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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADAP</td>
<td>Adolescent Development and Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>After-School Programme for Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4D</td>
<td>Communications for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Central Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>Child Deprivation Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Child Friendly Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>Centre Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office (or Officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHO</td>
<td>District Health Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EiE</td>
<td>Education in Emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>Formal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Flexible School Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATE</td>
<td>Girls Access to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoN</td>
<td>Government of Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWC</td>
<td>Homework Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILE</td>
<td>International Lead Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labor Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>National Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Least Developed Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDO</td>
<td>Local Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUL</td>
<td>Let Us Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDEP</td>
<td>Micro-Enterprise Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCO</td>
<td>Nepal Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>National Evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFE</td>
<td>Non-formal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOCC</td>
<td>NGO Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPR</td>
<td>Nepalese Rupee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOSC</td>
<td>Out-of-School Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Short Message Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOW</td>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Childrens Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States (of America)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USAID  United States Agency for International Development
VDC    Village Development Committee
WDO    Women’s Development Office
WE     World Education
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1. Executive Summary

This report examines two Let Us Learn (LUL)-funded programmes in Nepal: Girls Access to Education (GATE), launched in 2011 in Saptari District, and After-school Programme for girls (ASP), launched in 2012 in Parsa District.¹

The GATE programme is designed to engage out-of-school girls 10-18 years-old to participate in community-based, non-formal education (NFE), thereby building literacy and numeracy skills, improving their knowledge and practice of hygiene and coping with risks of early marriage, trafficking and other potentially harmful practices. GATE in Saptari District has had over 2,100 participants since 2011, with approximately 47 percent of participants mainstreamed into government schools.

ASP comprises a “basket” of inter-related approaches to improving conditions for and increasing the enjoyment of adolescent girls in school, including sports clubs, homework clubs, and instruction in menstrual hygiene for girls in classes 6, 7 and 8, with all three of these approaches implemented at ten programme schools.

These programmes reflect LUL’s commitment to increasing equity in education through focus on its three equity pillars—reaching out-of-school children (OOSC); expanding girls’ education; and, improving the education quality for learners—and its three themes—equity, education quality and innovation. GATE and ASP focus on adolescent girls in the Terai region, with implementation of ASP in the mid-Western Region launching in 2014. Data is incomplete, however per the government estimate girls make up 54-57 percent of OOSC of primary-school age, with dropout rates among girls increasing at the lower-secondary level.²

1.1. Evaluation of GATE and ASP

The evaluation is primarily qualitative, with information collection involving interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) at six GATE centers out of 100 in Saptari District and at eight lower-secondary schools out of ten in Parsa District, plus interviews and FGDs in those districts with UNICEF field personnel and with government and other stakeholders and in Kathmandu with Nepal Country Office and Ministry of Education (MOE) personnel.

This evaluation is part of a global self-evaluation of LUL in four countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Madagascar and Nepal). Each national evaluation focuses on programmes selected in collaboration with respective COs, and uses mixed-method approach focusing on qualitative processes in the field.

GATE and ASP were assessed primarily in relation to three evaluative criteria: relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. This self-evaluation is formative and qualitative, based primarily on responses from beneficiaries and stakeholders.

¹ At the time this evaluation was conducted, NCO did not have a clear and consistent name for the programme. “After-school Programme for Girls (ASP)” was generated for this report (by the evaluator).

² MOE Nepal “flash report” 2014.
1.2. Findings and conclusions, relevance

Both programmes are relevant to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries. ASP directly addresses barriers to regular attendance by adolescent girls, including lack of friends, play and social capital, incomplete homework, and the onset of menstruation. GATE addresses barriers to girls’ school attendance via compressed and flexible class times, advocacy by community members, facilitators and supervisors, and active, child-friendly pedagogies.

1.3. Findings and conclusions, effectiveness

Both programmes are effective, in that they accomplish their primary objectives; their effectiveness, however, should be improved.

Stated objectives for GATE are: to improve literacy, numeracy and life-skills among out-of-school girls who participate in the programme; to facilitate ‘mainstreaming’ of out-of-school girls who participate in the programme into formal education; and, to improve the prospective social and economic well-being of out-of-school adolescent girls participating in the programme.

One objective is defined for ASP: to increase the regularity of school attendance among at-risk girls enrolled in Classes 6, 7 and 8.

ASP. ASP, per reports by head teachers and participants however without independent verification, is effective in increasing regular attendance of school. Although ASP achieves its objective in part by engaging girls in homework club (HWC), that activity does not link to improved teaching and learning. In addition, ASP effectiveness is limited inasmuch as participants are not uniformly at risk or disadvantaged.

GATE. GATE effectively provides literacy, numeracy and life-skills learning to out-of-school girls; in addition, 47 percent of girls are mainstreamed into government schools. It is unclear, however, the extent to which GATE improves the well being of girls who are ineligible to be mainstreamed (ages 15 – 18). Participants and other stakeholder consistently request additional instruction, including Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET).

1.4. Sustainability

Both programmes correspond to Government of Nepal (GoN) priorities and feature low unit costs.

Monitoring and accountability structures for ASP, however, are not well implemented; these should be addressed in any replications in other districts or prior to scaling in Parsa District.

GATE is similarly cost effective, however questions regarding the strategy underlying the programme, as well as questions regarding GoN participation as an implementing partner, undercut the programme’s sustainability: GATE essentially enables girls to continue to work

---

3 Although not stated explicitly by UNICEF or DEO personnel, mainstreaming of GATE participants as observed and as reported during field visits, only involves girls’ matriculation into primary schools. Based on review of the Lalina curriculum and on gains in skills reported by participants, one can infer that although girls from ten to 18 years-old participate in the programme in Saptari District, their skill levels when they complete the programme are not equivalent to Class 6 (first year of lower-secondary school) or above. Based on this inference, primary school is the only practical option for mainstreaming.
for hire and access education; in addition, as an enjoyable, relevant and effective instantiation of learning, GATE highlights the inadequacies of the formal-education (FE) system operated by GoN. GATE sustainability is further limited insofar as one objective, mainstreaming of participants into government primary schools, is not feasible for girls over the age of 14 (about 42 percent of participants) because they have not attained skills via their participation in GATE that enable them to be mainstreamed into age-appropriate (e.g., lower-secondary or secondary) classes.

1.5. Recommendations
Recommendations are presented in order of priority.

ASP. Recommendations for ASP center on a needed redesign of pilot activities, and include:

- Plan a redesigned pilot phase.
- Reconfigure HWC and introduce activities to support improved education quality.
- Provide orientation for principals.
- Increase focus on schools in disadvantaged Village Development Committees (VDCs) and on at-risk girls.
- Redesign the ASP monitoring framework.
- Reinforce and reconfigure partnerships.

GATE. Recommendations for GATE encompass implementation, but primarily address strategy in relation to sustainability, and include:

- Develop a comprehensive GATE strategy for the Terai Region, especially in relation to design-related issues such as mainstreaming, TVET, child labor, age range of participants, etc.
- Develop a comprehensive strategy for replication of GATE outside of the Terai Region.
- Improve monitoring and information collection to support impact assessment (e.g., incidence of diarrhea, etc.), including longitudinal tracking of mainstreamed (and other) participants (in relation, for example, to school completion as appropriate).
- Review and revise the Lalima curriculum.
- Review GATE exams and link them to educational standards.
- Review partnership and implementation changes with DEO Saptari.
- Re-allocate facilitator oversight to Muslim communities to compensate for limited participation by women in supporting GATE.
- Review the approach to supporting education for Muslim girls.
- Make better use of the GATE survey.
1.6. **Lessons learned**

Lessons learned include the following, in relation to improving education quality:

- Improving education quality requires inputs in relation to defined objectives
- Education change requires comprehensive approaches

The following lessons emerge directly from the LUL approach to innovation, which frequently, as in the GATE programme, involves the extension of proven services, initiated by iNGOS and other organisations, to new contexts:

- Contextual differences call for innovative (or adaptive) responses
- Delineate programme objectives as early as possible
- Adoption and integration of programmes will benefit from strategic and practical review
2. Background

This section describes the two girls’-education programmes funded by Let Us Learn (LUL) in Nepal that are the focal points of this evaluation and report.

2.1. Overview of LUL Nepal

The foundation of the design of the LUL programme rests on three “equity pillars”: reaching out-of-school children (OOSC); expanding girls’ education; and, improving the education quality for learners. Activities that address each of these three pillars are in turn implemented in ways that promote three “LUL themes”: equity, learning and innovation.

Programmes funded by LUL Nepal are presented in the following table:

Table 1: LUL-funded programmes in Nepal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Scale &amp; scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After School Programme for girls</td>
<td>Improve regular attendance by girls in lower-secondary school</td>
<td>Establish sports clubs &amp; homework clubs; train teachers provide instruction in menstruation-hygiene instruction, Young Champions</td>
<td>2 districts&lt;br&gt;10 schools&lt;br&gt;(Expanded to 6 districts, 94 schools in AY 2014-2015)&lt;br&gt;346 Young Champions trained (117 female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS and Early Grade Reading</td>
<td>Improve child friendly learning environments, teaching and learning</td>
<td>School management Committee and PTA trained in School Improvement Plans, Teacher and head-teacher training in child-centred learning package and early grade reading; provide CFS kits, early-grade reading materials</td>
<td>100 schools, CFS&lt;br&gt;18,332 children (as of 2013)&lt;br&gt;280 schools, early-grade reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Young children (up to 5) have increased access to holistic development opportunities for improved school readiness</td>
<td>Training of ECD facilitators, provision of ECD kits, parent education</td>
<td>150 ECD centres in 6 districts&lt;br&gt;8400 parents and caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR and EiE</td>
<td>DRR is integrated into education sector</td>
<td>Teachers, resource persons, school supervisors and young champions</td>
<td>24 districts&lt;br&gt;267,000 children trained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Information in Table 1 is based on review of LUL annual reports and on communication with NCO,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls Access to Education (GATE)</td>
<td>Help adolescent girls build literacy, numeracy &amp; life skills; mainstream girls into government schools; improve girls’ well being</td>
<td>Establish community-based schools; introduce flexible, 2-hour school periods, child-centred pedagogies</td>
<td>6 districts 8,297 girls in 4 years 47% mainstreamed in Saptari District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools as Zones of Peace</td>
<td>Schools are not disrupted by political activities</td>
<td>Teachers, students, government officials, and community members are trained. Schools develop codes of conduct. Monitoring of the number of school days.</td>
<td>864 schools 320,000 students (as of 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Out of School Programme</td>
<td>Provide learning opportunities to children on the streets and in bazaars</td>
<td>Establish drop in and mobile learning centres, train facilitators, advocacy with municipalities</td>
<td>Pilot in 4 communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Increased understanding of WASH and menstrual hygiene management</td>
<td>Training of teachers, provision of materials to make cotton hygiene pads.</td>
<td>151 teachers (96 female, 55 male) in 100 schools in 6 districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevocational and field schools</td>
<td>Increasing relevant curriculum in remote and mountainous areas</td>
<td>Locally defined theoretical and practical prevocational skills, including school gardens, integrated into academic subjects.</td>
<td>In 20 schools in 2 districts benefitting 3298 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Meetings</td>
<td>Improve implementation of child friendly teaching</td>
<td>Provide post training mentoring to teachers</td>
<td>Pilot in mid and far west.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.1.1. Girls Access to Education (GATE)

The GATE programme enables out-of-school girls ten-years-old and older to participate in community-based, non-formal education (NFE). GATE is designed to help girls build literacy and numeracy skills, improve their knowledge and practice of
hygiene and better cope with risks of early marriage, trafficking and other potentially harmful practices.

**History.** GATE was originally developed in 1998 by the iNGO World Education in collaboration with the Ministry of Health (MOH) to address problems of out-of-school girls in Nepal’s mid-western region. UNICEF Nepal Country Office (NCO) education section adopted GATE for implementation in 2011 in Saptari District. The initial two GATE phases (2011 and 2012) were implemented by World Education (WE). In 2013, GATE implementation was shifted to the Saptari District Education Office (DEO).

**Scale and catchment.** GATE has been operating in Saptari District since 2011, during which time the nine-month Lalima curriculum has been delivered via 245 GATE centres to more than 5,500 adolescent girls in 103 Village Development Committees (VDCs).^5^

**Table 2: GATE Implementation 2011-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Centres</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Mainstreamed</th>
<th>VDCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saptari</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>2341</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>0^6</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhanusha</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rautahat</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsa</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>345</td>
<td>8297</td>
<td>3323</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GATE is designed to reach out-of-school girls, including both girls who have never enrolled in school and those who have enrolled previously but who have dropped out.

**Curriculum, teaching and learning.** Instruction presents the nine-month Lalima curriculum, delivered in GATE centres in two-hour sessions, six days per week, addressing basic literacy- and numeracy-learning, health, hygiene and social issues. Each GATE centre in Saptari District admits approximately 25 girls between 10 and 18 years.\(^7\)

Providing GATE instruction to fewer than 25 adolescent girls is inefficient, per UNICEF field and NCO personnel.

GATE instruction incorporates child-friendly methods, including group work, singing and dancing.

**Organization and implementation.** GATE implementation in Saptari and elsewhere establishes two complementary oversight systems.

---

^5^ Saptari District includes approximately 500 VDCs. As of 2014, GATE has been launched in Dhanusha, Rautahat and Parsa districts.

^6^ Completion data have not been reported for 2013 as of the drafting of this report. Twenty-five girls has been determined by WE to represent a cost-effective enrolment for GATE centres. (Centres are typically located in homes of CMC members or other community members.) Need per VDC is assessed via survey each year to determine location of GATE centres. Based on need as identified in the survey, some VDCs have four concurrently operating GATE centres located in different wards. I have not had access to translated survey results.

^7^ More recent LUL-supported GATE initiatives (e.g, in Parsa District) admit girls aged 10 to 16.
DEO management. DEO Saptari provides management of GATE. DEO personnel in Saptari include a GATE Coordinator and approximately 13 GATE supervisors.

Community management. Centre Management Committees (CMCs) participate in selection of the GATE facilitators, advocate among family members (parents, guardians, occasionally husbands) for the participation of out-of-school girls, and interact with VDCs.

GATE supervisors survey selected VDCs (augmenting the 2011 government census) to identify suitable populations of out-of-school girls, recruit CMCs and GATE facilitators, administer three assessments—pre-, mid-term and post—and facilitate mainstreaming of girls when they complete GATE.

Evaluable objectives. Objectives for the GATE programme are: to improve literacy, numeracy and life-skills among out-of-school girls who participate in the programme; to facilitate ‘mainstreaming’ of out-of-school girls who participate in the programme into formal education; and, to improve the prospective social and economic well-being of out-of-school adolescent girls participating in the programme.9

2.1.2. After-School Programme for girls (ASP)

ASP for girls addresses the needs of adolescent girls, however beneficiaries are already enrolled in lower-secondary school.

History and context. ASP for girls was launched in 2012 in Parsa and Saptari districts as a response to high dropout rates of adolescent girls, and specifically girls from disadvantaged communities, with high populations of Dalit caste and Muslims. According to Karki et al. (2014), reported estimates of children not in school range from 4 percent to 31 percent:

The Flash Report of the Department of Education (Flash-I, 2069) reports net enrolment of over 95 percent at primary level which means the OOSC in age 5-9 is less than five percent. The mapping of OOSCs conducted jointly by the Department of Education, Unicef, and World Education in 8 Terai districts reveals about nine percent. The NLSS-III, on the other hand, reveals staggeringly high (31%) OOSC. The Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) has recently provided very basic information on population not in school by age group. The CBS data suggests that the OOSC in basic education (5-12 age) are almost 15 percent (Figure 1). These variations in

---

8 Although not stated explicitly by UNICEF or DEO personnel, mainstreaming of GATE participants as observed and as reported during field visits, only involves girls’ matriculation into primary schools. Based on review of the Lalima curriculum and on gains in skills reported by participants, one can infer that although girls from ten to 18 years-old participate in the programme in Saptari District, their skill levels when they complete the programme are not equivalent to Class 6 (first year of lower-secondary school) or above. Based on this inference, primary school is the only practical option for mainstreaming.

9 Objective statements for all LUL programmes in Nepal (per Table 1) were not presented in documents provided for review. Objectives for GATE and ASP have been developed and agreed upon with NCO via observation and discussion. The absence of stated objectives is linked in part to the adoption or extension of pre-existing programmes for new areas, one of the LUL approaches to innovation: Challenges of replication and implementation can limit the ability of programme personnel to find, transfer or develop objectives, inputs, outputs, outcomes or other components of proper programme design. (This is a personal observation by the evaluator; there are many other possible explanations as to why programme design is not made explicit by programme personnel.)
OOSC data have created confusion regarding reliable information about OOSC in the country. Within these inconsistencies, it can be assert that the number of OOSC in Nepal is on a much higher side.

The estimates cited are for boys and girls, not for girls alone. Based on a CBS 2011 report and a 2012 Flash report (1-2069) of the Department of Education, Karki et al. (op. cit.) present an estimated proportion of OOSC in Saptari District of 17.93 percent, while the mean for all twelve districts included in the study is 11.69 percent. The report also states (no evidence is presented) that higher percentages of OOSC are girls in Saptari and other districts in the Terai (p.9 et passim).

Challenges to school completion mount for girls in adolescence, and include the onset of menstruation (accompanied by practical, health-related and culture-based challenges), domestic work (household chores) and work-for-hire, and other financial and cultural pressures that confront poor families, especially in relation to early marriage.10

ASP comprises a “basket” of inter-related approaches to improving adolescent girls’ attendance and enjoyment of school. Approaches include sports clubs, homework clubs, and instruction in menstrual hygiene for girls in classes 6, 7 and 8, with all three of these approaches implemented at the eight schools visited in Parsa District.11

Approaches. The three ASP activities engage girls in classes 6, 7 and 8 in confronting gender stereotypes and directly address barriers to school completion. In sports club, girls play football, volleyball, badminton, perform calisthenics or other exercises several times per week, and engage in inter-mural competitions. Homework club provides approximately 25 girls with the opportunity to complete their homework assignments outside of the home.12 Instruction in menstrual hygiene is provided by female teachers to all eligible girls, usually in pullout groups of ten students, and includes practical activities such as sewing menstrual pads out of donated/discarded cloth.13

Scale. Launched in 2012, ASP in Parsa is a small-scale pilot programme intended to test the effectiveness of the three activities described in terms of increasing the regularity of girls’ school attendance. With LUL funding, ten schools in Parsa District currently offer these activities. In fall of 2014, ASP was adapted and replicated in 84 schools in four districts in the Mid-Western Region (Accham, Bajura, Kalikot and Mugu), again with the intention of assessing the effectiveness of the programme in terms of improving attendance regularity. (Note that in 2012 ASP was also implemented in two schools in Saptari District. One of these schools was included in field visits by the international

10 Identifying challenges that confront girls is based primarily on FGDs with ASP and GATE participants, parents and teachers, and on interviews with GATE facilitators and supervisors, with stakeholders in local government, and with UNICEF NCO and field personnel. (DAC describes relevance in relation to “priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor” (DAC.)

11 Sports club is also implemented in other lower-secondary schools in Parsa.

12 Homework club is typically held after school, however in two schools homework club is held in the morning before class begins.

13 The cloth used for menstrual pads is a mix of new materials (inner part of pad) and used materials (outer part of pad), allowing increased absorption and pads to be changed during the day (per comments from Marian Ellen Hodgkin, education specialist, NCO, 28 Oct., 2014).
non-governmental organisation (NGO), Restless Development, however programme activities had been suspended.) At present, NCO has no plans to compare pilot schools with control schools. However, in line with the recommendations in this evaluation, NCO is revising and strengthening monitoring and reporting in ASP schools in all districts. Improved monitoring in combination with school records has the potential to increase substantially NCO’s ability to assess the effectiveness of ASP with regards to more regular attendance.

**Implementation.** ASP is implemented by locally based NGOs, with LUL and UNICEF funds and in-kind resources channelled through the DEO. The implementing NGOs train sports and menstrual-hygiene instructors, disburse in-kind resources, such as sports uniforms and football boots, stage inter-school competitions, and monitor both ASP activities and the Young Champions programme. This programme, in which volunteer “Young Champions” identify girls with poor attendance and reach out to girls and their parents to advocate for school completion, currently serves as a primary monitoring mechanism for ASP. As presented during field visits, and based on monitoring information provided in response to requests, monitoring involves collection by Young Champions of information about attendance by girls, based on principals’ attendance records; Young Champions’ reports are shared with the implementing organisation, NGO Coordinating Committee (NGOCC) and with the UNICEF education field officer. (It is possible that additional monitoring mechanisms are in place, however these were not disclosed in response to inquiries either during field visits nor, as reports, following the completion of field visits.)

**Evaluable objective.** One objective is framed for ASP: to increase the regularity of school attendance among at-risk girls enrolled in Classes 6, 7 and 8. As described during field visits, at-risk girls are considered broadly to be those who are low caste or from poor families.

2.1.3. **UNICEF and LUL contributions to GATE**

Contributions from UNICEF and LUL for GATE activities in Saptari have been enabling; LUL funding in 2014 is US $98,083, or 50.8 percent of total programme funding (US $193,041).

With regard to GATE, UNICEF contributions include:

- **Launching GATE in Saptari.** GATE, as mentioned, was designed previously by World Education and implemented in other regions by WE in partnership with MOH. Working with World Education initially, UNICEF introduced GATE to the Saptari District.

- **Engaging the education sector of GoN.** Over the two-year implementation of GATE in Saptari by WE, UNICEF engaged Saptari DEO in partnership, leading to the “mainstreaming” of GATE activities and personnel into DEO for 2014.

- **Providing field support to GATE personnel.** UNICEF education field officers have provided support to GATE including oversight and observation, and direct communication with the GATE coordinator, supervisors, facilitators, and CMCs.

- **Periodic evaluation and research.** UNICEF NCO has conducted several research and other assessments of GATE, including an investigation of the impact of GATE.
on early marriage, conducted for Adolescent Development and Participation (ADAP) and upcoming photo-narrative evaluations by GATE participants who have completed the Lalima curriculum. (This effort is funded by LUL.)

2.1.4. **UNICEF and LUL contributions to ASP**

Contributions from UNICEF and LUL to ASP activities have also been enabling; all funding for 2014, US $14,334, is provided by LUL.

With regard to ASP, UNICEF contributions include:

- **Launching and supporting ASP in Parsa and Saptari.** ASP was designed by UNICEF education personnel working in collaboration with the iNGO Restless Development, and was implemented in Saptari by Restless Development in partnership with DEO Saptari. In Parsa, UNICEF personnel have worked with the implementing organisation, NGOCC.

- **Engaging the Parsa DEO.** UNICEF education field personnel have engaged the DEO as a partner in ASP.

- **Providing in-kind goods and supplies.** UNICEF has provided support to the ASP schools in the form of cloth needed for the sewing of menstrual pads, sports equipment (secured as donations in some instances) and

- **Planning and supporting ASP expansion**

As noted, as of fall 2014 ASP is being replicated at a small scale in four districts in the Mid-Western region; this expansion has been planned and led by UNICEF NCO.
3. Evaluation overview

3.1. Evaluation criteria and objectives
The evaluation of LUL Nepal focuses on the following Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria: relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability. The self-evaluation is intended to provide actionable findings and recommendations to NCO and to contribute to the global evaluation of LUL.

Evaluation objectives. The evaluation addresses the following objectives:

- To determine the extent to which GATE and ASP are relevant as designed to the needs and interests of adolescent girls, out-of-school and enrolled, respectively
- To determine the effectiveness with which GATE and ASP as implemented achieve their objectives
- To analyze issues and factors influencing the potential sustainability and scalability (or replicability) of GATE and ASP in their districts and elsewhere in Nepal
- To assess the internal and external coherence of GATE and ASP in terms of the needs of UNICEF programming

Evaluation timing. The evaluation presents different opportunities in relation to the two programmes: ASP has as yet been implemented in only ten schools in Parsa District, but is in the process of being replicated in other districts. GATE is a more mature programme, and is implemented in Saptari District on a much larger scale (~100 sites per year) and in three other districts in the Terai Region.

Methodology and design. Because these programmes have not been evaluated previously, and because ASP remains a very small-scale pilot programme, this assessment is formative. Qualitative methods are primary in the evaluation design.

Reliance on qualitative methods (interviews, focus groups, etc.) helps ensure that the evaluation is participatory, equitable, and open to unexpected information.

- **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).** FGDs will comprise the primary means of field-level data collection.
- **Semi-structured interviews.** Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in at the field and central levels.

Analysis. Interview and FGD responses have been coded to enable information to be aggregated and analyzed via descriptive statistics (i.e., means/medians, percentages, cross-tabulations). Designing, testing and implementing instruments and a coding framework will also support comparisons of this 2014 formative evaluation with formative and summative evaluations conducted subsequently.

---

14 DAC criteria of impact and efficiency have been eliminated from all LUL national evaluations as: 1) projects are too new to enable measurement of impact; 2) projects are in many instances in pilot phases, making consideration of efficiency not valuable. For additional discussion of the DAC criteria, please refer to the LUL international-evaluation inception report.
**Sample for qualitative approach.** Field visits for the LUL Nepal evaluation have been conducted in Saptari and Parsa districts. Primary focus in Saptari was GATE centres; in Parsa, ASP schools. Of the 100 GATE centres active in Saptari in late August and early September 2014 (when field visits were conducted), six centres were visited, each in a separate VDC, with the sample limited by time and resource constraints. The sample for ASP comprises eight of ten ASP schools in Parsa district.

### 3.2. Limitations

Limitations stem from design-based factors and from implementation. Design-based limitations focus on sampling. The GATE sample was determined largely by logistics and is best understood by GATE facilitators who made that determination. The ASP sample included eight of ten participating schools, however selection was made by the UNICEF education field officer. In addition, the GATE sample size is limited (six centres out of 100). In field visits for both programmes, selection of participants in FGDs was not randomized (relying on support from participants and stakeholders). In addition, the reliability of responses from FGD and interview respondents is unclear and has not been adequately verified.

Implementation-based limitations stem from bias on the part of translators in both Saptari and Parsa districts. In addition, field visits in Parsa District relied heavily on local knowledge and guidance by personnel from the implementing organisation, NGOCC.

(More detailed information about design and implementation is contained in “Annex A: Methodology.”)

#### 3.2.1. Equity focus

Both the GATE programme and ASP have been designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged and worst-off groups—adolescent and at-risk girls in poor communities, and specifically in Dalit and Muslim communities in the case of GATE as implemented in Saptari. Challenges for girls as members of these groups are intensified by the conservative outlook and gender bias prevalent in Nepal’s Terai Region.

Equity focus in this evaluation is founded primarily on use of Articles 5 and 10 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as a framework for assessment of programme activities. These activities are assessed, especially in relation to the criteria relevance and effectiveness, in terms of their support for CEDAW. (Additional information provided by NCO suggests that the Country Programme Action Plan is based on a comprehensive international human rights framework, including the Convention on Rights of the Child.)

---

15 In the evaluation framework, centre performance is listed as a sample criterion. In the event, however, geography and ethnicity created significant challenges (five sites were proposed originally), and centre-performance data were not available at DEO Saptari when the sampling was developed.

16 I had originally, and I now believe mistakenly, thought that eight schools represented a complete sample of ASP in Parsa. I have since learned that there are an additional two ASP schools in Parsa (Bimala Manandhar, 13 January, 2015). As a result, I can make no representation in relation to sample methods or sample selection.
3.3. **Ethical safeguards**

Ethical safeguards were pursued in all field visits. All girls participating in FGDs received and signed consent forms (in Nepali) advising them that their responses were valuable, their identities would be kept in confidence, and asking their release of rights over any photos that would be taken. Adult respondents were similarly advised that their responses would be kept private and presented as anonymous, that they were not required to respond to any of the questions, and that they were free to end their participation at any time.

3.3.1. **Feedback to key stakeholders**

Versions of this report have been shared with a Reference Group convened by NCO, including representation by the donor community, the iNGO community and the MoE. In addition, findings were shared within the Education section of NCO, and with education field officers stationed in Parsa and Saptari districts.
4. Findings, conclusions and recommendations

This section presents findings, conclusions and recommendations in relation to ASP and GATE.

4.1. Findings and conclusions, relevance

GATE and ASP are designed to address problems stemming from poverty and cultural norms (including parental bias)—problems generally described by participants and stakeholders in both programmes—through increased support for learning and participation in education. Respondents identify several barriers that are faced common by both GATE and ASP beneficiaries, however respondents for each programme describe the underlying causes and effects of these problems differently.

4.1.1. Relevance: ASP

The stated objective of ASP is to reduce levels of irregular attendance among girl students, especially those disadvantaged by poverty or caste. Participating girls in all eight schools describe many different circumstances (e.g., failure to complete homework, lack of friends, lack of parental support, etc.) that were important causes of irregular attendance in the past and that are addressed by ASP programme activities. Adult respondents in six schools mention irregular attendance, linking the phenomenon to one or more specific factors (e.g., menstruation, work for hire, etc.). However, the reliability of the information collected should be viewed with reference to potential limitations of the evaluation design and implementation. (See “3.2 Limitations.”)

In addition, MOE personnel in conversations in September 2014 stated that both objectives and programme design corresponded to needs and interests of GoN MOE. ASP, in addition, supports the following provisions in CEDAW article 10 by pursuing:

- (f) The reduction of female dropout rates…;
- (g) The same opportunities to participate actively in sports and physical education;
- (h) Access to specific educational information to help ensure the health and well being of families…

Conclusion. ASP is highly relevant to the needs of adolescent girls in lower-secondary school, and to the needs and interests of GoN MOE. This conclusion is based on the evaluator’s assessment of programme design in relation to respondents’ descriptions of challenges to regular attendance and on statements by MOE personnel.

4.1.2. Relevance: GATE

GATE objectives were presented to the evaluator as follows: To improve literacy, numeracy and life-skills among out-of-school adolescent girls; To facilitate ‘mainstreaming’ of out-of-school girls into formal education; To improve the prospective social and economic well-being of out-of-school girls. GATE’s Lalima curriculum provides a more detailed view of the programme’s focal areas. Among the 50 topics are: discrimination, pregnancy, diarrhea, sexually transmitted diseases and menstruation. The Lalima curriculum was originally developed by WE.
While participants and stakeholders confirm that problems addressed by GATE are important, they directly ascribe the causes of these problems to gender-related norms and biases, lack of girls’ rights, and to poverty. (See “4.1.4 Limitations to relevance: GATE” for more information.) GATE does address gender-related norms and biases, as well as girls' rights, primarily via the Lalima curriculum and more generally, if indirectly, through the empowerment of participating girls in relation to their families and communities. These problems and their effective address are not explicitly identified in stated objectives; programme design, however, suggests an implicit focus on these issues.

MOE personnel in conversations in September 2014 stated that mainstreaming of out-of-school girls is aligned with policies and plans of GoN.

GATE in addition supports CEDAW article 5 (a), calling for change in social and cultural norms that promote men over women and boys over girls.17

Conclusion. GATE is relevant to its participants and stakeholders. There are limitations to relevance, however, insofar as respondents’ concerns are directly related to economic well-being rather than either school participation or literacy/numeracy skills. In addition, as discussed in following sections, mainstreaming within GATE is only feasible for a sub-set of participants.

This conclusion drawn by the evaluator, based on statements of field and central respondents both in relation to problems and challenges and in relation to the effect of programme participation.

4.1.3. Problems identified by respondents in both districts

Household chores. Participants in both programmes identify household chores as a problem in relation to school attendance. Girls at all eight ASP schools state that chores conflict with homework, and uncompleted homework leads to irregular attendance. (Girls who fall behind in their homework assignments are motivated to miss class to avoid punishment; such motivation increases each time class [and a homework assignment] is missed.)

GATE participants in three of six centres visited identified the problem of household chores, primarily as an illustration of bias against girls.

Work for hire. Girls in both Saptari and Parsa districts are hired out to other adults to perform fieldwork, notably during paddy planting and harvesting periods; according to girls and to adult stakeholders, this practice bars them from attending school. Work for hire is mentioned more frequently by GATE participants and adult stakeholders (four of six centres visited) than by ASP participants. This difference likely results from economic and social circumstances accompanying girls’ status in school (enrolled or out of school), and more generally from higher levels of poverty in the GATE communities visited. (See “4.2.3 Impact of economic development on apparent effectiveness of ASP” for more

17 “States Parties shall take all appropriate measures: (a) To modify the social and cultural patterns of conduct of men and women, with a view to achieving the elimination of prejudices and customary and all other practices which are based on the idea of the inferiority or the superiority of either of the sexes or on stereotyped roles for men and women. . . .”

18 All schools visited have received CFS inputs, however degree of child friendliness achieved was not assessed within this evaluation. At two of the eight schools visited we encountered canes.
information.) In addition, girls who are hired out for fieldwork did not appear to be represented in HWC FGDs.

**Menstrual hygiene.** Respondents in both districts cited menstruation hygiene as a challenge for girls, however the importance of that challenge differs.

ASP respondents in all categories—participating girl students, head teachers, participating teachers, School Management Committee (SMC) members and parents cited menstruation as a problem leading to irregular attendance and dropping out. As described by one menstrual-hygiene instructor, menstruation is stigmatized in many disadvantaged and low-caste communities and families; pain, embarrassment and lack of sanitation facilities can each lead to irregular attendance. 19 GATE participants in three centres identified menstruation hygiene as a challenge, however statements in all instances link menstruation to other hygiene-related problems, such as sanitation and food handling, as evidence of the effectiveness of GATE instruction. (Menstruation is not linked to school or GATE attendance.)

**Early marriage.** Early marriage is considered a problem among stakeholders of both programmes. In six ASP schools, adult respondents identified early marriage as an obstacle to school completion. One head teacher described the problem: “The problem is not that girls don’t enroll. However they leave school due to early marriage and menstruation.” In the words of an SMC member at another school: “Early marriage is a problem. The dowry system encourages parents to keep their girls out of school.”

Girls in all six GATE field sites identify early marriage as a problem, and girls are aware that concomitant with early marriage are problems stemming from early-adolescent pregnancies, including maternal and infant mortality and maternal morbidity.

**Bias against girls.** Participants and stakeholders in both programmes identify bias against girls as a problem itself and as a cause of other problems (e.g., household chores, work for hire, lack of agency). Girl students in all four schools that identify chores as a barrier, and principals in two of those schools, state that boys are never assigned such tasks, that boys have the opportunity to play. Girls in three of six GATE centres visited cite parental bias as a factor causing other problems.

Related to parental bias and gender-based cultural norms are problems relating to girls’ opportunities and agency, and to harassment. ASP participants and stakeholders mention shyness and hesitation among girls and prohibitions against girls playing outside as

---

19 Causality in relation to menstruation and irregular attendance should be reconsidered in light of research conducted in the Terai region that shows that the linkage of menstruation to absenteeism is over-stated by donor agencies and NGOs (Oster, E. and Thornton, R., 2011). Within the methodology of this evaluation, however, the linkage of menstruation to absenteeism remains valid: Girls, teachers, parents and community leaders describe this linkage, relating it to absenteeism and to practical concerns described in some detail. And as mentioned, a single day’s absence can lead to additional missed classes, in part due to fear of punishment, and eventually to dropping out. It possible that given the research methodology of Oster and Thornton, such “snowball” absences would only link a single day’s absence to menstruation, with no connection of menstruation to the additional days of missed school or to an eventual dropping out.

Although this evaluation finds that menstruation-hygiene instruction in ASP is effective in addressing irregular attendance, the timeframe of implementation is very short; it is unlikely that instruction has produced results that are observable even by girls themselves in all ASP schools.
problems. GATE respondents (both girls and adults) cite teasing and harassment by boys, notably of girls on as girls walk to primary or lower-secondary school.

**Conclusion.** Both programmes address these issues identified in common. GATE, however, addresses early marriage and menstrual hygiene directly, while addressing parental bias indirectly. Work for hire and household chores are addressed within GATE primarily as an outcome of the indirect address of parental bias.) ASP addresses menstrual hygiene directly; other factors are addressed through complementary activities, primarily outreach and advocacy conducted by teachers and by Young Champions.

4.1.4. **Limitations to relevance: GATE**

Several factors limit the relevance of GATE. Findings in relation to these limitations include:

- **GATE curriculum.** The life-skills content of the GATE curriculum, originally developed by WE in partnership with MOH for use in hilly regions, is only partially relevant to the lives of GATE participants in the Terai Region. Lessons in a few instances alert girls and their families to apparently false threats. In VDC Bhangaha and VDC Piprapurwa, in particular, GATE participants and CMC members identify one of the benefits of GATE as girls’ increased awareness of trafficking. In addition, girls in VDC Piprapurwa and VDC Basbiti describe their increased awareness of being cheated by bus drivers and at markets, and their increased abilities to resist same. When asked if they knew of any girls who had been trafficked, girls said they did not. When asked if anyone had tried to cheat them, girls said no one had.

- **Vocational skills.** GATE respondents living with their parents and engaged in seasonal fieldwork for hire, as is typical, do not identify lack of jobs or employable skills as problems that they currently confront, however respondents in all field sites consider these problems likely to be significant to them in the future. Girl respondents in five of the six field sites report that they require vocational training in order to pursue employment in the near future. Respondents in VDC Piprapurwa did not mention vocational training per se, but did state that their plans for next year would include work.

Members of CMCs and VDCs in all six villages identify the need for vocational training for girls, characterizing it as a critical issue.

- **Fieldwork.** GATE participants and stakeholders differentiate between jobs calling for vocational skills (e.g., tailoring, grocery-shop operation, etc.) and the fieldwork and other agricultural activities. Fieldwork is identified as an obstacle to school attendance and as a problem, generally, with small incomes generated for their families. Work developed out of vocational training would generate more substantial income that would support their future lives and independence, according to respondents.

---

20 Per conversations with UNICEF field and NCO personnel, and with the originator of the WE GATE curriculum, trafficking is not an issue in the Terai Region, while it is a danger for girls in hilly regions. Other persons within NCO suggest that there is reason to doubt the reported absence of trafficking in the Terai.
- **Mainstreaming.** Girls over the age of 14 are not considered candidates for mainstreaming into primary-school classrooms.

- **Educational attainment/access to school.** GATE participants do not identify barriers to school attendance among the problems of greatest importance to them. No participants specifically describe a desire to read, write or calculate, or attend school, however girls in VDC Bhangaha, VDC Badgama, VDC Basbiti and VDC Odraha do describe the opportunity to go to school as one of the many advantages given to boys, and, as discussed in “4.2.4 Effectiveness: GATE,” participating girls describe in detail the ways that literacy and numeracy skills provide them with benefits, influence their interactions with their families, and empower them.

Adult stakeholders in Muslim communities identify the lack of opportunity for girls to attend adequate schools as a central problem. Key factors include: Muslim girls upon attaining a certain age are no longer permitted to be in the presence of men (including teachers); Muslim schools (madrassas) are typically underfunded and provide inadequate education; government support for madrassas is sporadic and inadequate.

**Conclusions.** While GATE is generally relevant in relation to the challenges and well being of out-of-school girls in the wards visited, there are limitations to such relevance chiefly related to poverty. The relation of formal education to income-generation is indirect, and is perceived as being indirect by beneficiaries, while demand for job-related education or vocational training—with direct bearing on poverty—is high.

In addition, the effort to meet the needs of out-of-school girls leads in some instances to results that contradict equity-based principles: GATE as designed, with its adaptive scheduling and minimal hours, possibly enables or supports girls’ fieldwork by providing education to girls in ways that do not clash with rice planting or harvesting, among other activities.

These observations are based on evidence collected during field visits, but result from analysis of this evidence by the evaluator.

**4.2. Findings and conclusions, effectiveness**

Both programmes are effective in relation to their stated objectives. Limitations to ASP effectiveness are also noted.

**4.2.1. Effectiveness: ASP**

Girls are empowered in relation to school. Underpinning these outcomes are indirect effects reported by girls, such as parents’ improved attitudes about girls and improved relations of female and male students, among others. In terms of its CEDAW-related objectives, notably reducing dropouts and improving access to information about health and hygiene, ASP is effective.²¹

---

²¹ This statement of effectiveness in relation to CEDAW is based in part on reports by participating girls and by principals that link irregular attendance to increased risk of dropping out. Data are not available to definitively connect the improved attendance resulting from ASP with reduced dropout rates.
More regular attendance. “More regular attendance” is the change cited most frequently by adults, with 18 respondents in seven schools directly citing improved “attendance regularity,” and with respondents in six schools also citing “increased enrollment” and “reduced dropouts.”

Reduced barriers around menstruation. At all eight ASP schools, girls partially attribute their increased attendance to menstruation-hygiene instruction received via ASP. Girls also describe the prior existence of substantial barriers to attendance in relation to menstruation. These include lack of menstruation pads and female toilets, related problems stemming from bleeding on school uniforms, and teasing by boys.

Reduced barriers around homework completion. At all eight schools, girls partially attribute their more-regular attendance to their participation in HWC. HWC provides girls with a regular, dedicated time to complete their homework assignments, ensuring that household chores do not supersede their homework, and thereby increasing the regularity of girls’ school attendance.

Improved physical and emotional well being. Sports club, open to all girls in classes 6, 7 and 8, provides girl students with opportunities to play sports such as football (soccer), volleyball and badminton, as well as tag and other playground games. Respondents in five schools link playing sports to improved physical and emotional well being (“We feel happy. And joy.”).

Key provisions per both respondents’ comments and observations of the evaluator include the leadership of a trained teacher, permissions from parents, sports uniforms including soccer boots, and inter-school competitions. Sports-club teachers participate in approximately two weeks of training, during which time they receive incentives as well as per-diem; after completion of training sports-club teachers contribute their time to the programme.

The importance of competition. FGD respondents in seven schools describe the importance of competition against teams of girls from other schools. In addition to the significance of competition to the girls themselves, competitions serve as an important validating mechanism for parents (as mentioned by sports-club teachers in two schools). The competitions also provide girls with a rare opportunity (in some instances a first
opportunity) to travel outside their VDCs. FGD respondents in five schools mention the excitement of travel outside the VDC: “Do you know how we went there? We all got on one tractor!”

**Increased agency and social capital.** Girls reported strengthened friendships, greater confidence, feelings of equality with boys, improved relationships with teachers, greater emotional health and improved attitudes on the part of parents in relation to opportunities for girls.

**Conclusions.** ASP, per principals’ and participants’ reports in all schools, is highly effective in improving girls’ attendance—the programme’s core objective—and in increasing girls’ motivation to attend school, primarily by connecting girls to the academic experience through the development of friendships, improved relationships with teachers and opportunities to have fun and enjoy new experiences. Among the unexpected outcomes of the programme are its strong influence on girls’ self-perceptions, their increased agency and social capital, and their empowerment. Sports club comprises the most radical and perhaps the most empowering component of ASP, as participation requires girls to break gender-focused norms. In the (translated) words of one respondent:

> We were never allowed to play outside before. Not at school and not in our village. People would say to us “You will face problems, no one will marry you.”

**4.2.2. Limitations to effectiveness: ASP**

Several factors, including factors linked to implementation, limit the effectiveness of ASP.

**Variable implementation of sports club.** In seven of the eight schools visited, sports club is scheduled from three to five afternoons per week. In Bagwana Lower Secondary School in Bagwana VDC, however, sports club is offered only one time per week, on Friday afternoon, although informal sports-play takes place many afternoons. In sports-club sessions at Bagwana Lower Secondary School, girl and boy students both participate; this combination is not practiced by any other ASP school (although one sports-club instructor suggested that mixing boys and girls would improve the programme).

The status of sports-club teachers varies similarly across ASP schools: in one school (Bagwana Lower Secondary School) the sports-club teacher is a volunteer from the community; in four schools, sports club is led by a temporary teacher; in three schools, sports club is led by a permanent teacher.

---

22 Girl students in three FGDs reported greater emotional health, translated as “improved emotions.” No follow-up questions were asked, however. (FGDs with girl students were conducted by the assistant evaluator, Daisy Gupta.)

23 This statement is true within the qualitative methods of this evaluation; it accurately reflects statements of beneficiaries and local stakeholders in relation to project objectives. As pointed out by Ms. Anna Maria Vangoor of NCO personnel, the statement lacks quantitative support (comment, 18 November, 2014).

24 Bagwana Lower Secondary School is also an outlier in terms of HWC scheduling, with HWC conducted in mornings before school.
**Limited impact on learning outcomes.** Girl students participating in FGDs in no instances reported improved academic performance as a result of HWC; head teachers in two schools and HWC teachers in two (different) schools reported improved learning outcomes. In one of these instances, a head teacher cited the fact that a girl student participating in HWC was ranked second in Class 7; however in the subsequent FGD the girl in question reported that she had ranked second in her class in each of the past two years (or more). Overall, students who performed well prior to participating in HWC continue to perform well; students who performed less well previously perform at about the same level.

Selection processes and guidelines for participation of girls in HWC are not known by the evaluator.

**Variable implementation of HWC.** Structure and implementation of HWC vary across the eight schools. Lack of training and lack of a clear format for implementation in schools contribute to these variations and limit the impact of HWC (especially in relation to education quality) and possibly the programme’s scalability and sustainability. Variations are observed in relation to: scheduling, staffing, pedagogy, and incentives. This finding is based on evidence, composed of descriptive statements by principals and teachers and assessments by the evaluator based on these descriptions.

**Delayed implementation of menstrual-hygiene instruction.** Teacher training in menstruation hygiene began approximately May 2014, while other components began in Academic Year (AY) 2012-2013. Causes of delay include high-level decisions, implementation by NGOCC, and challenges procuring cloth for pads.25 Such delay should be avoided in future implementations. (Please note that this delay compromises findings of effectiveness to an indeterminate extent; respondents report that this component reduced irregular attendance, but in many instances menstruation-hygiene instruction had only just been completed.)

**Limited engagement of disadvantaged populations.** Limitations on the effectiveness of ASP’s provision of service to girls from disadvantaged populations stem from a combination of factors, including: low enrolment of Dalit girls in schools and limited participation of girls who are academically low performing. In many instances, however, non-Dalit HWC participants are members of the also-disadvantaged Madhesi caste.26

ASP effectiveness in this area can be improved. Solakhpur Higher Secondary School, VDC Solakhpur, located in a peri-urban area near Birgunj, has established an HWC section that was wholly or primarily composed of girls disadvantaged by poverty and poor performance. (This determination is based on two sources: a statement by the school principal, and; observations by two Nepali members of the evaluation team.) This school and its ASP activities are well run: school grounds, classrooms and toilets are clean; hundreds of students and many teachers attended on Saturday morning to welcome the evaluation team; students and teachers interacted with familiarity and enjoyment. (While these qualities were not absent from other schools visited, their

---

25 Per comments received from UNICEF field personnel via correspondence, 13 January, 2015.

26 It is possible that caste is not the most accurate indicator of disadvantage in ASP-school communities. Consultation with the 2015 equity strategy is advised.
appearance in combination is unique.) Student and alumni engagement with the school is high. (The Young Champion is an alumnus of the school. This was the case in one other ASP school.)

Conclusions. There are several conclusions to be drawn from findings of limitations to ASP effectiveness:

Variable implementation. Scheduling sports club and HWC poses challenges for ASP schools, with those challenges addressed in various ways by different schools. While it is possible that each scheduling decision is optimal, clearly these decisions result in changes in access and participation.

Disadvantaged populations. ASP does not appear, either independently or as complemented by other programmes (e.g., Young Champions27), to effectively engage girl students from disadvantaged populations. This conclusion, however, should be considered provisional until the conclusion is confirmed. Factors complicating assessment of the limited scope of ASP in relation to disadvantaged populations include:

- **Barriers of parental limitations are indeterminate.** Girls’ participation in HWC and sports club is subject to parental approval. Girls in six schools reported that their parents no longer (after outreach from school faculty) restricted girls’ participation in after-school programmes, including sports. However it is possible, and perhaps likely, that eligible girls do not participate due to their parents’ prohibition; these girls are excluded from this evaluation. (The primary school activity intended to address this situation is outreach by teachers and by the Young Champions. Without adequate recordkeeping the effectiveness of this approach is indeterminate.)

- **Numbers of Dalit girls both in school and out of school are indeterminate.** Dalit girls are not heavily represented among ASP participants in FGDs, however the proportions of Dalit families in the schools’ catchments, possibly available in the GoN Education Management Information System (EMIS) records, was not provided to this evaluation. (Relevant queries were for information about levels of disadvantage, however, not about the demographic composition of school catchments.)

- **Participation of academically challenged or at-risk girls is indeterminate.** Participation in HWC of girls who under-perform academically appears to be limited. In general selection processes for participation in HWC are not known by the evaluator and are likely not consistent within ASP schools in Parsa.

- **Effect of bias among school faculty is indeterminate.** A number of head teachers and teachers interviewed appear to be biased against Dalit. (The same appears to be true of some Young Champions.) One way this bias impacts ASP

---

27 Per agreement with HQ, the Young Champions project was not included in this evaluation (as I believe the project is not funded by LUL). However per communication with UNICEF field personnel, the Young Champions are integrated into ASP implementation via their efforts in outreach and in monitoring. Future evaluations of LUL should be alert to benefits of including complementary projects in the scope of evaluations.
is that most head teachers and other faculty deny that problems of irregular attendance, dropouts and out-of-school girls continue in their communities or are prevalent among disadvantaged groups, although out-of-school adolescent girls are visible throughout the VDC. In three schools in which principals and teachers made these statements, girl students participating as respondents in FGDs reported that they were collectively aware of between three and ten out-of-school girls of their ages in their communities; in addition, the evaluation team when traveling to schools could observe adolescent girls doing housework and working in fields.

ASP, then, increases the regularity of attendance among participating girls, all of whom are enrolled in classes 6, 7 and 8, however the prevalence of at-risk girls in the catchments of ASP schools and in HWCs is at best indeterminate and should be considered to be below the prevalence of these girls in schools and communities.

4.2.3. Impact of economic development on apparent effectiveness of ASP
The Child Deprivation Index (CDI) for VDCs in Parsa District suggests that of the 14 VDCs ranked lowest on the CDI, only one (or perhaps two) is addressed by ASP, while at least two VDCs are ranked in the top two quartiles. Distribution of ASP schools in Parsa appears not to be linked tightly to social and economic development.

In addition, head teachers and SMC members in five of the eight ASP schools reported that economic conditions in the VDC had improved over the course of the past five years as a result of the arrival of factories offering employment (two VDCs) and increased remittance payments from males working abroad (two VDCs). No respondents suggested that economic conditions had worsened over the five-year period; the question was not asked in the first three VDCs visited.

Conclusion. It is likely that improving economic conditions contribute to improvements in terms of girl students’ regular attendance and completion of school, possibly influencing school attendance by girls and the apparent effectiveness of ASP. In relation to the new (2015) equity strategy of GoN, the design of ASP possibly undercuts the programme’s equity focus. While ASP directly addresses the challenges of girl students currently in school, the programme does not necessarily focus on groups disadvantaged by poverty, caste or other factors (as outlined in the new strategy). It is likely that this limitation in equity focus stems in part from constraints on schools eligible to participate in ASP. (Please refer to “4.2.1 Effectiveness: ASP” and “4.2.2 Limitations to effectiveness: ASP” for more information.)

4.2.4. Effectiveness: GATE
GATE is generally effective in relation to its stated objectives: improving literacy, numeracy and life skills of out-of-school girls; mainstreaming out-of-school girls into formal education; improving social and economic well-being of out-of-school girls. These objectives, while discussed here in relation to programme effectiveness, also pertain to LUL pillars (and evaluation criteria) of education quality and equity. Of critical importance, these findings also

---

28 Observations of head-teacher bias were reported to me by Daisy Gupta, the assistant evaluator during field visits in Parsa district.

29 The CDI presents a composite ranking of VDCs in Nepal based on presence of VDC secretaries, Gross Enrollment Ratio, Control of Diarrhoeal Disease, DPT3 vaccinations, Sanitation Status, and the ratio of girls to boys.
suggest that GATE is effective in relation to CEDAW articles 5 and 10, including reduction of bias against girls and provision of educational information ensuring health and well being.

**Literacy, numeracy learning.** Evidence of gains in literacy and numeracy is inconclusive but positive. Multiple sources, many of them anecdotal, suggest that the GATE programme leads to gains in literacy and numeracy skills, however standardized pre- and post-tests or other definitive comparisons are not available. GATE “in-house” exams are not mapped to government curricula, but suggest that participants are learning.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Division</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Division</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Performance on mid-term review, GATE 2014

However, other sources—participating girls, head teachers, GATE facilitators—support the finding that GATE participants improve literacy and numeracy skills. The principal at a local school states, “Girls complete GATE and enter school and perform better than girls at the same level who have been in government schools from the beginning.” GATE participants also provide examples of their acquired literacy and numeracy skills: girls in VDC Ghoghanpur state that benefits of GATE extend to being able to read signs on busses; in VDC Bhangaha girls say they are able to calculate prices and amounts at the market; in VDC Badgama girls are able to use SMS (text) for communication. (One girl in VDC Badgama said in addition that using the phone and her math skills she was able to help her father, working in India, to ensure that he was paid fairly.)

**Life skills.** GATE participants per their statements in FGDs learn life skills, notably related to hygiene and menstrual hygiene, to a degree that enables them to teach others, including adults, and that results in changed practices at home. Girls also report increasing agency and social capital. Support for these findings is primarily anecdotal. Specific examples include:

- **Improved hygiene and menstruation.** Respondents in VDC Piprapurwa, VDC Odraha and VDC Ghoghanpur emphasize the direct benefits of improved hygiene, mentioning cleaner home environments, improved menstruation-related practice, and improved personal hygiene.

- **Reduced diarrhea.** Respondents in VDC Bhangaha, VDC Badgama, VDC Odraha and VDC Ghoghanpur stated that as a result of improved hygiene they and their families experience reduced incidence of diarrhea and improved treatment of diarrhea: “We don’t bathe in dirty water,” “If we cannot get good food we will get diarrhea and malnutrition,” “When we have diarrhea we go to the health office because we know people have died from diarrhea”. (Both of these statements were provided by respondents when they were asked about valuable information that they learned as part of their participation in GATE.)

---

30 Source is “GATE Mid-term Consultative Review,” a presentation file received on 15 September, 2014, from NCO. The presentation was translated verbally from Nepali on 16 September, 2014, by Ms. Daisy Gupta in Kathmandu.
Mainstreaming of out-of-school girls. Per information provided by NCO, 47.5 percent of GATE participants in 2013, the last year for which reporting is complete, were mainstreamed; of the 2,443 participants completing GATE in that year, 58 percent were between 10 and 14 years old, ages generally considered eligible for mainstreaming into primary classrooms, suggesting that approximately 81 percent of eligible girls were mainstreamed in 2013, while approximately 268 age-eligible girls (or 19 percent of all participants) completed GATE but were not mainstreamed.

Social well-being. Across various questions about benefits, activities and aspirations, GATE participants report increases in agency that directly or indirectly addresses the restrictions, attitudes and requirements that impinge on their lives. Reported examples of increased agency include: making friends; enjoying dancing and playing; parents’ changed attitudes; successfully resisting early marriage; less shyness and hesitation; taking busses and going to markets; standing up to boys and teasing. Girls in addition say in the future they will support their own girl children.

Sharing knowledge with parents. Participants in all field sites relate instances in which they have shared knowledge with or used new skills to benefit their families in ways that include: improving menstruation hygiene, food hygiene and sanitation; calculating wages owed a parent; reading vaccination and other notices; advocating for younger siblings to be permitted to attend school.

Changes in parental attitudes. The introduction of GATE, simply by demonstrating that the lives of girls have value to other outside the VDC, upends traditional values that denigrate the worth of girls (per GATE facilitators and/or CMC members in VDC Bhangaha, VDC Badgama, VDC Basbiti, VDC Odraha and VDC Ghoghanpur).

Economic well-being. Although included as a GATE objective, girls’ economic well being is not addressed directly by the programme. For younger girls, eligible for mainstreaming, directly addressing their economic situation is perhaps inappropriate (without focusing on parents’ economic opportunities, for example). For girls too old to be effectively mainstreamed, GATE effectiveness is limited to its areas of direct influence, the scope of

---

31 Information was provided in the file “Data base Revised – Nov-20.xls.”
32 GATE Mid-term Consultative Review.
33 VDC Piprapurwa, VDC Basbiti, VDC Badgama, VDC Odraha and VDC Ghoghanpur.
34 VDC Piprapurwa, VDC Basbiti, and VDC Odraha.
35 VDC Bhangaha, VDC Piprapurwa, VDC Basbiti and VDC Ghoghanpur.
36 VDC Odraha and VDC Ghoghanpur.
37 VDC Bhangaha, VDC Piprapurwa, VDC Basbiti, VDC Odraha and VDC Ghoghanpur.
38 VDC Piprapurwa and VDC Basbiti.
39 VDC Badgama, VDC Basbiti and VDC Odraha.
40 VDC Badgama and VDC Ghoghanpur.
which encompasses hygiene, personal empowerment and qualities of good character, and specific activities that threaten well-being. There is no evidence within the Lalima curriculum that GATE addresses improved economic well being. (For more information about the curriculum, refer to “Annex G: Gate Lalima curriculum topics.”)

Limitations to GATE effectiveness are linked to sustainability, and are addressed in the sections, “4.3.4 Limitations to sustainability: GATE.”

Conclusions. Conclusions drawn in relation to GATE effectiveness are several:

- **Literacy, numeracy learning.** While GATE participants do build literacy and numeracy skills, their skills levels are indeterminate and cannot be compared with outcomes produced by other (e.g., FE) approaches. More accurate, independent and competency-based assessment is required to determine learning by participants. In addition, review of the Lalima curriculum is required to determine the degree to which the curriculum supports acquisition literacy and numeracy skills required for mainstreaming.

- **Life skills.** Although precise assessment is not possible within this evaluation, it appears that influence on well being stemming from life skills and related knowledge (e.g., menstruation hygiene, food safety, etc.) is at least equal to and probably greater than the influence of literacy and numeracy on participants’ well being. To an unknown extent, this influence results from girls’ improved standing in their families and improved self-esteem as a result of shared knowledge (although there are also reports of shared knowledge and increased capacity resulting from literacy and numeracy skills).

- **Mainstreaming.** GATE effectiveness in terms of mainstreaming eligible girls is high. However the effectiveness of mainstreaming itself—in terms of girls’ completion rates, among other education-specific indicators—is not known. In addition, the value of primary education per se is not known, limiting assessment of mainstreaming as an objective (i.e., the relevance of mainstreaming).

- **Well being.** GATE’s influence on participants’ perceived well being is pronounced. GATE’s influence on their actual well being appears to be commensurate with those perceptions.

4.3. Findings and conclusions, sustainability and scalability

Both ASP and GATE have qualities that make them worthy to be scaled and sustained: relevance, effectiveness, low unit costs, correspondence to MOE priorities.

4.3.1. Sustainability and scalability: ASP

Primary factors that support scaling include the following.

Alignment with MOE and GoN objectives. ASP addresses GoN objectives in relation to equity and overall development. Key points in relation to GoN/MOE objectives include:
• **MOE readiness to mainstream and scale.** MOE personnel have affirmed the MOE’s interest in mainstreaming and scaling effective and appropriate UNICEF programmes. Per one MOE respondent:

> We would like to have information about outcomes of these (UNICEF) projects so that they can, if it’s worthwhile, be mainstreamed and scaled… We would like to know what is working, what is not working and what can be upgraded.

• **UNICEF as an effective MOE partner.** One MOE respondent credits UNICEF NCO with acting as an effective partner to the MOE, citing flexibility and UNICEF’s range of expertise, bridging the distance between national policy and implementation in the field.

• **MOE prioritization of school completion.** Per discussion with MOE personnel, GoN has declared that Nepal should transition from LDC status to Developing Country status by 2020. One requirement for that transition is 100 percent enrollment at the secondary level.

• **Equity strategy 2015.** GoN has adopted a revised equity strategy. While equity approaches in Nepal have previously prioritized girls and women to the exclusion of other groups, the new strategy will address the needs of girls and women via a group of eight “dimensions” based on indicators of disadvantage.

• **Low costs.** Overall capital and operating expenses for ASP are low.

Table 4: Unit costs for ASP in Parsa and the mid-western region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Amount (Nrs)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Programme Cost Per School</td>
<td>48,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration for focal teachers</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Support</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Kit (in kind)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring by Young Champion</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per the above, costs per school per year in Parsa district are approximately US $50, yielding costs per student in HWC of US $2 per year, with far lower costs per student in sports club and menstrual-hygiene instruction. (Costs per school per year for ASP in the Mid-western Region are substantially higher, approximately US $320.)

**Conclusion.** ASP is based on the preceding factors likely to be both sustainable and scalable.

**4.3.2. Limitations on sustainability and scalability: ASP**

Several factors limit sustainability and scalability of ASP. These include the following.

---

41 Discussion of the GoN equity strategy is indebted to communication with NCO personnel, including persons supporting development of the current strategy.
Limited number of qualifying schools. Participation in ASP in Parsa is restricted to lower-secondary schools that have participated in UNICEF’s CFS and Young Champion programmes. The potential effect of relaxing these standards (e.g., no participation in CFS or Young Champions) is not known.

(The criteria for participation were shared with the evaluator relatively late in the development of this evaluation; the rationale for these selection criteria is not known. It can be inferred, however, that the increased rates of dropping out among adolescent girls led to implementation in lower-secondary schools, and that both CFS participation and the presence of Young Champions were seen as enabling conditions with the potential to improve programme effectiveness.)

MOE and mixed signals. MOE readiness, as described, notwithstanding, recent actions should raise questions with regard to MOE priorities and willingness to adopt programmes originating within UNICEF.42

Risks posed by unpaid personnel. Although low costs are essential to the mainstreaming of most education programmes, costs of ASP are so low that they pose potential risks to sustainability and scaling of the programme. At present, sports-club teachers and HWC teachers—as well as Young Champions—volunteer their services to ASP. Relying on service-for-free undercuts the sustainability of ASP; volunteers might at any time face pressures and/or opportunities to engage in other activities.

Limited monitoring and information. Monitoring of ASP is linked to monthly monitoring meetings among a school’s gender focal point, a representative of the implementing organization NGOCC, and the school’s Young Champion. Reporting protocols, however, are unclear, but appear to repeat the school’s regular attendance reports.

Limited accountability or performance monitoring. In addition, UNICEF field personnel and NCO have no means of tracking numbers of ASP participants or numbers of sessions conducted. The regularity with which HWC and sports club are conducted is simply not knowable by UNICEF; the potential importance of this issue in a scaled programme is high.

Lack of evidence. As a result of the limitations stemming from monitoring of ASP, no quantitative evidence has been collected to demonstrate the programme’s effectiveness in relation to increasing attendance regularity or reducing the number of dropouts.

Conclusion. Challenges to ASP scalability and sustainability are substantial, as the programme is implemented currently, but can be addressed through a combination of programme re-design and improved practice. The primary challenge to the scalability and potential sustainability of ASP is the lack of effective monitoring, including both monitoring of performance by teachers and schools and monitoring of indicators of students’ achievement and educational attainment. Limited monitoring undercuts conclusive findings of effectiveness and impact.

Other limitations, in addition, affect scalability and sustainability less directly: although HWC provides a ready-made platform for improving learning for participants and for school

42 Despite UNICEF NCO’s transition to partnership with DEO Saptari, in October 2014 the MOE removed funding for GATE from its budget agreement with UNICEF. Funding has since been restored.
improvement overall (via improved teaching and learning methods), that platform is unused. Additional inputs, such as teacher orientation and training or provision of learning resources, that result in measurable improvement in learning will increase the value of ASP to partners and stakeholders.

4.3.3. **Sustainability: GATE**

Factors strengthening sustainability and scalability of GATE include the following.

**DEO management.** An efficient management and oversight structure operated out of the DEO Saptari contributes to the sustainability of GATE and to its potential scaling or replication. Since 2013, GATE in Saptari has been managed within DEO by a team of 12 supervisors plus the GATE coordinator. Supervisors, most of whom began their involvement when WE implemented the programme, oversee GATE centres in approximately nine VDCs each, visiting one VDC four times per month. Supervisors’ responsibilities include supporting the facilitator, strengthening the CMC, administering the three internal exams, and supporting mainstreaming.

**Community management.** Levels of support for the GATE center by CMCs and by VDCs are high. (In Muslim communities, however, the connection of the CMC to the facilitator and to the GATE centre was observably less strong, possibly because fewer women were CMC members.)

**Costs.** GATE costs in Saptari District support both sustainability and scalability. The ~100 facilitators are currently paid NPR 3,000 (~US $30) per month for two-to-three hours work per day for nine months; supervisors are currently paid NPR 13,000 (~US $130) per month for full-time work for nine months; salary of the GATE coordinator is unknown; total other operating costs (e.g., exam printing) are not known, however textbook printing is US $190 per class or $19,000 per year for all Saptari District GATE centres. GATE facilitators pay travel costs—chiefly petrol and the capital costs of motorbikes—themselves. No capital costs are required for GATE operations. Licensing costs if any of the Lalima curriculum are unknown, but are likely zero or low.

**MOE readiness to mainstream and scale.** GATE corresponds to strategic priorities and plans of GoN and MOE, and as such can be considered potentially sustainable and scalable. This finding has been corroborated in interviews with MOE personnel and has been supported in detail by NCO personnel who have been working directly with GoN on the development of a revised equity strategy, approved in late 2014.

**Conclusion.** Findings in relation to sustainability and scalability of the GATE programme are complex: Operating costs are low, management is strong, and the programme corresponds to MOE priorities. However among GATE facilitators there is the expectation that once the programme has been implemented all VDCs in Saptari, the needs of out-of-school girls will have been addressed (to the extent possible), and eligible girls will have been mainstreamed, and cost-effective catchments (25 girls in a ward) will be few. Extending GATE to districts in other regions is similarly likely to face challenges posed by lower population density and by considerations emerging from different cultures. These considerations are elaborated upon in the next section.

4.3.4. **Limitations to sustainability: GATE**

**Retention of supervisors.** Supervisors complain that their monthly wage has not been increased since the start of the programme in 2011 (under WE). At least two supervisors
have recently left GATE, attrition that is attributed by other supervisors to static wages and limited opportunity for advancement.

**Recent GoN support for GATE.** Policy correspondences notwithstanding, GoN support for GATE fluctuated in fall 2014. In September 2014 DEO signed an agreement with UNICEF for the establishment of 100 new GATE centres in 2015. In October 2014, the incoming head of the new MOE TVET Centre in Kathmandu announced that GoN would no longer support GATE. While this decision was ultimately reversed, its occurrence demonstrates that expressions of support by GoN are tenuous.

**Current DEO implementation undercuts effectiveness and sustainability.** Changes to the GATE programme and management protocols instituted by DEO Saptari undercut effectiveness, according to GATE supervisors, and possibly sustainability as well. Programme changes include both delays in and shortening of the GATE term: Launch of the 2014 term was delayed, resulting in longer periods between completion of Part 2 of the *Lalima* curriculum and the April/May start of school enrolment, potentially impinging on mainstreaming. The 2014 term has in addition been shortened from ten months to nine months, limiting opportunities for examinations and mainstreaming.

In addition, DEO has increased requirements for visits by supervisors to GATE centres from two visits per month to four. This change, in the opinion of several supervisors, diminishes the quality of support for the GATE centres and the CMCs.

**GATE catchment (1).** GATE sustainability in the Terai District and scalability in other districts are dependent on demographic considerations; these considerations center on the numbers of out-of-school girls in VDCs. Because GATE centres address the needs of most out-of-school children in a given ward each year, centres are opened in different wards or VDCs each year based on need. Eventually, as stated by UNICEF field personnel and GATE supervisors, the need for GATE will be eliminated over time as more girls and then all girls attend school. The design of GATE, then, includes a “sunset provision” that problematises sustainability.

**GATE catchment (2).** Scaling GATE outside of Saptari District presents challenges in relation to population density, required numbers of participants, and relevance/appropriateness. In hilly regions (per conversation with UNICEF field personnel) sparse populations in VDCs will likely mean that GATE costs per participant increase or that travel is required of some proportion of participants. In urban regions (e.g., Kathmandu, Pokhara, etc.), cost-effective catchment will not be an issue, however relevant life-skills issues will differ substantially from those needed in the Terai Region.

**Demand for TVET.** High demand for TVET highlights strategic considerations for UNICEF in relation to NFE, formal education, NCO’s countrywide mandate, and partnerships with donors and GoN. GATE participants who are too old to be mainstreamed complete the *Lalima* curriculum and gain some degree of relevant life skills, minimal literacy

---

43 The events described here occurred after my field visits and information-collection efforts were complete. For additional information, please contact appropriate NCO personnel.

44 Supervisors stated that they did not know causes of the delay. In subsequent conversation, NCO personnel suggested that delay might have been resulted from issues within NCO. However, corruption proceedings against the prior DEO and other education personnel in Saptari impeded launch of GATE in 2014.
skills and minimal numeracy skills. While it is possible that these accomplishments ensure that girls will enjoy improved well being, girls themselves and adults (CMC, VDC) request TVET.

**Conclusion.** GATE cost-effectively provides benefits to participating girls in ways that support an equity agenda, however scaling, replicating and sustaining GATE will likely require strategic reconsideration. Such reconsideration will creatively address issues emerging from catchment and population density, and, perhaps of greater importance, will address issues resulting from GATE’s potential support for fieldwork (child labor): Insofar as GATE scheduling adapts to enable girls to engage in fieldwork while continuing to learn life, literacy and numeracy skills, there is a risk that GATE will increase or at any rate not diminish the prevalence of this challenge to girls’ well being and empowerment.

4.4. **Coherence**

This section addresses both internal and external coherence of GATE and ASP. However given that these programmes represent a limited subset of LUL-funded activities in Nepal, findings are inconclusive. The potential for a complementary relationship between the two programmes is also discussed.

4.4.1. **Internal coherence**

GATE and ASP both demonstrate a reasonably high degree of internal coherence in LUL-funded programming in Nepal. GATE aligns with programmes for urban OOSC, with WASH activities that address menstruation-hygiene management, and with the child-centred teaching and learning practices introduced by CFS. ASP schools participate in NCO’s CFS programme, which is partially funded by LUL, and ASP activities align with WASH. Overall, LUL-funded programming demonstrates coherent approaches to OOSC, menstruation hygiene and child-centred classroom practices.

4.4.2. **External coherence**

ASP and GATE benefit from UNICEF’s sector-wide presence in education in Nepal. Field-focused programming in combination with upstream activities (e.g., participation in drafting of the 2015 equity strategy, etc.) strengthens UNICEF NCO’s partnership with MOE, and increases the sustainability and scalability of LUL programmes. Limitations on external coherence with regard to GATE stem from older participants’ lack of opportunities after completing the programme: they can neither be mainstreamed into government primary schools nor do they qualify for TVET programmes supported by UNICEF partners (e.g., GoN, etc.) or other UN agencies (e.g., UNDP, ILO).

4.4.3. **Complementarity**

Complementarity is addressed here because GATE and ASP both address the needs of adolescent girls (further evidence of internal coherence in LUL-funded programming). In addition, both programmes: seek to influence gender-biased norms; provide life-skills education (e.g., menstruation-hygiene management), and; engage girls in play as a means of developing self-confidence and friendships. However, the two programmes, while demonstrating coherence, do not complement each other. In part this is because their objectives and beneficiary populations are different: GATE is intended to mainstream out-of-school girls into primary classes, while ASP addresses the needs of girls enrolled in lower-secondary classes.
4.5. Recommendations

Recommendations are provided for ASP and GATE. All recommendations are intended for NCO, and are provided in decreasing order of priority (highest priority to lowest priority).

General recommendation: Information from this evaluation should be shared with stakeholders. Findings, recommendations and other information should be shared with additional UNICEF field officers, DEO Saptari and Parsa, NGOCC and Restless Development. Although information has been shared with the Reference Group for this evaluation, the information should be shared more widely among central stakeholders, notably the MOE, as well as other donor agencies, iNGOS and NGOs offering relevant programmes (e.g., UNDP in relation to its Micro-Enterprise Development Programme [MEDEP], GoN in relation to its Women’s Development Office [WDO] and other entities).

4.5.1. Recommendations: ASP

ASP recommendations center on issues of scaling, replication and sustainability. Recommendations are offered in the context of a redesigned pilot phase. While these recommendations are presented in order of priority, in the event the redesign and renewal of pilot activities should enable all recommendations to be accommodated in one iteration.

- **Plan a redesigned pilot phase.** Recommendations and other changes to ASP should be made in the course of a renewed and reconfigured pilot phase. The parameters of ASP in a renewed pilot phase should be determined by findings and recommendations in this report and by strategic objectives and priorities of the MOE and UNICEF. (This pilot phase could center on the just-launched implementation in the Mid-mountain Region.)

  A new pilot phase should meet requirements to support quantitative assessment of effectiveness and results. Such requirements could include establishing baselines, monitoring a control group of schools or students, and collecting data on participants’ attendance, their performance in school, and class / school completion.

- **Reconfigure HWC and introduce activities to support improved education quality.** As mentioned, HWC presents an interesting and potentially important means of improving teaching and learning and addressing outcomes for learners. However efforts to realize this potential must be synched to MOE and UNICEF strategic objectives to ensure both effective design and scalability/sustainability. Possible pedagogical approaches include: peer learning and multi-grade classrooms; small-group, station-based and collaborative learning; independent learning and project-based learning, among others. Whether or not HWC is linked to improving learning outcomes, inputs (with costs) and oversight are required to ensure that HWC implementation becomes regular across different ASP schools. Follow up and follow through are essential if capacities built in training are to be consolidated and realized in practice (Gaible, E. and Burns, M., 2006).

---

45 One key to the potential of HWC to support innovative teaching and learning is that the activity fewer constraints than regular class sessions do: Primary responsibility for progress through the curriculum and for mastery of required competencies lies with regular instruction by a subject-versed teacher. HWC can focus on student-centered approaches, which frequently require more time per unit of instruction and which give the student more control over what is learned and how learning happens.
The potential for effective improvement of teaching and learning in HWC appears high: The concept of peer learning has been mentioned by UNICEF field and NCO personnel in relation to HWC, and UNICEF starting in the 1980s has pioneered peer-learning techniques in multi-grade classrooms in developing countries (Furniss, et al., 1999).

As soon as a training-and-mentoring framework is settled for the renewed pilot phase of ASP, a broader training-and-mentoring plan should be developed to enable estimates of numbers of trainers, facilities, training throughput, and the design of mentoring/follow-up mechanisms to support replication and scaling of ASP.

- **Provide orientation for principals (as part of the redesigned pilot and reconfigured HWC).** Orientation should enable principals to become more familiar with ASP and its equity goals, to understand HWC models and approaches, and to work out any issue regarding logistics and scheduling.

- **Increase focus on schools in disadvantaged VDCs, in part by addressing selection processes.** An ASP second-phase pilot should focus on disadvantaged VDCs and on at-risk girls in schools. Measurements of disadvantage, such as CDI, should be consulted. If schools in a disadvantaged VDC do not qualify for ASP participation because they are not participating in the CFS programme or the Young Champions programme, extension of these programmes should be considered as a means of increasing ASP impact.

In addition, this pilot phase should seek determine whether participation in CFS or the Young Champion programme affect adoption, implementation and the effectiveness of ASP. If not, these criteria should be eliminated.

- **Increase focus on at-risk girls, in part by addressing selection processes.** Selection criteria and processes for girls’ participation in HWC should be made clear to duty-bearers to help ensure that the most disadvantaged or at-risk girls have the opportunity to participate.

- **Redesign the ASP monitoring framework.** The ASP monitoring framework and protocols should be redesigned, addressing both on-site monitoring and collection of administrative data to include, at a minimum: attendance rates for all girls in Classes 6, 7 and 8, with disaggregation of girls participating in HWC and in sports club; class-advancement information for the same groups; class ranking for girl students participating in sports club and HWC; demographic information of girls participating in ASP (estimated social and economic status, if possible), caste membership, marital status. In addition, qualitative measures of change in well being of participating girls should be determined. Ideally, indicators and information categories will be compatible with information collected about OOSC.

- **Reinforce and reconfigure partnerships.** Relevant partnerships should be re-examined and reinforced or reconfigured to increase effectiveness, sustainability and

---

46 One commenter from NCO has suggested that this recommendation should be re-phrased as “Design the ASP monitoring framework.” My interpretation of this comment is that NCO M&E should be involved in development of monitoring protocols. The question of design vs. redesign is, under the circumstances, moot. A second commenter suggests that indicators should be selected based on an express theory of change, which would require a much more strongly stated programme design among other framing documentation.
results in relation to LUL themes of education quality and equity. Key partners include: MOE Nepal, DEO Parsa (or Bajura, etc.), NGOCC or Restless Development (the implementing partner in other districts). Specific recommendations include:

- **Reexamine partnership with MOE Nepal** to determine, first, the position of ASP in relation to government priorities and strategic objectives and, if that relationship is strong, key steps that could lead to mainstreaming of ASP. A second, but important consideration is the determination of the importance of improved teaching and learning (education quality).

- **Reexamine and reinforce partnership with DEO Parsa.** In our meeting on 7 September, 2014, the DEO was cordial but apparently not engaged with or very familiar with ASP. DEO engagement is critical to the programme’s scalability and should be developed.

- **Reexamine partnership with NGOCC** to determine whether the organization is delivering optimal or adequate value in relation to ASP implementation and whether another NGO operating in Parsa district might be a preferred partner for programme replication. The primary mission of NGOCC, per the organisation’s name and per discussion with respondents at other NGOs, is to serve as a coordinating committee of NGOs operating within Parsa district; the organization’s primary capacity, per interview with the current chairman on 12 September, 2014, is in social mobilization. If improvement in outcomes for learners is identified as a priority, education capacity in relation to training, mentoring and support of HWC teachers needs to be increased.

- **Reexamine partnership with Restless Development.** The purpose of re-examining this partnership should be to align activities in the Mid-western Region with activities in Parsa District. This alignment does not mean that the approach in Parsa should be duplicated in other districts; rather, data collection must be aligned, contextual differences should be outlined and addressed (e.g., challenges girls face, attendance and school completion rates, the importance of caste, the contours of tradition and culture, etc.). The relationship between ASP in Parsa District and the Mid-western Region should be designed rather than improvised.

4.5.2. **Recommendations: GATE**

GATE recommendations center on increasing effectiveness and on strategic consideration of the programme as a precursor to replication or scaling. Note that the highest-priority recommendation is for strategic reconsideration. Other recommendations should be based on the results of that process.

- **Develop a comprehensive GATE strategy for Saptari and other Terai districts.** Strategic questions surround and limit consideration of GATE’s effectiveness, scalability and sustainability. Does offering an effective, two-hour, flexibly scheduled NFE programme establish a more attractive and more economically advantageous alternative to school? Is equity achievable when approximately 40 percent of participants can’t benefit from a programme objective (mainstreaming)? Answers to these and other
questions depend on strategic goals and priorities. Several points to be considered from a strategic perspective are identified here.

- **Age range.** The split in possibilities for girls participating in GATE, between those eligible for mainstreaming and those too old to enter or re-enter school, impedes strategic consideration of GATE. The prevailing future approach appears to be limiting GATE participation to girls’ ages 10 to 16 years old—as currently implemented in Parsa District. However this approach in isolation fails to meet the needs of 17 and 18 year-old girls, who would then be excluded from participation, and doesn’t (to my knowledge) address the needs of the older girls (15 and 16-years-old) who continue to be included in the programme but who are less likely to be mainstreamed. Decision-making with regard to this issue should begin with information and evidence, including: The number of GATE participants in Saptari District between the ages of 15 and 16, and between 17 and 18; current results of GATE participation on girls in these age ranges; completion rates of 14-year-old girls who are mainstreamed, and other considerations as appropriate.

- **TVET.** Demand for TVET is high, as noted, however its strategic consideration in relation to GATE requires an approach that is both innovative and nuanced. TVET falls outside activities of the NCO education office. While TVET programmes are provided by UNDP through its MEDEP and by GoN through the Office of Small and Cottage Industries, WDO and other offices, these services do not effectively address the needs of girls in the upper range of GATE participation: No programme admits women under age 20; the number of participants over time of these programmes is low; participation can require travel; job skills supported by these programmes (e.g., candle- and soap-making, tailoring, etc.) are gender-defined and of questionable real value. Per one MOE respondent: “Effective TVET will be ‘gender-neutral’ TVET.”

- **Child labor.** A key strategic consideration in relation to GATE is the extent to which its flexible scheduling and two-hour class period serve to enable girls’ participation in fieldwork and household chores. If GATE enables girls to gain literacy and numeracy skills while continuing to work for hire and to perform household tasks, is GATE an optimal input?

---

47 This conclusion is based on observation, consideration and extensive conversation with NCO personnel, as well as interviews with MOE personnel.

48 Discussion of TVET is based on extensive conversation with UNICEF and GoN personnel in Rajbiraj, Saptari.

49 There are several TVET-focused resources that might be of value in considering this question, however. Chief among these are possibly the TVET programmes operated by the International Labor Organisation (ILO) in hilly regions of Nepal.

50 The answer to this question might lie in findings regarding GATE relevance and effectiveness. Girls’ participation in the programme apparently leads to changes in parents’ attitudes, community norms and practices, girls’ agency and senses of self-worth. These outcomes are directly related to concerns that girls identify as relevant. Their labor, in any case, is not enabled by GATE, per se, but is required by poverty. (This question, however, has been raised in multiple conversations with NCO personnel and warrants additional consideration.)
- **Parallel NFE.** Similar strategic considerations emerge from GATE’s effectiveness in terms of literacy and numeracy learning: What are the implications for formal education if learning outcomes from participation in GATE exceed those of government schools? If need for GATE continues, does that imply that a parallel, non-formal system is required to meet GoN’s education goals and obligations?

- **Calendar and programme duration.** Current GATE calendarisation—a nine-month programme ending in the fall—should be evaluated in relation to costs and effectiveness.

- **Transition to school.** The Flexible School Programme (FSP) is mentioned by several respondents in relation to facilitating mainstreaming of GATE participants into government schools. Under FSP, a girl who completes GATE would be introduced to the principal of the school she is to attend in the upcoming term, and she would participate in non-formal classes there to help her prepare for school attendance. FSP is thus referred to as a potential mitigation for the change in calendarisation and reduced employment of supervisors. However funding for FSP in Saptari and Parsa districts has not been approved.

- **Develop a comprehensive strategy for replication of GATE outside the Terai Region.** Development of a broader strategy for replication of GATE outside of the Terai Region should be based on communication and close cooperation with MOE. (Note that planning and discussion could reveal that such replication is not feasible.) Issues to be addressed and resolved include assessments of: demand and catchment among populations with different densities; barriers to school attendance and; outcomes for participants who are not mainstreamed; challenges to well being in different populations.

- **Improve monitoring and information collection.** Although data is collected by the GATE programme itself and by MOE, evidence in relation to the significant questions about GATE effectiveness should be sought. Indicators could include: change in incidence of diarrhea; change in performance on GATE-administered exams (disaggregated by VDC, community ethnicity, remoteness, economic indicators); completion rates of mainstreamed GATE participants disaggregated by age-and-class characteristics; school-completion rates of mainstreamed GATE participants (including comparison with class cohorts at the time of enrollment). In addition, national and international researchers should be encouraged to consider experimental approaches to determining correlations between: age of participants and learning outcomes; GATE participation and early marriage; GATE participation and early pregnancy; other issues as appropriate.

- **Review and revise the Lalima curriculum.** If GATE is to be continued in the Terai Region, or if the programme is to be implemented in Kathmandu or in other regions, a curriculum review is essential. Such review should at a minimum update life-skills units to ensure their relevance, and should assess and possibly strengthen literacy and numeracy learning. Integration with Early Grade Reading Assessments (EGRA) should be considered.
• **Review GATE exams and link them to educational standards.** GATE entry, midterm and final exams should be reviewed, and: first, integrated with effective monitoring/reporting so that comparisons within cohorts are possible, and; second, linked to MOE curricula through specific literacy and numeracy standards or outcomes.

• **Review partnership and implementation changes with DEO Saptari.** The involvement of DEO Saptari as implementing partner is a clear strength of the GATE programme, however DEO Saptari has recently made decisions that appear to undercut programme effectiveness and sustainability. These changes are not irreversible (and might be reversed by DEO and NCO in AY 2015-16), nor is their negative impact proven. However taken as indicative of a trend in DEO implementation of GATE they suggest that over time DEO implementation will lead to reduced effectiveness; reduced effectiveness will likely lead to reduced sustainability.

• **Re-allocate facilitator oversight to Muslim communities.** Inasmuch as male dominance of CMCs in Muslim communities limits support for facilitators and the effectiveness of CMCs, GATE supervisors should provide additional support.

• **Review the programme approach to supporting education for Muslim girls.** There are specific barriers to education within the formal education system in relation to Muslim girls. It is possible that the GATE approach in Muslim communities can be modified to increase the effectiveness of mainstreaming.

• **Make better use of the GATE survey.** The GATE programme includes an annual survey of VDCs, wards and households, used to determine location of GATE centres in the coming year. This survey, conducted by GATE supervisors, represents both a means of better supporting strategic planning of GATE in Saptari District and a potential means of increasing GATE sustainability through partnerships with GoN offices responsible for health, local development, DRR and other activities. Current costs, protocols, affordances, information quality and information management for this survey should be determined as a first step.
5. Lessons learned

This section presents lessons learned in the course of the formative evaluations of ASP and GATE. These lessons are intended to be of value to LUL and, as appropriate, to education programming more broadly considered.

5.1. Lessons learned from ASP

Lessons to be learned from ASP are as follows.

5.1.1. Improving education quality requires inputs in relation to defined objectives

In education systems such as Nepal’s, in which curricula lack relevance and teachers lack education and training, establishing innovative opportunities for enhanced learning must be accompanied by specific objectives and inputs (e.g., training, etc.) that help teachers and students achieve those objectives. ASP presents an opportunity to improve outcomes for learners, in part because in HWC girls and teachers can engage with science, math and English curricula away from the pressures of regular class. However the opportunity is missed for several reasons, primarily because teachers have no training or education in relevant multi-grade, small-group or learner-centered pedagogies.

5.1.2. Education change requires comprehensive approaches

Given that education systems are large and resistant to change, improvements to teaching and learning confront systemic barriers that can be more resistant than simple barriers of capacity; addressing these barriers requires a comprehensive approach. HWC teachers describing their use of alternative, learner-centric approaches in HWC reported that these changes were not extensible to their regular teaching practice due to constraints placed on them by curricula, exams, and other factors (in addition to their lack of training). To consolidate such changes or extend them to other teachers, other components of the education system such as curricula, exams, teacher education and training, information management and learning resources should be addressed in concert.

5.2. Lesson learned from GATE

A lesson to be learned from GATE is as follows.

5.2.1. Contextual differences call for innovative (or adaptive) responses

GATE demonstrates (or reinforces) the importance of adaptive programming in response to contextual differences. Both relevance and effectiveness of GATE in Saptari—and, potentially, its scaling or replication—are influenced by contextual factors. These include: the location of centres in Dalit, Muslim or mixed VDCs; regional differences; rural/urban differences, and; age differences among participants. The influence of these factors—and the overall diversity of populations in Nepal—suggests that programmes’ sustainability, as well as scalability, is framed by contextual diversity and limited by those diverse contexts in the absence of adaptive responses.

5.3. Lessons learned overall

Lessons learned from assessment of both programmes include the following.
5.3.1. **Delineate programme objectives as early as possible**

Optimally effective programme design and implementation require clearly stated objectives. This evaluation has relied on implicit objectives with regard to both ASP and GATE; the needed strategic reconsideration of these programmes requires delineation of goals and objectives. Uncertainty about the objectives of GATE might be due to its original design by WE in partnership with MOH. The causes of uncertainty about the objectives of ASP, which was designed by NCO in collaboration with Restless Development, should be traced and described.51

5.3.2. **Adoption and integration of programmes will benefit from strategic and practical review**

Activity-focused approaches prevalent in the LUL Nepal programmes evaluated will benefit from timely strategic and practical consideration (or re-consideration). In implementing one programme (GATE) developed originally by an iNGO, and another (ASP) developed in collaboration with an iNGO, UNICEF NCO demonstrates strong capacity to adopt and integrate projects in partnership to increase (or scale up) beneficial outcomes. Both programmes demonstrate, however, that timely strategic planning and possible mid-point recalibration of implementation is necessary. The two programmes also prove instructive with regard to the nature of timely reconsideration.

- **ASP.** ASP at present is implemented at a very small scale, making the programme open to change in terms of implementation (e.g., local monitoring) and objectives and outcomes (e.g., improving education quality), even as the programme is being replicated—again on a small scale—in other districts. It is instructive to observe that prior to implementation in Parsa District, concerns about monitoring, education quality, and other components and objectives would not have been apparent. (Prior strategic consideration might have led to refined approaches in these areas, however.)

- **GATE.** GATE in Saptari District, in contrast, is a mature and sustained pilot programme. Examination of GATE raises strategic questions regarding integration with TVET, the role of mainstreaming and the range of ages to be included, and practical considerations such as the programme’s time-worn curriculum, the timing and duration of the programme each year, and the programme’s required catchment. The GATE project’s dynamic “re-setting” each year, with the selection of new VDCs, facilitators and participants, should work to its advantage, facilitating change in response to strategic and practical reconsideration.

(While GATE in Saptari District is mature, relevant and effective, and perhaps on those bases ready for adoption by MOE, the host of unresolved strategic issues that attend the programme suggest that such adoption should be deferred.)

The lesson to be learned, perhaps, is that strategic review should be built into project planning such that programmes do not mature past their potential for change.

5.4. **Conclusion**

In relation to both ASP and GATE, the UNICEF NCO Education Office is in the process of adopting, adapting, replicating and scaling programmes in collaboration with iNGOs.

---

51 Logical frameworks and theories of change have also not been developed for these programmes.
Under NCO oversight those programmes demonstrate relevance in relation to beneficiary and stakeholder concerns and effectiveness in relation to objectives. In addition, NCO has increased the integration of these programmes into district DEO activities and their alignment with MOE priorities—fulfilling the UNICEF mandate to work with national governments and increasing sustainability.
Annex A: Methodology

Evaluation objectives
The evaluation addresses two NCO programmes, GATE and ASP, which are funded primarily via LUL.

The evaluation addresses the following objectives in relation to GATE:

- To determine the extent to which GATE is relevant to the needs and interests of out-of-school girls in Saptari District
- To determine the extent to which GATE is relevant to equity needs and issues in the communities served
- To determine the extent to which GATE achieves its objectives in Saptari District
- To analyze issues and factors influencing the potential sustainability and scalability (or replicability) of GATE in Saptari District and elsewhere in Nepal

The evaluation addresses the following objectives in relation to ASP:

- To determine the extent to which ASP as designed is relevant to the needs of lower-secondary girl students in Parsa District
- To determine the extent to which ASP as designed is relevant to equity needs and issues in the communities served
- To determine the extent to which ASP as implemented achieves its objectives in Parsa District
- To analyze issues and factors influencing the potential sustainability and scalability of ASP in Parsa District and elsewhere in Nepal

In addition, the evaluation seeks to address the following objectives in relation to LUL as a multi-country initiative:

- To determine the ways in which LUL, as a multi-country programme, has influenced the activities of the NCO, especially in relation to the three equity pillars of LUL reaching OOSC, expanding girls education and improving education quality).
- To engage with questions of equity (one of the LUL themes) as highlighted by the design and implementation of the two programmes evaluated.
- To support future evaluations of LUL (both in Nepal and globally)

Approaching these objectives is intended to help position LUL and the specific initiatives in relation to the ongoing global discussion of equity and, as an adaptive, multi-country funding mechanism, in relation to equity programming and programming in general within UNICEF.
Evaluated criteria

The evaluation of LUL Nepal focuses—as do all evaluations of LUL national programmes—on three of the five DAC criteria:\footnote{The five evaluation criteria established in 1992 by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC)—relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability—have become an internationally accepted standard. However implementation of the DAC criteria is generally accepted to involve modifications and supplementation (ALNAP, 2006). Efficiency is not included in LUL evaluations because the criterion focuses on value-for-money, which is beyond the scope and capacity of this evaluation. Impact is excluded primarily because impact (positive and negative social, economic and other changes, both anticipated and unanticipated) is difficult to measure outside of controlled circumstances and unlikely to be detectable in programmes as “young” as the LUL Nepal initiatives.}

1. Relevance (the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of beneficiaries and stakeholders);
2. Effectiveness (the extent to which the activity achieves its objectives); and
3. Sustainability (the likelihood that the activity will be continued after donor intervention is withdrawn). Additional attention is given to LUL themes of equity, education quality and innovation.

Implementation of the DAC criteria is generally accepted to involve modifications and supplementation (ALNAP, 2006). In this evaluation, efficiency is not included because the criterion focuses on value-for-money, which is beyond the scope and capacity of this evaluation, and because pilot programmes can incur start-up costs, such as content development or training of trainer, that can be amortized over the life of a longer-term programme. Impact is excluded primarily because impact (positive and negative social, economic and other changes, both anticipated and unanticipated) is difficult to measure outside of controlled circumstances and unlikely to be detectable in programmes as “young” as the LUL Nepal initiatives.

As part of the effort to appropriately assess the pilot-scale initiatives launched under LUL, evaluation criteria include “scalability” as a sub-criterion of sustainability.

Population and sample

Evaluation population

Samples focus on populations of individual girls (beneficiaries), duty-bearers (facilitators, teachers, etc.) and other stakeholders (CMC and SMC members, etc.) and on groups comprising ASP schools and GATE centres.

GATE population. GATE operated 100 active centres in Saptari District serving 2,443 out-of-school girls between the ages of ten and 18. GATE communities are characterized as Dalit, Muslim or mixed Dalit and Muslim.

ASP population. ASP operated in ten schools enrolling lower-secondary students in Parsa District at the time of the evaluation. All schools also enrolled primary or senior-secondary students, or both. Enrolments varied between ~350 students and 737 students, with 40 - 60 percent girl students. Lower-secondary classes ranged between 30 and 50 students, with 50 – 60 percent girls.

As mentioned in “2.1.1 Girls Access to Education (GATE)” and “2.1.2 After-School Programme for girls (ASP),” both programmes are currently implemented in other districts. This evaluation, however, focuses on GATE as implemented in Saptari District and ASP as implemented in Parsa District.

52 The five evaluation criteria established in 1992 by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC)—relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability—have become an internationally accepted standard. However implementation of the DAC criteria is generally accepted to involve modifications and supplementation (ALNAP, 2006). Efficiency is not included in LUL evaluations because the criterion focuses on value-for-money, which is beyond the scope and capacity of this evaluation. Impact is excluded primarily because impact (unanticipated effects extended from project activities, per the DAC) is both difficult to measure outside of controlled circumstances and unlikely to be detectable in programmes as “young” as LUL.
Sample for qualitative approach

GATE sample. Six centres were visited, each in a separate VDC. The sampling method was a modified quota sample, intended to ensure representation in relation to:

- **Community composition**
  Two centres in each category (Dalit, Muslim, mixed) were selected.

- **Remoteness**
  Two VDCs are located in or near municipalities; four are more distant from district population centres.

Selection was made in collaboration with the GATE coordinator and with GATE supervisors during a meeting in the Saptari DEO offices on Sunday, 31 August, immediately before the start of field visits. (One centre was visited that Sunday.)

ASP sample. Sampling plans initially called for a sample of eight ASP schools in Parsa and the two ASP schools in Saptari. Flooding in Saptari, however, caused the visit to one ASP school to be cancelled. The Parsa sample was developed collaboratively by the UNICEF field officer and NGOCC personnel with the intention of including disadvantaged communities both remote from and near to the main population centre, Birgunj municipality.

Quantitative methods

To better support the formative and qualitative nature of this evaluation and to support future formative or summative evaluations, quantitative methods center on collection and review of existing data. As of this writing, however, the reliability, accuracy and utility of data sources are subject to question.

Methodology and design

Because these programmes have not been evaluated previously, and because ASP remains a very small-scale pilot programme, this assessment is intended to be formative. Qualitative methods are primary in the evaluation design.

Qualitative methods

Two primary qualitative methods were used (semi-structured interviews, focus groups). These methods were necessary to ensure that the evaluation is participatory, equitable, and open to unexpected information.

FGDs were the primary means of field-level data collection about the experiences, opinions and ideas of direct beneficiaries—children, parents and community members, while semi-structured interviews were conducted with key informants in the field, and with MOE representatives and iNGO partners (Restless Development). Table 5 indicates the type of respondents, and estimated number of respondents for FGDs and semi-structured interviews.

---

53 Additional criteria were proposed, such as inclusion of high- and low-performing centres. In addition, a randomization process was proposed, entailing selection from several possible centres in each category. However, in the event, practicalities of planning and challenges of communication rendered these requests moot. The addition of a sixth school, however, to ensure adequate representation of Muslim communities, however, was an important achievement—especially given that as will be discussed the challenges facing out-of-school girls in these communities are somewhat distinct.
Table 5: Qualitative methods used, types of respondents, estimated number of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>After-School Programme for Girls (ASP) in Parsa District</th>
<th>Girls Access to Education (GATE) in Saptari District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FGDs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in ASP schools (48)</td>
<td>GATE participants (out-of-school girls) (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls in ASP schools (200)</td>
<td>CMC members (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC and community members (32)</td>
<td>VDC leadership and other community members (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO Parsa resource persons (12)</td>
<td>GATE supervisors (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO (1)</td>
<td>GATE facilitators (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOCC personnel (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-structured interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports club teachers (8)</td>
<td>GATE coordinator (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWC teachers (12)</td>
<td>DEO (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menstruation-hygiene teachers (12)</td>
<td>LDO (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (8)</td>
<td>WDO personnel (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Champions (8)</td>
<td>UNICEF field personnel (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOCC evaluation facilitator (1)</td>
<td>UNICEF education specialists, NCO (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF field personnel (1)</td>
<td>iNGO leadership (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF education specialists, NCO (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iNGO leadership (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint semi-structured interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE personnel (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF NCO education leadership (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis
Qualitative information gathered from focus groups, observations and semi-structured interviews was analysed using coding framework and descriptive statistics where applicable. Secondary data was used to support understanding of the operating contexts of GATE and ASP and for triangulation.

Limitations
As is common to many evaluations, limitations arise in part from the evaluation design, and in part from field-level implementation. Limitations include:

- **Indeterminate sample quality**
  Development of samples for the evaluation of both programmes relied on guidance from implementing personnel, with strong emphasis on logistical considerations.

- **Sample size (GATE)**
  The size of the sample (six institutions) for field visits in relation to the GATE programme is small. At the time of field visits, 100 GATE centres were operating in Saptari District; over the past three years, 5,786 girls\(^{54}\) have completed the *Lalima* curriculum.

---

\(^{54}\) This number includes 2,443 girls participating in GATE in the current year; at the time of field visits, these girls had not yet completed the *Lalima* curriculum.
curriculum in 245 centres (Saptari GATE.xlsx). This limitation arose primarily from logistical and timeline considerations.

- Indeterminate quantitative data
  The LUL Nepal evaluation encountered previously collected data that were unreliable (e.g., in relation to numbers of OOSC).

- Lack of baseline data
  Baseline datasets were not collected for either GATE or ASP.

- Unrepresentative samples and potential bias in FGDs
  Selection of participants in FGDs did not involve randomization processes, and relies on support from participants and stakeholders.

- Unreliability of responses
  The reliability of responses from FGD participants and interview respondents is unclear. Factors that were identified include: response bias, bias in translation, bias among various actors (e.g., principals, teachers and Young Champions, refer to “3.2 Limitations.”)

- Sample populations
  Interview and FGD respondents did not include members of the eligible population who did not participate in either the GATE programme or in ASP.55

- Evaluated populations
  Both GATE and ASP evaluations did not include implementation of these programmes outside of Saptari and Parsa districts, respectively. In the case of ASP, implementation outside of the Terai Region involves beneficiary populations that are likely to be culturally and economically distinct from the beneficiary population in Parsa.

Mitigation of these limitations involves the following:

- Triangulation
  To increase the reliability of the information collected, responses of multiple sources were compared. Triangulation methods incorporated: redundancy in scripted questions for different categories of respondent (e.g., participating girls, school principals, etc.); responsive re-structuring of interview scripts; reference to existing data (e.g., CDI in Nepal, etc.)

- Strata sampling methods
  To the extent possible, the quality of limited and possibly low-quality samples was mitigated by strata sampling to ensure that field visits included respondents representing the target population’s diversity in terms of ethnicity, religion, remoteness and other factors.

---

55 Inclusion of non-participants would have entailed trade-offs in terms of the (already limited) samples that compromised the equity safeguards of the evaluation. In Saptari, identifying girls who did not participate in GATE could engage stigmatizing non-participants in terms of literacy, hygiene, early marriage or other factors. In Parsa, girls participating in sports club occasionally referred to girls who “weren’t interested” in playing sports. If girls do not participate because of parents’ decisions, embarrassment or similar factors, stigmatization would again be risked.
Participatory / qualitative methods
Beneficiaries and other stakeholders have had opportunities to share experiences and opinions in open-ended discussions.

**Equity analysis**
Equity analysis in this evaluation relies in part on use of Articles 5 and 10 of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as a framework for assessment of programme activities. GATE and ASP activities are assessed in relation to their support for CEDAW, especially in relation to relevance and effectiveness.

In addition, consideration is given to the new national equity strategy (adopted December 2014); that strategy identifies eight disadvantaged groups to be addressed by equity-focused programming. The important change incorporated in that strategy is the broadening of focus to include caste, economic status and five other factors, including gender, in the identification of disadvantaged groups.
Annex B: Evaluation matrix and instruments

The following pages present the evaluation matrix, including questions, inquiry methods, and indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What are key challenges to children’s well being and learning?          | Document review; Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central stakeholder interviews | Review: Statements or analyses of challenges  
Students: Descriptions of factors that interfere with school attendance, completion and success that link to LUL objectives  
Community: Attitudes about and support for girls’ and boys’ education that link to LUL objectives  
Teachers: Descriptions of environmental challenges to student attendance, completion and success; descriptions of academic challenges that link to LUL objectives  
Central: UNICEF CO personnel describe challenges that link to LUL objectives  
| How are these or other challenges specific to girls’ learning and well being? | Document review; Available quantitative data; Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central stakeholder interviews | Review: Statements or analyses of challenges  
Girl students: Descriptions of challenges with specific relevance to girls  
Community: Attitudes about and support for girls’ and boys’ education  
Teachers: Attitudes about girls’ and boys’ education  
Central: UNICEF CO personnel describe challenges specific to girls  
Quantitative: Girls’ (performance / completion / advancement in comparison to boys  
| How does the LUL initiative (as designed) address these challenges?      | Document review; Field-site FGDs and interviews | Review: Descriptions of initiatives that identify relationship to challenges that confront girls  
Girl students: Descriptions of activities that identify the relationship to challenges that confront girls  
Teachers: Descriptions of activities that identify the relationship to challenges that confront girls |
In what ways does the design and/or implementation of the LUL initiative address challenges to student learning, their well being, and their success in education and in life?

Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews

Girl students: Descriptions of improved environment, increased motivation, other improvements in school

Central: Descriptions of specific components or activities in the context of change or results that have direct bearing on challenges

### Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is (or are) the objective(s) of the LUL initiative?</th>
<th>Document review; Central-stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>Review: Descriptions of objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the LUL initiative accomplished the stated objectives?</td>
<td>Document review; Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Review: Performance monitoring information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How has the LUL initiative, to the degree it has accomplished its objectives, affected the learning and well being of students, their families, and their communities? And What changes in terms of the education environment, educational opportunities or out-of-school opportunities for girls have resulted from the LUL initiative?</td>
<td>Document review; Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Review: Performance-monitoring information; case-studies, narratives or analyses that describe results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl students: Descriptions of activities or changes that link to objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Girl students: Descriptions of initiative activities in relation to improvements in school environment, motivation, self-conception, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers: Descriptions of activities or changes that link to objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers: Descriptions of activities in relation to improvements in girls’ motivation, participation, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families: Descriptions of activities or changes that link to objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Families: Descriptions of changed attitudes, in particular increased understanding of or support for girls’ schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central: UNICEF CO personnel or others describe activities and results that link to objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Central: Success stories, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When challenges arose, what adaptive responses emerged?</td>
<td>Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Girl students: Descriptions of problems and obstacles to initiative participation or effectiveness (broadly framed), and of changes in implementation in response Community: Descriptions of problems and challenges encountered by initiative (especially that they themselves communicated), and of changes in implementation in response Teachers: Descriptions of problems and challenges in classroom implementation or girls’ participation (especially that they themselves communicated), and of changes in implementation in response Central: Descriptions of problems in planning, design, implementation, follow-up, etc., , and of changes in implementation in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways did those adaptive and/or innovative responses address the needs of girls and women?</td>
<td>Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Teachers: Descriptions of adaptive responses or innovative approaches to address challenges Central: Descriptions of adaptive responses or innovative approaches to address challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges to achieving change have not been addressed?</td>
<td>Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Girl students: Descriptions of unmet challenges or ongoing problems Teachers: Descriptions of unmet challenges or ongoing problems Community: Descriptions of unmet challenges or ongoing problems Central: UNICEF CO personnel and others describe unmet challenges or ongoing problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How could the effectiveness of the initiative be improved?</td>
<td>Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Girl students: Descriptions of potential solutions to unmet challenges Teachers: Descriptions of potential solutions to unmet challenges Community: Descriptions of potential solutions to unmet challenges Central: Descriptions of potential solutions to unmet challenges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability and scalability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the initiative relate to MOE or partners’ priorities?</td>
<td>Document review; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Review: Statements of policy and planning goals, objectives, priorities, etc. Central: Linkage of initiative to policy and planning priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are unit costs for the initiative and what are their ramifications for scaling?</td>
<td>Document review; Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Review: Budget information; other relevant information (number of schools, regions, etc.) Local implementers: Descriptions of variant local costs (e.g., generator/petrol, transportation, etc.) Central: Assessment (formal or informal) of relative costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What current or potential partners are likely to have interest in scaling (or replicating) the initiative?</td>
<td>Central-stakeholder interviews</td>
<td>Central: Descriptions of plans or other evidence of intention to scale (or replicate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In what ways have activities resulted in outputs (e.g., learning resources, administrative processes, etc.) that will reduce costs of scaling or replicating?

How enduring are the changes that have resulted from the initiative?

What are their potential longer-term effects?

How could the sustainability of the initiative be improved?

Review of initiative design; Review of programme documents; Central-stakeholder interviews

Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews

Programme review; Field-site FGDs and interviews; Central-stakeholder interviews

Review: Identification of content resources, expertise or other items that can be re-used

Central: reports of support and/or interest on the part of ministry or other partner-organization personnel

Document review / central: connection to policies or plans

Teachers: Descriptions of attitudinal or practical change associated with success

Head teachers: Descriptions of attitudinal change and of practical measures for ongoing teacher development related to the initiative

Central: Explanations of connection between initiative and policy or planning goals and values; mainstreaming of initiative in MOE budget

Review: Identification of potential overlap and recombination, standardization, and other areas

Teachers/Head-teachers: Identification of potential pathways for integration or mainstreaming (e.g., in school requirements, budgets, etc.)

Central: Descriptions of possible improvements to address effectiveness or sustainability
Annex C: Evaluation scope of work

TOR received from UNICEF HQ 6 Feb., 2015.

**Terms of Reference (TORs) for the Evaluation of**

LET US LEARN
NEPAL
A. Background

The Let Us Learn initiative (formerly known as the Basic Education & Equity initiative) is a unique private partnership that allows for flexible and innovative approaches to addressing inequities in education access and outcomes. Challenges and barriers to education, particularly amongst excluded and marginalized children and youth have been identified in five diverse country contexts, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Madagascar and Nepal. Each country is targeting the hardest to reach children by sharpening the equity focus in both programming and monitoring of results. 20 million USD have been designated for the period 2011-2014.

The programme is focused on three equity pillars: reaching out-of-school children, expanding girls’ education and improving quality outcomes for learners. Each of the participating Country Offices is working to address inequity through targeted approaches, adapted to address their specific contexts. Each programme is conducting a country-level evaluation that will also contribute and inform a global-level evaluation.

Nepal: Multiple pathways to learning are provided for children and youth via both formal and non-formal education interventions. Initiatives aim to improve reading skills, provide access to schooling for out of school girls and help girls in junior secondary school succeed.

B. Rationale for the evaluation

The partners involved in launching Let Us Learn agreed that an evaluation would be carried out at the end of the programme. The evaluation effort is intended to ensure accountability, strengthen any future programming and contribute to the global equity dialogue. In order to capture information across a broad range of goals, a series of evaluation activities are being proposed. Evaluative activity is broadly defined to include evidence gathering, performance monitoring and measuring results. Outside of the technical assessment, consideration will also be given to improving organisational effectiveness by examining development and implementation processes, as well as programme supervision.
One primary focus of evaluation will be to engage all COs and HQ in a learning process around the Let Us Learn (LUL) initiative, documenting new efforts in monitoring for equity, innovations, partnership and good practice. A series of 5 discrete evaluations and a synthesis/consolidation are planned, along with participatory products such as testimonials and ‘most significant change’ stories involving beneficiaries.

We are aware that some of these analyses may be be challenged by a lack of baseline data and varied programme approaches across all of the participating COs. Activities should build evidence to fill information gaps and inform any next phase of the LUL, thus retroactive baselines may need to be established to measure change. Mixed methodologies will be utilized given the diverse range of activities taking place across COs but should fall within a global methodological framework.

The initial audience for the country-level evaluation products will be internal with discussions held on what elements best contribute to the global evaluation. Each country office will have a dedicated evaluator to review their programmes. These evaluators will work closely with the lead evaluator at the global level to integrate efforts into the global evaluation. The country level evaluations should be complete in September and the final evaluation product needs to be completed by December 2014.

C. Evaluation approach and scope

Activities included and excluded from evaluation. The self-evaluation study will examine only activities/results that are agreed upon with the respective country offices. Processes related to planning, coordination and monitoring will be included. Selected programme activities along each of the three pillars of the programme will be included as will thematic analysis related to equity and innovation.

Attribution and/or contribution. While evaluating outcomes also often determines if a programme/project has added value to country-level results as stated in the Country Programme, it is often difficult to attribute results to only one source of inputs, actions, or actors in a field where there are multiple actors and inputs. Therefore the evaluation will seek to outline, to the extent possible, LUL’s contribution to overall results through a contribution analysis. From a country perspective, the objectives of the evaluation are threefold;

1. To examine the extent to which LUL projects are achieving intended outcomes at the country level; and,
2. To systematically document new learning, and to document new efforts in monitoring for equity, in particular.
3. To contribute to the global evaluation and analysis of cumulative impact.
The proposed approach is to conduct a self-evaluation exercise in Nepal with a primary focus on learning and a secondary focus on accountability, utilizing a common evaluation/learning framework. Methodologies and scope will be determined in consultation with the Country Office and with technical inputs from the lead evaluator.

**Evaluation Criteria and questions:** Since this is an evaluation of innovation (equity innovations), the OECD/DAC criteria should be used only to the extent that they are relevant. However, we expect the evaluator to propose criteria that is more appropriately suited to evaluation of innovations. Similarly, the evaluation criteria will be the basis for developing evaluation questions.

- **Attribution and/or contribution.** While evaluating outcomes also often determines if a programme/project has added value to country-level results as stated in the Country Programme, it is often difficult to attribute results to only one source of inputs, actions, or actors in a field where there are multiple actors and inputs. Therefore the evaluation will seek to outline, to the extent possible, LUL’s contribution to overall results through a contribution analysis.

**D. Methodology**

- **Sample:** A draft stakeholder analysis has been conducted as part of preliminary planning for the evaluation, hence a sampling framework that reflects a range of activities, stakeholders and will be developed for each country. Detailed information on sampling will be included in the inception report.

- **Design and data collection methods:** Data will be collected from multiple sources, using both qualitative and quantitative methods. A menu of methods and sources include a review of programme documents, interviews of key/elite informants, interviews and/or focus groups of important groups of beneficiaries, testimonials involving beneficiaries (One Minute Jrs.), and direct observations of activities with beneficiaries wherever possible. A retroactive baseline will be established in consultation with programme staff and relevant education authorities to assess to extent possible contribution to quality of education (leaning outcomes, reduction in violence, etc. as per the Child Friendly Schools framework).

  - **Review of documents and procedure:** A desk-based review will be used as an important tool to examine the theory of change, restate and/or amend it to reflect what happened in practice (empirical ToC); assemble evidence of activities or outputs. LUL focal points in each country will avail key documents for a systematic desk review. These will include LUL programme documents (proposals, monitoring frameworks, reports, human interest stories, etc.), sector plans, other education evaluations and assessments as relevant.

  - **Data Collection:** Primary data – to be collected through interviews and focus groups, self-administered surveys, and possibly small scale assessments – will add to the existing knowledge

---

56 This is an evaluation that it is intended only partly for accountability, and more for the purpose of learning. Secondly, the evaluation management arrangements do not aim for a high level of independence at the country level. Ideally, the M&E Officer will be the primary manager, but the situation in the country may be such that the programme officer (Education) is the only person available to manage the consultant.
about the activities, and will be used to gauge perceptions of stakeholders on the utility and impact of interventions.

E. Evaluation responsibilities and management

The LUL Nepal evaluation will be supported by:

- A national evaluator
- An in-country manager and reference group, responsible for technical supervision of the evaluator, and for clearance of all evaluation products, respectively;
- An international Lead evaluator (ILE), who will provide technical guidance on the overall approach to enable learning across countries; and,
- The LUL global coordinator and Evaluation Office in HQ, on administrative matters, supervision of the international lead evaluator, and overall quality assurance.

The National evaluator (NE) in Nepal will be responsible for the professional conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the terms of reference, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation. He/she will be expected to perform the following tasks:

- review and finalize the evaluation approach and work plan;
- customize, review and validate data collection tools, (the self-evaluation module, which may include questionnaires, interview questions and protocols);
- supervise data collection and data processing;
- design and facilitate consultative workshops and meetings;
- prepare all country reports – inception, draft and final reports, and develop PowerPoint presentations;
- convene a forum to validate the findings of the evaluation;
- attend and make a presentation at the global reporting workshop; and,
- ensure that the International Lead Evaluator and reference group is regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation, any possible causes of delays and issues to resolve.

The Evaluation Manager (ideally the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer) will provide overall guidance and contribute directly to its quality assurance activities. The Nepal LUL country team will support the self-evaluation by providing support to arrange for meetings, write letters of introduction and/or accompany the evaluator to meetings where necessary.

Reference Group: Our recommendation is to establish a reference group in each participating country. Membership will be determined within country for each of the five country offices.

57 http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

58 http://www.unevaluation.org/documentdownload?doc_id=100&file_id=547
The **Reference Group Chair** is responsible for oversight of evaluation activities, while members will advise on the following:

- Consultant’s terms of reference and work plan, including any adjustments required at inception or other phases
- Approval of all evaluation products, including the final report

The **international lead evaluator (ILE)**, contracted by the UNICEF Evaluation Office, will be responsible for leading the evaluation efforts from a global perspective. Specifically, he/she will be responsible for the following:

- develop the evaluation approach and methodology, including the evaluation/learning framework;
- develop a self-evaluation module/guide and other materials as he/she sees fit;
- facilitate a virtual planning workshop for national consultants and focal points in each participating country;
- pilot the evaluation methodology in one country, and effect the necessary revisions;
- review data collection tools and protocols used at the country level;
- undertaking quality assurance missions during data collection in up to two participating countries;
- review country reports - draft and final reports;
- ensure that the evaluation managers (Evaluation Specialist and Education Specialist in New York) are regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation, possible causes of delay and issues to resolve.

The **Evaluation Specialist and Education Specialist (in New York)** will manage the work of the international lead evaluator, provide overall guidance to the evaluation, and contribute directly to its quality assurance activities.

### F. Evaluation processes and products

- **Evaluation Planning Workshop (via Webinar)**: The **International Lead Evaluator** will develop initial draft of the evaluation approach, and convene an orientation and planning webinar for the national evaluators, to finalize the approach to the evaluation. The planning workshop is expected to agree on the methodology, including the sampling frame for each country, a set of evaluation tools with necessary customization to each country, and a tentative work plan that reflects all evaluation activities for country teams and for the international lead evaluator.

- **Inception Reports**: An inception report will be produced at the global level by the **International Lead Evaluator**, and adapted/customized for each country by the **National Evaluator**. In addition to presenting a short summary of the programme context, these reports will be used to confirm a common understanding of the description of what is being evaluated, and the logic or theory of change for each programme. The report will include, *inter alia*,
  - **Evaluation purpose and scope** – a clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects and limitations of the evaluation
  - **Evaluation criteria and questions** – question to be answered by the evaluation, and the criteria which will be used to assess performance, including questions that address critical human rights and gender equality issues
  - **Evaluation methodology** – expanding on the methodology section in the TOR, a sampling strategy, a description of data collection methods and data sources (including a rationale for their selection),
draft data collection instruments, a discussion on reliability and validity of the evaluation, and a discussion on the limitations of the methodology. This section should include instruments to assess relevant human rights and gender equality aspects.

- **Evaluation matrix and analysis plan** – a mapping that identifies evaluation questions, how they will be answered through the selected methods, and a data analysis plan;
- **Evaluation work plan and timeline** – a revised work and travel plan
- **Structure for the final report** will be proposed in the inception report, and may be revised later in the evaluation
- **Resources requirements** – detailed budget for the evaluation, tied to evaluation activities, work plan, deliverables.

- The inception report will be 10-15 pages, including the revised work plan, and will be presented at a formal meeting of the in-country reference group, and LUL extended management team (HQ Manager plus Chiefs of Education/LUL focal points in participating countries).

- **Evaluation Report**: The final evaluation report should include, but not limited to the following
  - An analysis of concepts, trends and critical themes in innovating solutions for equitable provision of education in respective contexts;
  - An analysis of overarching programme goals and themes (OOSCI, equity, innovation, etc.), nothing those with most demonstrable impact;
  - An overview of each of the country evaluations, analyzing trends, areas of divergence and any lessons learned;
  - An assessment of UNICEF’s mandate, strengths and weaknesses relating to UNICEF’s strategic and programmatic choices for equity, against a set of agreed evaluation criteria;
  - An analytical framework which UNICEF can apply to improve the effectiveness of its support for equity interventions, at the country level, and an assessment of the role of the regional and global offices in support of equity in education;
  - Derived from the findings of the evaluation, recommendations for improving coordination, and successful scale up of equity focused programming.

The evaluation report should not exceed 30 pages (excluding the executive summary and annexes). Annexes will include the TOR, description of methodology (including evaluation/learning framework), list of background materials used, list of people interviewed, PowerPoint presentations, and workshop materials.

**G. Desired Competencies for Evaluator**

- Evaluator must offer the following demonstrated experience, knowledge and competencies:
  1. Significant knowledge and experience of evaluation concepts and approaches;
  2. Good knowledge in gender in the Education Sector, and experience in evaluating equity and education innovations;
  3. Facilitation skills, particularly design of stakeholder consultation exercises as well participatory methods;
4. Strong quantitative and qualitative data collection skills;
5. Strong quantitative and qualitative data analysis skills;
6. Excellent language and communication skills in English;
7. Demonstrated report writing skills, in English; and
8. Computer literacy in Word, Excel and PowerPoint;

Evaluator must remain in strict adherence with UNEG ethical guidelines and code of conduct.

H. Proposed resource commitments

It is anticipated that the resource commitments would as follows:

- 50-60 person days for National Evaluators in each country; DSA for international and/or in-country travel
- Travel costs for one international mission and 4-6 days DSA for national consultant (reporting workshop)
- Travel costs for one international mission and 4-6 days DSA for UNICEF/LUL Nepal focal point or UNICEF M&E Special (reporting workshop)

I. Tasks for the National Evaluator (Nepal)

- The National Evaluator will be responsible for leading the evaluation for the LUL Nepal Phase 1. Specifically, she will be responsible for the following:
  - Adapt and customize the evaluation approach and methodology, and learning framework to the Nepal context, and develop and work plan;
  - Develop draft evaluation tools aligning them with the overall evaluation methodology;
  - Participate in the piloting of the evaluation methodology in Nepal, and update the tools accordingly;
  - Execute the evaluation in Nepal; collect and analyse data as per the agreed methodology;
  - Participate in reference group meetings, including a dissemination meeting where s/he will present the evaluation findings.
  - Draft country reports and/or updates - draft and final reports;
  - Ensure that the evaluation manager and lead evaluator is regularly informed of the progress of the evaluation, possible causes of delay and issues to resolve.

J. Deliverables

- National evaluator for Nepal is responsible for the following deliverables:
  - Inception report: This report will include, among others, the revised evaluation approach and methodology, revised evaluation work plan, country-evaluation module and other materials for the orientation and planning webinar and facilitating the workshop;
  - Nepal evaluation reports: These will be developed by the national evaluator - the ILE will provide quality control/review;
• **Evaluation synthesis report:** First, second and final drafts, according to the UNICEF House Style and UNICEF standards for evaluation reports. These will be developed by the national evaluator - the ILE will provide quality control/review; and,

• **PowerPoint presentation for evaluation synthesis report:** The national evaluator will be expected to present at 1-2 reporting/dissemination events.
Annex D: Respondents

Kathmandu-based respondents

- UNICEF Country Representative
  Mr. Tomoo Hozumi
  (informal conversation and group debrief)

- UNICEF Education Director
  Ms. Marilyn Hoar, Ph.D.

- MOE Undersecretary of Policy and Planning
  Mr Rojnath Pandey, Ph.D.

- MOE Head of Education Policy Section
  Mr. Mukund Mani Khanal, Ph.D.

- MOE Head, Gender
  Ms. Durga Basaula, Ph.D.

- UNICEF Education Specialist
  Ms. Sumon Tuladhar, Ph.D.

- UNICEF Education Officer
  Ms. Purnima Gurung

- UNICEF Education Specialist
  Ms. Marian Ellen Hodgkin

- Country Director, Restless Development
  Mr. Ravindra Shakya

- Head of Operations, Restless Development
  Ms. Kaajal Pradhan

- Country Director, World Education
  Ms. Helen Sherpa

Respondents in Saptari District

- DEO team, GATE coordinator and GATE supervisors

- DEO, Saptari
  Mr. Dik Badahur Rai

- LDO (acting), Saptari
  Mr. Suresh Raut

- UNICEF Education Specialist (field)
  Ms. Laxmi Maya Rai
• UNICEF field officer, Rajbiraj
  Mr Ashok Jha
• DEO representative, Saptari
  Mr. Bhogendra Yadav
• Mr. Madhav Chaudhury
  GATE Coordinator, Saptari
• Representatives (2), Women’s Development Office (WDO), Saptari
• Representatives (2), District Health Office (DHO), Saptari

Respondents in Parsa District
• UNICEF field representative, education
  Ms. Bimala Manandhar
• DEO Parsa and DEO resource persons
• NGOCC Chairman and NGOCC personnel
• Ram Naresh Prashad
  NGOCC Coordinator
## Annex E: Evaluation instruments

**Nepal FGD guide:**

*Girls Access To Education (GATE)*

*Guide for FGD with participating girls*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion: Topic or theme</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Getting started</td>
<td>Please tell me when you attended the GATE programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What did you do in the GATE programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges</td>
<td>Please tell me about some of the problems that girls typically face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls in other groups have told me that they are bothered by <em>(evaluator lists 2 or 3 problems)</em>. Are any of these things also bothersome for you or for other girls?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BLANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: The initiative</td>
<td>Did you address these problems in the GATE programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: General</td>
<td>What was your favorite activity in the GATE programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What did you learn that was most important to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please tell me how doing these activities has changed things for you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In your daily life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At home and with your friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How has doing these activities changed the way you see yourself? Now? In the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Challenges</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Innovation</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Impact</td>
<td>Since you started attending the programme for girls, have things changed at home in any way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, please tell me how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Sustainability</td>
<td>Tell me about what you are doing now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are you going to school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you have a job?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you gotten married, or are you likely to be married soon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Wrapping up</td>
<td>What are some other things about your programme for girls that are important, but that we haven’t talked about?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Nepal FGD guide:

**GATE**

**Guide for FGDs with Center Management Committees and parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion: Topic or theme</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>Please tell me about your trip to this meeting. How did you travel? How did you learn about the meeting? How long did it take to get here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Getting started</td>
<td>Please tell me about the importance of education. Is it important that your children complete school? If so, please tell me why. What might keep one of your children from completing school? Do you have a plan to help your child address these problems? If so, please describe it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges</td>
<td>Does your child’s school also help address these problems? If so, please tell me how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges 2</td>
<td>What are differences between girls’ education and boys’ education? Is it more important for boys to be educated than for girls? If so, please tell me why. Please tell me about your hopes for your children, in relation to education. Do you believe that your child will finish primary school? Secondary school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Equity</td>
<td>What factors do you think keep more girls from participating in the GATE center in your VDC? Are these changes important? Why (or why not)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: General</td>
<td>What are the most important effects of the GATE center for girls in your VDC? How has the programme changed learning or going to school for your child? Are these changes important? Why (or why not)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Challenges</td>
<td>What factors do you think keep more girls from participating in the GATE center in your VDC? Other groups have mentioned that (evaluator lists 2 or 3 potential obstacles) keep girls from participating. How important are these factors here? Are there other factors that are more important?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness: Learning & Innovation
How have these problems affected the programme or girls who participate in it?
Do you know if the programme been changed to respond to these problems? If it has, please tell me how.
Has the change been successful?

Effectiveness: Learning & Innovation
Are there other changes that might improve the programme?

Effectiveness: Impact
Has the girls’ GATE center in your VDC changed your attitude about your child’s schooling?
If so, please tell me how.

Sustainability
Do you support the girls’ GATE center in your VDC in any way—with your time, or in other ways?
If so, please tell me how.

Effectiveness: Wrapping up
Are there other aspects of the girls GATE center in your VDC that are important, but that we haven’t talked about?
If so, please describe these.

Nepal INTERVIEW guide:
Girls’ After-school Programme
Guide for FGD with FIELD STAKEHOLDERS
(Centre Management Committee and others)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Topic or theme</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Getting started</td>
<td>Please tell me what the CMC does in relation to the GATE programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges &amp; equity</td>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Relevance: Challenges & Equity | How does the GATE programme help improve girls’ social and economic well-being?
Do these benefits to girls also benefit the community?
If so, please tell me how. | |
| Effectiveness: General | BLANK | |
| Effectiveness: Equity | BLANK | |
| Effectiveness: Equity | What important challenges to girls’ social and economic well-being does the GATE programme not address? | |
| Effectiveness: Learning & Innovation | What obstacles has the GATE programme encountered in your village?
How have these obstacles affected the programme? | |
<p>| Effectiveness: Learning | Are there potential changes to the GATE programme that might make it more effective, but that we haven’t discussed? If so, please describe these potential changes. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Effectiveness: Community</strong></th>
<th>Please describe the effect of the GATE programme on the parents and families of girls. Has that effect spread to families with girls who are <em>not</em> taking part in GATE?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>BLANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability: Scalability</strong></td>
<td>BLANK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness: Wrapping up</strong></td>
<td>BLANK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nepal INTERVIEW guide:**

*Girls’ After-school Programme*

*Guide for interview with FIELD STAKEHOLDERS (Village Development Committees, school head teachers etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Criterion: Topic or theme</strong></th>
<th><strong>Question</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance: Getting started</strong></td>
<td>Please tell me about your organisation’s relationship to the GATE programme. How were you or other personnel involved? \ Does your organisation have other programmes that address the needs of girls specifically? Please describe these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance: Challenges</strong></td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges that girls face in relation to their social and economic well-being?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance: Challenges &amp; equity</strong></td>
<td>How are these challenges related to education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance: Challenges &amp; Equity</strong></td>
<td>How does the GATE programme address challenges to girls’ social and economic well being? \ Which of these challenges does the Girls’ After-school programme address most successfully? \ <em>For each challenge named</em> \ In your opinion, is this challenge important? Please tell me why or why not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness: General</strong></td>
<td>What are the most important changes brought about by the GATE programme? \ Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness: Equity</strong></td>
<td>Please describe the ways that life has changed for girls in the GATE programme. \ Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness: Equity</strong></td>
<td>What important challenges to girls’ social and economic well being does the GATE programme <em>not</em> address? \ How could the programme be changed to address these challenges?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effectiveness: Learning & Innovation

What obstacles has the GATE programme encountered in your village?
How have these obstacles affected the programme?
Has the programme been changed to respond to these obstacles? If it has, please tell me how.
How did your organisation view or contribute to these responses?

Effectiveness: Learning

Are there potential changes to the GATE programme that might make it more effective, but that we haven’t discussed? If so, please describe these potential changes.

Effectiveness: Community

Please describe the effect of the GATE programme on the parents and families of girls.
Has that effect spread to families with girls who are not taking part in GATE?

Sustainability

In what other programmes and activities is your organisation partnering with DEO?

Are there past partnerships that are important? If so, please describe these.
In what ways has DEO been effective?
In what ways has DEO been ineffective?
Do you have any specific recommendations for DEO in relation to the GATE programme?

Sustainability: Scalability

In your opinion, what are next steps for the GATE programme?

Effectiveness: Wrapping up

Do you have other recommendations with regard to the GATE programme?

Are there other aspects of the GATE programme that are important, but that we haven’t talked about?

If so, please describe these.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion: Topic or theme</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Getting started</td>
<td>Please tell me about your organisation’s relationship to the GATE programme. How were you or other personnel involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please tell me about your organisation’s relationship to the Girls’ After-school programme and to the GATE programme. How were you or other personnel involved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does your organisation have other programmes that address the needs of girls specifically? Please describe these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges</td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges that students face in relation to education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do these challenges affect student learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges &amp; equity</td>
<td>Are these challenges different for girl students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, please describe these differences. <em>(e.g., differences could stem from differences in impact, intensity, frequency, etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges &amp; Equity</td>
<td>How does the Girls’ After-school programme address challenges to girls’ education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which of these challenges does the Girls’ After-school programme address most successfully?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(For each challenge named)</em></td>
<td>In your opinion, is this challenge important? Please tell me why or why not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance: Challenges &amp; equity (GATE)</td>
<td>How does the GATE programme address challenges to girls’ education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Which of these challenges does the GATE programme address most successfully?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(For each challenge named)</em></td>
<td>In your opinion, is this challenge important? Please tell me why or why not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: General</td>
<td>What are the most important changes brought about by the Girls’ After-school programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: General (GATE)</td>
<td>What are the most important changes brought about by the GATE programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Equity</td>
<td>In what ways does the Girls’ After-school programme specifically change conditions for girls in school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Equity (GATE)</td>
<td>In what ways does the GATE programme specifically change conditions for girls in school? Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Equity</td>
<td>What important challenges to girls’ education does the Girls’ After-school programme not address? How could the programme be changed to address these challenges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Equity (GATE)</td>
<td>In what ways does the GATE programme specifically change conditions for girls in their homes and communities? Why are these changes important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Learning &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>What obstacles has the Girls’ After-school programme encountered in relation to its launch and implementation? How have these obstacles affected the programme? Has the programme been changed to respond to these obstacles? If it has, please tell me how. How did your organisation view or contribute to these responses? In what ways did other organizations contribute? How effective were these responses? And why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Learning &amp; Innovation (GATE)</td>
<td>What obstacles has the GATE programme encountered in relation to its launch and implementation? How have these obstacles affected the programme? Has the programme been changed to respond to these obstacles? If it has, please tell me how. How did your organisation view or contribute to these responses? In what ways did other organizations contribute? How effective were these responses? And why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Learning (GATE)</td>
<td>Are there potential changes to the Girls’ After-school programme that might make it more effective, but that we haven’t discussed? If so, please describe these potential changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness: Learning (GATE)</td>
<td>Are there potential changes to the GATE programme that might make it more effective, but that we haven’t discussed? If so, please describe these potential changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Please describe your organisation’s relationship with UNICEF (and with the DEO). Please describe the role of UNICEF (and the DEO) in supporting the Girls’ After-school programme. How can the MOE best support the Girls’ After-school programme in the next 3 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Please describe the role of UNICEF in supporting the GATE programme. How can the MOE best support the GATE programme in the next 3 years?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sustainability

In what other programmes and activities is your organisation partnering with UNICEF?

Are there past partnerships that are important? If so, please describe these.
Please describe the role of UNICEF in the Girls’ After-school programme.

In what ways has UNICEF been effective?

In what ways has UNICEF been ineffective?
Do you have any specific recommendations for UNICEF in relation to the Girls After-school programme?

Role of UNICEF

Please describe the role of UNICEF in the GATE programme.

In what ways has UNICEF been effective?

In what ways has UNICEF been ineffective?
Do you have any specific recommendations for UNICEF in relation to the GATE programme?

Sustainability: Scalability

In your opinion, what are next steps for the Girls’ After-school programme?
Do you believe that the Girls’ After-school programme should be scaled up in Nepal? If so, please describe the measures that you think are necessary.

Sustainability: Scalability (GATE)

In your opinion, what are next steps for the GATE programme?
Do you believe that the GATE programme should be scaled up in Nepal? If so, please describe the measures that you think are necessary.

Effectiveness: Wrapping up

Do you have specific recommendations with regard to the Girls’ After-school programme?
Do you have specific recommendations with regard to the GATE programme?
Do you have recommendations with regard to the LUL programme overall?
Are there other aspects of the Girls’ After-school programme that are important, but that we haven’t talked about?

If so, please describe these.
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Annex G: Gate *Lalima* curriculum topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Lalima Part-1 Description</th>
<th>Lalima Part-2 S. No.</th>
<th>Lalima Part-2 Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cleanliness Hygiene</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Danger of early marriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Food</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Young Girl</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Allergies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Menstruation</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Traditional healer-Dhami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Cleverness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wastage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Addiction/Deviation (Kulat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Smoke</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Shree panchami festival of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mud</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Vitamin A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Women and care during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Youth age</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Midwife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Self-respect</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Law/Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Complain register</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Diarrhoea</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Amrit-Importance of Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Wild forest</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tree Plantation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Birth spacing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual transmitted diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>