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I Context

Serbia has undertaken extensive changes and reforms of its educational system in the past 10 years. The present reform cycle, which started in 2008, is aimed at improving equity, quality and efficiency of education. The main objective of current policies and strategies is to improve the quality and coverage of preschool and primary education, so as to enhance the educational achievement of students in general, and children from vulnerable social groups in particular. These measures are also intended to contribute towards poverty reduction, greater social inclusion and better employment.

The enactment of the Law on Foundations of the Education System in 2009 (LFES) was a significant step towards decentralizing and democratizing the school and education system. The Law provides a normative foundation for inclusive education and non-segregated participation of children in education and continued learning.\(^1\) It further offers support mechanisms for children and teaching staff in the application of inclusive education, e.g. through individual education plans and teaching assistants. It also extends the duration of the mandatory and free preparatory pre-school programme from six to nine months, and facilitates the enrolment of children from socially vulnerable groups. The Law also envisages introduction of a per-student formula as the modality for education financing as of the 2014-2015 school year.

Preschool education (PSE) is delivered in three forms: (a) nurseries for children aged 0.5 to 3 years, (b) kindergartens for children aged 3 to 5.5 years, and (c) the compulsory Preparatory Preschool Programme (PPP). PPP is mandatory for all children 5.5 to 6.5 years of age, who have to attend 9 months of PPP in the year before they start primary education. Other forms of pre-school education are not obligatory.

The Law on Preschool Education (2010) introduced significant changes in the functioning of the preschool education system in Serbia. It requires Preschool Institutions (PIs) to ensure a more equitable coverage of children and priority is to be given to enrolment of children from vulnerable groups. The law also provides possibility to open special and specialised short-term programmes for children who are not covered by the pre-education system. It also defines a standard child to adult ratio in the classroom, obliges PIs to implement quality programmes based on modern theory and practice, including the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child and to introduce quality monitoring with the participation of parents and children. The law further allows other legal entities and private persons to establish preschool institutions.

Although Serbia has a long tradition of pre-school education, it has one of the lowest rates of participation in pre-school education in Europe (approximately 44% in comparison to 87% in the EU

---

member states). Participation of children from some ethnic minorities, children living in poverty or children from rural areas is even lower (only 8% of Roma children attend kindergartens, 22% of children from the poorest families and 29% of children from rural areas).

The present preschool capacity is also below the EU countries’ standards, and fails to meet national MDG targets. Each municipality has a pre-school institution that has a large number of kindergartens—the network of preschool institutions consists of 160 public preschool institutions operating in 2,427 preschool facilities, with a total of 9,264 education groups. During the last six years, the number of preschool facilities has increased by about 30%, but this still fails to satisfy the needs of children and families. Moreover, the network of pre-school institutions is not evenly distributed geographically, and often there are no pre-schools in underdeveloped and rural areas, whereas the number of pre-schools in urban areas is insufficient. Also, in rural areas pre-schools are twice as far from children’s homes as in the country as a whole (2.2 kilometres compared to 1.1 kilometres respectively). The worst situation can be found in the 40 municipalities officially categorized as devastated, with a level of development below 50% of the national average. Two-thirds of municipalities with very low coverage with preschool education belong to this group. In addition, a large number of pre-school institutions are in a very bad physical condition.

Although the new Law on Pre-school Education is quite modern and introduces a variety of programs for children, those programs have not yet been put into practice. Programs in “urban kindergartens” are full-day programs and there are no shorter programs to suit both parents and children. Another problem for inclusion of greater number of children in early childhood education and care (ECEC) programs are parental attitudes. More than half of parents of children aged 3-5 primarily considers pre-school education through its role of taking care of children. They do not see other benefits of attending pre-school for the development of their children at this age and this is one of the challenges addressed by the project.

At present, there is a lack of precise data on the preschool coverage of children living in socially disadvantaged conditions and children with disabilities. Although the Law and relevant by-laws stipulate that preschool institutions are obliged to give disadvantaged children priority in enrolment, these regulations are not being applied effectively. Many preschool institutions have not incorporated this obligation into their school statutes, while local self-governments (LSGs), having legal responsibility to cover 80% of preschool costs and 100% in cases of socially disadvantaged children, often fail to provide financial support for these measures. Data on coverage unambiguously indicates that preschool institutions have not invested sufficient efforts in developing inclusive enrolment practices and that they are not sensitive enough to children and family needs, especially those from vulnerable groups.

Thus, expanding the pre-school education coverage requires interventions in three directions – increasing physical capacities for pre-school education, defining a funding model that would allow out-of pre-school children to engage in pre-school education through the minimum of 4-hour programs (especially children of poor families, children from rural areas), as well as working to increase parental awareness of the benefits of pre-school education for the development of their children.

Policies relevant for the area of preschool education in Serbia and the reference framework for the implementation of the project that is the subject of this evaluation are defined by the following legal and strategic documents adopted at the national level:

- Law on Preschool Education (LPE) 2010;
- By-law on Special and Specialised Preschool Programs, 2012 (defines types of programs, ways in which they can be implemented and financial mechanisms);
- By-law on preschool enrolment priorities (2011);
- Standards of the quality of work of preschool institutions (2012);
- Strategy for Development of Education in the Republic of Serbia until 2020 (2012);
- Strategy for Improvement of Status of Roma in the Republic of Serbia (2009);
- National Plan of Action for Children 2004-2015 (2004);
- Millennium Development Goals.

II The project to be evaluated

The Project “Expanding Early Learning Opportunities for Vulnerable Children” was developed in close cooperation between UNICEF and the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development (MoESTD) with the development objective to provide better access to quality pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on the most vulnerable.

The project’s immediate objective is to increase coverage and improve quality of pre-school education for 1,500 children 3-5 years old in 10 municipalities.

The project “Expanding Early Learning Opportunities for Vulnerable Children” is supporting the ongoing reform of the education system, focusing on improving the quality of early education and increasing equitable access of the most vulnerable children to early childhood education and care (ECEC) programmes in 10 deprived localities where access to such programs was limited for the most vulnerable children. This is a part of UNICEF’s overall efforts to assist the Government of Serbia to deliver quality services to all young children, especially the most vulnerable ones – children from poor families, from Roma and deprived rural communities and children with disabilities.

The project’s Theory of Change and the main hypothesis were that preschool coverage of excluded children (poor, rural) with ECEC will be increased if physical capacities and tailor made programs are made available to children and their parents. The further logic behind the project approach was that:

- Physical capacities can be increased through low cost reconstruction of existing spaces.
- New programs, if developed in cooperation with parents and children, will respond to their needs and will facilitate higher interest and enrolment rates.
- Once parental awareness on importance and benefits of ECEC is raised, they will be more interested to enrol their children.
- Once capacitated in the area of ECEC planning and provided with evidence that this approach yields cost-effective results, municipalities will sustain it and expand it to other areas.

In 10 municipalities with the lowest pre-school attendance rate, the space in the existing pre-schools has been adapted and additional space was created, or the existing, often abandoned facilities in local communities have been adapted and children playgrounds have been revived. Advantage during enrolment in new programs was given to the children from rural areas and children who have never attended pre-school education before. In order to respond to the needs of both parents and children, short half-day programs for children aged 3-5.5 year have been developed in collaboration with parents. Activities were undertaken to raise parental awareness on importance and benefits of ECEC and they were strengthen to demand quality services. In addition, pre-school teachers were trained to identify the needs of children, parents and the local community and create programs in accordance with their needs.
On the long run, the project is contributing to equitable transformation of the preschool education in Serbia, through building capacities of local stakeholders (LSGs, teachers, parents) to use the current legislation and design and implement preschool programs adjusted to the local needs.

The project is implemented by UNICEF Serbia in partnership with the NGO Centre for Interactive Pedagogy and in close collaboration with the MoESTD and in partnership with the LSGs, and parents. The project has been implemented in 10 municipalities in Serbia with the lowest coverage with preschool education in Serbia. Those municipalities are: Kladovo, Zajecar, Bor, Novi Pazar, Sjenica, Aleksinac, Loznica, Pirot, Prokuplje and Vranje. Municipalities were selected in close cooperation with MoESTD. In the first phase of the project, Smederevo was included into the project instead of Pirot, due to the lack of interest of the Pirot LSG.

**Right holders** of the project were children, aged 3 to 5 years, living in rural, economically disadvantaged and border regions, particularly vulnerable children (from Roma communities, poor, children with developmental difficulties and disabilities), parents and parents’ associations.

The project supported NGOs, LSGs and professionals of different profiles working with young children and their families.

In addition to partnership with the MoESTD of the Republic of Serbia as the primary stakeholder, other important stakeholders who contributed to the Project include:

- **Local self-governments and preschool institutions in 10 municipalities in Serbia** – through active participation in selection of facilities for adaptation, financial contribution to reconstruction works, training activities, community mobilization of parents and other actors, employment of new teachers and commitment to sustainable funding of new programs as per the MoU signed with UNICEF.
- **Preschool teachers** from 10 preschool institutions - through participation in training activities, development, implementation and documentation of programs, mobilization of parents and wider community.
- Representatives of the Regional school administrations (branch offices of the MoESTD responsible for professional support and oversight of education institutions) – through active participation in trainings.
- **Parents groups** from 5 local self-governments - through participation in training activities, development and implementation of new programs and through small parental initiatives aimed at improving conditions for early childhood development.
- **SIPRU – Team for Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction, GoS**, through their efforts to coordinate activities of different stakeholders within pre-school sector.

Of significant benefit to the project implementation was UNICEF collaboration with the EU funded project - “Improvement of Preschool Education in Serbia” (IMPRES) whose implementation period ran in parallel to this project (from mid-2011 towards the end of 2013). IMPRES works on broadening access to preschool education through support in optimization of the preschool network, improvement of the legislative framework, improved access for the most vulnerable children and improved preschool quality in 15 municipalities.

The project to be evaluated was developed with an aim to be complementary to the IMPRES goals and objectives and this intention was realized in practice through close cooperation and nurturing of synergy during the implementation. This was mainly in the areas of new programs development,
capacity building of local stakeholders (LSGs, practitioners), development of training tools and learning materials for practitioners etc.

Thanks to cooperation with IMPRES, the project had an opportunity to learn from EU countries about their experience with development of early learning opportunities. This cooperation has also provided broader opportunities for horizontal learning and exchange among PSIs covered by two projects – instead of 10 PSIs sharing knowledge and experiences, 25 PSIs actually participated.

The total budget of the project is 517,483,00 EUR. IKEA provided 409,483,00 while UNICEF contributed with complementary funds of 108,000,00 EUR.

III Time frame of the project and current phase of implementation

The project was planned to be implemented within 30 months, starting from May 2011 and ending by the end of October 2013.

Preparatory phase for project implementation was from May to September 2011 and it included intensive communication with MoESTD, pre-selection and selection of municipalities to be included into the project, intensive communication with different stakeholders, particularly IMPRES, and development of the detailed joint project document with the implementing partner, Centre for Interactive Pedagogy (CIP).

IV Rationale for the evaluation

The evaluation is undertaken at the end of the project implementation as envisioned by the original project proposal.

The evaluation will inform discussions among the key stakeholders on future areas of action. The knowledge generated by the evaluation should be used by:

- the MoESTD as an important source of information for the further policy work and programming - more specifically to further operationalize the Action plan for the implementation of the Education Strategy 2020+ and Preschool Education Law with specific focus on inclusion of children from vulnerable groups;
- Local self-governments and preschool institutions in all local self-governments in Serbia for planning how to broaden access and improve quality of the preschool services in cost effective and innovative manner;
- Preschool institutions in assessing values and benefits from special and specialized programs in their local communities as well as in planning such services;
- NGOs – professional NGOs working in the area of the preschool education will use the best practices and lessons learned from this project in order to further participate in creating stimulating and supportive conditions for preschool education;
- NGOs representing vulnerable groups, especially Roma and children with disabilities in lobbying for creating conditions for broadening access and quality of preschool education for vulnerable groups;
- Parents and parents' groups and associations- to support further organization and empowerment of parents to participate in development and implementation of preschool programs and demand quality preschool services for their children;
- Institute for Education Quality and Evaluation which is in cooperation with UNICEF currently working on development of instruments for external evaluation of the quality of pre-school institutions;
- Institute for Advancement of Education, which is in charge for accreditation of programs for professional development of teachers and development of the foundations of the pre-school program;
- Parliament of the Republic of Serbia, especially the Child Rights Committee, which is active in monitoring and promoting right to education;
- SIPRU which is coordinating social inclusion policies in the country and in particular activities of different stakeholders in the area of preschool education;
- UNICEF – for future programing and support in the area of ECEC.

The main evaluation findings and recommendations will be presented and discussed with all project partners and stakeholders. In addition, the full text of the evaluation will be shared with all relevant stakeholders.

V Objectives of the Evaluation

The main immediate purpose of this summative evaluation is to evaluate the project outcomes and achievements in relation to the project strategy.

More specifically, the evaluation objectives are to:

1. Provide feedback to UNICEF and its national counterparts (MoESTD, and other stakeholders) on the soundness (defined as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability) and impact of the project approach in increasing coverage of children from 3 to 5.5 and improving quality of pre-school services;
   a. Evaluate Project Impact following Project Outputs,
   b. Reveal good practices and gaps in approaches,
2. Provide the IKEA with information on impact of their specific support to expanding pre-school services for vulnerable children in Serbia;
3. Based on the experience from the project implementation, to extract general lessons learned and recommendations aimed at further enhancement of the preschool education and further UNICEF interventions in this area.

VI Scope

The project evaluation should cover the entire project implementation period (May 2011–October 2013) at both national and local levels.

It should cover 10 municipalities included in the UNICEF project and all project components, including the aspect of the cooperation with IMPRES project. Available resources and time will require evaluators to visit only selected/sampled sites.

Project outputs to be evaluated:

1. Two types of alternative pre-school services/programs developed, piloted, documented and ready for scaling up;
2. Pre-school facilities in 10 municipalities adapted and equipped with didactic materials;
3. 1,500 children from target groups covered (enrolled into) by organized early learning and care services;
4. Training modules for the 2 alternative early learning services developed and accredited at the national level;
5. 300 pre-school professional staff trained for implementation of alternative services;
6. 500 parents and 5 parents’ associations have benefited from training on how to support children’s early development and sustain demand for quality services.
The evaluation will particularly look into how project components impacted the most vulnerable children and equity gaps in access to pre-school education.

Project progress reports, other ad-hoc analyses as well as other data sources that should inform the evaluation are listed within the section VII Methodology and will enable systematic assessment of the project achievements.

One of the limitations in terms of data availability is the lack of reliable data at the national and local levels related to the total numbers of children from different vulnerable groups (Roma, children with disabilities and developmental difficulties, poor children). Furthermore, it will be difficult to assess impact of newly developed programs on development of children’s abilities, skills and knowledge. The project introduced instruments to measure development of children attending newly developed programs but did not have any control groups of children enrolled into other preschool education programs.

VII Evaluation Questions

The focus of the evaluation is articulated under 5 main evaluation criteria, each accompanied with guiding questions for the evaluation. These are the following:

**Objective 1 - assessing relevance / to what extent is the Project responding to the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries?**
- How relevant was the applied strategy for broadening access to early learning opportunities in 10 municipalities?
- To what extent were development of diversified pre-school programs and capacity building of pre-school teachers relevant for improving quality and provision of pre-school education in Serbia?
- To what extent was capacity building of local authorities on how to expand pre-school services relevant for the pre-school education reform?
- To what extent are policy level activities relevant for the improvement of the system of preschool education in Serbia?
- To what extent are groups of activities related to parent involvement relevant for improvement of quality of the pre-school programs?

**Objective 2 - assessing effectiveness / to what extent does the Project meet the outcomes as defined by the Project document?**
- Have the planned results been achieved to date (quantitative and qualitative)?
- To what extent Project contributed to the mobilisation and capacity building of selected municipalities for improvement of PE provision?
- To what extent Project contributed to expansion of physical capacities for pre-school education in 10 municipalities?
- To what extent project contributed in development of models of diversified alternative pre-school programs, their piloting and documentation?
- To what extent the project managed to increase access for the most vulnerable children?
- To what extent parents influenced development of new services or were strengthened to participate in further expansion of PE?
- Has the project provided any additional (not directly planned by the Project) significant contribution/outcomes towards improvement of pre-school education at local and national level?
Objective 3 - assessing sustainability / to what extent are the project outcomes achieved sustainable?

- To what extent legislation in this area supports implementation and further development of services and approaches put in place by the project?
- To which extent was synergy with similar initiatives achieved?
- To what extent are new knowledge and skills integrated into regular activities of professionals working with children and their families?
- To what extent were national and local level stakeholders involved in the project design, implementation and monitoring?
- What is the likeliness that the local self-government/ preschool institutions will continue financing pre-school services that target the most marginalized children?
- To what extent have the preschool institutions endorsed approach to improvement of quality and coverage promoted by the project?

Objective 4 - assessing impact / to what extent has the Project increased local capacities to ensure that more children from vulnerable groups benefit from pre-school services in a way which contributes to their social inclusion?

- To what extent has the project contributed to increasing the number of children from vulnerable groups benefiting from pre-school services?
- How involvement in project/newly developed pre-school programs affected /pre-school teachers/parents/ preschool institution, local community/LSGs?
- Which are the effects of the alternative (special and specialized) - programs in terms of benefits for children participating in the program (skills, abilities and knowledge)?
- What are the effects of the teacher training programs on other children enrolled in those kindergartens?
- To which extent pilot PI supported other PI in development of alternative (special and specialized) programs?

Objective 5 - assessing efficiency / to what extent did the management of the project ensure timelines and efficient utilization of resources?

- How well have the implementation of activities been managed? To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled? What management and monitoring tools have been used?
- How well have the financial resources been used / were funds managed in a cost-effective manner / what is the correlation between funds utilized and outputs / results achieved / could the same results been achieved with less resources?
- Did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?

In addition to the 5 main evaluation criteria, the evaluation shall also focus on assessing human rights-based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues. More specifically, it should look into the extent of the project outcomes’ contribution to achievement of children’s rights and how the project contributed to addressing key cross-cutting issues?

- Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of child rights?
- To what extent and how the project ensures an equity focus?
- Does the project reflect gender mainstreaming issues?
- Was the design of the Project ethical? How was the balance of cost and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) considered during the Project implementation?
VIII Methodology

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nation Evaluation Group (UNEG)\(^2\) (http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards/indexes.jsp?doc_cat_source_id=4).

Evaluability assessment:

The project strategy/log frame and available data allow for the assessment of the progress achieved and evaluation of the project results and impact.

The baseline study conducted before the project implementation sets a good basis for the most of output indicators. Besides that, other reliable data sources include:

- Project document “Expanding Early Learning Opportunities for Vulnerable Children”
- Theory of Change of the project
- CIP project document, draft final report, progress reports and other project reports and materials
- CIP – Module 1 and 2 for training sessions
- IMPRES and CIP - Manual for development of diversified/special and specialised programs
- UNICEF Serbia (2012)- Investing in Early Childhood Education in Serbia, Costing models for ensuring preschool education for all
- By-law on types, modalities of implementation and financing of specific, specialized programs and other forms of work and services that achieves Police (Official Gazette of RS, No. 26/13).

National Education Council (2012) – Quality Standards for Preschool Institutions

Other literature that provides reference framework:

All of the documents listed, together with a contact list of all for the project relevant stakeholders, project implementing partners and consultants will be provided to the evaluator once a contractual agreement has been made.

Approach

The overall evaluation approach to be applied will rely on the Project strategy/log frame and will have an equity focus to assess if the project results equally benefited children of different backgrounds (from rural and urban areas, children living in the poorest municipalities, of parents with lower education and socio economic status, Roma children, children with disabilities). It shall combine qualitative and quantitative data and apply data collection strategy that relies on primary and secondary data collection and non-experimental design.

The contractor will use the desk review to get familiar with the policy basis, relevant project documents and other means of verification / sources of information listed above (state and non-state actors’ reports).
The contractor should develop more precise evaluation work plan that will allow insight into the both national and local level project components.

In addition to interviews with the Project implementing partners, UNICEF and CIP, opinions of the following actors (key stakeholders should be acquired and analysed:

- MESTD
- SIPRU – Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Unit of the Government
- IMPRES project staff
- Local authorities in 10 LSG
- PI in 10 LSG
- Project beneficiaries representing children, parents and pre-school teachers.

The guiding questions for the evaluation against defined evaluation criteria will be further elaborated through evaluation matrix and used as a basis for development of the main data collection instruments (interviews, focus groups and observations).

All the data gathered will be analysed by the evaluator/s. Triangulation of data will be used to increase reliability of findings and conclusions.

Since the field visit cannot cover all project locations, criteria for selection of evaluation sample from among the 10 LSGs covered by the project should be:

- Rural and urban localities
- Level of development of LSG
- Regional distribution of project locations
- Pilot and non-pilot LSGs

Special measures will be put in place to ensure that the evaluation process is ethical and that participants in the evaluation process can openly express their opinion. The sources of information will be protected, and known just to the evaluator/s. The Evaluation Team will ensure that the evaluation process is in line with UNEG Ethical Guidelines. The contractor has to ensure that it is clear to all subjects that their participation in the evaluation is voluntary. All participants should be informed or advised of the context and purpose of the evaluation, as well as the privacy and confidentiality of discussions.

**IX Work plan**

Evaluation will be implemented from 1st of October to 31st of December 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of ToR</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>First and second week of September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection / contracting of agency</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>By 18th of October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of the existing documents</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Fourth week of October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report (including evaluation work plan,</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>1st of November 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentation of methodological approach, instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be used, annotated outline of final report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logistics (arranging meetings / interviews) | UNICEF | first week of November 2013
--- | --- | ---
Field visit to Serbia (meeting / interviews with UNICEF, MESTD, IMPRES Project, key partners and stakeholders) | Agency with the support of UNICEF | 8-17 November 2013
De-briefing meeting with UNICEF and MESTD | Agency | Third week of November

Reporting:
- Submission of the draft report | Agency | 1st of December 2013
- Feed-back on the draft report from UNICEF | UNICEF | 5th of December 2013
- Submission of the final report | Agency | 13th of December 2013

Use of evaluation findings:
- Dissemination of the final report to all partners and stakeholders | UNICEF | End of January 2014

The evaluation will be managed by the UNICEF Country Office – Evaluation steering committee consisted of the Deputy representative, Social Policy Specialist (M&E focal point) and Education Specialist. The management of the evaluation will include development of the terms of reference, assignment of the evaluation team, liaison between the evaluation team and partners / stakeholders involved (supporting organisation of meetings / interviews and field visits), as well as quality assurance of the report.

CIP and MoESTD will be involved in all critical phases of the evaluation and will participate in the definition of recommendations through active contribution during debriefing meetings and providing feedback to the draft report.

Key intermediate tasks of the contractor:
- Desk review of relevant documents and reports
- Develop more detailed evaluation methodology and work plan – draft to be submitted as a part of the Inception Report to UNICEF for approval, including key instruments / interview questions
- To conduct data collection through field visits (realize interviews/focus groups with selected stakeholders, partners and beneficiaries)
- Present initial findings through a de-briefing meeting with UNICEF and MESTD
- Prepare the draft report with key findings, recommendations and lessons learned based on all sources of information used
- Based on feedback provided by UNICEF prepare and submit the Final Report with all key findings, recommendations and lessons learned following the UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards
- Prepare a material with the key evaluation findings and recommendations for further dissemination
- Deliver presentation of the main evaluation findings and recommendations to UNICEF and main stakeholders.

The Agency will be selected based on the following criteria:
- Experience of conducting project and programme evaluations
- Technical expertise on pre-school education and early learning;
- Knowledge on the pre-school education/education system in Serbia;
- Communication skills.
The evaluation team must have a national consultant.

The qualifications and skill areas required include:

- Agency with expertise in the area of education (pre-school education, inclusive education etc.)
- Sufficient number of qualified contracted experts and staff members to respond to the tasks in the TOR
- Knowledge on child rights and social inclusion concept
- Knowledge on gender equality and human rights
- Documented extensive evaluation expertise and experience
- Proven knowledge on the education system in Serbia,
- Excellent report writing skills
- Good communication and presentation skills
- Excellent written and spoken English
- Ability to keep with strict deadlines
- Knowledgeable of UN Evaluation policy
- Experience in working with UN / UNICEF (would be an asset)

Contractor should be sensitive to beliefs and act with integrity and respect to all stakeholders. In the report evaluators may not refer to individual children. Contractor may not share findings with media in Serbia or abroad concerning individual children or individual institutions.

X Procedures and logistics

Timeframe for this work assignment is from the 14th October to 13th of December 2013. During that period total number of consultancy days available is up to 36 maximum, with estimated share of days as following:

- Desk review and submission of Inception report – 10 days,
- Field visits and debriefing – 8 days,
- Draft report development – 10 days,
- Final report submission and presentation - 8

Meetings and field visits will be organized with the support of UNICEF and in close cooperation with CIP.

UNICEF premises will be available during the time spend in Serbia if needed. Printers, photocopying services, and other similar services will be provided by UNICEF. It is expected that contractor will bring their own laptops.

XI Products and payments

Deliverables:

- Inception report (including evaluation work plan, presentation of methodological approach, instruments to be used, annotated outline of final report), to be presented and approved by UNICEF – 28th of October 2013.
- Interim (draft) evaluation report (draft findings, conclusions and recommendations from all data sources used in the evaluation) – 25th of November 2013
- Final evaluation report (including summary), subject of approval by UNICEF– 13th December 2013
- Presentation of the Evaluation report by the end of January 2014.

1 See „UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards”.
All the products shall be submitted in English. UNICEF will ensure translation in Serbian.

The Agency will be paid in three installments upon the satisfactory completion of deliverables: Inception report (up to 10 working days) Draft report (up to 16 working days) and Final report (8 working days).

All the original invoices related to the contract (e.g. transportation costs, airport taxes, visa…) should be kept and submitted to UNICEF for reimbursement.

XII Reference to the UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards

The final evaluation report should follow UNEG Norms and Standards, UNICEF Evaluation Report Standards and should follow the GEROS Quality Assessment System. The report template to be used includes:

- Title page and Opening pages
- Executive summary
- Project description (including the logic of the project design and/or expected results chain)
- The role UNICEF, Centre for Interactive Pedagogy, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development Labour and other stakeholders involved
- Purpose of the Evaluation
- Evaluation criteria
- Evaluation Scope and Objectives
- The evaluation design
- Description of Methodology
- The stakeholders participation
- Ethical issues
- Findings
- Analysis of results
- Constraints
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Annexes
Theory of Change

Background
Serbia has one of the lowest rates of participation in pre-school education in Europe (approximately 44% in comparison to 87% in the EU member states). Participation of children from some ethnic minorities, children living in poverty or children with special needs and disabilities is even lower (Roma children make 8%, children from the poorest families make 22% and children from rural areas make 29%). Serbia has a long tradition of pre-school education. Each municipality has a pre-school institution that has a large number of kindergartens. However, the network of pre-school institutions is not evenly distributed geographically, and often there are no pre-schools in underdeveloped and rural areas, whereas the number of pre-schools in urban areas is insufficient. Two-thirds of municipalities with very low coverage are the least developed municipalities in Serbia. A large number of pre-school institutions are in a very bad physical condition. Although the new Law on Pre-school Education is quite modern and introduces a variety of programs for children, those programs have not yet been developed and put into practice. Programs in “urban kindergartens” are full-day programs and there are no shorter programs to suit both parents and children. Another problem for inclusion of greater number of children in ECEC programs is the attitude of parents. More than half of the parents of children aged 3-5 primarily considers pre-school education through its role of taking care of children and are not sending their children to full day programs as there is someone at home to take care of them. They do not see other benefits of attending pre-school for the development of their children at this age, and the lack of this being one of the challenges addressed by the project.

Intervention Logic/Hypothesis
Preschool coverage of excluded children (poor, rural) with ECEC will be increased if physical capacities and tailor made programs are made available to children and their parents.

- Physical capacities can be increased through low cost reconstruction of existing spaces.
- New programs, if developed in cooperation with parents and children, will respond to their needs and will facilitate higher interest and enrolment rates.
- Once parental awareness on importance and benefits of ECEC is raised, they will be more interested to enrol their children.
- Once capacitated in the area of ECEC planning and provided with evidence that this approach yields cost-effective results, municipalities will sustain it and expand it to other areas.

In order to expand the pre-school education coverage and to increasing quality of pre-school education for children from 3-5.5 y/o (outcomes) there was a need to implement following set of measures:
- increasing physical capacities for pre-school education and equipping with didactic material,
- building capacity of LSGs on importance of ECD and how to plan local network of PI
- defining a model that would allow out-of pre-school children, to engage in pre-school education through the minimum of 4-hour programs (especially children of poor families, children from rural areas),
- working to increase parental awareness of the benefits of pre-school education for the development of their children.
- training pre-school teachers to identify the needs of children, parents and the local community and create programs in accordance with their needs

In the 10 municipalities with the lowest pre-school attendance rate, the space in the existing pre-schools has been adapted, or the existing, often abandoned facilities in local communities have been adapted and children playgrounds have been revived. Advantage during enrolment in new programs was given to the children from rural areas and children who have never attended pre-school education before. In order to respond to the needs of both parents and children, short half-day programs for children aged 3-5.5 year have been developed in collaboration with parents. Activities were undertaken to raise parental awareness on importance and benefits of ECEC and they were strengthen to demand quality services. In addition, pre-school teachers were trained to identify the needs of children, parents and the local community and create programs in accordance with their needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification/ Documentation</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Means of verification/ Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school facilities in 10 municipalities adapted and equipped with didactic materials.</td>
<td>- At least one space/facility per LSG, in kindergarten or in other public space adapted and equipped with didactic materials</td>
<td>- Field report (before/after) - Constructor reports - Final Technical Report on Infrastructural Works - Photo-documentation Contracts, Invoices</td>
<td>To increase coverage with preschool education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on most vulnerable.</td>
<td>- Newly created spaces are part of PI network at local level (legally) - LSG provides funds to support functioning of expanded capacities and diversified programs developed by this project (staff, running costs...)</td>
<td>The decision of LSG to extend the network of preschool institutions - The long term Plan for Development of PI networks - The annual Plan of PI for 2013/14 - The decisions of 10 municipalities / city authorities on adoption of The Annual Working Plan of local PIs for 2013/14 (which includes staff and running costs...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500 children from target groups covered (enrolled into) by organized early learning and care services/programs.</td>
<td>- Needs and capacities for pre-school education of children 3-5 in 10 municipalities assessed - Representatives of PIs and LSG trained in optimal planning and organization of preschool education at local level - Parents informed on benefits of ECD - Importance of ECD better represented in media</td>
<td>- Assessment Report - Training Evaluations - Reports on meetings with parents - Video clips and media reports (local and national level)</td>
<td>To increase coverage with preschool education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on most vulnerable.</td>
<td>- Number of newly enrolled children/benefiting from improvement of teaching methods - Number of children from regular (whole day) programme benefiting from skills and knowledge on special and specialized (S&amp;S) programs - % of children from vulnerable groups enrolled in PI - Parental awareness on benefits of ECE increased</td>
<td>- Progress and Final Narrative Reports (quantitative data) - Results of Survey for parents and staff from PIs on benefit of S&amp;S Programme for children and themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Means of verification/ Documentation</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Means of verification/ Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two types of alternative pre-school services/programs developed, piloted, documented and ready for scaling up.</td>
<td>- No of types of programs developed, piloted and documented</td>
<td>- Description of developed types of programs in Final Narrative Report</td>
<td>To increase coverage with pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on most vulnerable.</td>
<td>- Implementation experiences on S&amp;S programs systematized and available for professionals and wider public</td>
<td>- The Manual/Guidance for development and implementation of special and specialize programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programs developed through participation of professionals and parents</td>
<td>- Progress narrative reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Manual/Guidance prepared for distribution to PIs and LSGs</td>
<td>- Child Portfolios (where exists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Programs piloted in 5 LSGs</td>
<td>- Project Self-evaluation Report on quality in S&amp;S programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Drawings and statements/testimonies of children (verbal expressions) on programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- New programs evaluated and documented</td>
<td>- Compendium on good practice in S&amp;S programs developed and available for practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Increased level of skills, abilities and knowledge of children attending programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training modules for the 2 alternative early learning services developed and accredited at the national level.</td>
<td>- 3 Training modules developed</td>
<td>- Training package for implementation of various models of pre-school programs for children from vulnerable groups</td>
<td>To improve quality of pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on most vulnerable</td>
<td>- In 10 S&amp;S premises created supportive and enabling environment for ECDE</td>
<td>- Project Self-evaluation Report on quality in S&amp;S programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 3 Training modules accredited</td>
<td>- Training evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- In 10 locations in S&amp;S programs implemented quality child centered practice</td>
<td>- Foto documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Applications for accreditation of 3 Training Modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality monitoring reports of Mentors in S&amp;S programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Means of verification/Documentation</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Means of verification/Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 pre-school professional staff trained for implementation of alternative services/programs.</td>
<td>No of professionals from LSGs, PI and social welfare centers trained to promote importance of ECDE. No of professionals from PI trained to develop and implement special and specialized (S&amp;S) programs.</td>
<td>- Training reports. - Training evaluation.</td>
<td>To improve quality of pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on most vulnerable.</td>
<td>Increase in knowledge of training participants/preschool teachers.</td>
<td>- Project Self-evaluation Report on quality in S&amp;S programs (with focus on improvements in teaching methodology and child centered practice in S&amp;S programme). - Report on surveys of children, parents and pre-school teachers. - Progress Narrative reports (PI to PI visits and horizontal learning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 parents and 5 parents’ associations have benefited from training on how to support children’s early development and sustain demand for quality services.</td>
<td>No of local parents groups/initiatives supported. No of trained parents.</td>
<td>- Progress and Final Narrative reports. - Photo/video documentation/ppt.</td>
<td>To improve quality of pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on most vulnerable.</td>
<td>Capacities of parents and parents associations/groups to support ECD enhanced.</td>
<td>- Project Self-evaluation Report on quality in S&amp;S programs. - Progress Narrative Reports (about peer education among parents). - Photo and video documentation about parent’s actions and local initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 – Documents Consulted during Evaluation

- Centre for Interactive Pedagogy, “Baseline Study. Project Kindergartens without Borders”, Belgrade, February 2012
- Faculty of Philosophy, Institute of Psychology, “Evaluaciona studija projekta „vrtići bez granica– više mogućnosti za učenje i razvoj dece ranog uzrasta”, Belgrade, 2013
• Ivić I., Pešikan A. and Jankov R., “Situation analysis of educational institutions network, human resources and educational statistic in Serbia”, Ministry of Education of Republic of Serbia, Belgrade, 2010
• OECD Regional Typology Directorate for Public Governance and Territorial Development, OECD June 2011
• Pavlović Babić, D., Videnović, M., Videnović, D., "Evaluation Study Project Kindergarten without Borders -- Expanding Early Learning Opportunities for Vulnerable Children", Faculty of Philosophy, Institute of Psychology, Belgrade, November 2013 (available in Serbian language)
• Republic of Serbia Government Regulation on Regional Development of Regions and Local Self-governing units for 2013
• Republic of Serbia, “Plan of Action for Children”, Belgrade, 2004
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Function</th>
<th>Institution/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNICEF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Lesley Miller</td>
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<td>UNICEF Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Tanja Rankovic</td>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>UNICEF Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Aleksandra Jović</td>
<td>Social Policy Specialist</td>
<td>UNICEF Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Anne-Maria Cukovic</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>UNICEF Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Slobodan Vapa</td>
<td>Programme Assistant</td>
<td>UNICEF Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Government of the Republic of Serbia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Gordana Cvetkovic</td>
<td>Head of School Administration Belgrade</td>
<td>School Administration Belgrade, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representative of the Coordination Body of the Network for Inclusive Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ljerka Djordjevic</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>School Administration Belgrade, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gordana Čaprić</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Institute for Education Quality and Evaluation, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Jovanka Bogdanov</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Pre-school Department, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ljiljana Marolt</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Pre-school Department, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Jelena Markovic</td>
<td>Education and Human Capital Development Coordinator</td>
<td>Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction Union (SIPRU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dusanka Stojkovic</td>
<td>Education Advisor</td>
<td>Regional School Administration, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Nena Marinkovic</td>
<td>Education Advisor</td>
<td>Regional School Administration, Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Donor organizations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Milena Vujičić</td>
<td>Focal point</td>
<td>IKEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Jelica Stojanovic</td>
<td>Project Manager IMPRES</td>
<td>EU Delegation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Lidja Miskeljin</td>
<td>Key expert on early learning</td>
<td>IMPRES project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parliamentary bodies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Desanka Radunovic</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>National Education Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Milica Vojic Markovic</td>
<td>Member of the Parliamentary Child Rights Committee</td>
<td>Parliament of the Republic of Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pre-school institutions, kindergartens and universities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Aleksandar Baical</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution/Institutional Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Dragica Pavlovic</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mirjana Cosic</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Pre-School Institution Smederevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Vladan Lazic</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Pre-School Institution Smederevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Marina Stanojevic</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Pre-School Institution Smederevo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dobrila Savić</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Kindergarten “Lipogradic”, Lipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ankica Bajićić</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Kindergarten “Lipogradic”, Lipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Violeta Popovic</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Pre-school institution Aleksinac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Valentina Petrovic</td>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>Pre-school institution Aleksinac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Marija Nedeljković</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Kindergarten “Green Bunch”, Aleksinac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Maja Bošković</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Kindergarten “Green Bunch”, Aleksinac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local Self-Governments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Grujica Veljkovic</td>
<td>Chairman of the Assembly</td>
<td>Municipality of Aleksinac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gordana Stanojevic</td>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>Centre for Social Work Aleksinac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Civil Society Organizations and Think Tanks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Olga Lakicevic</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>CIP Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dragana Koruga</td>
<td>Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>CIP Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bozidar Nikolic</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>CSO Romanipen Kragujevac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Slava Timarac-Jovanov</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>Association of Advisors and Partners of Preschool Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Snezana Djurovic</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Union of Associations of Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Sanja Drezgic Ostojić</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Red Cross Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dragana Socanin</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Network of Serbian Parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4 – Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELEVANCE - to what extent is the Project responding to the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 1</strong></td>
<td>How relevant was the strategy applied by the Project for broadening access to early learning opportunities in 10 municipalities?</td>
<td>• Alignment of the strategy for broadening access to early learning opportunities in 10 municipalities with needs and priorities identified in national and local strategies aimed to guide and advance pre-schools programmes</td>
<td>• Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for broadening access to early learning opportunities and the strategy developed by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 2</strong></td>
<td>To what extent were development of diversified pre-school programs and capacity building of pre-school teachers relevant for improving access and quality of pre-school education in Serbia?</td>
<td>• Extent to which the development of diversified pre-school programs and capacity building of pre-school teachers are in line with objectives and priorities for improving access and quality of pre-school education in Serbia</td>
<td>• Coherence between the capacity building needs for improvement of quality and provision of pre-school education in Serbia and the packages/programmes designed and implemented within the project • Recognition of developed diversified pre-school programs and capacity building of pre-school teachers in relevant documents as being priority measures for improving quality and access of pre-school education in Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 3</strong> To what extent was capacity building of local authorities on expanding pre-school services relevant for the pre-school education reform?</td>
<td>• Training courses and other capacity building activities addressed the knowledge and abilities required for the planning and expansion of pre-school network/services at local level&lt;br&gt;• Extent to which the capacity building package addressed the priorities of the local authorities to expand pre-school services as per the pre-school education reform at local level</td>
<td>• Training curriculum matches capacity building needs&lt;br&gt;• Consistency between training topics and priorities for diversification and expansion of pre-school programmes and services</td>
<td>Strategic and regulatory documents&lt;br&gt;Available training needs assessments&lt;br&gt;Training curriculum&lt;br&gt;Training courses reports (evaluations and feedback from trainees)&lt;br&gt;Interviews with key stakeholders and feedback from discussion groups&lt;br&gt;Project reports (yearly, monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 4</strong> To what extent are policy level activities relevant for the improvement of the system of preschool education in Serbia?</td>
<td>• Extent to which the policy level activities are in line with overarching objectives and priorities for improvement of preschool education system in Serbia&lt;br&gt;• Policy level activities are in line with Serbia’s international and European commitments and needs</td>
<td>• Evidence of consistency between needs and priorities for improvement of preschool education and the content of policy documents developed by the project</td>
<td>Research studies and Assessments undertaken within the project&lt;br&gt;EC Progress Reports&lt;br&gt;Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Rights of the Child&lt;br&gt;Strategy Europe 2020&lt;br&gt;Government Documents /Strategies, reports, studies and analyses&lt;br&gt;Programme documents and reports&lt;br&gt;Interviews with key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQ 5</strong> To what extent are groups of activities related to parent involvement relevant for improvement of quality of the pre-school programs?</td>
<td>• The extent to which the training, networking and mentoring of parents are consistent with the needs for empowering parents within the broader perspective of improving the relevance and quality of the pre-school programs</td>
<td>• Consistency between training topics and priorities for inclusion of parents in the process of improvement of quality of the pre-school programs</td>
<td>Strategic and regulatory documents&lt;br&gt;Available training needs assessments&lt;br&gt;Training curriculum&lt;br&gt;Training courses reports (evaluations and feedback from trainees)&lt;br&gt;Interviews with key stakeholders and feedback from focus groups with parents&lt;br&gt;Project reports (yearly, monitoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFECTIVENESS - To what extent does the Project meet the outcomes as defined by the Project Document?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQ 6                     | Have the planned results been achieved to date (quantitative and qualitative)? | • The project produced the planned outputs  
• The outputs produced the intended results (quantitative and qualitative)  
• Intended results (i) have been achieved, (ii) have been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) have not been achieved | • % outputs and results achieved (indicators)  
• Quality of outputs and results  
• The project has a well defined intervention logic, demonstrating how the outputs will produce the intended results  
• Evidence and examples of high/poor effectiveness  
• Examples of factors which contributed or hampered the effective achievement of outputs and results  
• Examples of where final beneficiaries have taken up/used the outputs made available | Project reports (annual and monitoring)  
Interviews with stakeholders, focus groups and discussion groups  
Site visits to a selected number municipalities, including interviews with end beneficiaries to the extent possible |
| EQ 7                     | To what extent has the Project contributed to the mobilisation and capacity building of selected municipalities for the improvement of pre-school education provision? | • The extent to which the project contributed to the mobilisation and capacity building of selected municipalities for improvement of pre-school education provision | • Evidence and examples of municipal initiatives for improvement of PE provision  
• No. of municipal authorities familiar with priorities and strategies for improvement of pre-school provision  
• Evidence of new decisions put to practice in order to improve PE provision  
• Evidence of pre-school institutions using programs created by the project, based on a child-centred methodology | Project reports (yearly, monitoring)  
Municipal decisions/regulations reflecting national regulations and innovative programmes  
Site visits  
Interviews with key stakeholders and discussion groups |
| EQ 8                     | To what extent has the Project contributed to expansion of physical capacities for pre-school education in 10 municipalities? | • Improved physical capacities for the pre-school education in target municipalities | • Evidence and examples of increase of physical capacities for pre-school education in 10 municipalities  
• Evidence of rural pre-school premises adapted in accordance with the  
• No. of rural pre-school premises adapted in accordance with the | Project reports (yearly, monitoring)  
Site visits to a selected number of pre-school institutions, including interviews with end beneficiaries to the extent possible  
Interviews with key stakeholders |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ 9 To what extent has the project contributed to the development of models of diversified alternative pre-school programs, their piloting and documentation?</td>
<td>Quality of models of diversified alternative pre-school programs developed with the project support</td>
<td>Requirements and standards of special programs, as well as the needs of children and families, endowed with furniture, equipment and didactic materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation of the training courses</td>
<td>Evidence of urban pre-school premises adapted in accordance with the requirements and standards of special programs, as well as the needs of children and families, endowed with furniture, equipment and didactic materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilisation of new curricula and other capacity building materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports of the MoESTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 9 To what extent has the project contributed to the development of models of diversified alternative pre-school programs, their piloting and documentation?</td>
<td>Quality of models of diversified alternative pre-school programs developed with the project support</td>
<td>No. and quality of modalities of four-hour special programs for children aged 3-5, 5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accreditation of the training courses</td>
<td>Evidence of participatory approach to development of models of diversified alternative pre-school programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utilisation of new curricula and other capacity building materials</td>
<td>Quality of models observed through piloting; no major shortcomings identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of successful/ unsuccessful results of piloted programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reports of the MoESTD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site visits to a selected number of pre-school institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus groups with teachers and parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 10 To what extent parents influenced development of new services or were strengthened to participate in further expansion of pre-school education?</td>
<td>Capacity of parents to influence the development and expansion of pre-school education</td>
<td>% of parents of children enrolled in special programs who are directly involved in creating programs, planning and implementation of activities with children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examples of successful/ unsuccessful results of initiatives led by or including parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project reports (yearly, monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with key stakeholders and feedback from focus groups with parents and teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site visits to a selected number municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 11 Has the project provided any additional (not directly planned by the Project) significant outcomes?</td>
<td>Identification and assessment of additional (planned and unplanned) outcomes</td>
<td>Evidence through examples of additional outcomes and their appraisal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Government policy reviews and reports on pre-school education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research studies and reports developed within the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</td>
<td>Judgement Criteria</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution/outcomes towards improvement of pre-school education at local and national level?</td>
<td>- The identified additional outcomes are (not) classified into positive or negative</td>
<td>- Effects (positive or negative) of identified outcomes</td>
<td>project Fieldwork investigations, including consultation with focus groups and main stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFICIENCY - To what extent did the management of the project ensure timeliness and efficient utilization of resources?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ 12</th>
<th>How well have the implementation of activities been managed? To what extent are activities implemented as scheduled? What management and monitoring tools have been used?</th>
<th>- Management of the project ensured timeliness and efficient use of resources</th>
<th>- Evidence that chosen management modalities provided for needed efficiency, timely delivery and adaptation/flexibility in project implementation</th>
<th>Project reports (annual, monitoring) Interviews with stakeholders and beneficiaries Site visits to selected projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chosen management and implementation modalities are in line with best practices of other UNICEF or donors' interventions</td>
<td>- Examples of management intervention for overcoming barriers and constraints in project implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 13</td>
<td>How well have the financial resources been used / were funds managed in a cost-effective manner / what is the correlation between funds utilized and outputs / results achieved / could the same results be achieved with less resources?</td>
<td>- Financial and human resources spent for the achievement of outputs and results</td>
<td>- Examples of project activities with a good/poor cost-effectiveness level</td>
<td>Project reports (annual, monitoring) Evaluation reports Interviews with stakeholders Focus groups and discussion groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Results could have been achieved at a lower cost (or not)</td>
<td>- Cost/unit of achieved results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Same / better results could have been achieved (or not) at same cost using other means</td>
<td>- Examples of alternative ways of minimising costs of achieving the same or better outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ 14</td>
<td>Did the project ensure co-ordination with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?</td>
<td>- Judgement will be based on the examination of: - Objectives of similar interventions - Complementarity with the project</td>
<td>- Coherence between the project and similar interventions' objectives; co-ordinated implementation schedules</td>
<td>Projects documentation Interviews with key informants Minutes of coordination meetings (if available)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Demonstrable effects of complementarity or/and overlaps, both upstream on the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation Questions (EQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQ</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 | To what extent has the project contributed to increasing the number of children from vulnerable groups benefiting from pre-school services? | - Contribution of the project to the increase of children from vulnerable groups benefiting from pre-school services  
- Services are used by families from vulnerable groups | - Quantitative evidence that the project made a visible contribution to meeting this strategic priority of reform compared to baseline numbers  
- Evidence of beneficiaries’ increased use of pre-school education services | Project documentation  
National statistics and reports  
Reports of international organisations (EC, CRC, WB, etc.)  
Research studies and assessments  
Interviews with key stakeholders  
Site visits and focus groups, feedback from end beneficiaries (to the extent possible) |
| 16 | How involvement in project/newly developed pre-school programs affected /pre-school teachers/parents/ preschool institution, local community/LSGs? | - Contribution of the project to increased involvement of community stakeholders in the development of diversified pre-school programs  
- Parents take more active role in pre-school education system  
- Pre-school teachers embrace the new models of pre-school education  
- Local community and LSGs opt for reform of pre-school education | - Quantitative evidence that the project made a visible contribution to meeting this strategic priority of reform compared to baseline numbers  
- Changes in the behaviour of parents, as end beneficiaries of the project  
- Changes in the behaviour, approaches and decisions of teachers and LSGs towards development of diversified pre-school programs | Project documentation  
Reports of international organisations (EC, CRC, WB, etc.)  
Research studies and assessments  
Interviews with key stakeholders  
Feedback from discussion groups with teachers and municipal authorities  
Feedback from end beneficiaries |

**IMPACT - To what extent has the Project increased local capacities to ensure that more children from vulnerable groups benefit from pre-school services in a way which contributes to their social inclusion?**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EQ 17. What are the effects of the alternative (special and specialized) programs in terms of benefits for children participating in the program? | ▪ The alternative (special and specialized) – programs developed with support of the project have positive effects in terms of benefits for children participating in the program (skills, abilities and knowledge)  
▪ Identified systemic barriers (administrative, institutional, financial, human resources, etc.) which reduce the identified impact of the project | ▪ Evidence and examples of positive effects and benefits of alternative programs developed with support of the project for children participating in the program (skills, abilities and knowledge)  
▪ Factors reducing the impact of projects (external and internal to the management of the project)  
▪ Risk management strategies developed and implemented | Project documentation  
Reports of international organisations (EC, CRC, etc.)  
Research studies and assessments  
Interviews with key stakeholders  
Feedback from discussion groups with teachers and municipal authorities  
Feedback from focus groups with parents  
Documentation of pre-school institutions/ kindergartens |
| EQ 18. What are the effects of the teacher training programs on other children enrolled in those kindergartens? | ▪ Skills, knowledge and attitudes of teachers acquired through teacher training programs have positive effect on other children enrolled in target kindergartens  
▪ Children enrolled in kindergarten benefit from improved skills and capacities of teachers | ▪ Evidence and examples of positive effects of increased capacities of teachers on all children in kindergartens | Interviews with key stakeholders  
Feedback from discussion groups with teachers, parents and pre-school principals  
Site visits and feedback from children (to the extent possible) |
| EQ 19. To which extent pilot PI supported other PI in development of alternative (special and specialized) programs? | ▪ Judgement will be based on the examination of the extent to which the network of pilot PI educators and expert associates and advisors spread the knowledge to other PIs.  
▪ Functioning coordination and | ▪ No. of PI educators and expert associates and advisors in pilot PIs  
▪ No. of occasions for exchange and mentoring of other PI for PI educators and expert associates and advisors | Projects documentation  
Interviews with key informants  
Minutes of coordination meetings (if available)  
Site visits and feedback from principals and teachers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>networking of PIs towards disseminating special programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABILITY</strong> - To what extent are the project outcomes achieved sustainable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| EQ 20                     | To what extent legislation in this area supports implementation and further development of services and approaches put in place by the project? |  ▪ By-laws and soft laws enabling reforms of pre-school education, particularly implementation and further development of services and approaches put in place by the project |  ▪ No. of by-laws and soft laws adopted/approved enabling reforms of pre-school education  
▪ Evidence of implementation of adopted legislation that supports implementation and further development of services and approaches put in place by the project | Relevant legal framework on pre school education in Serbia  
Project documentation  
Analytical reports by government and independent experts  
Evaluation reports  
Interviews with key stakeholders |
|                           | The extent to which professionals working with children integrate their newly acquired knowledge into regular activities to be judged by:  
- extent to which new approaches are integrated in pre-school programmes and in activities  
- level of use of teaching materials  
- availability of human resources to maintain effects in beneficiary organisations  
- further staff development planning, based on capacity building packages developed by the project, for keeping abreast with professional challenges |  ▪ No. of professionals applying new knowledge and skills in their regular activities, measured through extent of integration of new methodologies in their work practices  
▪ No. of pre-school institutions integrating new teaching methods developed by project into everyday activities | Project documentation  
Analytical reports by government and independent experts  
Evaluation reports  
Interviews with key stakeholders  
Site visits and feedback from professionals and end beneficiaries (to the extent possible) |
<p>| EQ 21                     | To what extent are new knowledge and skills integrated into regular activities of professionals working with children and their families? |            |                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions (EQ)</th>
<th>Judgement Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources and Methods for Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EQ 22 To what extent were national and local level stakeholders involved in the project design, implementation and monitoring? | • National and local level stakeholders have been actively involved in the project design, implementation and monitoring  
• Regular consultations and coordination with local and national government, CSOs operating nationally and locally | • Number & type of inputs provided by stakeholders during the project design process  
• Number and type of inputs of local level stakeholders in the implementation  
• Capacities and resources for monitoring of the project by local stakeholders, including children and parents | Project documentation  
Evaluation reports  
Interviews with key stakeholders  
Feedback from discussion groups with teachers, parents and municipal authorities |
| EQ 23 What is the likeliness that the local self-government/preschool institutions will continue financing pre-school services that target the most marginalized children? | • Provision of funds in the local budgets for running pre-school services that target the most marginalized children  
• Sufficiency of human and material resources at municipality level to continue the functioning of services | • No. of pilot special programmes where future running costs have been taken over by the municipal budgets  
• Evidence through examples of sustainable actions, continuation of project activities and goals beyond its duration | Project/contracts documents and reports  
Municipalities’ Decisions on pre-school institutions  
Municipalities’ budgets  
Interviews and discussion groups |
| EQ 24 To what extent did pre-school institutions endorse approach to improvement of quality and coverage promoted by the project? | • Preschool institutions embed the approach to improvement of quality and coverage promoted by the project in their daily routine | • No. of pre-school institutions which integrate new practices developed by the project in their work | Project documentation  
Analytical reports by government and independent experts  
Evaluation reports, interviews with key stakeholders  
Site visits and feedback from professionals |

Human rights-based approach and relevant cross-cutting issues - extent of the project outcomes’ contribution to achievement of children’s rights and how the project contributed to addressing key cross-cutting issues?

| EQ 25 | Does the project actively contribute to the promotion of child rights? |
| EQ 26 | Does the project reflect gender-mainstreaming issues? |
| EQ 27 | To what extent and how the project ensures an equity focus? Was the design of the Project ethical? How was the balance of cost and benefits to participants (including possible negative impact) considered during the Project implementation? |
Annex 5 – Guides for Interviews

General methodological notes:

Each interview, focus group and discussion group will start with the presentation of the evaluation team and of the evaluation objectives, followed by the presentation of the interlocutors. Whenever necessary, a brief presentation of the Project will be also done. The questions will be sent in advance to the people who are going to be interviewed. Interviews will last 1-1.5 hours each.

The participants in focus groups and discussion groups will be briefed in advance about the major topics to be discussed during the meeting. The focus groups will be composed of 6-8 people, while the discussion groups could be larger (around 8-12 people). The focus and discussion groups will last 1.5-2 hours each and will take place in the municipalities sampled for site visits and in-depth review.

In line with best evaluation practices, the interviews and focus groups and discussion groups will be attended only by the evaluation team and the interviewed people.

Interview Guide for UNICEF management and project staff

1. To what extent has the project achieved its intended overall objectives and outputs?
2. Please provide examples of project contribution to the attainment of its immediate objective i.e. “To increase coverage and improve quality of pre-school education for 1,500 children 3-5 years old in 10 municipalities”
3. What types of alternative pre-school programmes were most improved by the project activities?
4. Which capacity building activities and mechanisms were the most / least successful in achieving the planned results and outcomes and why? What was the effect of training delivered by the Project to: a) municipalities and service providers, b) vulnerable parents, and c) parents’ associations?
5. Did some municipalities perform better than others and why?
6. Which, if any, contextual factors (e.g. political, economic, social) have affected the work of the project and your own efforts in this area?
7. To what extent were relevant actors and stakeholders included in UNICEF’s programming and implementation, including policy advocacy processes?
8. What efforts did UNICEF undertake, and what challenges did it face in view of managing available funds efficiently?
9. Looking ahead, which of the achievements made to date are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them will require further support?
10. The project was aiming to contribute to the longer-term goal of “increasing coverage with pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on the most vulnerable”. Looking beyond the work of individual actors, how far or close do you feel Serbia currently is from that goal? What are the main bottlenecks/obstacles to achieving this goal? What should be done in the future?
Interview Guide for Institutional Partners

1. To what extent was the project aligned with explicit priorities and needs of the (national/local) government and/or your institution?
2. What positive changes has the project contributed to?
   - As regards strengthening relevant legal and policy frameworks and budgets related to reforms of pre-school education in Serbia?
   - As regards enhancing the capacity of your institution? (Please specify what capacities and how) Which capacity building activities and mechanisms were the most / least successful in enabling your institution/organization to conduct pre-school education reforms and improve access for vulnerable children?
   - As regards improving access to pre-school education for children from vulnerable groups?
   - Other changes?
3. What, if any, contextual influences (e.g. political, economic, social) have influenced the work of the project as well as your own efforts in this area?
4. To what extent were relevant actors and stakeholders included in UNICEF programming and implementation, including policy advocacy processes?
5. Looking ahead, which of the achievements made to date are likely to be sustained or expanded without further external support? Which of them would require further support?
6. What do you consider the key factors likely to support or hinder the sustainability of results?
7. The project was aiming to contribute to the longer term goal of “improvement of pre-school education system to increase coverage with pre-school education for children aged 3-5 with the focus on the most vulnerable in Serbia”. Looking beyond the work of individual actors, how far or close do you feel Serbia currently is from that goal?
8. In your view, what are the three top priorities for the continuation of reforms in the area of preschool education in Serbia? What would your role?

Guide for Discussion Groups with pre-school principals, representatives of Regional School Administrations and LSGs

Introduction
- Introduction of the consultant to the group
- Provision of information on background to the discussion group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the discussion group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The time allocated for discussion and explanation of the discussion group approach
  - Answering any questions participants may have.
Discussion

1. How do you see your role in the process of improving access to pre-school education, particularly with regards to children from vulnerable groups? What are the measures your institution took to support the process of improving access to pre-school education?

2. How did the project support your efforts? What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the project (e.g. capacity building, adaptation of space, introduction of new approaches to working with children, assisting the reform processes initiated in the community, inclusion of children from vulnerable groups in pre-school education)?

3. Would it have been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without the project?

4. Has your municipality ensured funds for continuation of models and practices initiated by the project? If yes, in what way?

5. What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them? What would your role?

End of Discussion

Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback

Guide for Focus Groups with parents

Introduction

- Introduction of the consultant to the group
- Provision of information on background to the focus group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The amount of time the discussion is anticipated to take and explanation of the focus group approach
- Answering any questions participants may have.

Discussion

1. What was your role/role of parents/parents' associations in the advocacy / process of improving access to pre-school education for your children?

2. Are you satisfied with the extent to which your ideas and views have been taken into account?

3. Are you involved in the quality monitoring of pre-school education of your children?

4. What do you think have been the benefits that the Project brought to your children?

5. Would it have been possible to achieve these changes (if any) without the project?

6. What priority needs do you still have and how could be addressed in the future?

End of Discussion

- Thanking parents for attending and giving feedback.
**Guide for Focus Groups with teachers**

**Introduction**
- Introduction of the consultant to the group
- Provision of information on background to the focus group:
  - The purpose of the discussion
  - The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
  - How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection)
  - Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
  - The amount of time the discussion is anticipated to take and explanation of the focus group approach
- Answering any questions participants may have.

**Discussion**

1. **Exploring actual learning experience**
   - Which new skills and knowledge do you retain following the trainings delivered by the Project? Do you apply new skills and approaches in your daily routine?

2. **Exploring actual changes in behaviours and attitudes of teachers**
   - What is the profile of children that you teach? (residence, education level of parents, socio-economic status of the family, Roma, children with disability)
   - How do you see your role in the process of improving access to pre-school education for children from vulnerable groups? Are you satisfied with the extent to which your ideas and views have been taken into account?
   - What do you think have been the biggest achievements of the project in terms of inclusion of children in pre-school education upon finalization of the trainings?
   - Would it be possible to achieve these changes (if any) without the project?
   - What are the challenges ahead and ways to overcome them? Do you see any particular role for you in this process?

**End of Discussion**
- Thanking teachers for attending and giving feedback.
### Annex 6 – Results Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned outputs</th>
<th>Achieved outputs</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 - Preschool facilities in 10 municipalities adapted and equipped with didactical materials</strong></td>
<td>• 11 pre-school facilities in 10 municipalities adapted and equipped with furniture, adequate equipment and didactic materials&lt;br&gt;• Courtyards of 8 project locations designed and equipped with playground equipment (swings, slides, see-saws).</td>
<td>Overly achieved (110%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 - 1,500 children from target groups covered (enrolled into) by organised early learning and care services</strong></td>
<td>• 713 children enrolled in the new programmes&lt;br&gt;• 2,500 children attending whole-day programmes benefitted through improved capacities of their teachers to apply child-centred programmes, which encourage active participation of parents.&lt;br&gt;• 4,621 children benefited of improved pre-school policies at local level through participation of principals, expert associates and LSGs reps in trainings and other events organised by the project</td>
<td>Partially achieved (47.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 - Two types of alternative preschool services developed, piloted, documented and ready for scaling up</strong></td>
<td>• 2 models developed, tested in 5 pilot municipalities and documented&lt;br&gt;• Special and specialized programmes included in the work programmes of each PI and approved by the LSG&lt;br&gt;• Manual for pre-school professionals and compilation of best practices distributed to all 160 PIs in Serbia</td>
<td>Fully achieved (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 - Training modules for the 2 alternative early learning services developed and accredited at the national level</strong></td>
<td>• 3 training modules developed and accredited at national level (54 hours of professional training)</td>
<td>Fully achieved (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 - 300 preschool professional staff trained for implementation of alternative services</strong></td>
<td>• 314 professionals benefitted of direct training for the development and implementation of alternative services</td>
<td>Overly achieved (104.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 - 500 parents and 5 parents’ associations have benefited from training on how to support children’s early development and sustain demand for quality services</strong></td>
<td>• 224 parents directly benefitted from training&lt;br&gt;• Only informal groups of parents were formed in the pilot municipalities&lt;br&gt;• 600 parents benefited from involvement in the design or implementation of programmes, meetings, and events under this project</td>
<td>Partially achieved (44.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 7 – Project Budget and Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMES</th>
<th>Approved budget May 2011 - December 2013 (USD)</th>
<th>Actual &amp; commitments (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- IKEA Foundation project budget</td>
<td>538,571</td>
<td>571,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IKEA Foundation recovery costs</td>
<td>37,687</td>
<td>37,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Sources (UNICEF contribution)</td>
<td>148,439</td>
<td>148,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE PER ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Approved budget May 2011 - December 2013 (USD)</th>
<th>Actual &amp; commitments (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A. Assessment of needs and capacities for pre-school education of 3-5 years old children

| Development of the baseline for 10 project municipalities | 9,950 |
| Presenting project to main actors and stakeholders from project municipalities | 480 |
| Development of instruments for data collection | 9,950 |
| Report development | 1,680 |
| Analysis of the access to early learning opportunities for children from marginalized groups | 360 |
| Assessment (space and equipment) in 10 project municipalities | 400 |
| Trainings for LSG | 14,979 |

Total A | 27,489 | 27,489 |

B. Development of models of new services

| Development of the two models of programmes | 2,400 |
| Training for mentors for development of models of alternative pre-school services | 15,750 |
| Building local training expertise ToT Importance of Early learning opportunities | 14,125 |
| Meeting with representatives of pilot municipalities | 6,750 |
| Expert visit to pilot municipalities | 13,800 |
| Mini grants for functioning of implementation and piloting | 31,680 |
| Monitoring and mentoring, supervision and consultative meetings | 31,680 |
| Development and publishing of the manual for implementation of alternative models | 10,600 |
| Scaling up and dissemination | 9,335 |
| Production of promotional materials | 21,000 |
| Web and media presentation | 7,895 |

Total B | 142,735 | 142,735 |

C. Development and accreditation of 2 alternative training modules

| Development of final version of two alternative models and all back up materials (training) | 31,612 |

### D. Training for 300 pre-school professional staff and 500 parents from 5 parents’ associations

| Description                                                                 | Total C |  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|--
| Dissemination of knowledge and skills by local trainers in 10 project municipalities. Training for pre-school staff on Importance of Early Years | 18,300  |  |
| Establishing Local Parents’Groups for providing Support for Children of Early Age | 3,950   |  |
| Training for parents groups and associations in pilot municipalities         | 3,540   |  |
| Providing support to parents to for their associations and initiatives      | 3,050   |  |
| Providing mini grants for parent’s actions                                  | 7,000   |  |
| Training of preschool teachers on “Models of alternative preschool services and programs” | 23,500  |  |
| Trainings on “Quality in preschool education” in 10 project municipalities   | 31,600  |  |
| Networking between parents from different municipalities and different but similar projects (meeting of representatives of parent’s groups) | 8,462   |  |
| Development and printing of materials                                       | 4,680   |  |

**Total D**  
103,082 104,082

### E. Adaptation of pre-school facilities and provision of didactic materials in 10 municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of pre-school facilities</td>
<td>118,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and didactic materials</td>
<td>28,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground equipment</td>
<td>22,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total E**  
162,183 169,364

### F. Evaluation of programme implementation and achievements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41,233</td>
<td>21,273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. Project support, technical support, office work and logistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178,676</td>
<td>185,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total  
687,010 682,212

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recovery Costs</th>
<th>37,687</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES**  
724,697 719,899

Source: UNICEF Serbia