ACSM was difficult to evaluate as individual NGO SM plan either did not exist or were unavailable. There were huge data discrepancies in regard to the reporting of
SM events as submitted by different PNGOs. Many of the PNGOs did not play a proactive role in community mobilization. There was a lack of strategic direction and inadequate resource availability. Only 3.9% of the total budget was allocated to ACSM and it was observed that till December 2013, only 81% of this total allocated budget had been spent.

As NGO performance assessment was not done during the entire phase, it was difficult to conclude how many NGOs were rated well and why. Some NGOs reported that due to the outsourcing of training, inconsistent messages were delivered by different organizations. Child rights especially the CDW issues, were not covered in the training details although the majority of the girls were from this group. Only one orientation workshop on gender, child rights, and child labor were conducted for PIU and PNGO staff.

5.3.4 Capacity Development

Capacity of the NGOs is another critical factor. Most NGOs lack a clear understanding of Rights Based Approach and movement oriented activities. NGOs had little capacity to link macro level policy issues to micro level interventions. Staff of the NGOs were just not capable as they neither had an understanding nor the training.

One of the major weaknesses was inadequate institutional capacity of PIU and PNGOs to lobby and advocate for child rights and child labor. Mass scale sensitization programming for employers or duty bearers was absent.

The project lacked any strategies to instill accountability on the part of the duty bearers. Unless they are sensitized, they will not take responsibility. Unless a strong monitoring system against child labor is introduced, the exploitation of cheap child labor will continue.

Inter-ministerial coordination and linkage was poor. Ministry of Women and Children’s Affairs (MoWCA), Ministry of Labor and other Ministries have undertaken similar types of program such as Enabling Environment for Child Rights (EECR), but due to lack of interagency collaboration and coordination there is no sustained impact. The recommendations of the 2008 midterm report were not implemented and no time bound action plan was developed.

The PIU structure is not gender balanced. Out of nine MOs, there is only one woman and only two women POS. Out of eight Assistant Directors of BNFE and PIU, only two are women. Also, just because they are women does not mean that they understand gender mainstreaming. Lack of gender expertise within BNFE and PIU are needed for mainstreaming gender into the curriculum and the program.

Capacity gaps of some PNGOs in terms of mainstreaming gender also failed to deliver the desired result. Moreover, the rigidity of the project did not allow any kind of innovation or modification in the project. Gender issues were not addressed due to lack of gender analysis at the planning stage. Continuous assessment on gender needs and redesigning was not done. Though the project addressed the basic needs of enrollment, it failed to respond to the strategic needs of urban working children especially girls, in terms of protecting their rights as well as claiming their

36 The compiled report of Stage 3.
rights. The midterm report comment that “Mainstreaming is acknowledged as a challenge, but was never a priority for this project”, is still valid.

5.4 Impact

It is too early to determine the true impact that BEHTRUWC had on the overall policy environment in Bangladesh or its effect on the elimination of child labor. The evaluation has identified some initial comments on the short-term impacts.

5.4.1 Elimination of hazardous working environments

Communities are now increasingly aware of hazardous child labor. There is also increased awareness of child rights and hazardous labor among parents, learners, and duty bearers to some extent. But was it the efforts of ACSM, or just the maturation of the community as a whole to these issues as they have begun to receive significant attention in the media and in public discussion that this awareness came about. Through the BEHTRUWC ACSM, perhaps the community developed some sense of these issues, but as there was little data collected in a systematic way, it is difficult to give a definitive answer. The team heard numerous times that parents now want to send their children to school and many of the children have left hazardous jobs, but how BEHTRUWC contributed to this change is not known.

5.4.2 Sensitization of employers

As employers needed to have a buy-in to send their child employees to BE, there is evidence that they were sensitized to the children’s needs, but many of the girls were CDW and worked at home so their employers were their parents. It is not clear whether this means that the parents were more sensitized or that the parents saw BEHTRUWC as a way to help the whole family and therefore took the opportunity offered as they could not afford to send their children to government schools.

There were reports that employers began to take better care of the learners and even took them to doctors if needed. They gave them snacks, clothes and gifts during festival period. More needs to be done to promote the rights of marginalized working children. Mass awareness with critical thinking and reflections was missing. The rigidity of the project failed to be responsive to the changing needs of the community. Birth registration activities were successful in registering 98% of the learners which is useful for the learners and also in preventing early marriage. Through successful lobby and advocacy with policy makers, the BEHTRUWC model should be adopted as part of PEDP3.

5.5 Sustainability

The evaluation investigated the level of support that BEHTRUWC had among families and communities on which to build future initiatives.

5.5.1 Community Empowerment

Social transformation is a slow movement-oriented process that demands careful planning and community empowerment. A great deal of success in SM campaigns depends upon community empowerment in terms of meaningful participation, decision-making, leadership, and gender equity. For instance, the communities did not take any initiative on their own to continue the LCs after the project was over. No
Fund was created; no action plan was developed; no sustainability issues were ever discussed in CMC meetings.

The learning of the project should be documented as lessons for the future. Undoubtedly, this project has been able to create multiplier effect in the lives of working children including girls. With renewed hope and aspirations, these children can play a vital role in the progress of the nation. When the project is integrated into the repertoire of government education, it needs to be redefined with a strong gender analysis and role of girls and women.

5.5.2 Community Ownership

Lack of ownership by the community was a paramount obstacle. Limited budget allocation for ACM accounted the community not trying to develop the program on a larger scale. As the team went into the community, one of the major questions is why has BEHTRUWC stopped, when is the government going to have a program to educate our children. Due to lack of ownership of the project by the CMC, sustainability issue remained a challenge. Moreover in urban communities, group cohesiveness and group solidarity are not as strong as rural due to heterogeneous complex characteristics. Had adequate community mobilization been planned and budgets increased, the current plans for educating the hard to reach working children would not be at the ‘talking stage’, but a reality.

The ownership of the project by the CMCs and the social leaders was vital for sustainability. Community participation of a much greater level requires full involvement in designing the planning and implementation of the campaign with ensuring shared responsibilities to achieve the common agenda. In this respect, building capacity of the CMCs deserved more attention. This is a major flaw in the program design, but is typical of project design throughout the world as ACM is thrown in as one of the legs projects stand upon, but seldom is true planning and budgeting included. It is an afterthought that is thought to be necessary, but seldom supported.

5.6 Recommendations

5.6.1 Advocacy

1. That a specific Gender Action Plan is developed to support program activities.
2. That facilitators be appointed at field level to coordinate, monitor, and follow up all ACM activities.
3. That training is provided at national and district level to build the capacity of BNFE and NGOs with regards to mainstreaming gender.
4. That the institutional capacity of BNFE to lobby and advocate be strengthened.

5.6.2 Social Mobilization

1. That GoB looks at the possibility of linking with Corporate Social Responsibility programs such as the Dutch Bangla Bank’s scholarship program for high-performing but poor students.
2. That NGOs and other participating community stakeholders be taken as “partners in development” and not as “contractors”.
3. That a Coordination Plan be developed to ensure that GoB activities across ministries and NGO networks are leveraged and maximized.
4. That the role and structure of CMCs be reviewed and strengthened to play a functional proactive role at the community level.
5. That a robust plan for the training and development of working CMCs be developed, funded, and implemented, including LC management.
6. That the use of mobile technology to build awareness across a wide audience around the issues and opportunities for urban working children be explored.
7. That NGO staff be trained on RBA approaches.
8. That SM events like IPT shows be carefully planned in consultation with the community.

5.6.3 Program Communication

1. That coordinated advocacy campaigns to support NFE projects be run at both a national and local levels and seek endorsements by public figures or celebrities.
2. That the GoB explores public-private partnerships (PPPs) with media outlets such as BTV and private TV channels to telecast communications to a wider, national audience.
3. That strategies for sensitization programs for employers and duty bearers are developed and undertaken through PPPs be explored.
6. Monitoring and Evaluation

This section discusses the M&E delivery system of the BEHTRUWC project. It puts priority on M&E as an integral part of institutional development process. Therefore it puts more emphasis on the potentials for improving the system based on lessons learned.

In the decade since this project was visualized and implemented, M&E had made a sea change. Traditionally, M&E focused on identifying impact metrics or indicators. Often these approaches have been purely indicator-driven, with little attention to designing M&E systems that measure outcomes associated with particular interventions. Although the indicator/metrics perspective still prevails, there has been a movement towards more comprehensive approaches to M&E. These include project cycle management, results-based management (RBM), and learning networks.

In the context of project management, the concept of management effectiveness is gaining significant ground. Indicators alone are not sufficient to reveal project effectiveness. Project M&E is most effective when undertaken in the context of a complete process that links indicators to project goals, objectives, and activities. To accurately assess the impact of an intervention, it is important to understand the context in which the intervention takes place, the management processes behind the intervention, and the causal mechanisms supporting the intervention.

M&E answers questions related to how well a project or strategy is working independently of or in relation to other possible projects or strategies. M&E is also critical for improving project management. It can help identify the conditions under which a project is likely to succeed or falter. Moreover, it can also serve as an early warning system for potential problems, and it can lead to ideas for potential remedial actions. As such, effectively delivered M&E results often provide the basis for improved decision-making and as such, become the backbone of the project and must be taken into consideration early in the project development process.

There has been an evolution in the field of M&E involving a movement away from traditional implementation-based approaches toward new results-based approaches. The latter helps to answer the “so what” question. In other words, governments and organizations may successfully implement programs or policies, but they need to know whether they have produced the actual, intended results and truly delivered on promises made to their stakeholders. For example, it is not enough to simply implement health programs and assume that successful implementation is equivalent to actual improvements in public health. One must also examine outcomes and impacts. The introduction of a results-based M&E system takes decision makers one step further in assessing whether and how goals are being achieved over time. These systems help to answer the all important “so what” question, and respond to stakeholders’ growing demands for results.

As the principles behind BEHTRUWC are expected life beyond the end of this project in, the evaluation will use this more inclusive paradigm in which to evaluate the project M&E so as to lay the foundation for future NFE for urban working children. The evaluation conceptualizes M&E more as a system that needs further improvements, rather than a series of activities that need corrections.

BNFE within its permanent organization structure has planning and monitoring activities assigned to a specific department under a Director, who directly reports to the Director General (DG). However, each project such as BEHTRUWC is placed under the remit of a Program Director (PD), who is deputed to the post for a limited period. The PD is responsible for all the functioning of the PIU. As a result, the PIU under the PD can exert its autonomy over M&E activities. Out of 50 staff, one Assistant Director and nine MOs are specifically assigned to carrying out M&E activities. PIU’s M&E activities were also supported by BNFE central and UNICEF.

UNICEF’s support role recently had further been strengthened due to decentralization of its operations in the divisional towns. UNICEF’s presence has helped to ensure better communication and interaction with BNFE’s divisional offices, as well as with the project NGOs.

The context within which the M&E system was conceptualized has changed, therefore, any meaningful improvements will require integrating the ranges of concepts and lessons learned into this new paradigm. The object then, is not to be critical, but rather to build on knowledge and lessons learned to ensure that the future M&E system can maximize effectiveness and efficiency in ensuring expected outputs and outcomes, and be used as a management tool.

This section starts with M&E system design. It then discusses the four streams of M&E mechanisms involving three different institutions, followed by a narration of strengths and weaknesses of the M&E system as compared to the critical steps needed for setting up RBM&E (Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation), which has become one of the top program priorities of the government in the formal primary education sector. This section also provides a brief narration relating M&E with overall project management. Finally, a number of comments have been provided, which indeed forms the basis of subsequent recommendations.

### 6.1. Relevance

The design and operation of the current M&E system was examined to establish its relevance to the context it is working within and its ability to respond to the needs of BEHTRUWC.

#### 6.1.1. Assessment of the current M&E system

The GoB is attempting to transform its M&E system from a conventional into a more effective and efficient system within the context of RBM. RBM&E is a powerful management tool that can be used to track progress and demonstrate a project or program’s impact. RBM&E differs from traditional M&E which is implementation-focused, in that it moves beyond an emphasis on inputs and outputs to a greater focus on outcomes and impacts.

It has already started to progressively implement RBM into its primary education governance. Therefore it makes sense to attempt at transforming the NFE interventions like BEHTRUWC, to be managed through RBM&E. The following narrative highlights the potentials for making such a change.

The M&E system was a conventional implementation-focused system looking at inputs and outputs. Its emphasis was on targeting achievement of agreed activities and reporting them to management and the funders, but was essentially a one-way system which did not manage the project or solve problems. This system was useful
in finding out how well the project had been implemented by linking the project implementation responsibility mainly to PIU.

An RBM&E system goes beyond target achievements and investigates what does achievement of project outputs imply. Results-based monitoring is a continuous process of collecting and analyzing information to compare how well a project, program, or policy is being implemented against expected results. Therefore, from a conventional standpoint, the M&E system might show a project to succeed in terms of achievements of its mandated objectives; however, it might fall short of delivering the expected results. In this case, it could be stated that the project’s achievement does little to show to what extent the project has actually helped to achieve its goal/outcome. For instance, the achievement of project outputs will make sense if the children can apply their literacy and livelihood skills for increased income in a sustainable manner. The M&E system could be redesigned in ensuring that the processes and outcomes are better reflected in the system. The project took a number of initiatives that features elements of RBM for instance, as discussed earlier, and it modified its monitoring design to improve the learning outcome of children.

6.1.2. Project Readiness

Readiness assessment is necessary to find out the project’s capacity to make change and manage change. Project readiness is contingent upon a number of factors such as policy alignment, absorption capacity, resource bottlenecks, established processes, etc. A careful analysis of these factors will ensure to assess project readiness. The project could have done better in assessing these factors in-depth before implementation. The project also had not included a participatory and partnership processes with relevant stakeholders in developing the M&E system. This aspects needs to be taken into consideration before taking up similar initiatives in the future.

6.1.3. Agreeing on Outcomes to Monitor and Evaluate

The indicators that are shown in the log-frame, which did not exist until after the MTE, are basically output indicators and there was no evidence in support of the project making any concerted effort to determine outcome indicators suited for the project. This involves setting key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor progress with respect to inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts at the beginning of the project. The key outcome indictors to measure progress could have been determined through appropriate consultative processes and would have resulted in a richer, more concise final evaluation. The primary education system is currently reviewing its KPIs. Lessons in this domain could be integrated within the context of NFE BE and LST.

6.1.4. Selecting Key Indicators

The project did not have any key performance indicators. A KPI is used to evaluate factors that are crucial to the success of an organization. This could have been identified through consultations among the project implementers. This could have helped the project monitoring for results, evaluation, and reporting findings.
6.1.5. Establishing Performance Baseline

The baseline study helped to understand project design and general reporting performance but was not a true baseline. It was an assessment research as it did not measure indicators or the current situation with the purpose of measuring those again to see what changes had been made, positively or negatively, since the inception of the project.

It also did not comprehensively engage with cost baseline which allow the project manager and management to predict when the project will be spending monies and over what duration. It also did not deal comprehensively with scope baseline (scope baseline includes the project scope statement), or schedule baseline (schedule baseline is the approved project schedule and used to determine the variation between the plan and actual progress to decide if preventive or corrective action is needed). These aspects appear in the RDPP, but there is no evidence that the RDPP was the result of well-organized baseline study. The baseline provided benchmark skills sets for the skills training while the MTE findings were used to review/reform the project, including revising the targets at some point. These are some indices of practical evidence informed RBM.

6.1.6. Planning for Improvement

This aspect builds on the previous steps and involves the selection of interim steps on the way to a longer-term outcome. Targets can be selected by examining baseline indicator levels and desired levels of improvement. If another project is undertaken, it could take initiative in this direction.

Once the project started its actual operations, it had a continuing process of planning in place. Practice of joint reviews was ensured throughout the project enabling sharing of findings, lessons, and mutual decision making to inform limited revisions to the project to the extent permitted by the project implementation regulations. To this extent, the project made a reasonable effort to bring needs-based changes but remained constrained due to inherent inflexibilities.

6.2. Effectiveness

The evaluation looked at the effectiveness of the M&E system for the management of a project such as BEHTRUWC to assess its ability to respond to project needs.

6.2.1. M&E system design

The M&E system design appears to have been strengthened after the midterm review with the introduction of the logical framework and the development of a database. In doing so, more emphasis apparently was given to the input monitoring. The monitoring formats which were used as information collection tools included enrollment, attendance, dropout, etc. The monitoring also covered other important aspects of provisioning such as whether materials were provided on time, whether classroom space conformed to the standards, whether salaries were provided on time, etc. However, the monitoring design was less pronounced in addressing day-to-day teaching/learning challenges the children and teachers faced, problems faced in center operations, and measures taken to overcome them. These process-oriented elements were addressed by supervisors and other field level operators, but were not recorded and analyzed in a way that would provide important strategic insights.
The categories of formats (Table 17) and the kind of information they were supposed to collect show an overriding concern by the project designers to ensure that the inputs are in place, as ensuring inputs was the foremost challenge for a project as complex as BEHTRUWC. The team could not verify whether proper orientation was provided to the format users. Nor could they verify whether the formats were provided to users on time. The team was told by the PIU staff that at the initial stage there might have been some delays in printing and disseminating formats to users, but this problem was quickly resolved as the project progressed. The PIU apparently has a database but with limited use.

Table 17:
M&E Formats, Target Audiences, Frequency, and Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formats</th>
<th>Target audience/ info related to project</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Filled by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>Static data- parents name, address, education, etc. Dynamic data- achievements, certificate, working conditions, etc.</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Teacher (with verification from NGO coordinator and MOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Teaching learning materials, learning center materials, curriculum materials, etc.</td>
<td>For each Stage/Cycle</td>
<td>POs, NGOs and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers and supervisors</td>
<td>Gender desegregated information on teachers and supervisors</td>
<td>Every six months</td>
<td>PO, NGO coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Events organized under social mobilization and communication component</td>
<td>Every six months</td>
<td>PO, NGO coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Center info</td>
<td>Learners’ achievement, learning center facilities, teachers and supervisor’s performance</td>
<td>Each time during visit to the learning center</td>
<td>MOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Participants in capacity building component</td>
<td>Events, gender segregated info on partners</td>
<td>According to needs</td>
<td>Responsible official from BNFE, PIU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2. Four streams of monitoring

There were four monitoring streams for the project. The first stream was led by the PIU and was the main monitoring stream. The second stream was based with BNFE central, which is headed by the DG. This system was responsible for monitoring all of the projects under BNFE’s remit. The PIU monitoring system is also sub-ordinated to this mechanism. The third stream was conducted independently by NGOs to serve their own internal needs. The fourth stream led by UNICEF, was basically used to verify the project needs and verify other data. The existence of four monitoring streams under the same project structure testifies to the fact that each of the key stakeholders had needs and accountability for some form of M&E activities. For instance, UNICEF needed to have some form of independent quality assurance on the reports and results shared by the implementing NGOs.

Figure 10 shows the four streams of monitoring. PIU carried out core monitoring activity. BNFE central also provided monitoring support. The NGOs had their own M&E mechanism and that complemented PIU’s M&E system by reporting outputs,
but also used for their own internal needs. Through their own M&E system, it was possible to take necessary action on a day-to-day basis as well as keep them prepared to respond to PIU’s M&E related queries. UNICEF’s role was mainly supportive and in addition, UNICEF has provided an important aspect of qualitative monitoring through consultant for livelihood training who have provided technical support and have contributed to capacity building.

Figure 10:  
Four Streams of Monitoring

1. Monitoring by PIU: The PD as the head of the project was responsible for managing the monitoring system. It appears that the project was well versed with the kind of inputs provided and also about fulfillment of specific tasks assigned to the project implementers at the various levels.

Perhaps the most effective mechanism of information use was through GO-NGO meetings organized on a monthly basis. In these meetings, PIU used to collate monthly information gathered mainly by the MOs through Format 6 and courses of action were agreed upon for future rectifications. This particular exercise was critical for achieving the expected outputs of the project. The issues that emerged most frequently according to the PIU, had to do with attendance, and students and teachers drop out. Overall, M&E system appears to be inputs-based and top-down in nature. This type of monitoring is helpful at the input as well as output level. The project apparently had scope for further improving the monitoring of process and outcomes which was not implemented.

For instance, it was stated by a number of NGOs that the BE curriculum and books were of high quality, but that the teachers often failed to deliver the curriculum in the expected manner. Though these teachers were in the minority, the project through its monitoring mechanisms, could have explored ways to locate these teachers and generate appropriate remedial processes. Similar processes based on participatory principles could have been generated particularly at the LC level concerning CMCs, community (even though communities were loosely bonded and floating), and teachers and supervisors under the facilitation of MOs. This would have helped to collect process-oriented qualitative information. The participatory processes could also have helped to create a sense of ownership at the LC level among the
stakeholders and would have further motivated grassroots stakeholders to take more responsibility spontaneously. The MOs are also in a position to report directly to PIU about these findings under the current mechanism.

The issue of power relation between NGOs and PIU is also a point to consider since many NGOs felt that the feedback provided both at GO-NGO meetings, as well as at the field level, was top-down in nature. Since the team did not have a chance to see this process because the evaluation was carried out after project completion, it could not be verified or validated. However if the comments have some validity, the GO-NGO meetings should evolve processes that would ensure more space for more feedback from NGOs for ensuring two-way accountability.

It is also to the PIU’s advantage to develop their monitoring system more thoroughly so as to meet the needs of the NGOs in their managing of the project. This type of lower-level, everyday data is essential in monitoring the running of a good program and will be needed for a new iteration which at this point, is planned to be housed in the BNFE. Every activity of a project has value and data needs to be generated at the impact level so the project can be measured and managed accurately.

2. **BNFE Central Monitoring:** Every month, the BNFE central office got together in a combined meeting with all the representatives responsible for various projects under BNFE’s remit. In these internal monitoring meetings, BNFE officials share their experiences from the various projects. These experiences are then recorded with action points and followed-up during the subsequent meetings. All the directors and assistant directors at BNFE are responsible for monitoring different centers each month irrespective of their nature of responsibility. This type of monitoring helped to cross check and validate findings by the project and NGO staff. Overall the structure of BNFE for conducting monitoring appears to be on sound. Within this structure however, there still appears to be room for further functional improvements.

3. **UNICEF’s Monitoring Support:** UNICEF/ILO have played a positive facilitative role in supporting the BEHTRUWC implementation process. UNICEF/ILO have provided the services of six skills development consultants. These consultants according to project staff, played an instrumental role in providing technical support to ensure effective and efficient implementation of LST intervention. Occasionally, they have also provided motivational inputs to the employers and have played a positive role in creating awareness about safe working environment for employees. They are also in a ready position to offer additional assistance such as the supplemental food that was provided to the learners by the World Health Organization (WHO). This is an example of how qualitative dimensions can be addressed through funder monitoring. In addition, the UNICEF field offices were always in communication with the BNFE’s field staff and responded to their needs wherever possible.

4. **NGOs:** There was no mechanism within the PIU monitoring to assure that NGO implementation was successful, so NGOs had to develop their own monitoring system. The capacities of NGOs varied and were independent from each other that each NGO had its own monitoring system in place. As there was no uniformity, data could not be collected at the lower levels so as to have a picture of how the NGO programs were functioning and at what level. Since the evaluation is not directly about NGO performance, this aspect was not investigated in detail. However, due to the presence of the NGOs at the grassroots and their close interaction with the
community, their project readiness could be much better in terms of installing participatory M&E systems including RBM&E.

6.2.3. Evaluations

A number of evaluations were carried out related to basic literacy achievements. The MTE for Phase 2 also played an important role in understanding the effectiveness and efficiency of the project delivery. The MTE provided a number of recommendations and strategic insights. Some were implemented such as the development of a database and others were not, but it was beyond the capacity of the team to determine why. There was not any form of needs-based evaluation carried out during the project.

6.3. Efficiency

The evaluation team looked at the process for how the M&E data was collected and used to inform project decisions.

6.3.1. Information-flow and processes involved in M&E

The BEHTRUWC M&E system was based on a multi-level, multi-stakeholder structure. The lowest level of this structure was at the LC, managed by the teacher with support from the CMCs. The teacher was responsible for children’s enrollment, drop out, progress, adequacy of learning materials, supply, etc. The CMCs were supposed to provide support to the teacher in carrying out their responsibilities. However, CMCs in general were not active.

6.3.2. Key decision-making features of multi-level M&E system

Multiple stakeholders were involved in decision-making based on monitoring information. If the nature of problem identified had to do with the teaching/learning process, the supervisors provided on-the-spot feedback but it was not captured in the monitoring system. If the problem had to do with finances or supply of materials, the problem was referred to NGOs or to PIU through NGOs according to the situation and was reported on the monitoring system. Yet in other cases, the center operation administrative matters were generally referred to the implementing NGO themselves. Therefore, the decision-centers were functionally decentralized in providing inputs to the center and there was no cross-learning between NGOs and this was also lost to the BNFE. In addition, the sub-system offered a good opportunity for generating process-oriented qualitative data which could have contributed to further strengthening the qualitative dimension of the project and might have turned into quantitative data had trends been captured. The qualitative information such as challenges faced in teaching learning process, reasons behind various problems faced in managing the centers, the results of administrative actions taken, etc., were mainly addressed by supervisors on a day-to-day basis. The system however, did not have any provisioning for recording process-oriented information for feeding into the central management information system (MIS) database.
6.3.3. M&E Sub-System at Learning-Center Level: Project Staff (Teachers, Supervisors, Program Officers, and NGO Coordinators).

Teachers were accountable to supervisors who were assigned the responsibility to monitor 60 centers each month. The supervisors were also provided with prescribed formats to collect information. On their visits to a center, the supervisor crosschecked the information provided by the teachers. The supervisors also discussed the kind of problems and challenges they faced. Once information was collected from each center, the supervisor collated the information from the 60 centers and sent the report to NGO coordinators who collated all of the supervisors' information by entering it into the BNFE's database. The hard copies were then sent to PIU for verification. After initial checking of the information, they were finally sent to TBS for cross checking.

The NGO coordinators also collected information from the LCs on prescribed formats and sent this on to the PO responsible for each division who used it to cross check the collected information based on their own monitoring activity. This information was then sent to the PIU. The NGO coordinators were also responsible for entering the collected information into the database in same manner they entered supervisors' monitoring information. The entered data was then sent to TBS central database for further processing.

Within this sub-system, the actual monitoring took place during visitations. Each monitor from different levels provided on the spot feedback during their visit. The sub-system ensured accountability of the teachers for carrying out comprehensive management of teaching at the LCs. It also ensured that the teacher problems and challenges lead to appropriate remedial measure. Through this mechanism, direct and rapid monitoring was made possible but it was not captured in the database.

6.3.4. Monitoring Sub-System at Intermediate Level (Monitoring Officers, Program Officers, and Assistant Directors)

The MOs, POs, and Assistant Directors mediated monitoring information flow from the LCs to PIU. The MOs operated within a centralized monitoring arrangement and reported to PD. Their collated report was the main information material used for GO-NGO meeting, which usually took place every two or three months, according to the situation. In these meetings monitoring feedback were provided to the NGOs.

The POs operated at the same level as MOs but operated under a more decentralized arrangement with more authority and responsibility. Unlike the MOs, they had the authority to approve SoE (Statement of Expenditures). SoEs are deemed to be very important by the NGOs as they are the basis for NGOs to be paid for project implementation. It was reported by the project personnel that in some cases, NGOs were not timely in submitting SOEs and it was also alleged by a number of NGOs that the POs were stringent in approving them. The POs often sent them back for resubmission since they suspected over invoicing of expenditure. The net result was that SoEs were often not cleared on time. Since installment disbursement was based on clearance of previous SoE, the project implementation suffered. As most of the NGOs were of national repute, most of them had a financial safety net to tide them over until they were paid. Consequently, implementation at a larger scale with more NGOs in the future could pose a problem unless the process is reviewed and made simpler and faster. Robustness of transparency and accountability need to be maintained as well.
Currently, after the approval of SoE from the POs, the SoEs are then sent to the BNFE Assistant Director for cross checking. Viable alternatives need to be explored as this is double-checking, there must be a faster, yet accurate, transparent method. One alternative would be to randomly sample the SoEs monthly and then in the annual audit, make sure all are accurate.

According to MOs, they are not as effective as POs in program monitoring as they do not have the authority to take financial and administrative action as POs do. Their reporting efforts are used only for the GO-NGO meetings and by then, the data is at least a month old. The MOs felt that if they had adequate authority to make LCs directly accountable to them, they could effectively resolve many issues on the spot.

6.3.5. M&E Sub-System at the Central Level

The PD was responsible in ensuring the predetermined outputs of the project were accomplished. These outputs were spelled out in the project document which was finalized after detailed scrutiny by MoPME. Therefore it is worth noting that initially, once the project was approved, the PD was not in a position to make any major changes during project implementation. This inflexibility in project implementation was mitigated somewhat by a new directive which allows change within a limited scope. While the team could point out the need for integrating quality issues into the monitoring system, the narrative in the project document actually determined the quantity-based and output-oriented M&E system.

Considering the M&E system’s output-oriented nature, the PIU was in a good position to keep a tab on the project. However, collection of monitoring information and processes was slow and in many cases, the delivery of information was not timely. Right information at the right time for the decision-makers is hallmark of an effective and efficient M&E system. Since the team was not in a position to carry out in-depth investigation, it cannot conclusively suggest that such constraint was due to over-centralization of M&E system. However, based on the principle of subsidiarity (which suggests that optimum effective decisions are taken at the lowest level of implementation where actual events occur), the progressive decentralization of M&E could be contemplated.

Yet another dimension of the M&E system was that BNFE staff, outside the BEHTRUWC project, also participated in monitoring and the DG had an overall oversight on the process. This was useful in creating institutional learning for sustainable capacity building. However the team has not come across any evidence that indicates any meaningful participation of BNFE’s own MIS in the process. In the future, even if external MIS firms are contracted, it should function in close collaboration with BNFE’s MIS.

6.3.6. Financial Management

Since the inception of the BEHTRUWC Project, Sida provided technical assistance (TA) to UNICEF to organize and provide needed technical support in crucial areas of the project for the purpose of strengthening capacity, efficiency, transparency, and credible reporting. Among the crucial areas identified for this TA support from Sida were M&E and financial management. The latter was particularly relevant based on the findings of the first Sida External Audit of the project for the period 2004-2006 (dated November 2007). Following this first external audit report, all the three Development Partners supporting this government project in consultation with BNFE, worked together on how to address these findings where relevant actions were
needed. The financial management strengthening of the BEHTRUWC project financial system was imperative to ensure better accountability, enhanced tracking of project expenditures against agreed activities, and capacity building of the BEHTRUWC Project PIU and BNFE in general. Relevant actions were taken to address the findings or irregularities of this first external audit so that these could be avoided in the future.

There were three no-cost extensions of the BEHTRUWC Project, wherein the government project document (Development Project Proposal, DPP), had to be revised three times. Due to this and other valid reasons, the next Sida External Audit covering the period 2006 to 2011 (dated 2 April 2014) could not be carried out before 2013. This second audit had key findings that needed to be addressed on an urgent basis (please see the ToR for the second Sida External Audit of the BEHTRUWC Project, 2006 to 2011 – Annex 3). The follow-up activities/actions in this context are continuing and will be a crucial part of the Final Sida External Audit of the project covering the period 2011 to mid-2014. This final audit has commenced and will be completed by mid-September 2014. Both Sida Headquarters and the Swedish Embassy in Dhaka are involved in the Sida external audit process of the BEHTRUWC Project.

After the first Sida External Audit of the project, UNICEF in consultation with the BNFE, Sida, and CIDA, produced three ToRs in 2008, 2009, and 2013 to actively follow-up and improve the financial management aspects and financial reporting of the project, and to build up the needed capacity. The contract for this task was awarded to a national audit firm by UNICEF. However, in the second Sida External Audit of the BEHTRUWC Project covering the period 2006-2011, a number of key management issues and weaknesses throughout the BEHTRUWC project financial system were identified. These needed immediate remedial action. They included the need for better financial management through TA, and supervision from UNICEF with regard to the PIU to improve fund management and reporting, and to support the overall system development. An efficient and transparent financial management and reporting system is key to any replication effort of the BEHTRUWC Project in the future both in the national or international context.

Another key finding that emerged in the second Sida External Audit was the disbursement of seed money for the LST component of the project, which is discussed in Chapter 4. Consequently, a major change in this context was using a different mode for the disbursement of the second tranche of seed money, in contrast to the disbursement of the first tranche of the seed money for better transparency and accountability. This again would be applicable to any replication of the BEHTRUWC model in the future.

The timeframe set for the Final Evaluation of the BEHTRUWC Project meant that a thorough analysis of the financial management aspects of the project for the BEHTRUWC Project Final Evaluation was not possible.

Based on these three ToRs, Sida has requested UNICEF to prepare a progress report to better understand the financial management aspects of the project in relation to the identified weaknesses in the financial system of the project, and how these can be addressed in a constructive manner. It is also expected that this report, though unable to provide an in-depth analysis of BEHTRUWC’s financial management system, will still be of some value in understanding the causes of the identified financial management weaknesses of the project, and how this could be avoided in future initiatives of this kind. Effective utilization of project funds is key to
the efficient implementation, monitoring and results reporting of any given development project.

6.4. Impact

The evaluation looked at the impact that the M&E system and data had on the project in terms of making corrections and improvements or identifying gaps.

6.4.1. Application of database

An external consultancy firm was awarded with the assignment of developing a database and data entry of both basic literacy and livelihood skills. The output of their work had limited application during project implementation, since the data entry work was still in progress long after project completion. Also for each cycle ended, the data was collected, entered, processed, and MIS reports were prepared. Significant time passed before the information and analysis provided was available. Therefore the critical task of providing necessary information that could be used to manage the project was not available. There is wealth of information that was used in the evaluation that could also be used in carrying out longitudinal studies in the future.

6.4.2. Improvements based on monitoring data

Despite inherent inflexibility in the governance of the project, a number of measures were taken based on monitoring findings. These measures contributed to monitoring improvement. For instance during the BE phase, the scores of children were recorded without any classification. This made taking adequate remedial measure difficult. At a later phase, the scores were classified into four grades (A, B, C, and D). Children earning A or B grades were assessed as having achieved the required BE competency. Children earning C or D grades were judged as weak learners and below the competency level. Special measures then were taken to support these children in acquiring the required competency. Some of the measures taken were monitoring them more intensively. Also in LCs where there was a high number of low achieving children, the PD instructed the monitors and supervisors to provide intensive pedagogical inputs to the teachers. A negative result in this practice was that since an intervention such as this is time consuming, the regular number of LCs to be monitored was reduced. This is an example where the monitoring system adapted itself to the needs of the situation. The MOs and POs were the main officials who led this process. This intervention was adapted half way through the project and implies that the M&E system has the capacity as an institutional learner and can change procedures for project improvement.

Another instance was in regards to tiffin. As a measure of monitoring strategy, 100% of the LCs where tiffin was provided were monitored. This proved to be a useful approach since it ensured all children received tiffin. However, the team is unaware of any formative evaluation carried out linking the learning outcomes with the provision of tiffin.

In case of LST, the UNICEF appointed consultants monitored on a monthly basis and it was reported this this was very useful for the trainers, MCPs, and children.
6.5. **Sustainability**

A well-functioning M&E system is an important tool for identifying lessons learned and following progress to ensure that outcomes and impacts are sustained in the long run. The evaluation looked at features that should be included in the M&E system to aid this.

6.5.1. **Monitoring for Results**

Monitoring for results entails collecting quality performance data, for which project specific guidelines are given. There were no guidelines prepared for this project. In terms of determining output, the project had an elaborate structure and system with predefined tools for monitoring information collection. The current M&E has apparently fallen short of working at the outcome level. However, the commitment of the government, two major donors and UNICEF to this evaluation reflects that the system is committed to make necessary shift towards RBM.

6.5.2. **Evaluation**

In order to maximize project performance, the project needed to decide which kind of evaluation is needed (formative or summative, as well as the sub-categories of evaluation). The project has carried out summative evaluation. However, the team does not have sufficient information to suggest that other forms of formative evaluations were carried out during project implementation on needs-basis.

6.5.3. **Reporting**

M&E in order to be effective, requires analyzing and reporting data to help decision makers make the necessary improvements in projects, policies, and programs. The project has been effective in collecting mainly inputs related information. It also had an effective reporting, feedback and follow-up mechanism in order to keep the project on target. On many occasions however, the project did not have required flexibility to take action according to M&E findings. This inflexibility has made the current M&E appear to be less effective than expected. The limitation of M&E design was the reason for the limitation of scope in reporting, but the reporting structure itself was based on sound rationale.

6.5.4. **Using Findings**

A large part of information gathered through field investigation and information gathered through MIS system were only partially used. A large part of this information was processed late. Therefore adequate mechanisms were absent in generating information and knowledge for policy makers and practitioners enabling to enhance their capacities for better policy making and project implementation.

6.6. **Recommendations**

1. That the GoB develops a robust RBM&E system to support the effective and efficient implementation, management and monitoring of NFE activities.
2. That a strong results framework (RF) underpins the RBM&E system, demonstrating how the activities lead to the outputs which shows the behavior change at the intermediate results (IR) level. This shows what will be
accomplished at the strategic objective level and finally, led to the goal being accomplished.

3. That key gender indicators be set in M&E system.

4. That data entry is decentralized to the field level. Rather than entering huge amount of data centrally which takes time, data entry could be initiated at the field level with NGOs, and collected and delivered electronically in a very cost effective way. This would create a system of having right now or almost right now data from which the project could be managed. The collected information then could be fed into the central system and processed subsequently for reporting and feedback. Collecting data at the field level will provide opportunity for the field offices to partially analyze information and take action. This decentralized arrangement could serve the necessity for time intervention quite well.

5. That the database prepared by TBS be transferred to BNFE’s MIS section. The collected information could be used for developing action researches for NFE activities which could be conceived, planned, and implemented through NGOs.
7. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The BEHTRUWC Project 2nd Phase provided life-skills based BE to 166,150 hard-to-reach urban working children in the age range of 10-14 years, in the six divisional urban cities of Bangladesh. Recognizing that the hard-to-reach children require more than BE (literacy and numeracy), 20,130 children also received LST. Capacity building, SM, program communication and advocacy were the other components of the project.

The key stakeholders of the project were the GoB in general and MoPME in particular, donor agencies Sida, CIDA and UNICEF, the children of age 10-14 years in the urban areas of the six regions of the country, and the other implementing institutions affiliated with BEHTRUWC as well as education sector partners.

The project began in 2004, first implemented in 2006, and finished in 2014. It was funded by UNICEF (US$6.031 million), Sida (US$23.922 million), and CIDA (US$11.415 million). Implemented by the BNFE, the general objective was to enhance the life options of the urban working children and adolescents to access their rights to education, protection and development and participation. The specific objectives of the project were:

1. To provide quality non-formal, life-skills-based BE to 166,150 urban working children and adolescents ages 10 to 14 years, of which at least 60% were girls,
2. To provide 20,130 (out of 166,150) urban working children and adolescents (13+ age group) with LST, and access to support systems to ensure optimal use of life-skills-based BE to improve their life,
3. To advocate at City and National levels for education, social and economic policies in favor of working children and their families and for protecting children from hazardous working environment, and
4. To increase awareness of all relevant stakeholders to act in favor of progressive elimination of child labor.

A project of this complexity and magnitude is always going to face issues and challenges, no matter how well it is planned. BEHTRUWC was no exception to this, but it was also a project that accomplished significant achievements in difficult situations and impacted the lives of thousands of children, their families, employers, and communities. Without exception, those who the evaluation team spoke with had high praises for the project and were concerned that it was ending without a visible replacement. All of the individuals, funders, GoB, and NGO staff should be proud of BEHTRUWC’s accomplishments and proud to be a part of it.

7.1 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats Analysis of Project Management Outputs/Outcomes

It needs to be noted that the entire evaluation either directly dealt with project management or reflected on project outputs and outcomes that are the result of the management processes (covering relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact). However at this point, a global overview of the framework within which this project was implemented will further put this evaluation into perspective. For purposes of clarity, only the key project milestones that guided the project management has been discussed based in the SWOT analysis.
7.1.1. Strengths

- **Innovation and pragmatism**
  Given the socio-economic status of children and the fact that sufficient resources are not available to withdraw them from the labor market by covering the opportunity cost, the project has taken a bold and pragmatic step in providing basic literacy and then providing some with the livelihood skills which will make them better equipped to overcome the cycle of poverty. The project was pioneering work in opening a window of hope and opportunity for these children which was a unique opportunity, as they or those like them, have never been exposed to anything like this before. The project has also introduced innovative interventions both in BE and livelihood interventions to a difficult group of children to reach.

- **Collaborative arrangement in project management**
  The collaborative arrangement between UNICEF and PIU was functional and complementary. Due to mutual trust and respect between the two agencies, it was possible for them to complement each other’s role based on their respective comparative advantage. The PIU’s comparative advantage was based on output-based project implementation while UNICEF is experienced in technical provisioning and facilitating the implementation process. This collaborative arrangement was instrumental in dealing with institutional uncertainties when the former Department for Non-Formal Education was abolished. During this institutional vacuum, the process of conceptualizing and preparing the BEHTRUWC project remained virtually unhindered.

- **Drawing from lessons and experience**
  The project has demonstrated that it remained open to feedback and recommendations. It also took remedial actions to a reasonable level. For instance, it learned from the problems it faced in selecting more than 100 NGOs during NFE 3 phase (the earlier version of BEHTRUWC project) as involving such a large number of NGOs created capacity issues. Many NGOs did not have adequate capacity. It also created unrealistic management burden for project staff from both UNICEF and BNFE. This strained the entire project management process and generated consequent inefficiencies.

In the second phase, the selection responsibility was given to UNICEF. NGO selection is usually the prevue of the Ministry (until or unless it is delegated it to the other agency, as in this case, UNICEF). This resulted in selection of reduced number of NGOs with credibility and has contributed reasonably in enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of the project. This measure has been proven to be effective and transparent as it was a swift process to identify the NGOs who had the capacity to implement their part of the project and has kept favoritism and cronyism at bay. Therefore, should be the model for future NGO selection.

Yet in another instance, having to do with tiffin and school bags provision for children, the project officers made a decision based on observation and feedback from project participants, as well as external evaluators in appropriate distribution. This also happened with the identification of weak learners below the competency level when remedial action was taken.

- **Deployment of expertise**
  The project has been able to contribute to the process of value addition by identifying appropriate expertise. The project also created appropriate conditions based on
accountability to ensure the expected results. This resulted in the introduction of one of the best curriculum packages in Bangladesh.

Also on the livelihood side, the expertise of UNICEF/ILO was utilized. This took an active form through regular monitoring of the livelihood experts and this intervention added value to the process. This reflects that despite lack of comprehensive outcome indicators, the project management was well aware of the critical factors that have bearings on outcomes.

7.1.2. Weaknesses

- **Project preparatory stage**
  The baseline survey completed during the project preparatory stage, did not comprehensively address the issues needed to measure and evaluate subsequent progress of the project. The baseline survey was helpful in project design and in some cases necessary to measure progress and conduct evaluation. However by the time this study was carried out, most of the design issues and the strategic concerns that came with them had already been decided.

  Curriculum development was hampered, possibly due to the delay in NGO selection. During this period, the project could have mobilized its resources which would have resulted in the creation of a well-developed curriculum. Yet this was a project weakness since it could not foresee the value of extending its preparatory period for this purpose beforehand. The essential learning from this is that such developments in the future ought to happen by design and not by default.

- **Teacher and student dropout**
  This aspect has been dealt with in some detail under the BE section in Section 3. The recording of student dropout was particularly problematic. It was reported that there were cases of replacements, but this data was not captured so the reported dropout rate is faulty. This has resulted in the understatement of actual dropout. It has also undermined the pedagogical challenges faced by the teachers due to dropout and replacement of children at the different cycle of BE intervention. The dropout of teachers also created similar challenges.

- **Strategic planning for SM and advocacy**
  The project did not develop a strategic oversight plan to guide its SM and advocacy activities along the line of a campaign model. Because of this, they were not able to simultaneously use media and engage the communities in a mutually reinforcing synergic relationship. Rather, SM and advocacy is seen as a sum total of events and activities with no ability to identify causal relationships. Bangladesh society is more aware than when the project started, of gender and hazardous child working conditions. It is not clear whether this change was due to the result of the project SM and advocacy activities or its level of contribution, or whether it is just part of the maturation of society which happens naturally when economic conditions improve.

- **Financial reporting**
  A substantial number of NGOs failed to preserve necessary financial documents. From NGOs, the excuse of long delay between cycles and phases were given. Such excuses do not ‘hold water’ from the standpoint of professionalism. This has exposed the incapacity of NGOs in the domain of documentation, an aspect often acknowledged as missing by many NGOs themselves. This has created gaps in transparency and financial accountability. As a result, disbursements were delayed and the project participants including the children, suffered.
• **Delays**

Delays are costly both in terms of time and money. Perhaps one of the central weaknesses of the project was its inability to meet deadline between stages. The various forms of delays include:

1. **NGO Selection**: NGO selection was delayed and later resolved when the responsibility was delegated by the government to UNICEF.

2. **Delay between Baseline and beginning of BE**: One of the reasons for the baseline was to identify the hard to reach urban children who would be the learners in the BE program, but by the time the BE was implemented, many of these children who are mobile by nature, were no longer there and the process had to begin again.

3. **Delay between BE and LST**: The project faced problems in targeting the actual children right from the beginning. As these children are hard to reach as the title of the project suggests, the delay between BE and LST further aggravated this problem. It also undermined the link between literacy and livelihood skills as many of the children had no opportunity or practical application to practice their new skills, so many of them had forgotten them.

4. **Delay between LST and Seed Money Distribution**: This created similar problems. The project staff reported that in some cases, the seed money did not reach the intended children as they were no longer in the area. This number however, was not significant, but the delay meant that graduates could not practice their newly learned skills as they could not purchase the equipment needed and many had to go back to the old jobs, many hazardous, that the project was trying to draw them away from.

5. **Delays in Disbursing SoEs**: A number of NGOs informed the team that the acceptance of their internal M&E reports caused delays in disbursing their SoEs. Conversely, PIU has suggested that NGOs themselves were responsible for delay so it is hard to lay blame. This type of delay is widely prevalent in the project management system of the government. Even though this problem was reported through the M&E mechanism, the system does not have sufficient flexibility to take swift action to redress the issue and a better system of delivery needs to be developed.

• **Supply of materials**

There were reports of inputs not provided to LCs on time. At times the materials were reported to be insufficient and of sub-standard quality. However these allegations were not frequent and for a project as large as BEHTRUWC, it appears that these inconsistencies were within acceptable limits. Since M&E was input oriented, it apparently could follow-up on these discrepancies and take necessary measures for rectification.

7.1.3. **Opportunity**

• **Potential for replication**

The project was transformative. It has shown that combining BE with appropriate skills development holds a promise for breaking the poverty cycle for hard to reach children. It cannot be stated that the project in its present form, is replicable. It could be safely suggested that the project has made positive shift towards meaningful replication. Further fine-tuning is needed to overcome bottlenecks that have been identified through this evaluation and other major endeavors before it could be considered ready for replication. One of the bright notes is that the apprenticeship model BRAC piloted is already being replicated with facilitation from UNICEF and BRAC sees many uses for it in Bangladesh and elsewhere.
• **Sustainability**
The project has created the possibility of sustaining some of its achievements by integration with major national initiatives. For instance, the BE curriculum holds the promise to be integrated within the Second Chance Education under the PEDP3. The same applies for ROSC being implemented by the DPE. Whether similar projects such as BEHTRUWC will be undertaken in the future or not, its ideas and achievements are already finding their way into many of the national initiatives for children. All these possibilities are now being seriously contemplated by the government.

7.1.4. **Threat**

- **Inherent inflexibility in project governance**
  Any centralized governance system often finds it difficult to offer the degree of flexibility to ensure efficient project implementation and BEHTRUWC is no exception. The central governing agencies are traditionally more concerned about whether the money has been disbursed on time and whether the quantitative aspects of projects have been achieved. The project's basic parameters are assessed, determined, and managed under a centrally controlled command structure. Projects like BEHTRUWC are approved by the Executive Committee of the National Economic Council, the highest approving authority of projects under the Prime Minister. These complex centralized arrangements have found correspondent expression in designing and running of project that focuses on effectiveness and makes efficiency less of a priority.

- **Political commitment**
  While access to BE is high on the policy agenda, the issue of urban working children is yet to gain prominence. Without a strong political commitment resulting in national ownership of the issue, it will be difficult to carry the process forward in a meaningful manner. The development partners can only facilitate and essentially not in a position to create national ownership.

7.2. **Assessment of Overall Relevance**

Although BEHTRUWC did indeed meet the educational needs of poor urban working children in the BE program, it did not look at knowledge sustainability after their graduation. As BE ended in October 2011, there were no learners to talk to except those who were in the skills training program. They said that was a long time ago and they were quite young so they do not remember. The project prioritized enrolling girls over boys, but it was not designed using a gender framework and it did not address many of the issues girls faced nor did it develop programs which might appeal to girls in the skills training so they could have the potential to earn on a par with the boys. Lower paid teachers tended to be women and higher paid men were supervisors, so there was no modeling here either.

Two of the key components of the project were to protect children from hazardous working environment and progressive elimination of child labor. There was some movement to eliminate children working in hazardous conditions. SM tended to be the celebration of specific Days or Weeks and this was not well integrated into the project except externally with the production of television and radio programs as well as other forms of media. These were only peripherally tied to the project and it started late so there was not a ground swell of change brought about by these efforts.
The project also did not link itself to other organizations which work towards the equity-focused and rights-based approach. Integration of the project with other logical partners did not happen, to the detriment of the project.

BEHTRUWC indeed contributed to closing the access gap in the BE sector and 166,150 children benefited from this. It was not successful though, in assuring a successor was waiting ‘in the wings’ and parents and community members are concerned about what will happen to the younger children coming up and needing to be educated.

The M&E was a conventional implementation-focused system. It emphasized target achievement in the light of agreed activities. It was not designed to help manage the project and as the project never had any key indicators, it could not measure them to find out how well the project was fairing. A large part of information gathered through field investigation and information gathered through MIS system were only partially used. A large part of this information was processed late. Adequate mechanisms were absent in generating information and knowledge for policy makers and practitioners enabling to enhance their capacities for better policy making and project implementation.

There were numerous project revisions and suggestions for revisions from the MTE. The revisions often came with additional funding and were logical directions for the project to move. The MTE recommendations though, except for the creation of a database, were not implemented and should be taken into consideration for the next iteration of BEHTRUWC.

7.3. Assessment of Overall Effectiveness

One of the strengths of BEHTRUWC was the curriculum development and the textbooks. They reflected the lives of these children and were much more useful than mainstream textbooks. The one deficiency in this was where gender and social change issues could be addressed and they were not reflected in the texts. Girls and women, boys and men did traditional things. The preference of girls to boys in enrollment meant that more girls benefited from BEHTRUWC, but this was not a true gender decision as there were no actions other than this.

It also became obvious that those who were fortunate enough to have both BE and skills training were in a much better place than those who just had BE. Education alone will not break the back of poverty. It has to have a catalyst such as the skills training component. The team was told that many of the classmates who had not gone on to skills training were doing the same work they were doing when they started the program.

BEHTRUWC was the first time that an issue as hidden as poor urban working children has ever been addressed. There have been education projects who have targeted rural poor, but the issues affecting children in the urban areas was more severe and they are harder to access and support as there was no community surrounding them. Just these factors have brought the dialog to society and the government.

The dropout rate for both BE and skills training was low. BE’s rate dropped significantly as new groups started. Teachers and supervisors spoke with family and employers to try to retain the learners. The fact that learners brought their younger
siblings to class so they could attend was a wonderful, but unplanned accommodation.

Domestic work was quite hidden and was predominantly a girl’s responsibility so girls are less protected from hazardous working environments. Boys though, also engage in hazardous work and discussion and working with parents and employers often changed the situation. Until girls are counted as domestic workers and regulated, they will continue doing hazardous work.

Both Dhaka and Chittagong had serious problems finding space for LCs. It was easier in the four other urban areas as they are more open and rural. A number of employers changed their behavior toward their child employees. In the BRAC apprentice program, many of the MCPs have employed their trainees or helped to set them up in business.

The NGOs for the BE program were hired as service providers and not implementers. The curriculum had little equity-focused and rights-based approach integrated into them and the skills training was just that and did not include external education.

The SM component of the project was composed of celebrating special Days and Weeks and was not well integrated into the project. The media work that came out of the project did educate the public and make them more aware of working children's rights and their well-being as learners.

The number the team talked to was not very high, but more boys than girls were able to choose their skills training. The project did not purposely try to develop non-traditional skills training for girls and it seemed it went out of its way to ensure they existed. This creates an income disparity for life between girls and boys.

The majority of the learners the team talked to were planning on using their seed money for equipment and supplies. Since the project insisted learners have bank accounts, they seem more in control of their seed money than earlier groups. The amount of seed money was also not a big enough to dent in the life of the incumbent at least in terms of setting up an effective occupation.

Partner NGOs were assessed using M&E staff from BNFE who visited them to make sure they were in compliance in their teaching. If they were not, they were given a warning and those teachers were helped to become stronger.

7.4. Assessment of Overall Efficiency

As BEHTRUWC was unique in the education field, it was hard to judge it against other models. Bangladesh’s own history was one in which rural poor education was developed early and delivered by many NGOs.

As the BE was used by NGOs as a delivery mechanism for a prescribed service, the management was similar in most locations and was managed by BNFE, PIU, and M&E staff. There were glitches in the early days which were overcome and the biggest issues have been lack on continuity of education, to skills, to seed money.

The gaps between programs were difficult to overcome. The urban poor by circumstances, was a very mobile population and by the time the skills training was
ready to start, it was hard to find graduates of the education program. UNICEF and 
BNFE field staff worked long hours to find graduates qualified. NGOs delivering 
skills training found knowledge gaps that they attributed to the time between the two 
programs so often had to have supplemental education along with their skills training.

The database development which was a MTE recommendation, really enhanced the 
project and allowed much better record keeping.

The partners the team interviewed which were primarily involved in the livelihood 
skills delivery did an excellent job of training the learners. There were four modalities 
in the project and BRAC’s apprenticeship model was the most effective in creating 
lasting mentoring relationships and getting the learners employed. UCEP also had 
an appealing model, but learners should be enrolled for their BE through training with 
them as it takes the learners longer to complete the program. MAWTS has a lot of 
experience in training and were able to help the learners obtain employment better in 
Dhaka, but it was lacking in employment contacts.

The project only addressed gender in the ratio of girls to boys. Social background 
was not an issue in most places. The project did not target boat people, although 
they were available in Khulna and Barisal. The rights of children and other SM 
efforts was never fully integrated into the project.

7.5. Assessment of Overall Impact

BEHTRUWC had significant impact on the retention, learning outcomes, and 
livelihood skills of hard-to-reach urban working girls and boys when they were part of 
the skills training. Those who only had BE are hard to judge, but unless they did 
something to sustain their abilities, they will lose these skills especially reading, in a 
short period of time.

The most significant unintended consequence of the project was the anticipation of 
the poor that their children will finally be educated and have a chance to escape the 
clutches of poverty. Intended consequences were awareness and elimination of 
child brides, cessation of children working in hazardous conditions, and the ‘amazing’ 
success of the skills training.

If children did not continue their education, become part of the skills training, or find 
another way to sustain their learning, there was little chance that BE alone will 
change their lives and girls, since both girls and women are discriminated against 
within society, will have a harder time than boys.

7.6. Assessment of Overall Sustainability

Communities and families are immensely supportive of BEHTRUWC and one of the 
constant questions the team had to field was how soon would a similar program be 
available as there were younger children who needed education.

Child rights and the elimination of child labor on paper, was an integral part of the 
project, but in delivery, it was almost non-existent. Little was done in the classes or 
communities to change people’s thinking, except peripherally.

BNFE and the GoB have been in discussion on the correct way to integrate the 
education of poor urban working children into the national education plan. The team
has been assured it was in there or that it will happen, but there are no hard plans and more significantly, no monetary allocations. There were many well-trained people working in all aspects of BEHTRUWC, but as time goes on and no program is in sight, their skills and knowledge were lost and any program will have to start at almost zero.

BRAC put some of its own money into their LST program and they were so pleased with the results that they are trying to develop it as way to train Bangladeshis who want to work abroad so as to enhance their earning abilities and are planning on exporting the model to use in other countries. BEHTRUWC may adapt this model in its own way to improve the quality of the project.

The discussion of scaling BEHTRUWC up into sector wide policies, programs, and the budget are only at the talking stage and it was supposed to be part of PEDP3. It was too early to know what will happen in the future. Bangladesh has a constitutional responsibility to educate all of its children, but how soon a strategy is developed to continue education the poor urban children was anyone’s guess.

7.7. Recommendations

The following section provides a combined list of all of the recommendations made throughout the report.

7.7.1 Basic Education

Relevance
1. That any curriculum and TLM prepared are cognizant of and well targeted to the context of urban working children.

Effectiveness
2. That gender analysis is integrated into the planning process for NFE programs and strategies and is continued through the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.
3. That further investigation is done into the reasons that children dropped out of the BEHTRUWC program so that the lesson learned from this can inform strategies for GoB programs moving forward.
4. That emphasis is given to identifying and enhancing delivery mechanisms that promote appropriate gender inclusion.
5. That issues that particularly affect girls’ attendance and participation are further investigated and addressed.

Efficiency
6. That the possibility of using mobile networks to promote life skills, including gender awareness, sexual health rights, and other sensitive issues, is investigated.
7. That a cost benefit analysis of the overall BEHTRUWC program and components of the project, such as models implemented by different NGOs, is undertaken to inform strategies for GoB moving forward.
8. That future projects have mechanisms in place to collect accurate data regarding attendance and drop out rates.
9. That BEHTRUWC curriculum and TLM are made available to BNFE for reference and to inform future program activities.
Impact
10. That a longitudinal study of at least one year is conducted to measure the success of the basic education component of BEHTRWUC to identify wider lesson learned.
11. That parental training on gender rights be included in programs.
12. That the possibility of resources such as local reading facilities and/or libraries be investigated to improve the sustainability of outcomes for NFE graduates.

Sustainability
13. That GoB looks to provide a pathway for continuing education for NFE learners, including options for mainstreaming.
14. That sustainable mechanisms are identified to support the retention of teachers and training of new teachers in NFE programs.
15. That a stipend program be investigated to support high performing children from poor backgrounds to continue their education.

7.7.2 Livelihood Skills Training

Relevance
1. That advanced business skills training are included in LST programs to support self-employment options for graduates.

Effectiveness
2. That strategies are prepared to support more girls being trained in non-conventional areas like computer training, packaging, electronics, etc.
3. That LST programs take a wide view of the skills necessary to improve earning potential e.g. learning both hardware and software aspects of mobile repair.
4. That the training based model is interfaced with NGOs/institutions which specialize in implementing demand-driven, market-oriented livelihood strategies.

Efficiency
5. That seed money is commensurate with the minimum amount needed for business start-up for self-employment.
6. That entrance into skills training is available to participants immediately after completing basic educational training.
7. That seed money is available immediately upon completion of training as it is key to helping learners in their new occupations.
8. That further investigation is done into the development of a viable tracking system of graduates engaged in employment and self-employment so there will be longitudinal data.
9. That the children and community should acquire the skills to carry out rapid market assessment on the basis of simple action research principles as the market changes through time and can quickly change with the elimination or addition of some external element as even though a market assessment was conducted by a professional firm, this is not sustainable in the long-run.

Impact
10. That further investigation is done into how apprenticeship model could be extended and used to facilitate the process of bringing non-traditional livelihoods that are traditionally thought to be in the male purview to girls.
11. That further investigation is done into how in center-based training models, could better engage the communities to provide support to the children in having access to marketing outlets, procuring raw materials, transportation, etc.
12. That an impact evaluation on BEHTRUWC is conducted one to three years after completion to identify long-term impacts and lessons.
Sustainability

13. That the possibility of drop-in/support centers in each divisional town is investigated to provide reading, counseling, and further business training experience, etc. It could also be further expanded into a small-business support center for the community.

14. That a reasonable post-graduate support period be built in to LST programs so that the skills applied by the children for gainful employment become sustainable.

7.7.3 Advocacy

1. That a specific Gender Action Plan is developed to support program activities.
2. That facilitators be appointed at field level to coordinate, monitor, and follow up all ACSM activities.
3. That training is provided at national and district level to build the capacity of BNFE and NGO s with regards to mainstreaming gender.
4. That the institutional capacity of BNFE to lobby and advocate be strengthened.

7.7.4 Social Mobilization

5. That GoB looks at the possibility of linking with Corporate Social Responsibility programs such as the Dutch Bangla Bank’s scholarship program for high-performing but poor students.
6. That NGOs and other participating community stakeholders be taken as “partners in development” and not as “contractors”.
7. That a Coordination Plan be developed to ensure that GoB activities across ministries and NGO networks are leveraged and maximized.
8. That the role and structure of CMCs be reviewed and strengthened to play a functional proactive role at the community level.
9. That a robust plan for the training and development of working CMCs be developed, funded, and implemented, including LC management.
10. That the use of mobile technology to build awareness across a wide audience around the issues and opportunities for urban working children be explored.
11. That NGO staff be trained on RBA approaches.
12. That SM events like IPT shows be carefully planned in consultation with the community.

7.7.5 Program Communication

13. That coordinated advocacy campaigns to support NFE projects be run at both a national and local levels and seek endorsements by public figures or celebrities.
14. That the GoB explores PPPs with media outlets such as BTV and private TV channels to telecast communications to a wider, national audience.
15. That strategies for sensitization programs for employers and duty bearers are developed and undertaken through public private partnerships be explored.

7.7.6 Monitoring and Evaluation

1. That the GoB develops a robust RBM&E system to support the effective and efficient implementation, management and monitoring of NFE activities.
2. That a strong RF underpins the RBM&E system, demonstrating how the activities lead to the outputs which shows the behavior change at the IR level. This shows what will be accomplished at the strategic objective level and finally, led to the goal being accomplished.
3. That key gender indicators be set in M&E system.
4. That data entry is decentralized to the field level. Rather than entering huge amount of data centrally, which takes time, data entry could be initiated at the field level with NGOs and collected and delivered electronically in a very cost effective way. This would create a system of having right now or almost right now data from which the project could be managed. The collected information then could be fed into central system and processed subsequently for reporting and feedback. Collecting data at the field level will provide opportunity for the field offices to partially analyze information and take action. This decentralized arrangement could serve the necessity for time intervention quite well.

5. That the database prepared by TBS be transferred to BNFE’s MIS section. The collected information could be used for developing action researches for NFE activities which could be conceived, planned and implemented through NGOs.
8. Annexures
ANNEXURE 1
TERMS OF REFERENCE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP): To conduct final Evaluation of the Bangladesh Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Working Children (BEHTRUWC) Project - 2nd

RFP # LRPS- 2013-9109614

1.0 BACKGROUND

The Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Working Children (BEHTRUWC) Project 2nd Phase was a follow up project of its Phase I implemented between 1997 to June 2004. The lessons learned and recommendations from the final evaluation of Phase I (Mitra, 2004) have guided the development of Phase II, refining focus and outputs. The Phase II project was originally planned for the period of July 2004 to June 2008 and planned to be rolled out in two stages over five years. However, the project was finally approved by the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education (MoPME) in May 2005. A baseline survey and mapping exercise completed in the second half of 2005 which identified the out-of-school urban working children aged between 10-14 years in six divisional cities. With 18 months delay, the BEHTRUWC 2nd Phase project was finally started from early 2006.

BEHTRUWC 2nd Phase project was being implemented by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) of the Bureau of Non Formal Education (BNFE) under the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education. The project was supported by the Government of Bangladesh (GOB), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The current budget after three revisions of the project was US$ 41.368 million (UNICEF US$ 6.031 million, SIDA US$ 23.922 million, and CIDA US$ 11.415 million). The financial contributions of both SIDA and CIDA are channelled through UNICEF to the Government of Bangladesh as per the agreement in 2006 with Economic Resources Division (ERD) of the Ministry of Finance. The CIDA funding to the project was closed on 30 April 2012 and SIDA funding will continue until 31 December 2013. However, the project were closed in June 2014.

The project was designed to initially provide life-skills based basic education to about 166,000 hard-to-reach urban working children in the age range 10-14 years, in the 6 divisional urban cities of Bangladesh. Recognizing that the hard-to-reach children require more than basic education (literacy and numeracy), it was planned to simultaneously provide livelihoods training to about 20,000 children. Capacity building, social mobilization, program communication and advocacy were the other components of the project. Due to delay in implementation, the project adjusted its strategy and adapted to roll out in four stages instead of two as planned. The first stage started from July 2006 with implementation of basic education component.

As planned, the Mid-term Evaluation of the project was conducted in June 2008. The major findings and recommendations of the evaluation are summarized in annex A while a full report was available. Meanwhile, the project was extended three times respectively— till July 2011, then 31 December 2012, and finally 30 June 2014. Accordingly, the objectives of the project were also adjusted considering the findings of the mid-term evaluation and all the necessary extensions.

The general objective of the BEHTRUWC 2nd Phase Project was to enhance the life options of the urban working children and adolescents to access their rights to education, protection & development and participation. The specific objectives of the project are:

1. To provide quality non-formal, life-skills-based basic education to 166,150 urban working children and adolescents ages 10 to 14 years, of which at least 60% were girls,
2. To provide 20,130 (out of 166,150) urban working children and adolescents (13+ age group) with livelihood skills training, and access to support systems to ensure optimal use of life-skills-based basic education to improve their life,
3. To advocate at City and National levels for education, social and economic policies in favor of working children and their families and for protecting children from hazardous working environment, and
4. To increase awareness of all relevant stakeholders to act in favor of progressive elimination of child labor.

Rationale of Evaluation:

The Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Working Children (BEHTRUWC) Project-2nd phase was going to be phased out in June 2014. The Government of Bangladesh and the development partners—particularly SIDA, CIDA and UNICEF— have planned to conduct a final evaluation of the project by end of 2013, before it ends officially on 30 June 2014.

A further rationale was the pertinence to document and use lessons from the BEHTRUWC into Education and relevant sector wide programmes for a more inclusive development.

Objective of the Evaluation:

The objective of the evaluation was to measure and examine the outcomes, outputs and strategies of the project in terms of quantity and quality against the set project targets and intended results. It will also evaluate the project results at output and outcome level, particularly, in terms of its contribution to basic education, livelihood skills, social mobilization and communication, gender equality and project management in the context of Bangladesh.

2.0 PURPOSE/OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT:

This RFP was being issued to select and contract a full social service research agency to conduct the final evaluation to enable the Government, particularly the BNFE and development partners (particularly SIDA, CIDA and UNICEF) to impartially document good practices, note gaps, take lessons learnt into future programming for education of out of
school children aged 10-14 years old; to promote inclusive education sector development within the ongoing third Primary Education Sector Development Programme.

With 60 per cent of the target group of beneficiaries of children aged 10-14 years being girls, the evaluation will assess if the benefits of the BEHTRUWC project reached the intended target group with adequate gender sensitivity; and created knowledge on strategies to deal with inequities in effective coverage of education for this age group, especially girls. The lessons learnt and good practices documented in this final evaluation were used to support the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, particularly the Bureau of Non-formal Education in evidence-led adjustments to increase the equity focus of the BEHTRUWC project in urban areas under the second chance education component of the Third Primary Education Development Programme (PEDP 3) for reduction of out of school children.

The lessons learnt from the BEHTRUWC strategy will also inform UNICEF’s emerging multi-sectorial focus on urban poor areas which includes promotion of non-formal education and livelihood skills and provide an opportunity to refine the strategy further. Together with the UNICEF’s study on Out of School Children, this evaluation will provide paired evidence for advocating with the Government and expanding partnerships for more inclusive strategies and interventions to tackle the adolescent development challenges in the country.

Scope of Evaluation:

The evaluation will focus on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project; as well as its key strategies and major components - basic education, livelihood skills, social mobilization and communication, project management (including monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, financial management system, and NGO partnership).

Target Group: The main target group for the project was out of school children of 10-14 years old with special focus on girls who live in urban slum areas and are working in informal sectors and in their homes.

Cross-cutting issues: It was expected that these issues would be incorporated into the OECD-DAC criteria described above. More specifically:

- As the project aimed to cover 60 percent girls, the evaluation will assess the physical coverage, equity dimensions, analyzing girls’ participation across the OECD-DAC criteria.
- Given that the project was designed specifically for children out of school, and based on the findings of the study on OOSC, the evaluation will assess the strengths and weaknesses of this strategy and recommend ways in which the successes can be up scaled, and the gaps filled to address the issue of out of school children in more sustainable and cost-effective terms.
- As the project was predominantly led by the MOPME’s BNFE, the evaluation will assess the extent of integration, harmonization and alignment that the project’s processes imbibed into the government’s own system in terms of results-based management, risk management and accountability.
- The extent of ownership of the strategy in terms of mainstreaming and government budget allocation and internal capacity of the government to promote the BEHTRUWC strategy into sector development policies and programme.

Time frame: The evaluation was expected to cover the second phase of the BEHTRUWC project beginning from 2008 to date, since a midterm evaluation was undertaken in 2008.

In terms of the ‘impact’ criteria, the evaluation shall primarily examine the impact from the perspective of rights holders and beneficiaries, including unintended consequences, if any; and to a limited extent the larger second chance education programme and relevant sector policies and programmes.

Participation: The evaluation will seek response to the evaluation questions under the different criteria from the children, implementing partners and the stakeholders of the project in the urban areas of the six regions where the project was implemented.

Key stakeholders: The key stakeholders of the project are the Government of Bangladesh in general and Ministry of Primary and Mass Education in particular, donor agencies Swedish SIDA, Canadian CIDA and the UNICEF, the children of age 10-14 years in the urban areas of the six regions of the country and the other implementing institutions affiliated to the BEHTRUWC project as well as Education sector partners.

Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions:

The inception report shall detail the evaluation questions to capture the purpose and objectives as stated above. Essentially, the evaluation shall answer the following or more questions in line with the criteria below:

A. Relevance

1. To what extent was the project designed and aligned to address the education sector priorities and deprivations affecting children in general, children of age 10-14 years and girls in particular?
2. How appropriate was the project’s articulation and delivery in addressing the underlying causes and consequences of the deprivations faced by the rights holders?
3. To what extent was the project aligned with the statutory Government and other stakeholders’ priorities, policies and projects for these rights holders?
4. To what extent did this project enhance (or weaken) and align with the statutory accountability of government institutions and stakeholders responsible for ensuring the rights of the children? — linked to impact and sustainability criteria
5. To what extent did the project contribute in closing the access gaps in the basic education sector services for its focused age group of children? linked to the effectiveness criteria
6. To what extent was the project designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated jointly by all key stakeholders/partners, taking into account different population groups as well as boys/girls? linked to sustainability criteria

7. In the project revision, what changes were required and to what extent were corrective strategic decisions made? (Reference the under-used management committee structure as per finding of the mid-term evaluation)

B. Effectiveness

1. How much and in what ways did the project contributed to improve education for out-of-school children in urban Bangladesh, taking into account the social background, gender and dynamic urban contexts of the children?
2. How has the project facilitated and contributed to social and economic policies in favor of working children and their families? To what extent have such policies taken into account social disparities and gender?
3. How successful was the project in addressing the factors that hamper working children's enrolment, retention and learning achievement in the learning centers?
4. To what extent were girls and boys differentially and specifically protected from hazardous working environment?
5. How much and in what ways have national and city authorities and other relevant stakeholders contributed toward the elimination of child labour, as a result of this project? To what extent has this affected girls and boys differently, or affected certain population groups more than others?

To what extent do the participating implementing partners/NGOs incorporate equity focused and rights-based approach to planning, advocating and delivering this project to address deprivation faced by children, particularly urban working children and adolescents?

1. To what extent was the social mobilization component successful in advocating and garnering positive actions (or otherwise) for working children's right and their well-being as learners? To what extent has the project reinforced or weakened the accountability of families, public and private institutions engaged in activities for the rights of working children? linked to sustainability criteria.
2. How and to what extent did female and male learners participate in the selection of livelihood skills for training? To what extent was the project valuable and gender sensitive in impacting learning outcomes and livelihood skills for the girls and boys?
3. To what extent are the learners prepared to plan and manage the utilization of seed money to enhance their livelihood skills?
4. How were implementing partner's performance in operating learning centers assessed?

C. Efficiency

1. To what extent was the project design, strategies and delivery effective compared to similar and/or alternative models in delivering the same/equivalent quality of learning and livelihood skills, compared to alternative costs and counterfactual?
2. To what extent was the project management model efficient compared to results attained?
3. What were the obstacles faced and to what extent these affected project efficiency? To what extent was the project able to identify and address critical capacity gaps of the key partners, at reasonable costs and in a timely manner?
4. To what extent did the project use evidence and knowledge from mid-term evaluation and other available sources to advance the rights of children and inform project, stakeholders and partners?
5. To what extent were partnership arrangements judicious and conducive to the delivery of outputs?
6. To what extent did project activities address differences in social background and gender?

D. Impact

1. What impact has the project had on the retention, learning outcomes and livelihood skills of hard-to-reach urban working girls and boys? linked to relevance criteria.
2. What are the intended and unintended benefits/consequences of the project on children, their families and/or the education sector?
3. To what extent have the basic education, skills and competencies attained in the learning centers assisted girls and boys to have improved life options and opportunities? Were girls and boys affected differently and did their respective socio-ethnic background determine outcomes?

E. Sustainability

1. To what extent are community and family contexts supportive of this and future initiatives in this area?
2. To what extent was the project able to increase awareness and actions of the rights holders' families and communities in protecting the rights of children to education in similar contexts?
3. To what extent have BNFE and the implementing partners' undertaken necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the project?
4. How successful has the project been in leveraging additional interest and investment
5. In supporting basic education and livelihood skills training for marginalized urban working children?
6. To what extent have BNFE and MoPME used technical capacity, tools, strategies and leadership commitment to drive the project and scaling it up into sector wide policies, programme and budget?
7. To what extent has the operating capacity created and reinforced in all key partners?

Methodology:
The evaluation will entail desk review of available literature including the programme document, process documentation and status/progress reports, discussions with key stakeholders, consultation meetings and interviews with participating agencies, ministries/departments of the Government, UNICEF, SUM and CIDA. This will include review and analysis of BEHTRUWC project records, evaluation findings (see background above and annex) and
related sector review and project performance reports; work plans, Project Cooperation Agreements and related reports.

A mix of quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect information. This will include and not limited to collection of primary and secondary information from the key informants (implementing partners and duty bearers), claims holders (BEI-TRUWC-graduates, parents, teachers and others related to the delivery of the project). Methods of key informant interviews of the stakeholders shall be triangulated, then analyzed with the FGA of the rights holders groups (beneficiary children and their parents) as well as service providers. However, the detailed, most appropriate, methods are to be elaborated in the inception report. The inception report should also specify designs and methods to triangulate all the information collected from the field as well as the stakeholders, to ensure sufficient rigor and reliability of findings/recommendations.

**Management arrangement:**

The UNICEF Bangladesh Evaluation Management Team (EvMT) shall exercise management oversight as per prevailing office guidance note/guidelines.

Led by the UNICEF SPPME Section, a quality assurance technical reference group of specialists and peers with evaluation or substantive knowledge, plus external partners or counterparts from government and civil society, and Chief of Evaluation UNICEF ROSA shall be constituted. The reference group shall provide technical inputs to enhance quality of the evaluation by specifically reviewing the inception report, sampling design, tools and draft reports for compliance with UNICEF standards.


Overall, the conduct of the research and its report must pay particular attention to and respect dimensions of equity, gender, human rights. The rights and dignity of those to be interviewed, including children, adolescents, vulnerable populations, women and men must be respected. The norms and standards of the UNEG shall guide the conduct of this research and any person, institution and affiliates associated with this exercise shall abide by the provisions therein, including but not limited limited to conduct, ethics, behaviour etc. A copy of the UNEG standards and norms was available at: [http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNEG Norms 2005-FINAL.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/UNEG Norms 2005-FINAL.pdf)

The Chief of Education shall be co-opted to the EvMT where/when necessary and shall work with SPPME Section to facilitate interaction with partners, promote national ownership of the evaluation by the Government and stakeholders and implement actions to close all recommendations in the UNICEF Global Evaluation Review and Oversight System.

**3.0 TERMS OF REFERENCE:**

**3.1 Description of Assignment:** To conduct final Evaluation of the Bangladesh Basic Education for Hard to Reach Urban Working Children (BEHTRUWC) Project – 2nd phase the consultant team should carry out the following tasks and produce the deliverables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>End Product/deliverables</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a briefing session on the assignment with BNFE, PIU, UNICEF, SIDA, CIDA. Set up division of labor between the consultants, led by the team leader.</td>
<td>Meeting records. Work plan.</td>
<td>02 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and analyze the BEHTRUWC project records, mid-term and related baselines and evaluation findings and related sector review and project performance reports; work plans, Project Cooperation Agreements and related reports. Planning, reports, evaluation and assessment to date.</td>
<td>Analytical Notes Data Tables and matrix on key findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of an Inception Report — including conceptual approach and design for the evaluation, elaboration of the methods, evaluation questions, outline of the report, and time lines for delivering the key products of the evaluation</td>
<td>Inception report Evaluation design and tools Work plan Outline of a) working papers and b) evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visit and collection of primary and secondary information from the key informants (implementing partners and duty bearers), claims holders (BEI-TRUWC-graduates, parents, teachers, service providers and others related to the delivery of the project) and ensure triangulation of the field for data and information.</td>
<td>Field notes Draft data tables Summary of field findings Key Informant Interview and FGD Notes and transcripts Pictures and clips All labeled chronologically for records, reference and easy retrieval.</td>
<td>08 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of information and data and draw sound conclusions based on facts;</td>
<td>Draft analysis plan Draft Reports and working papers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft the evaluation report answering key evaluation questions, linking findings to facts, stating limitations and challenges in compliance with the UNEG/UNICEF evaluation reporting standards;</td>
<td>Draft evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tasks | End Product/deliverables | Time frame
---|---|---
Presentation of the draft findings and recommendations to the stakeholders (BNFE, PIU, UNICEF, Sida and CIDA) and infuse the into the final evaluation reports in line with UNICEF evaluation standards | Draft presentation in appropriate format — soft and hard copies. Record of comments at consultations. | 02 weeks
Document for publication the good practices and lessons learnt from the BEHTRUWC in Bangladesh, but of local and global value to the education sector, share and finalize for dissemination with wider stakeholders | Working Papers (2 or more) | 
Final evaluation reports in line with UNICEF evaluation standards | Final evaluation report | 12 weeks or 3 months

3.2 **Duty station:** Assignment was Dhaka based but the agency personnel shall go to field to collect information from the children, implementing partners and the stakeholders of the project in the urban areas of the six regions where the project was implemented.

3.3 **Time line:** The time frame against each task was indicative — if required, the bidders may approach an alternative justified time-line for the activities maintaining the total duration mentioned.

3.4 **Deliverables and Key Tasks:**

Working closely with UNICEF, BNFE and relevant stakeholders, the consulting team shall produce the following deliverables, in English Language.

1. Inception report — detailing the conceptual approach and design for the evaluation, elaboration of the methods, evaluation questions, outline of the report, and time lines for delivering the key products of the evaluation.
2. Two or more working paper(s) on the BEHTRUWC good practices and case studies on groups of claim holders (5-10 pages).
3. A final report of up to 40 pages (with a succinct executive summary) presenting briefly the evaluation approach, key findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations (in line with standard UNICEF evaluation report).

The inception report shall detail the key tasks for the execution of the evaluation to deliver the products stated above. These may include the following or more tasks, consultative processes and products:

- Review and analyze the BEHTRUWC project records, evaluation findings and related sector review and project performance reports; work plans, Project Cooperation Agreement and related reports.
- Draft the key evaluation questions, tools and work plan as an inception reports and finalize with inputs from UNICEF (in coordination with stakeholders).
- Consult stakeholders and undertake field visit to interact with key informants (implementing partners and duty bearers), claims holders (BEHTRUWC-graduates, parents, teachers and others related to the delivery of the project) and ensure triangulation of the field data and information.
- Undertake logical analysis of data and information and draw sound conclusions based on facts;
- Draft the evaluation report to answer the key evaluation questions as intended in line with the UNEG/UNICEF evaluation standards based on facts.
- Present the draft findings and recommendations to the stakeholders and infuse into the final evaluation reports in line with UNICEF evaluation standards (see intranet for details) and finally;
- Document the good practices, noting gaps and lessons learnt and provide recommendation for future programming for education for out of school children of 10-14 years old.
- Document for publication the good practices and lessons learnt from the BEHTRUWC in Bangladesh, but of local and global value to the education sector.
- The final report and working paper(s) on good practices were published and disseminated, in line with UNICEF’s Evaluation Policy, aimed to reach a wide audience of education sector stakeholders and development partners in Bangladesh and beyond. Hence all deliverables shall be in English Language with reader friendly appeal.

**Dissemination of findings:**

All reports shall ensure audience friendliness and focus on the ultimate use and dissemination of the evaluation findings and recommendations to influence policy and programmes, forge partnerships and leverage resources and media attention towards the realization of the rights of children in similar deprived situations.

The audience shall include but not limited to the Government of Bangladesh (specifically MOPME, the BNFE/PIU and participated by relevant ministries such as Finance, Women and Children's Affairs, Social Welfare, Home Affairs, agencies, NGOs, CSO network, UN agencies, development partners, media, private sector especially those engaging adolescents etc.)
ANNEXURE 2
EVALUATION TOOLS

Basic Education Focus Group
BNFE Interview Guide
Center Management Committee Member Questionnaire
Development Partners Interview Guide
Employers Questionnaire
GoB Ministries and Agencies Interview Guide
Implementer Livelihood Skills Training Questionnaire
Life Skills Education Questionnaire
Livelihood Skills Children Questionnaire
Livelihood Skills Focus Group
Livelihood Skills Training Questionnaire
Livelihood Skills Trainer Interview Guide
M&E Questionnaire
Neoliterates Questionnaire
NGO Partner Interview Guide
NGO Supervisors Questionnaire
Non-Formal Education, Child Rights and Labor NGO Questionnaire
Teachers Questionnaire
BASIC EDUCATION FOCUS GROUP

Note: About 8 to 10 community people including farmers, businessman, local elites, CMC member, school teacher and parents were represented in the FGD.

- PURPOSE: To find out in detail how the skills livelihood training had impacted the recipients and community.
- The information you give us was completely confidential, and we will not associate your name with anything you say in the focus group.
- You may refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any time.
- We understand how important it was that this information was kept private and confidential. We will ask participants to respect each other’s confidentiality.
- If you have any questions now or after you have completed the questionnaire, you can always contact an evaluation team member like me, or you can call the evaluation team leader.

Introduction:

1. Welcome
   Introduce yourself and the note taker.
   Review the following:
   - Who we are and what we’re trying to do
   - What were done with this information
   - Why we asked you to participate

2. Explanation of the process
   Ask the group if anyone has participated in a focus group before. Explain that focus groups are being used more and more often to find out what people think about things and in human services research.

About focus groups

- We learn from you (positive and negative)
- Not trying to achieve consensus, we’re gathering information
- No virtue in long lists: we’re looking for priorities
- In this project, we are doing both questionnaires and focus group discussions. The reason for using both of these tools was that we can get more in-depth information from a smaller group of people in focus groups. This allows us to understand the context behind the answers given in the written survey and helps us explore topics in more detail than we can do in a written survey.

Logistics

- Focus group will last about one hour
- Feel free to move around
- Where was the bathroom? Exit?

3. Ground Rules
   Ask the group to suggest some ground rules. After they brainstorm some, make sure the following are on the list.

   - Everyone should participate.
   - Information provided in the focus group must be kept confidential
   - Stay with the group and please don’t have side conversations
   - Turn off cell phones if possible
   - Have fun

4. Ask the group if there are any questions before we get started, and address those questions.
5. Introductions
   • Go around table: job here, where you were born

Discussion begins, make sure to give people time to think before answering the questions and don’t move too quickly. Use the probes to make sure that all issues are addressed, but move on when you feel you are starting to hear repetitive information.

1. What was your overall impression of project’s basic education component?
2. What are your view about the quality of the education?
3. Give concrete examples on how learners from this center are using acquired skills in their vocations
4. How appropriate was the student selection criterion for this learning center?
5. What specific affirmative actions or facilities were offered for girls?
6. What was the criteria adopted in selecting the teachers for the learning center or other specific aspects of the project?
7. Did teacher visit your house when your child was absent from the LC?
8. When this center was closed? Are there any alternative?
9. Do you think this CMC was very active?
10. Are there suggestions on how the CMC activities can be improved?
11. How many of you attended training on gender, human rights, CRC?
12. What was your assessment of the relationship between the project and the community or vice versa?
13. What was CMC’s role in eliminating child labor in hazardous work? What was the role of parents and employers?
14. If rent was being paid for premises, how much and by who? How will the rent be paid when the project ends?
15. What actions are being taken by the community to continue the Learning Centre activities after the project ends?
16. Have you noticed any benefits to individual children from this project? What are those?
17. Any final comments?

This concludes our focus group. Thank you so much for coming and sharing your thoughts and opinions with us.

Materials and supplies for focus groups
   • Sign-in sheet
   • Focus Group Discussion Guide for Facilitator
   • Notebook for note-taking
BNFE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name: ___________________________ Date: __________________

Designation: ___________________________________________________________

Organization: __________________________________________________________

1. How long have you been involved with the BEHTRWUC project?
2. What was your overall feeling about the activities of this project (like management, supply, outcome, etc.)?
3. In your opinion, as you were involved in a lot of the project activities, what were the priorities of the project?
4. What was your perception about different education policies reflected in this project, such as how National Education Policy was reflected?
5. How did the project address child rights?
6. In what ways were child labor issue addressed?
7. Do you think that the delivery strategy was appropriate?
8. Do you think that the project objectives were achieved?
9. Do you think that the strategies and key activities were done?
10. What was the per capita cost per child of the project?
11. How would you rationalize the cost for effective outcome of the project?
12. What percentage was fixed for human resource development (teacher training, supervision and monitoring)
   a. Percent spent for teacher training: _______%
   b. Percent spent for supervision and monitoring: _______%
   c. Percent spent for staff salary: _______%
   d. Percent allotted for SMC development: _______%
13. Materials:
   a. How much money was allotted for books and primers: Tk.________
   b. What was the quality of the books: □ Good □ Average □ Poor
   c. How much money was allotted for visual materials like posters and charts: Tk.________
   d. What was the quality of the posters and charts: □ Good □ Average □ Poor
   e. How much money was spent by parents for children outside school: Tk.________
14. Do you believe the Project gave good value for money in comparison with other NFE/other NGO projects? Give an example of a success story of a child?
15. Shade some light on the modality of the project:
   a. Condition of the center: □ Good □ Average □ Poor
   b. Number of learners per center: __________ average
   c. Average attendance: __________ average
   d. Average completion rate: __________ average
   e. Number of days teacher have basic training: __________
   f. Teachers have monthly refresher training? □ Yes □ No
   g. Teachers were supported by the community? □ Yes □ No
   h. Comments on teaching learning activities: □ Good □ Average □ Poor
   i. Involvement of community in the process: □ Good □ Average □ Poor
   j. Link with government: □ Good □ Average □ Poor
   k. Process of supervision: □ Weekly □ Monthly □ Irregular
   l. Process of monitoring: □ Formal □ Informal □ None
16. To what extent did the targeted children (ages 10 to 14) benefitting from the project? How did they benefitting (give examples and success story)?

17. How has this project benefited girls and transformed their lives (give example and success story)?

18. What method did you use to keep contact with other partners?

19. Have you noticed any failure in the project? If any, please narrate.

20. What were the strength of this project?

21. What were the perceived challenges of this project?

22. What changes did you notice in the national scenario as an impact of this project (give example and case studies)?

23. Tell me about the development of curriculum and its implementation process.

24. What was the quality of the materials in terms of their content, coverage, difficulty and achievement?

25. How were teachers recruited and trained?

26. What was your view about the teaching-learning methods in the learning centers?

27. How familiar were you with the child rights and child labor issues before this Project? To what extent did the education policy addressing the child rights or child labor issue?

28. How far has the Project been successful in bringing child rights to the attention of a wider public and the Government? What further advocacy could they have done?

29. What were your comments on the sustainability of the project (give concrete evidence)? What were your thoughts on the likelihood that Government of Bangladesh will allocate its own funds to sustain the BEHTRUWC activities or, through other means, ensuring that the innovation was sustained?

30. Do you have anything you want to add?

31. Do you have any suggestions?
CENTER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: __________________________ Date: ________________

Designation: __________________________

Organization: __________________________

1. How long have you been associated with this learning center?
2. What was your capacity at the center?
3. What was your responsibility as a member of this committee?
4. To what extent do you think you were able to fulfill your responsibility?
5. How frequently did you meet in the center and what kind of decisions did you take?
6. Did you have any training on the area in which you work?
7. What support did you received from BNFE for your work?
8. What was your view about the quality of education at the center?
9. What was your comment about the sincerity of the teacher?
10. As the project has now came to end, do you think it should be continued? If so how?
11. Is the Program addressing the needs of working children, especially girls?
12. What problems do girls face to continuing education that was different from boys?
13. When was the last meeting held?
14. Did you have an agenda for the last meeting?
15. As a committee member what did you mainly discuss and do?
16. Were you consulted during recruitment of teachers, site selection, identifying working children, etc.?
17. Do you have any interaction with employers and those who do not send their working children to the center? How was it?
18. What was your view on the quality of teachers?
19. Do they teach in a way familiar to you or different ways?
20. Do you think that the teachers use some method where learners are involved to learn?
21. Did the teachers visit the houses of absent children?
22. How often did the supervisors come?
23. What kind of social mobilization activities were undertaken by the Center Management Committee?
24. What was Center Management Committee’s role within the project in birth registration, early marriage, dowry, etc.?
25. Did you play a mediating role between employers and the market on behalf of the children?
26. Did you visit the children’s working place and or were you in contact with the employers to ensure the children’s wellbeing?
27. Were you in a position to help children with their seed money? If so, how?
28. Do you have anything you want to add?
29. Do you have any suggestions?
DEVELOPMENT PARTNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Organizational Name: ____________________________
Title of the Respondent: ____________________________
Years in this post? ____________________________ In the DP? ____________________________

Relevance:
1. How many of your staff work on BEHTRUWC?
   a. Full time: ____________________________
   b. Part time: ____________________________
   c. Total ____________________________
2. How relevant are the key interventions of the project to the deprived children? How do you define deprivation?
3. The MTE came up with various recommendations. What do you think about those recommendations? How far those were implemented?
4. Comparing the last phases of BEHTRUWC, what would you pick out as the main differences?
5. How do you define a hard to reach urban working child? How far was the Project meeting the needs of the hard to reach urban working child? Especially strategic need of girls?
6. How far was this Project linked with other non-formal education projects and more generally with implementation of the non-formal education for Education for All and PEDP 3? Do you or your staff attend coordinating meetings for the National Plan of Action?
7. Is your agency involved in Bangladesh in implementation of Child Rights Convention, Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, the Beijing Declaration (Platform for Action) and other conventions and treaties? Elaborate.
8. What was the main reason for your agency was involvement in BEHTRUWC?
9. How familiar are you with the issues of child rights and child labor issues before this Project was designed? How have you become familiar with the Child Rights Convention?
10. Can you describe your involvement in the
    • Design stage
    • Annual reviews
    • Project management
11. How have the processes of annual review been conducted? Have you felt satisfied with the review process and outcome?

Effectiveness
12. Did any factor affect Project performance? Could these have been foreseen at the design stage?
13. BEHTRUWC has a range of committees to support its work: Advisory Committee, PSC, Working Committee, City Implementation Monitoring Unit (CIMU), Ward Committee, and the Centre Management Committee.
   a. On how many of these committees was UNICEF/SIDA/CIDA, the BNFE represented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>SIDA</th>
<th>CIDA</th>
<th>BNFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Implementation Monitoring Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ward Committee
Centre Management Committee

a. What are your views on the effectiveness of these committees?
b. Could fewer committees be more effective and if so which ones could be merged or abolished?

14. What policy and practice changed in favor of the rights of working children and progressive elimination of child labor in informal sector after the intervention of this project?

15. What was the role of municipal authorities in major cities and other departments like Department of Social Welfare and Directorate of Women and Children’s Affairs?

Efficiency

16. Do you consider that the Project was giving good value for money in comparison with other NFE projects / other NGO projects?

17. Were accountabilities of stakeholders clearly set, agreed and assigned, monitored and reported regularly?

Sustainability

18. What are your thoughts on the likelihood of the GoB allocating its own funds to sustain the BEHTRUWC activities or, through other means, ensuring that the innovation was sustained?

19. What measures have been undertaken for scaling up the project into a sector wide approach?

20. What kind of measures were taken within the context of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) for leveraging additional interest and investment?

21. To what extent have linkages with skills delivery organization within government system been established?

22. Do you have anything you want to add?

23. Do you have any suggestions?
EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

Type of business: ________________________________

Number of employees: Female ___________ Male ___________

Involved in Phase I? € Yes € No

Number of employees in Project Learning Center: Female ___________ Male ___________

Relevance and Effectiveness
1. What was the main reason for you being involved as an employer in the Project?
2. How did you first hear of the Project?
3. Were you involved in the Employer’s Committee/ any other committee connected with NFE or Child Rights?
4. What kind of contact did you have with the NGO who was providing the services in the LC?
5. Were there other employees at your workplace/organization who could be attending the LC? What would persuade you to send them?
6. Are you familiar with other NF education projects in this area? How would you compare BERTRUWC with the other projects?
7. Any suggestions for improvement of Project?

Gender Sensitivity and Child Rights Awareness
8. How far were you familiar with the issues of child rights before this Project began? How have you become familiar with child rights?
9. Do you think boys and girls can do all job or prefer boys/girls in stereo typed work? if so why?
10. How many girls were working in your factory?
11. How did children attending school affect their employment – does it interfere?
12. Any contributions to the LC?
13. Do you think girls and boys can do all job equally well? I, yes, why? If not, why not?

Impact
14. What visible changes have you noticed so far?
15. What advantage did you receive with educated employee?
16. Can you give examples of how education has helped to decision making, problem solving, responsibility of the children etc.?
17. To what extent have this project assisted girls and boys to have improved life options and opportunities?

Sustainability
18. How this LCs could continue?
19. Do you have anything you want to add?
20. Do you have any suggestions?
GOVERNMENT OF BANGLADESH MINISTRIES AND AGENCIES INTERVIEW GUIDE:
MoPME, BNFE, CR, AND MoWCA

Name of Organization: ____________________________________________
Title of respondent: _____________________________________________
Years in this post: _______________________________________________

Relevance
1. Please describe the involvement of your Ministry/department, etc. in the field of non-formal education, Child Rights and/or Labor Policy. (As appropriate to the respondent)

2. What was the intended outcome of the BEHTRUWC project? (Prompts: Filling a gap in the NPA for EFA, Providing a pilot for larger scale duplication?)

3. Can you describe the involvement of your Ministry/department, etc. with the BEHTRUWC project’s:
   - Design stage
   - Implementation stage

4. Was the BEHTRUWC project aligned with the Government of Bangladesh’s non-formal education policies?

5. Was there a need for BEHTRUWC to be more aligned?

6. How consistent was BEHTRUWC with the non-formal education policy document?

7. In your opinion, was the Government of Bangladesh moving towards a sub-sector, approach for basic education? Explain.

8. In your opinion, how well did BEHTRUWC reflect the The Child Rights Convention, the Convention Number 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labor?

9. How well did the project design (e.g., objectives, strategies, and key activities) address gender disparity?

10. Did it meet the basic needs and strategic needs of working adolescents? Girls?

11. In your opinion, how flexible was the project to the changing demands of adolescent working children?

Effectiveness
12. What were the particular strengths of the BEHTRUWC project?

13. How could the project have been improved?

14. In your opinion, how well did the Project bringing child rights and child labor to the attention of a wider public and to the Government? Elaborate.

15. Could the Project have advocated more? How?

16. How coordinated was your Ministry, and other relevant Ministries such as MoWCA, Ministry of Social Welfare, etc. around working children’s basic rights? Explain.

Efficiency
17. In your opinion, how cost effective was the Project? Explain.

18. If you compare the Project to other non-formal education or NGO projects, how cost effective was it?

19. From your experience, what were the major factors that contributed to the success of BEHTRUWC (in terms of process)?

20. What were the obstacles?
21. How was accountability created or ensured from all actors at all level?
22. What capacities exists within BNFE?

Impact

23. In your opinion, what was the impact, positive or negative, this Project had on the lives of children? Explain.
24. Do you think this project benefited girls and boys equally? Explain.
25. If either group was not benefited as well, how could this have been better managed?

Sustainability

26. What are your thoughts on the likelihood that the BEHTRUWC activities will merge with PEDP 3 or will funds be allocated to sustain it?
27. What factors were identified to have contributed to sustainability of the changes that occurred?
28. What measures have been undertaken for scaling up the project into a sector wide approach?
29. Do you have anything you want to add?
30. Do you have any suggestions?
LIFE SKILLS EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>€ Boy € Girl</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s occupation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Father’s education | Years of Schooling | |
|--------------------|--------------------|

| Mother’s education | Years of Schooling | |
|--------------------|--------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Center</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Span of Time in Center</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

General questions

1. What life skills were provided for you?
2. Which life skills, according to you, were relevant for you?
3. Which life skills were not relevant for you?
4. Which life skills are you applying now?
5. Which life skills are now giving you benefits? How?
6. What you like or did not like most? Why?

Thematic life skills question on personal qualities

**Decisions related**

7. What type of decisions do you have to make (both at job and at home)?
8. Did life skills information given to you helped to improve your decision-making? Please give an example of a situation where information provided in life skills training helped you make a decision?

**Creativity related**

9. Did the life skills information provided helped you in solving problems, which you previously could not solve? Please give an example of a situation where information provided in life skills training helped you to solve problems
10. Is your job environment safe? If yes, and if you think that there are no safety measures for you, can you think of any ways that will ensure your safety? If so explain.

**Critical thinking related**

11. Which factors help or hinder your personal growth (within the context of your family and community)? How can you make use of the helping factors and overcome the hindrances?

**Inter-personal skills**

12. Are you able to express your opinions and desires to your parents, teachers, employers and friends clearly? Give instances.
13. What kind of response do you get for expressing your needs, fears, opinions and desires? Give instance?
14. Are you able to keep friendly relationship with your friends, family members and employers? If yes, how? If not, why not?

**Self-awareness related**

15. Are you aware of your personal strength and weaknesses? Give instances.
**Empathy related**
17. Do you try to understand personal problems of your family and friends?
18. Do you try to help your family and friends when it was needed? Give instances.

**Persistence related**
19. Do you think that you are strong enough to persist in improving your situation despite continued obstacles? Give instances?

**Stress/coping with stress related**
20. Are you able to able to express your opinions and desires to your parents, teachers, employers and friends clearly? Give instances.

**Thematic life skills questions on social/environmental/health related issues**

**Health related**
21. What health related issues were taught in the class?
22. To what extent do you apply them in your daily life?
23. Do you wash your hand before eating?
24. Do you wash your hands with soap or ash after using the toilet?
25. Do you know sources of safe water?

**Society related**
27. Are you aware of the problems of early marriage? If yes, explain.
28. Do you face any violence and harassment from your family, friends and employers? If so, how do you cope with it?
29. What did you do when you face discrimination or child rights violations?
30. What are the problems you faced while coming to school?
31. Have you faced Eve teasing issues? What did you do?

**Environment related**
32. Are you aware about the arsenic contamination problem? If yes explain.
33. Do you know in what ways the environment gets contaminated?
34. Can you talk about some measures that you can take to help prevent that contamination?
35. Do you have anything you want to add?
36. Do you have any suggestions?
LIVELIHOOD SKILLS CHILDREN QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ________________________________ € Boy € Girl  Age _______ Years

Father’s occupation: ____________________________

Father’s education: ___________________ Years of Schooling _______

Mother’s education: ___________________ Years of Schooling _______

Name of Center: ____________________________

Organization and address: _____________________________________________________________________________

Project intervention related questions
1. Which livelihood skills did you choose? Why?
2. What was your earning before acquiring your livelihood skills?
3. What was your earning now (after applying your skills)?
4. Who controls your earnings? How?
5. Did you want to learn livelihood skills on your own or did your family push you to learn them?
6. Did you find your livelihood training useful? If yes, why? If not, why not?
7. Do you have adequate learning materials to refer to in the future (when project skills development support was discontinued)?
8. Do you know any local expert/persons in your locality with the same skills to whom you can seek help when you are finding it difficult to apply your skills?
9. Was the seed money sufficient?
10. Did you face any challenges in using seed money? If yes, which challenges?
11. What additional training do you need to ensure a sustainable income from your livelihood training?

Potential support from parents
12. Do your parents/guardian’s skills in any way help you to retain and improve your acquired livelihood skills? If so, how?

Access to natural resources
13. What land, water, livestock or natural resources did your parents/guardians use?
14. What did they use them for?
15. How did your household owned natural resources help or hinder the application of your livelihood skills (e.g., it helps you if income from natural resources provide you with necessary working capital to run your business/it hinders your application if you have to spend more time managing your natural resources, etc.)?

Access to physical resources
16. What resources do you have access to and use for marketing and selling your produce (e.g., transport, marketing facilities, health services, water supply, etc.)?
17. What infrastructure or support facilities do you think you need to apply your acquired livelihood skills (which you did not currently have)?
18. What are the terms of access to different types of infrastructure (e.g., payment, open access, joint ownership, etc.)?
19. What tools or equipment do household you use during different livelihood activities and what are the terms of access to them (e.g., ownership, hire, sharing, etc.)?
20. How do your household owned physical resources help or hinder the application of livelihood skills (e.g., it helps you if income from natural resources provide you with necessary working capital to run your business/ it hinders your application if you have to spend more time managing your natural resources)?

Access to financial resources
21. What was the total earning of your household from different sources (e.g., income-generating activities, remittances, etc.)?
22. What other sources of finance are available and how important are they (e.g., bank credit, NGO support, etc.)?

Social relations that could facilitate or hinder livelihood related activities
23. What links do you have with other household or individuals in the community (e.g., kinship, social group, membership of organizations, political contacts, and patronage, etc.)?
24. In what situations did those links become important and how (mutual assistance)?

Questions especially for girls
25. Do you face any harassment or abuse at your working place?
26. Do you have separate provision for toilet in your working place?
27. Do you have access to safe water at your working place?
28. Do you need to go out of your household to apply your acquired skills? If so, does your parents permit?
29. Is your working environment safe? If not, why not?
30. How did you cope with hazardous situation at work?
31. To what extent do you have to perform household chores in addition to your livelihood related work?
32. Did you have anything you want to add?
33. Did you have any suggestions?
SKILLS LIVELIHOOD FOCUS GROUP

Note: About 8 to 10 community people including farmers, businessman, local elites, CMC member, school teacher and parents were represented in the FGD.

• PURPOSE: To find out in detail how the skills livelihood raining had impacted the recipients and community.
• The information you give us was completely confidential, and we will not associate your name with anything you say in the focus group.
• You may refuse to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any time.
• We understand how important it was that this information was kept private and confidential. We will ask participants to respect each other’s confidentiality.
• If you have any questions now or after you have completed the questionnaire, you can always contact an evaluation team member like me, or you can call the evaluation team leader.

Introduction:
1. Welcome
   Introduce yourself and the note taker.

   Review the following:
   • Who we are and what we’re trying to do
   • What were done with this information
   • Why we asked you to participate

2. Explanation of the process
   Ask the group if anyone has participated in a focus group before. Explain that focus groups are being used more and more often to find out what people think about things and in human services research.

   About focus groups
   • We learn from you (positive and negative)
   • Not trying to achieve consensus, we’re gathering information
   • No virtue in long lists: we’re looking for priorities
   • In this project, we are doing both questionnaires and focus group discussions. The reason for using both of these tools was that we can get more in-depth information from a smaller group of people in focus groups. This allows us to understand the context behind the answers given in the written survey and helps us explore topics in more detail than we can do in a written survey.

   Logistics
   • Focus group will last about one hour
   • Feel free to move around
   • Where was the bathroom? Exit?

3. Ground Rules
   Ask the group to suggest some ground rules. After they brainstorm some, make sure the following are on the list.

   • Everyone should participate.
   • Information provided in the focus group must be kept confidential
   • Stay with the group and please don’t have side conversations
   • Turn off cell phones if possible
   • Have fun

4. Ask the group if there are any questions before we get started, and address those questions.
5. Introductions
   • Go around table: job here, where you were born

Discussion begins, make sure to give people time to think before answering the questions and don’t move too quickly. Use the probes to make sure that all issues are addressed, but move on when you feel you are starting to hear repetitive information.

Questions:
1. Let’s start the discussion by talking about what the skills training. What did you think about it?
2. What impact did it have on the participants? Community?
3. Do you see any difference in their opportunities compared to those who only received the basic education component?

Probes for Discussion:

• Salary
• Culture
• Safety & Health protection
  o Protective measures (e.g., gloves)
  o Abuse issues on the job
• Working conditions
• Respect/recognition from community or others
• Opportunity, achievement, growth
• Standards of living
  o Cost of living
  o Housing
  o Electricity
  o Water
  o Transportation

That concludes our focus group. Thank you so much for coming and sharing your thoughts and opinions with us.

Materials and supplies for focus groups

• Sign-in sheet
• Focus Group Discussion Guide for Facilitator
• Notebook for note-taking
LIVELIHOOD SKILLS TRAINER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name ___________________________ Date ______________________

Educational Qualification: _____________________________________

Years of Experience in Trade: _________________________________

1. How did you learn your trade skills?
2. What was your current earning from your trade?
3. Are the conditions (time involvement and money) sufficient to keep you motivated for providing training? If not, why?
4. To what extent you are comfortable with the three separate dimension of training? List them in order of priority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Ranking (circle)</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>Hands on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>Theoretical inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Which specific skills do you teach the children?
6. Which skills are relatively easy and which skills are relatively difficult? Please explain.
7. Is the training duration sufficient for provide the necessary skills?
8. As an individual livelihood skills provider, are you able to assess skills gaps of the individual children before and during the delivery of training? If so, how do you do that?
9. How do you address the varied learning capacities of children?
10. How do you address the slow learners?
11. Do you think, given the specific nature of trade, girls need specific attention? If so, why?
12. Which questions most frequently asked by the children? Do you feel comfortable with answering all the questions?
13. Are there any particular aspect of your trade skills which the children find difficult to master? If so, which ones? Why?
14. How do you confirm that the children are learning or have learned your trade skills?
15. What constraints do you face most while providing children with training? How do you overcome them?
16. Have you shared information with the children about the nature of market in which you operate?
17. Have you provided tips to the children about marketing of the products?
18. Have you provided information to the children about procuring raw materials?
19. Did you provide information to the children about transporting their products?
20. Did you provide tips to the children about how to bargain with the market operators?
21. Did you help the children in developing business plan?
22. Do you inform the children adequately about taking safety measures to be taken while working?
23. What lessons you have learned from this training experience which will help children to learn and apply their skills?
24. Considering the competitive business environment in Bangladesh, what additional skills might the children have to learn in the future?
25. Do you have anything you want to add?
26. Do you have any suggestions?
LIVELIHOOD SKILLS TRAINING QUESTIONNAIRE

(For senior/mid/field level implementers)

Name ___________________________ Date ______________________

Designation: ___________________________

Organization: ___________________________

Qualification: ___________________________

1. Did you receive any livelihood related training (please give details of topic, duration and training provider)?

2. Do you have experience in livelihood training?

General questions

3. How many children (girls and boys) are involved in livelihood skills activity?

4. Which vocational trades were selected (gender segregated information trade and number of girls and boys trained for each trade)? How many days are for each training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trades</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Who were the livelihood skills trainers? What were their qualifications and job experience?

6. What were the percentage distribution training contents in terms of practical demonstration, hands-on training and verbal instruction/theoretical inputs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Content</th>
<th>Practical Demonstration %</th>
<th>Hands-On Training %</th>
<th>Verbal Instruction %</th>
<th>Theoretical Inputs %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How many children have developed their individual plan for development and are proceeding to implement the plan?

8. How many children have opportunities for leadership? How were they prepared?

9. How many children acquired technical skills and entrepreneurial skills to a functional level?

10. How many children have found employment?

11. How quickly after they graduated did they find employment?

12. How many children started their own business?
Relevance
13. What were the outputs and outcomes indicators for livelihood skills interventions?
14. To what extent with program goals?
15. Did the program identify gender sensitive curriculum and trades?

Effectiveness
16. What kind of preparation did you take to provide livelihood skills to children?
17. Are indicators for livelihood skills development measurable?
18. How were they measured?
19. How effective was the training? What were the key indicators
20. How were the results of market demand assessment used for identification of livelihood skills for both girls and boys?
21. How was the data being collected?
22. Is information being used to ensure that project was running according to its course? If so, how?
23. Are the project personnel reviewing the data/information? was there evidence of program changes based on information?
24. Do children get information about livelihood opportunities? Did the girls and boys take individual decisions or did parents selection the trade?
25. How many children have individual plans to prepare for livelihood? What percentage of them were girls?
26. Are children engaged in building livelihood competencies?
27. How many children (girls and boys) are acquiring vocational skills, business skills, and methods to increase income?
28. To what extent have girls and boys been sensitized about their rights as workers?

Efficiency
29. To what extent are the children involved in program and activity planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of livelihood inputs?
30. How was the market demand assessment conducted?
31. Which trades were provided through informal apprenticeship model?
32. What was the outcome of providing skills through informal apprenticeship model? In what ways did they differ with traditional training model?
33. Were the children willing and able to take responsibility for their development?
34. Does project administer tests, assessments, measures of competencies? Are they used to help children make decisions?
35. How many children have identified a supportive adult?
36. What are children doing to learn and practice leadership?
37. What leadership skills were provided to the children for collecting raw material, producing, transporting and marketing of their products?
38. What kind of counseling was provided to children while they were performing their livelihood skills?
39. What kinds of support were provided by the parents and peers?
40. Would suggest rephrasing: To what extent did boys and girls use their seed money differently? Did they get market information? How?
Impact
41. What were the expected outcomes and impact?
42. Were the outcomes and impact clear to the relevant implementers?
43. To what extent the children are applying their acquired skills in real life leading to enhanced income?
44. In what ways has the project intervention increased the quality of lives for the children?
45. To what extent did the acquisition of livelihood skills managed to empower the children within their families and society?

Sustainability
46. Were sufficient resources provided to the children so they had adequate access to resources, places and things that they need to create family, community and economic support in a way which was sustainable?
47. Did the livelihood intervention sensitize the adults in the community to be supportive to children’s cause (as specified by the project)?
48. Did livelihood skills provision help the children to increase their income in a sustainable manner?
49. What was the role of private and public sector in creating linkages with the project?
50. Did the project provide any market outlets for the children to help them entry into the market?

Gender related
51. How and in what ways did the project challenge the traditional role of girls while selecting livelihood skills?
52. To what extent were the boys and, particularly, the girls able to spend their earned money for their own benefit?

Work safety related
53. What criteria do you use for determining a particular vocation to be hazardous?
54. What kind of hazards were the children exposed to? What are its consequences?
55. To what extent have the children and employers been sensitized about taking the necessary steps to keep their working environment safe?
56. Do you have anything you want to add?
57. Do you have any suggestions?
MONITORING AND EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Designation: ___________________________ Organization: ___________________________

General questions
1. What was your role in monitoring and/or evaluation?
2. Whom you are accountable to?
3. What kind of training did you receive for conducting monitoring and/or evaluation?
4. To what extent you are familiar with project objectives, planning process and monitoring and/or evaluation indicators focused on outputs and outcomes?
5. To what extent the current M&E system facilitate or hinder your work?

Monitoring and evaluating system related questions:
6. How did the project conceptualize the notions of effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact?
7. How did the project design and develop the indicators in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and impact (underlying principles and logic);
8. Which key indicators were chosen to prove that the project output and outcomes have been achieved?
9. Which indicators were chosen to prove that the appropriate processes were used? To what extent these processes were followed?
10. How was monitoring and evaluating cycle structured and managed in terms of the following processes:
    a. Collection;
    b. Review;
    c. Summary;
    d. Analysis;
    e. Feedback
11. What was the nature of information flow of monitoring and evaluating activities involving UNICEF, BNFE and NGOs?
12. To what extent were the monitoring indicators integrated with project planning?
13. What was the role of UNICEF in designing monitoring and evaluating system for the project?
14. How did UNICEF collaborate with PIU at BNFE?
15. How did the NGOs fit into this collaborative arrangement?

Monitoring personnel
16. Did the monitoring personnel have clearly identified monitoring responsibilities?
17. What qualifications and experience did they have for carrying out monitoring activities?
18. Did they in any ways plan monitoring activities with the community?
19. Did they build capacity of community members on community-based monitoring systems?
20. To what extent did they use participatory monitoring techniques?
21. How did the individual monitor gather and verify monitoring data?
22. What procedures were in force to ensure integrity of data and proper storage of data?
Relevance

23. Describe the benefits you could gain from monitoring and evaluating the hard to reach children project?

24. Describe how monitoring and evaluating your project has strengthened your program for hard to reach children?

25. Are we doing the right thing?

26. How important was the relevance or significance of the intervention regarding local and national requirements and priorities?

27. How do you make judgments or decisions on programme strategies, corrective actions, etc. about your project?

28. How do you verify the validity and reliability judgments or decisions on programme strategies, corrective actions, etc. about your project? Your judgments?

Effectiveness

29. To what extent was the monitoring system effective in reporting the progressive achievement of the project so that timely and appropriate decisions could be made during the implementation of the project?

30. What events that took place in your community might have been important to monitor?

31. To what extent have the (direct) objectives of the development intervention been achieved in accordance with the (adjusted, if applicable) target?

32. To what extent the monitoring system was effective in identifying factors crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives?

33. Is the monitoring system well aligned with the strategic plan?

34. What was preventing activities from being carried out as planned?

35. Was the monitoring system effective in ensuring or facilitating:
   a. Activities offered when HARD TO RECH children can attend.
   b. Acceptability of HARD TO RECH children to project intervention.
   c. Project reach more children.
   d. Preventing needy children from dropping out of the project.

36. How effective was the monitoring system and tools for monitoring the empowerment of girls particularly?

37. What key indicators were used for gender?

38. Was there any process documentation?

39. Was the baseline report used for monitoring and evaluation purposes? If so, how?

Efficiency

40. How high were the costs? (e.g., by instruments, sectors, interventions)?

41. To what extent were the costs and benefits of the projects interventions in a reasonable proportion to each other?

42. Did you practice a collaborative approach in which everyone was involved?

43. Were the delivery mechanism, capacities created and potentials used appropriately? Were services provided in time?

44. Were you provided with adequate authority to perform your monitoring and evaluation activities? Did you received training on result based monitoring?

45. Do you have sufficient resources to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities?

46. Have you been adequately trained and oriented for the task?

47. How efficient was the monitoring and evaluation system of partner NGOs?
48. What was the quality of monitoring reports sent by NGOs

49. What was your perception on Project Tolerance (The permissible deviation above and below a plan’s target for time and cost without escalating the deviation to the next level of management) as a project manager:
   a. Time Tolerance - the amount of time by which the project completion can be later or earlier than the planned date.
   b. Cost Tolerance - the extent to which the project can be over or under the planned budget.
   c. Scope Tolerance - was measured as an agreed variation from the project objectives, and any potential variation should be documented in the product breakdown structure.
   d. Quality Tolerance - ranges that define acceptable performance of the project
   e. Benefits Tolerance – ranges of acceptable performance of the project at the outcomes level.

Impact

50. To what extent was it possible to mainstream the children to formal education and/or create opportunities for safe professions with enhanced income?

51. To what extent the project intervention has contributed to continued growth and wellbeing of the children?

52. What were the key indicators used for assessing the impact of the project in terms of socio economic empowerment and awareness building?

53. What impact was created at changing the quality of lives of children? How do you measure it?

54. Who was benefiting from what we do? How much are they benefiting?

55. To what extent the project process has enabled them to have some control over their lives?

56. Are there lessons in what we are doing that have a broader impact (than just what happened in the project)?

57. Are we getting optimum outputs for the least possible amount of inputs?

Sustainability

58. To what extent are the positive changes and effects of the project intervention was sustainable compared to the objectives regarding development policy?

59. What risks and potentials are visible regarding the sustainability of the project intervention?

60. Will the effectiveness of the development intervention most likely improve or worsen after project discontinuation?

61. To what extent the hard to reach children capable and prepared to receive the

62. Positive effects of the project intervention without support in the long term?

63. To what extent are the partner NGOs capable and prepared to maintain the positive effects of the project interventions without support in the long term?

64. Can what we are doing be sustained in some way for the long-term, or will the impact of our work cease when we leave?

65. What are the lessons that can be learned from this project in terms of replicability?

Opinion about project

66. Were the project activities accessible for hard to reach children?

67. Do the activities meet the needs and interests of the target group?

68. How did you ensure that hard to reach children had a say in project planning?
69. Do you feel hard to reach children had enough influence on the project? If yes/no, why?
70. How well do educators involved in hard to reach programs think the project was running?
71. In your opinion, what problems do the project personnel think the project has?
72. Do you have anything you want to add?
73. Do you have any suggestions?
NEOLITERATES QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ____________________________________  € Boy € Girl  Age _______ Years

Father’s occupation: ____________________________________________________________

Father’s education: ___________________________ Years of Schooling _______

Mother’s education: ___________________________ Years of Schooling _______

Name of Center: ______________________________________________________________

Organization and address: __________________________________________________________________________________________________

Relevance

1. Why did you joined the basic education program? What attracted you most?

2. How long did you studied at the center? _______ months?

3. What are main obstacles faced by children working in formal, informal and non-formal sector (employers, etc.)?

Effectiveness:

4. Did your parents/employers encouraged you to go to Learning Center?

5. Did your employers take an interest in your education? If yes, how?

6. How has this education helped you to improve the working environment?

7. If your employer beats you or abuses you sexually, what you will do?


9. What problems you faced to attend the learning center?

10. What you have learnt in the center?

   a. Literacy _____________________________________________________________

   b. Numeracy ____________________________________________________________

   c. Accounting __________________________________________________________

   d. Health and environment related information __________________________

   e. Income generated activities __________________________________________

   f. Agriculture and farming ____________________________________________

   g. Common day to day life ______________________________________________

   h. Others (specify) _____________________________________________________

11. What subject did you like most? Why?

12. Use the “Literacy Test Instrument”¹ starting on page 5.

13. Did you help your friends or relatives by writing letters or calculating income-expenditures?

   a. ☐ Yes

   b. ☐ No

   c. ☐ Do not remember

14. If yes, how many people did you help during the last six months?

15. In what way has your knowledge contributed in various ways to your family? Explain.

16. What did the teachers usually do if you or another student misbehaved in class? What methods did s/he use?

17. Was teaching on life skills, (e.g. decision-making, negotiating, provided at the LC) was emphasized? If yes, how was this training provided and which skills did it cover?

18. Are girls treated the same by the teacher?
19. What rights do children have? Why was it important to know them?
20. How much do you earn on an average day currently? What was your previous earning prior to attending the education program?
21. How has skill training improved your life? What opportunities did it create?
22. Who (you or your parents) decided the trade for skill training? What trade you selected and why?
23. How did you utilized your seed money?
24. Have you taken part in social mobilization? Do you like Bonophulergaan? Why?
25. When you feel sick where did you go in general for cure?
   a. ☐ Local doctor
   b. ☐ Local medicine man
   c. ☐ Religious leader
26. What was the reason you went to go to that person?

**Efficiency**
27. Did your attendance to in the basic education program cost you or your parent/guardians/employers had to pay anything? Why? How much?
28. Do you feel that the skills training has improved or increased your earnings? If yes, how; if no, why not?

**Impact:**
29. Has your life changed after you completing school?
30. Can you give an example of a time when the learning center helped you or a friend outside the classroom? For example: If anyone teases you (or for girls: makes indecent proposal), what do you do?
31. Did you persuade other parents of working children to send their children to school? How you did you motivate other parents, employers, community members to encourage a working child to go to school?
32. After attending the learning center, how do you compare yourself with your friend who did not attend the learning center?
33. Do you support girls ‘education? Why?
34. Are you in favor of early marriage or not? Why?
35. What you will do to prevent children working in hazardous condition?
36. What lifelong learning opportunities has the project generated for the children?

**Sustainability**
37. What are your future plans regarding your study?
38. Have you visited any library around during last six months?
   a. ☐ Yes
   b. ☐ No
   c. ☐ Do not remember
39. If yes, how many books have you read in last six months?
40. What was your overall comment on the issue?
(Concl. Annex E.2)

লেজার-১: দিন দিন গাছঘালার পরিমাণ করে যাওয়ার কারণ কী?
  
ক) গাছঘালার চেয়ে কম কাটা হয়ে বলে
  
খ) গাছঘালার চেয়ে বেশি কাটা হয়ে বলে
  
গ) গাছঘালার যথার্থ পরিমাণ কোথায় হয়ে বলে
  
ঘ) একই পরিমাণের গাছঘালা ও কাটা হয়ে বলে

লেজার-২: গাছঘালা না থাকলে কোনটির অভাবে মানুষ বেঁচে থাকতে পারবে না?
  
ক) হাইট্রাজেন
  
খ) হিলিয়াম
  
গ) আক্সিজেন
  
ঘ) ইন্ট্রাজেন

৪। নিচের ছবিওলার পাশের খালি খালিতে কোনটি কিছু ছবি লিখন।

্য গেছেন

৫। এবার আপনাকে দুটি বাগান বলা হবে। মনোযোগ দিয়ে তেমন বাগান দুটি লিখন।
  
[পাঠ্যের সব করে রাখুন, জারিকৃত বলান নাও]

৬। পাচটি বাগান শীর্ষ্কারের বর্ণনা দিন।

৭। নিচের ছবিতে কতটি চিত্র আছে লিখন।

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

৮। মূল্যায়নে কোন সংখ্যা চতুর্থতার বাআছে লিখন।
  
১৭, ১৮, ১৯, ____, ২১, ২২।

৯। বিবেচনা কর্মন:  ১০। তথ্য কর্মন:  

| ৪২ | ৪ | ৩৪ |  
|-----|---|---|---|

(Contd.)
নিচের সমসার অগ্রগণ্য প্রশ্ন। তারপর নিচের খালি জাতোগুলি সমাধান করতে (একটি করে কেবল হবে)।

১১। একটি দিনের যুবক ৫টি আম চিল। কিছুদিন পর যুবক ৪টি আম পেয়ে গেল। বাকি আমগুলো একবার মাছে সামনের ভাগ করে নিলে এরকমে কতটি করে আম পাবে?

উত্তর কলকে পেয়েছে ☐

১২। একটি ডুকের ৪৫ জন হাতে প্রায় ৫টি উড়ি করে উড়া দিল। একে যে উড়ি উড়ি তা তিন জনের মধ্যে সমান ভাবে ভাগ করে দেয়া হল। এখানে কত উড়ি করে পেলে?

উত্তর কলকে পেয়েছে ☐

১৩। নিচের চক্রকে কাটার বাসে তা লিখুন।

এই চক্রকে বাঙ্গালি লিখুন: ____________________________

১৪। নিচের চিত্রটি জানাতে পেয়েছেন। কেরার কোনটি নিচে রান হাত আর কোনটি খাম হাত? তা খালি ঘর দুটিতে লিখুন।

ঘরকে পেয়েছে ☐

১৫। মানুষের উত্তর নিয়োগ করা হয়। খিলারা ঘরটিতে দিকের নাম লিখুন।

ঘরকে পেয়েছে ☐
NGO PARTNER INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Designation: ___________________________

Organization: ___________________________

1. How long were you involved with the BEHTRWUC project?
2. What was your main reason for participating in this Project?
3. What was the role of your organization in providing services to the Project?
4. Did your organization receive any capacity development support from PIU?
5. Were you involved in Phase I?
6. How helpful was the baseline survey, organized by the PIU? Did you conduct survey before admitting the children?
7. Was the Project relevant to the hard to reach children’s needs in the rapidly changing urban context?
8. How effective was the curriculum for the hard to reach children? If not effective, what would have strengthened the curriculum?
9. Do you feel resources allocation was appropriate (30% livelihood, 70% basic education)?
10. Was there behavior change evidence of the children after project's intervention? Elaborate.
11. What problems the learning centers face? How were they overcome?
12. There were no centers in Barisal and Rajshahi in Stage 2 and none in Barisal and Khulna I Stage 4. Why were children no available?
13. What could have been done to find children?
14. How was student dropout rate across cycles? What were the reasons of drop out?
15. Was there a difference in the girl to boy dropout rate? Explain.
16. Was there a supervisor and/or teachers attrition rate? Why?
17. How were supervisors and/or teachers replaced if they left?
18. What happened if a supervisors and/or teachers was sick?
19. Were links developed with other NGOs to deliver additional services, e.g., health and nutrition, protection, legal service, counselling, etc.?
20. With which NGO networks are you involved?
21. Are Child Rights a focus of your NGO? How was that reflected in your delivery of the program? How do your staff and the public react to child rights?
22. Were the learners able to make any changes in the project or classroom, e.g., teaching method, time schedule, teacher behavior, etc.?
23. How do you support teachers to use effective child-centered teaching methods?
24. What role does your NGO play in sensitizing the community and civil society to the needs of urban working children?
25. What activities did you organize within or outside the scope of the project which enhanced the program?
26. Did you organized gender training for teachers, supervisors?
27. How did you advocate in the project for the prevention of children from hazardous work?
28. During the project, did you feel you were a “partner” of the PIU and not a “contractor”? Did that relationship change through the different phases of the project? Elaborate.
29. What did you think of the project management model? Was it effective or not? If not, why?
30. What support did you expect from the PIU? Were your expectations met? If not, why?
31. Comment on the project management model? What were the positives and negatives of UNICEF/BNFE collaboration?
32. How timely decisions made? What implications did that collaboration have for you on project implementation?
33. Was gender mainstreamed into the project management cycle (assessment, design, implementation, M&E, etc.)?
34. Did this affect or contribute to the results achieved? Elaborate.
35. Did the project have adequate provision for making changes based on lessons learned during implementation?
36. What strategies worked well or did not work well? Why?
37. What were the obstacles to achieve the desired result?
38. What were the changes in the different cycles?
39. What could be done to make the Project more responsive to the needs of urban working children?
40. Did the project transformed the lives of the children? Girls?
41. Do you think after skill training children got better job opportunities than those who only had basic education?
42. What noticeable changes did you observe in the behavior of children? Employers? Parents? Community?
43. Can the benefits of the project be sustained after end of the project by the children? Employers? Parents? Community?
44. Do you have anything you want to add?
45. Do you have any suggestions?
NGO SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name: ___________________________________________ Date: __________________

Designation: ____________________________________________________________

Organization: ___________________________________________________________

1. How long have you worked in the project?
2. What kind of training did you received and for how long?
3. What was your opinion about the training you received for your job?
4. Would you please describe your task in the organization?
5. How frequently did you visit a center per week?
6. What are the aspects you looked for in your supervision?
7. What was your supervising modality (i.e., observation, interview, support, etc.)?
8. Did you render any training for the teachers or trainers? How?
9. What was your reporting technique?
10. Were there any changes that took place on the basis of your supervision? What were those?
11. What was your overall comment on your supervisory role?

Relevance

12. How the children’s education was useful, give your answer with example.
13. What do you know about gender mainstreaming? How the project mainstreamed gender?
14. Was the learning center a supportive environment for girls?
15. How did the learning center support a child rights-based approach (and the project generally)?

Effectiveness

16. Do you think the strategies followed were effective in reaching the hard to reach children? If not, what could have be done?
17. Was your training adequate and appropriate (strengths/ weaknesses)?
18. Do you feel competent to support teachers in deliver a quality, child-centered education?
19. What problems did the teachers most often experienced?
20. What support did they need to overcome these problems?
21. How did you monitor a teacher’s performance?
22. What were the most effective teaching methods you saw on your visits?
23. What was the scope for improvement of BEHTRUWC?
24. How did you conduct performance appraisal of the teachers?
25. How do you assess gender specific needs of the learners and teachers?
26. Were sensitive issues like rape, sexual harassment, child abuse discussed openly with employers / children? Did the NGO train you on these?
27. Do you have any responsibilities beyond supervising teachers (e.g., home visits, etc.)?
28. Did attendance of learners improved after incentives were provided (Tiffin, bag, etc.)?
Efficiency
29. What support did you get/need from the NGO (presumably they are your line managers?)
30. Were you happy with the Terms & conditions of your employment with BEHTRUWC (hours, salary, training, conditions, etc.)?
31. Did the NGO and PIU support adequate for you and the children?
32. How do you assess age – appropriate skill or training needs assessment?
33. Can you suggest a strategy for improved job placements for learners?

Sustainability
34. Have you ever linked any learners to other learning centers, other NGOs schools or GoB schools?
35. What percentage of learners continue their education in secondary school?

Impact
36. Do you think gender equity in terms of participation and decision-making, has been achieved at home or workplace through this project? How, explain?
37. What in your opinion was the greatest achievement of BEHTRUWC? Why do you think so?
38. Do you have anything you want to add?
39. Do you have any suggestions?
NON-FORMAL EDUCATION, CHILD RIGHTS AND LABOUR
NGO DISCUSSION GUIDE

Organization: 
Designation: 
Date: 

Relevance:-

1. What do you know of BEHTRUWC?
2. What was its main aim?
3. Is BEHTRUWC consistent with the National Education Policies (NEP), National Plan of Action (NPA), Education for All (EFA), Millennium Development Goal (MDG), and Child Rights Convention (CRC) goal?
4. To what extent was this project relevant in relation to The Child Rights Convention, especially the Convention No. 182 on the Worst Forms of Child Labour?
5. How far different was the Project from other Non-Formal Education efforts?
6. How integrated was BEHTRUWC conception within the broad scope of GoB Non-Formal Education policies?
7. How aligned was the Project with existing GoB child labor policies?
8. What was your expectations of BEHTRUWC? Were these expectations met?
9. Are there other initiatives which cover the same target groups and activities? Elaborate.
10. How essential are Non-Formal Education interventions in the context of Education for All and the National Plan of Action? What part did BEHTRUWC play in reaching the Education for All goals?
11. Did child rights figure prominently in the Project? Comparing BEHTRUWC’s efforts to other Non-Formal Education and NGO programs, how well did it do?
12. How well was BEHTRUWC aligned with GoB targets, e.g., Non-Formal Education or Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, etc.?
13. How appropriate was the Project's design, e.g., objectives, strategies, and key activities, in address gender disparity and meeting the basic and strategic needs of working adolescents, especially girls?

Effectiveness

14. In your opinion, how have child rights been promoted through the BEHTRUWC project?
15. How far do projects such as BEHTRUWC go helping to solve child labour problems?
16. What research needs to be done for finding durable solutions to child labour, and the educational and social needs of urban working children?
17. To what extent did the project meet the educational and social needs of urban working children?
18. What improvements could have been made to meet these needs?
19. How responsive was the project to the emerging challenges/risks faced by the working adolescents, e.g., security, equal wages, drugs issue, child abuse, etc.?
20. How well did social mobilization and advocacy strategies worked or not work in promote the rights of working children?
21. How much were private institutions/human rights NGOs or other activists involved in child rights advocacy for the project?
22. How effective was the social mobilization campaign in terms of sensitizing employers, parents, community mobilization to take action to uphold child rights and eliminating hazardous child labour? Explain?

23. Were you involved in those campaign and how?

**Effectiveness**

24. What strategies were used to attract children, especially girls, to the project?

25. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

**Impact**

26. What lessons should other NFE projects learn from BEHTRUWC?

27. Do you have anything you want to add?

28. Do you have any suggestions?
TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ___________________________ Date: _________________

Designation: ___________________________

Organization: ___________________________

1. How long did you teach in this basic education component? How many cycles?

2. Did you receive any on-the-job training prior to beginning your teaching?
   a. Basic training: Duration: _______ days
   b. Skills training: Duration: _______ days
   c. Subject based training: Duration: _______ days

3. What were the strengths of the training?
   a. Basic training
   b. Skills training
   c. Subject based training

4. What idea did you received from your training in regards to teaching hard to reach children?

5. How many learners did you have in your classroom? How many dropped out?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Dropped out</th>
<th>Reasons for Dropping Out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girl</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What were your learners’ education levels at the beginning? Please give numbers\(^3\) and explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>Level 1(^*)</th>
<th>Level 2(^*)</th>
<th>Level 3(^*)</th>
<th>Level 4-5(^*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How much did their levels changed after the full cycle of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What was their literacy level in Bangla?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What was their literacy level in English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^3\) [http://www.oecd.org/edu/innovation-education/adultliteracy.htm](http://www.oecd.org/edu/innovation-education/adultliteracy.htm)

\(^4\) Level 1: Very poor literacy skills

\(^5\) Level 2: Capable of only dealing with simple, clear material involving uncomplicated tasks

\(^6\) Level 3: Adequate to cope with the demands of everyday life and work in an advanced society

\(^7\) Levels 4 and 5: Strong skills.
10. How satisfied were you with your learners’ achievements at the end of their 40 months? (please put a check mark in the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely high (7)</th>
<th>Very high (6)</th>
<th>High (5)</th>
<th>To a great extent (4)</th>
<th>Moderate (3)</th>
<th>Average (2)</th>
<th>Low (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. To what extent do you think they would be able to use this knowledge in their practical life? (please put a check mark in the appropriate box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely high (7)</th>
<th>Very high (6)</th>
<th>High (5)</th>
<th>To a great extent (4)</th>
<th>Moderate (3)</th>
<th>Average (2)</th>
<th>Low (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How many of your learners do you believe made a significant change in their education? (please give the number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Significant Change</th>
<th>Not Much Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What grades did they achieve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. How many received A’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. How many received B’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. How many received C’s?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Explain about the different methods you used to teach them?

15. What was your favorite method of teaching?

16. Let us know something about your classroom environment (regarding space, time and materials)?

17. How effective was the curriculum in responding to the needs of working children?

18. How did it address gender issues?

19. What aspects of child’s rights were emphasized by the curriculum?

20. Have you had any training on gender?

21. Did you take extra efforts for the dropouts? Please explain.

22. Who supervised your classroom teaching?

23. In what ways s/he support you in improving your teaching?

24. What were the strengths and weakness of the curriculum in this Project?
   a. Strength:
   b. Weakness:

25. What suggestions do you have to improve the curriculum?

26. Did you receive appropriate instruction for teaching from your training? Elaborate.
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Do not know
27. Did you receive all the necessary support from your supervisors and NGO officials? Elaborate.
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Do not know

28. Did you face any kind of resistance from the community regarding education? What kinds? What did you do to overcome it?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Do not know

29. How did you motivated parents and employers?

30. Do you suggest they continue the Project after 2014?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Do not know

31. Was the basic education component linked to the creation of employment opportunities? If yes what were those?

32. How many of your learners were accepted into the skills training program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. How skill training helped the children to obtain better employment opportunities as compared to those who just took the basic education component? Explain.

34. How you took part in social mobilization activities? How useful was it? What were the key messages?

35. Were these social mobilization activates effective? If yes, how?

36. How effective was Community Management Committee’s role in the Project?

37. What the Community Management Committee did for the improvement of the Learning Center? In ending child labor?

38. How did the Project contribute to eliminating child labor?

39. How aware were parents and employers at the beginning of the Project? Did that awareness change as the Project progressed? How much did it change?

40. What are the visible changes occurred in the lives of learners? Girls?

41. How did this Project help working children in achieve their right to education, right to association, and increased employment opportunity?

42. What lifelong learning opportunities has the Project generated for the children?

43. Do you have anything you want to add?

44. Do you have any suggestions?
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