

Final Evaluation Report

Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali



Submitted to:

**Karnali Integrated Rural Development & Research Center (KIRDARC)
Kopundol, Lalitpur, Nepal**

Submitted by:

Baikalpic Shikshya tatha Bikas Pratisthan (BSBP)
Chabahil, Kathmandu, Nepal

September 30, 2014

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Final Evaluation Team

Prof. Bidya Nath Koirala, PhD, Team Leader, Educationist, BSBP
Bhola Pd Dahal, PhD, Team Member, Child Rights Activist and Educationist
Saraswoti Bharati, PhD, Educationist, Team Member, Tribhuvan University
Bishal Bhandari, PhD Scholar, Team Member, Kathmandu University
Rajkumar Dulal, MPhil Student, Team Member, BSBP

Copyright/citation:

Dahal, B. P., Koirala, B. N., Bharati, S., Bhandari, B., & Dulal, R. K. (2014). *Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali*. KIRDARC, Kopundol, Lalitpur, Nepal and Baikल्पic Shikshya taha Bikas Pratisthan (BSBP), Chhabhil-6, Kathmandu, Nepal

**Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project**

Acknowledgement

First of all, we would like to thank senior management team of KIRDARC especially Min Bdr Shahi, Suraj Acharya, Madhav Neupane and Gobinda Shahi for entrusting us for this challenging work for final evaluation of the “Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali” project implemented in all five districts of Karnali Zone funded from European Commission. We were impressed from their keen interest and commitment to make this evaluation work more independent and qualitative so that it provides foundational grounds in shaping future course of actions.

We were overwhelmed by the friendly environment and team spirit of the KIRDARC staff in both Kathmandu and our field districts and their timely responses and logistic support. Mr. Tula Ram Pandey and Chankha Sahakari in Kalikot and Mr. Surendra Dhakal and Tika Datta Neupane in Dolpa, were safely and comfortably taking us to the different field sites and difficult terrenes. Prakash Buda, a privately hire vehicle driver had done an extremely unbelievable driving on the Rakam-Kalikot road with bumpy stones sketch.

We are indebted to students, teachers, parents and SMC/PTA representatives of Kalikot and Dolpa for openly sharing their experiences, frank opinions, future hopes and genuine commitment to improve quality of school education and to transform their society.

Special thank goes to DEOs, DCWBs, Schools and VDCs for their institutional commitment to strengthen support and cooperation to make quality education a reality. We are indebted to students, child clubs, parents, SM/PTA, and HT/teachers who were sources of the first hand information for this evaluation.

The critical views, insights and observations obtained from KIRDARC team especially from Min Bdr Shahi, Gobinda Shahi, Madhav Neupane and Suraj Acharya were useful and instrumental in the entire study. We are extremely surprised with the full commitment and inspiring support KIRDARC received from DEO of Kalikot and Dolpa. We are pleased to air out our views and observation in Kalikot through New Karnali FM.

The inputs and suggestions received from EC especially Dr. Uddhav Karki for making this report a showcase/learning tool for other country inspired us to be committed to EC for their future endeavours. On behalf of BSBP, we would like to thank Dr. Bhola Pd Dahal, Dr. Saraswoti Bharati, Ms. Anju Khadka, Mr. Bishal Bhandari and Mr. Raj Kumar Dulal for taking challenges to bring quality data and assessments from the field visit to shape this report with rich information and quality standards. Special thanks also goes to Dr. Bal Chandra Luitel, Dr. Binod Pokhrel and Ms. Milly Joshi for their distance support.

Prof. Bidya Nath Koirala, PhD
Team Leader/President of BSBP

**Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project**

Executive Summary

Relevancy and Coverage

Karnali Integrated Rural Development and Research Centre (KIRDARC) has been working on delivery of basic services including education, human rights, accountability promotion and livelihood improvement of the Karnali people since its establishment in 1999. In the last fourteen years, KIRDARC has been working with more than ten development partners on different projects guided by its periodic strategy plans. Main thrust of its work is to empower local people especially marginalized groups so that they are able to hold the local governments accountable and responsive towards the diversity and adversity of Karnali Zone. KIRDARC continuously works to create a link between the people and the government from rights based approach to development. This approach consists of human rights promotion, community empowerment, media and civil society mobilization, facilitation of development initiatives, and policy advocacy. With its continuous interventions and strong stand for marginalized people's right have resulted KIRDARC as a leading agency for change in Karnali, an obvious choice as a development partner in the region for funding and government sectoral agencies.

In addition, KIRDARC is committed to the holistic development of Karnali region. As a central player for the change in the region, KIRDARC strategically strengthens its governance structure and practices; expands its scopes; institutionalizes the good learning and practices; intensifies its relationship with partners; also to fulfill the expectation of Karnali people. In this direction, a project with KIRDARC for increasing access to education for vulnerable and marginalized groups in Karnali was a relevant, timely and appropriate choice for the European Commission.

The Project since January 2010 worked for 54 months until June 2014 in all five districts of Karnali Zone namely Dolpa, Jumla, Kalikot, Mugu and Humla. KIRDARC, through this project, positively contributed as a complementary and supplementary to school sector reform program of government of Nepal in collaboration with concerned District Education Office and local CBOs in 5 VDCs of each district. The Project reached to 3,848 children of 3-4 years age (1,865 girls, 825 dalit and 55 differently able) in 137 ECED centers and 18,571 children (9,249 girls, 3291 dalit and 325 differently able) in 116 primary schools. The Project interventions also carried out in 33 lower secondary, 17 secondary and 10 higher secondary schools to improve quality of education and school governance.

The Project directly worked with 137 child clubs (CCs) and SMCs/PTAs of working areas. The project had aimed to contribute for model building approach in some selected ECEDs and schools and initiated interventions to pilot and demonstrate improvement in student learning and quality of education through focused and comprehensive interventions in selected five ECED centres and five schools in each district.

Applied Methods/Approaches on Evaluation

This final evaluation is largely qualitative in nature in which the meaning is generated by study team through interactions, interviews, focus group discussions (FGD), observation and desk review. Evaluation matrix, together with checklist and study tools were drafted and discussed with KIRDARC Kathmandu team and also with EC representative for their inputs. Based on inputs and discussion with two study teams of BSBP, checklist and tools were finalized before field mission. The study team carried out all interviews, FGDs,

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

observations with the support from Resource Center (RC) and district level education officials, program staff of KIRDARC, SMC members, head teachers, teachers, parents and students. The guidelines and questionnaires were designed to explore meaningful results and elucidation of the study. The data, facts, figures and information collected from participants of 14 schools of four VDCs in two districts (Kalikot and Dolpa) were analyzed to produce key findings and recommendation of this evaluation as per ToR. The team's preliminary findings were shared with KIRDARC teams of Kalikot, Dolpa and Kathmandu and final draft report was presented to the Delegation of European Commission in Nepal.

The data analysis was accompanied by rigorous interaction with students, teachers, SMCs and PTA members. These interactions (FGDs and interviews) enabled the team to get learning, experiences and perceptions of the rights holders (children) and their stakeholders on the project interventions, its process and outcomes.

The collected data was compiled, transcribed and categorized according to the six outcomes of the Project. Then data were coded thematically with five dimensions of evaluation namely, relevancy, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and outcome/impact. The result areas include: identification of needs and establishment of baseline data; mainstream out of school children into regular schooling; increase access to quality ECED; improving learning achievement in primary levels; increase participation of children in school governance; and improve capacity and governance of education institutions. The themes were further sub- categorized according to the objectives of the study in different sectors and sub-sector for meaning making process. Finally, the findings and observations of the evaluation team were further categorized into good practices and learning of the Project. Key findings and information are presented in the format of tables, case study and pictorial forms for facts in the report.

Key Results Achieved Against Targets/Expected Results

The Project had six outcomes to achieve during the Project period. The summary of target and achievement in each objective are as follows:

Expected Result 1:

Achievement: Out of 176 school units in project areas, 82 schools carried out school self-assessment (SSA) and are preparing school improvement plans (SIP) based on the SSA. Out of 14 schools we visited, SSA and SIP was seen only in three schools. Schools do not continue SSA and update SIP process annually, as they are not mandatory for government funding and support from local government. Support from education authorities and agencies like KIRDARC do not restrict their support only for SIP interventions. The age specific data of students was prepared in 137 schools and 50 ECED centers through CEMIS process, which was helpful to find out of school children. This has led all five DEOs to make education mapping of district before taking any decisions related to schools such as allocation of building construction, teachers' quota and approval of schools.

Expected Result 2:

Achievement: 10 VDCs (out of 25 Project VDCs) declared as 100% enrollment of 3-4 years age children in ECDCs. All 137 ECED centers (11 new ECED centers established during project period) are school based and serving to 3, 848 children (*against the target of 7,000*). ECDC facilitators were trained once for 3 days and learning materials were

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

provided from KIRDARC. Because of the changed government decision to operate the ECED centers within the schools, the ECEDs are running as pre-primary schools applying rote-learning system. ECED centers are guided from pedagogical processes of schools that are teacher centric and content oriented. With the intervention of KIRDARC Nepal, some of the ECEDs have conducted the intensive discussion with parents to make aware them on the good parenting and importance of ECED for children's overall development and learning. Few model ECED centers have organized monthly parents meeting on children's health and sanitation issues. Parenting education in ECED centers has not been a regular phenomenon.

Expected Result 3:

Achievement: KIRDARC conducted 50 alternative education classes for 1,164 Children (9 to 14 years of age) in 2010 and 2011. Out of them, only 676 (50.7%) children completed the class and 517(76 %) of them enrolled in the formal grades in schools. There are still overage children studying in early primary grades. Teachers take inflating student number is beneficial for school getting per child fund (PCF) to recruit local teachers as most of them do not have teachers' quota. The continuous low pass rate of students from grade one to two (less than one third) in Kalikot raised questions of fake students as well as poor understanding among teachers on right to education and continuous assessment system. Child clubs have started doing follow up on the regularity of students in few schools.

Expected Result 4:

Achievement: 12 VDCs have declared 100% school children of (5-9 years of age) enrolled VDCs, however there is a need to establish the regular out of children tracking mechanism and also monitoring the regular attendance of children. Schools are practicing to keep multiple records of the students and there is less practice of analyzing the education indicators i.e. NER, drop out and repetition rate, learning achievement and promotion rate. Flash report is for DEO, CEMIS for NGOs like KIRDARC, mid-day meal record for school expenditure. Thus, exam record gives a sound basis for measuring performance of each grade. Head Teachers and SMC give more focus on infrastructure development and teacher recruitment, rather than the learning achievement. Children and child clubs are a part of school enrollment campaign each year. Each lower secondary and secondary school has a child club and their representatives are in SMC meeting from a tokenistic perspective following a circular issued by DEO with an initiative of KIRDARC. Very few children and child club members are trained on their rights and roles in schools and communities, however none of them has annual plan and actions.

Expected Result 5:

Achievement: KIRDARC reports 46 schools declared as the school as zone of peace. The stakeholders have taken the initiation positively. The stakeholders felt a need to strengthen mechanism in measuring progress regularly against indicators as per the national guideline to sustain the movement. Out of 176 schools, 121 schools have functional code of conduct and updating it annually. Parents, teachers, SMC, PTA and school children have been following the code of conduct that they have updated for their school. Compulsory ID cards for students, no corporal punishment by teachers, schools visiting by parents are some of the examples of functional code of conduct in the school that were exercised. It was noteworthy that DEO has issued circulate to all schools in Kalikot as a local norms to represent child club members in SMC meeting as an invitee.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Expected Result 6:

Achievement: In all working schools, social audits/ public hearings take place annually. Very few social audits include social, academic and economic aspects of schools. All 25 VDCs collaborated with KIRDARC for infrastructure development, which indicates the local authority giving focus to education. Local bodies are less responsible for delivering education service more qualitative and responsive, as they do not invest for quality education. The Project was successful to declare 100% primary students' enrolment in 12 VDCs against its target of 10. However, this does not include any VDC in Jumla and Kalikot. Due to difficult topography and deeply rooted socio-cultural values, differently able children are mostly out of school. Project does not have specific interventions to bring these children into education.

Conclusion

KIRDARC was a right partner for quality education project in Karnali having appropriate experiences, networking and internal management system. Project as such was relevant and appropriate in Karnali context where marginalized children had poor access to quality education, and education services delivery mechanism was weak. Project was efficient and effective in term of improving education services in working areas from transactional approach and was less focused from transformational approach in producing and sustaining results.

All ECED centers are school based had have female facilitators. Most of them are not functioning as per norms and guidelines issued by DOE in improving quality of learning process due to lack of sufficient facilities in the center, poor training to facilitators and not having technical support and follow-up from district authorities. Most of these facilitators are not getting refresher training each year. There is a high turnover (one third) among facilitators. The newly recruited facilitators have not received any training from DEO since last 3 years. KIRDARC provided training, orientation; learning materials and kit box in few selected ECED centers.

Local communities and education authorities are focusing still on enrollment, not in improving classroom learning except some trained teachers from the project who are using the skills and materials in classroom. SMC and HTs are paying priority on infrastructures development and teacher recruitment, with less focus on classroom pedagogy and learning materials. There is a mid-day meal provision to all students of ECED centers and primary schools, which is paid in cash for parents.

Child friendly schooling framework has not been available and understood by local education stakeholders. Schools and education authorities are yet to promote nine elements and all set of indicators provisioned in the guideline for quality education. However, ECED centers and schools have yet to build linkages with nearby health-post for making regular health checkup of students and providing first aid services. School has to start making washing and cleaning classes every week with all students so that they have clean cloth, haircut and proper sanitation.

Children's abuse, exploitation, discrimination and violence have less priority in the agenda of SMC and PTA as well as of education authorities. The child clubs have been formed in each lower/secondary school. KIRDARC provides support to few selected child clubs and their VDC level networks for extracurricular activities and training. However there is a need

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

to support in formulating annual plan of child clubs and their affiliation to DCWB for sustainability. The team felt to organize interactions between children and child clubs and between child clubs and schools for better learning.

Recommendations

Single Data based management

- Support and strengthen single data based management system owned and managed by schools and education authorities

ECED

- Coordinate and support for facilitators' basic training to each facilitator and also provide refresher training at least once a year.
- Initiate regular health-check up for children of ECED and early grades in collaboration with VDCs and health posts for de-worming, immunization, weight measurement etc
- Introduce practical knowledge and skills of health education, personal hygiene, sanitation and nutrition to children and parents regularly through mobilizing teachers, women health volunteers and VDC social mobilizers

Minimum learning environment/enabling conditions in ECED and schools

- Collaborate/cooperate with local stakeholders and authorities to ensure minimum provisions of sitting arrangement, drinking water and sanitation facilities including separate toilet for girls, fencing walls and play grounds in each ECED/school
- Introduce practical implementation of national framework on child friendly schooling for quality education with proper orientation, teacher training and material support
- Provide school based training to locally hired teachers on child centric and child friendly methodologies and continuous assessment system based on curriculum, teachers' guide, and also introduce English medium of instruction

Partnership with student and parents for quality learning

- Facilitate and strengthen child club in each school and continuously organize child rights training to students, parents and teachers by linking them with VDCs and DDCs in cooperation with DCWB
- Engage child club members into SMC/PTA for SIP and school calendar preparation and implementation with proper communication mechanism to each grade students
- Institutionalize and strengthen school self-assessment and social audit tools for students' learning enhancement and school governance improvement

Project management for better results

- Strengthen project monitoring and quality technical support for field staff and local institutions from KIRDARC management team towards expected results
- Document and disseminate implementation level issues in education sectors and better utilize KIRDARC's network and funding agency for policy advocacy at central level and for cross learning among education institutions
- Scale up good practices and transactional approaches of this project into transformational approaches of model building exercise focusing on quality improvement of public education, internal efficiency of education institutions with participatory governance and engagement of parents and students in school management.

**Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	iv
Relevancy and Coverage.....	iv
Applied Methods/Approaches on Evaluation	iv
Key Results Achieved Against Targets/Expected Results	v
Conclusion	vii
Recommendations.....	viii
Table of Contents	ix
Acronyms	x
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Boxes.....	xi
Introduction	2
Objective of the Evaluation	3
Evaluation Methods and Approaches	4
Evaluation Design.....	4
Field Data Collection	5
Data Collection Tools and Techniques	5
Quality Standards.....	6
Data Analysis and Interpretation	6
Ethical Standard	7
General Findings of the Evaluation	7
Assessment of Project Outcomes	9
Overall Evaluation of Project	12
Relevancy.....	12
Efficiency.....	14
Effectiveness	15
Sustainability.....	16
Value for Money	16
Implementation Status of Educational Policies in Karnali	17
Governance and Accountability of Education Stakeholders	19
Conclusion and Recommendation	21
Conclusion	21
Overall Recommendation	23
References	26
Annexure	27
Annexure 1: Term of Reference for the Final Evaluation	27
Annexure 2: Evaluation Matrix for Access to Education Project in Karnali.....	32
Annexure 3: Checklist for Interview with different stakeholders.....	33
Annexure 4: Key Leading Question for FGD.....	35
Annexure 5: List of Schools and People Met	36
Annexure 6: Expected Result, its indicators and achievement:.....	37

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Acronyms

BSBP	Baikalpic Shikshya tatha Bikas Pratisthan
CC	Child Clubs
CFLG	Child Friendly Local Governance
CFS	Child Friendly School
CP	Child Participation
CRO	Child Rights Officer
CWDO	Children and Women Development Office
DCWB	District Child Welfare Board
DDC	District Development Committee
DEO	District Education Office
DOE	Department of Education
DPHO	District Public Health Office
ECED	Early Childhood Education and Development
EFA	Education for All
GoN	Government of Nepal
HP	Health Post
HT	Head Teacher
KIRDARC	Karnali Integrated Rural Development and Research Centre
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOE	Ministry of Education
PTA	Parents Teachers Association
RC	Resource Center
RP	Resource Person
SIP	School Improvement Plan
SLC	School Leaving Certificate
SMC	School Management Committee
SS	School Supervisor
SSRP	School Sector Reforms Program
SZOP	School as Zone of Peace
VDC	Village Development Committee

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

List of Tables

Tables

Table 1. Project Coverage (ECED centers and Schools)	03
Table 2. Overall Promotion Rate in 5 Sampled Schools	15
Table 3. Distribution of Cost in Working Districts	16
Table 4. Implementation Status of Educational Policies	17
Table 5. Functionalities of Education Stakeholders	19

List of Boxes

Boxes

Box 1. Vision and Mission of KIRDARC	01
Box 2. Quality Education Possible even in Karnali	08
Box 3. Child Clubs for Better School Environment	11
Box 4. Improvement in ECED centers	13
Box 5. Active Teacher Makes Active Learning	14

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Introduction

Karnali Integrated Rural Development and Research Center (KIRDARC) since its establishment in 1999 has been recognized as a leading agency for change in Karnali, an obvious choice as a development partner in the region. Through its active and constant engagement with communities and collaboration and coordination with other development partners, KIRDARC has set an example of right-based development model: human rights promotion, community empowerment, media and civil society mobilization, development initiatives facilitation, and policy advocacy.

KIRDARC primarily focuses its efforts in the development of Karnali region, however, it adopts the strategies that go beyond the regional focus, and are linked to national and international issues and processes. It brings regional issues up to national and international forums in order to draw the attention of national and international stakeholders. In this way, KIRDARC bridges between Karnali and Kathmandu (capital city); and beyond. KIRDARC abides national and international human rights laws, principles and norms; and, operates drawing references and guidelines from international human rights movements.

As a central player for the change in the region, KIRDARC strategically strengthens its governance structure and practices; expands its scopes; institutionalizes the best practices; intensifies its relationship with partners; also to fulfill the expectation of Karnali people from KIRDARC.

Karnali is seen in the context of: 1) lack of understanding of human rights among the people, 2) unaccountable governance, 3) untapped human and natural resources, 4) lack of capable development catalyst and concerted efforts for Karnali development. However, national context: political, economic and social, has direct bearing on Karnali development. Thus, core values of KIRDARC for this strategy phase will be, i) all rights for all, ii) institutional good governance, iii) plurality and diversity, iv) promoting democratic institutions and practices, v) respect to and recognize potentiality and diversity of Karnali region, and, vi) believes in co-creation and innovation. KIRDARC's mission, vision and goals, thus rest on these core values, which are followed by the operation plan and a Logical Framework.

In addition, KIRDARC is committed to the holistic development of Karnali region. Therefore, it has an added responsibility to carry on the broader notion of human rights, that includes ESCR and rights to development and dignified life and deepen the value of non-discriminatory practices in the region, at the same time, delivering basic services for survival of the people, and working as a catalyst for the change in the region.

As the means to achieve the vision, mission and goal, KIRDARC prioritizes four specific objectives with 10 strategic objectives for the five-year period that starts from January 2014. The Specific objectives for KIRDARC for the period of 2014-2018 are: (1) to improve human right situation in relation to civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, (2) to promote inclusive democratic practices in the workings of all institutions and organizations, and create capacity for peaceful social transformation, (3) to improve livelihoods and living

Box: 1

The Vision

"All human being equally enjoy fundamental human rights in a just and prosperous society"

The mission

"Enable people and communities to claim and exercise their human rights, including the right to be free from poverty and neglect"

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

condition of people through multi-stakeholder's engagements as well as humanitarian assistance at all level, (4) to enhance institutional capacity development for better and greater change at large.

KIRDARC as a leading development actor and human rights defender in the region, with support from its 10 major development partners, is carrying out several integrated community-centered development activities, which have directly contributed to the livelihood and overall improvement of Karnali people. About 280,000 people are getting direct and indirect benefits from numbers of KIRDARC-implemented initiatives.

KIRDARC not only works for Karnali region, but all its general assembly members and executive committee members represent from the Karnali region. In its staff recruitment processes, preference is given to the people from the region, provided that they meet required qualification. Currently, KIRDARC has 174 staff with diversified knowledge, skills and experiences; and most of the field staffs also represent from that region.

Table 1: Project Coverage (ECED centers and Schools)

District	Schools in Project Area					VCPC	Child Club	Youth clubs	TEC	VEC
	PS	LS	SS	HSS	ECD					
Dolpa	21	2	4	1	28		23	22	39	1
Humla	21	7	2	2	19	1	22	0	40	0
Jumla	26	9	4	2	29	22	41	5	52	5
Kalikot	28	11	5	4	32	5	25	16	0	5
Mugu	20	4	2	1	29	5	21	7	5	5
Total	116	33	17	10	137	33	132	50	136	16

A Project since January 2010 was implemented by KIRDARC for 54 months in Karnali Zone until June 2014 in all five districts namely Dolpa, Jumla, Kalikot, Mugu and Humla. KIRDARC, through this project, positively contributed as a complementary and complementary to school sector reform program of government of Nepal through five District Education offices and five local NGOs in 25 VDCs. The Project reached to 3,848 children of 3-4 years age (1,865 girls, 825 dalit and 55 differently able) in 137 ECED centers and 18,571 children (9,249 girls, 3291 dalit and 325 differently able) in 116 primary schools. The Project interventions also carried out in 33 lower secondary, 17 secondary and 10 higher secondary schools. The Project directly worked with 137 CCs and SMCs/PTAs of working areas.

Objective of the Evaluation

The overall objective of final evaluation is to evaluate the achievement of the project results/outcomes. The evaluation has the following specific objectives, but not limited to:

1. assess project outcomes with the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation as a supplement and complement to the education system and institutions; and
2. evaluate sustainability of project outcomes in terms of relevancy, synergy, replication and scaling up.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

The purpose of the “Final Evaluation” is to evaluate the achievements of project results, record lessons learned, assess the sustainability of the project results and enable the dissemination of the lessons learned ([see Annexure 1 Term of Reference of the Evaluation](#))

Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation of access to education for vulnerable and marginalized groups in Karnali project was done against its outcomes and outputs as mentioned in the KIRDARC’s proposal to EC. Since, the Project started in 2010, the evaluation team concentrated on to evaluate the process, outputs and outcomes of the project on the following theme:

- Relevancy of the Project: in what extent the Project activities are relevant to the local need and context of community and education stakeholders;
- Effectiveness of the Project: how effective is the Project intervention in improving access and quality of school education in the context of Karnali;
- Efficiency of the Project: how efficiently the Project activities are being implemented to achieve the purpose and goal.
- Sustainability of the Project: what sort of provisions, mechanism has been developed to sustain the Projects interventions and its benefits in long run.
- Value of money: Comparing cost with perceived contribution from beneficiary and local education stakeholders.

Evaluation Methods and Approaches

The approach of this evaluation is mainly qualitative from first hand information from students, parents, teachers and education authorities which is supported by the already published facts and figures for exploring results, outcomes, good practices and lesson learnt in community schools of Kalikot and Dolpa districts of Karnali Zone. This approach helped to explore beneficiary’s feelings and attitudes towards access to quality education project in Karnali under EC funding. In addition, the evaluation involved digging out the perception of DEO, SMC, PTA, head teacher/teacher and child clubs member towards ensuring access of marginalized children to quality of education.

The analysis of key findings and recommendations in this evaluation is largely interpretative in nature in which the results and outcomes are assessed through interactions, interview, focus group discussion (FGD), observation and perceptions of participants and desk review ([See annexure two Study Matrix](#)). All check list and study tools were drafted and discussed with KIRDARC team for their inputs. The evaluation team carried out all interviews, FGDs, observations with the support from KIRDARC field staff in Kalikot and Dolpa districts.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation is qualitative in nature with quantitative data from project reports. The qualitative data collected from field observation, in-depth interview ([See Annexure 3 Check list for Interview with different stakeholders](#)) and FGD ([See Annexure 4 Key Leading Question for FGD](#)), which are supported by desk review. The checklist and guidelines were designed as suggested by Flick (2010) to produce meaningful result and elucidation of the study. The data, facts, and figures associated with ECED centers and primary schools were analyzed to produce implementation status of educational policies in working areas.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Field Data Collection

Data collected through primary sources and desk review of the secondary data. The primary source of data collection consisted of observation of site, in-depth interview with the key persons and FGDs with them. The day-to-day activities and the teaching-learning process of selected schools were also closely observed and analyzed. Primary data were collected in two phases from two districts as follows:

- **Kalikot District/Phase I:** A two-member evaluation team made a field visit during September (5-14) 2014. During the field mission the team was able to visit nine schools of Raku and Mehalmodi VDCs of Kalikot and interacted with students, parents, teachers and SMCs/PTAs. The team also observed school premises including teacher office and classrooms and its surrounding including toilets, library and drinking water facilities. The team carried out four FGDs with teachers, 2 FGDs with students, two with child clubs, five FGD with SMCs/PTAs representatives. The team also reviewed school data and files such as i) SMC, PTA and Staff meeting minutes; ii) flash report and mid-day meal record; iii) CEMIS, SIP and SSA; iv) examination records; v) financial and social audit reports; and vi) monitoring and feedback records.
- **Dolpa/Phase II:** The second team of BSBP made a field mission to Dolpa in September (13-22) 2014. This visit was crucial for finding first hand information, facts and figures. Rigorous field visit was carried out to collect data in five sample schools of two VDCs. In-depth interviews and FGDs were conducted with the children, parents, teachers, SMC/PTA and education officials separately.

After completion of field visits, the team met and interacted with DEO officials. The evaluation team also interacted with project team and KIRDARC officials after going through the project documents and archive in the district.

Secondary data were collected by desk study and documents review. Different relevant articles, books, journals, research reports, periodicals, magazines, newspapers and other relevant documents of various organizations including from KIRDARC available in print version and in the internet were reviewed.

Data Collection Tools and Techniques

Primary data and information were collected through observation, in-depth interview, and FGD with HTs, SMC/PTA. The questionnaires/guide lines and observation sheet were developed for collection of qualitative data.

1. **Observation:** Observation was an important tool in evaluating the education in pre-primary and primary education in schools. Studying situation of the students was fundamental. The observation was primarily vital in examining the current pattern and live scene of the study areas (Flick, 2012). The team visited 14 selected schools and interacted with multiple participants of education. This made us able to closely observe their feelings, emotions and psychology that students, parents and teachers perceive from work environments. The team was also able to identify the different aspects that the need and challenges of the schools are currently facing.
2. **In-depth Interviews:** The evaluation was largely based upon the open in-depth interview with 20 key informants interview. Interview was a major source of data collection. The team members visited various schools to discover and have clear findings and understating about the result of KIRDARC's work. The team members had

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

crucial role in building close relationship with the participants to make them comfortable during the study in order to find more detailed information.

3. **Focus Group Discussions:** Focus group discussion was another important tool used in the data collection process. A total of 12 FGDs were carried out. Two approaches, homogeneous and heterogeneous FGDs, were carried out with multiple stakeholders to maintain the integrity of information and facts. A total of seven homogeneous and five heterogeneous FGDs were conducted with more than 100 educational stakeholders including students, parents, teachers and educational officials. FGDs were found very useful in data collection process. The interaction made clearer for any plans and projects in future to tackle the educational issues in Karnali. (See Annexure 5 List of Schools Visited and People Met)
4. **Desk Review:** Initial stage of desk review was to collect key documents and information about the Project from KIRDARC. The main focus of the document was comparing the proposal with annual report of KIRDARC submitted to EC. Materials published by KIRDARC, DEOs, different NGOs were reviewed to identify different process of child right based learning. Materials required for the study is collected through Internet, libraries, and journals and different achieves from KIRDARC office.

Quality Standards

Quality standard in qualitative method determines the validity of findings. To maintain the quality standard of evaluation extensive document review of different relevant articles on the area published in local and national and international newspaper, journals, books and websites were referred. The preliminary findings from one group of informants (like school) was verified and triangulated with other group of informants (like DEO).

The analysis of outcomes was accompanied by rigorous field visit with close aid and support of students, head teachers/teachers, parents, SMC, PTA, local community members, KIRDARC officials, civil society and government officials. It enabled the team to closely work with children in identifying the results of KIRDARC work in quality education, their expectation and issues relating to the issues during data collection phase. It is already mentioned that the field visit was conducted in two phases/two districts with the support of KIRDARC in Kathmandu.

To maintain the quality and integrity of the evaluation, data were collected applying standard tools. Guidelines/questionnaires were distinctly prepared for qualitative information. Finally, the evaluation matrix was designed and explored the context-based modality for assessing the gaps between policies and practices including perceptions, opinions and learning of school stakeholders including local peoples on project outcomes.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This evaluation is based upon the qualitative information supported by desk review, field mission and facts to produce meaningful interpretation of the study. Firstly, the raw data were compiled, transcribed and categorized according to the nature. Then data were coded thematically with six broader programme interventions areas of the Project. They are: i) Baseline establishments; ii) access to ECED; iii) enroll out of school children into schooling; iv) improving quality of education; v) increase child participation; and, vi) better school governance and management.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

The themes were further sub- categorized according to the objectives of the evaluation in different sectors and sub-sector for result measuring process. These processes were substantiated by already established and published information related to the Project. Finally, the already explored ideas of the area were linked and analyzed for innovation and good practices. Such information was then presented in the format of diagrams, tables and pictorial forms for facts in report.

Ethical Standard

The ethical principle serves to keep the pride, rights, wellbeing and safety of every informant without harming others. Ethical issues in qualitative methods are more subtle (Bryman, 2008). These issues are often closely associated with interviewing and participant observations, which are characteristics of qualitative or field methodology. Within this essence, evaluation team maintained and followed the ethical rules of confidentiality; do no harm, anonymity etc.

To maintain the ethics during the study, the team visited different areas and people with the permission of schools and notified District Education Office (DEO). The help and support extended by school members was motivating factor during field visit. The evaluation was carried out rigorous fieldwork with active involvement of all participants. The evaluation does not affect any of the informants in any way. All the participants' emotions, feelings and sentiments were clearly understood and respected before seeking any other information. All the informants were given equal opportunities to participate during discussions. During interviews, team members also provided conducive environment to draw more information when anyone was uncomfortable.

General Findings of the Evaluation

A general awareness about education is for getting jobs among the parents and high prevalence of illiteracy also constitute a big obstacle for educating children. Faced with serious challenges in maintaining their livelihood, many parents take their children out of school to help with household, agricultural and wage work. The remoteness of the settlements and limited availability of resources and learning materials are hampering the provision of free and quality education to all the children.

The number of the teachers (government quota teachers and teachers recruited by the schools) is not enough to guarantee at least three teachers per primary schools as required in the SSRP and Educational Act [100 primary schools, 60 lower secondary schools and 20 secondary schools in Kalikot alone do not have a single teacher quota (permanent and relief)]. Most of PCF and locally hired teachers do not have teaching license. Both DEO and KIRDARC prioritize permanent and relief teachers in their training and workshop. None of PCF and locally hired teachers receives training.

There is a strong need to have school based training targeting to all teachers of school so that some changes take place in student learning. KIRDARC provided ATL for a teacher in each school once during Project period with regular follow up meeting with the trained teacher to transfer the skill into classroom. Most of schools we visited have difficulties to implement child friendly teaching learning process because of the poor enabling conditions and very less number of teachers even having the orientation, training on child friendly schooling concepts. DEOs have not incorporated this into teacher professional

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

development as a part of SSRP. Interestingly there were almost half of students were girls in schools and about 45% in ECED centers.

All schools have both formed SMCs and PTAs but most of PTAs are not functional and do not organize their own meeting. PTA chair and few members are invited in SMC meeting. SMC members lack the skills to ensure a proper school autonomy and child friendly school management and they often confer all the responsibilities to the head Teacher. Most of SMC/PTA members and HTs pay attention in adding physical infrastructure and teachers in school. Chair and a selected member of SMC had received the orientation on their role and responsibility from KIRDARC however they are not focusing on their roles on teaching learning process.

All the schools have done financial audit of 3 years once in last year and social audit up to last fiscal year. However quality of social audit is limited to approving income and expenditure of school. Most of the schools once updated the CEMIS data, but very few of them are regularly updating those data for educational planning. Similarly, they have developed the SIP through SSA; however the SIP are mostly using only for getting the regular resources from district education office, not for proper development of school with using that SIP. It was reported that the VEC were formed in all five target VDCs in each district but evaluation team did not find a single VEC active and fulfilling their roles. Most of the children are from marginalized and disadvantage groups including Dalit, who are facing many challenges in terms of accessing quality education services, livelihood, development aid and participation in governance.

KIRDARC's contribution is to create the movement to aware the educational community with minimum support to all the schools i.e. infrastructure, materials, training, orientation. This spread support leads difficult to measure the outcomes in quality education. Quality education issues have just been entered into education system and its stakeholders. Because of the less number of project staffs compared to the number VDCs and hard topographic situation inputs to schools and education stakeholders from KIRDARC on social mobilization, education service delivery and quality improvement in classroom pedagogy is minimal. Education stakeholders at school levels are not familiar with different

Box: 2

Quality Education Possible even in Community School of Karnali

Masta Saraswoti School was established in 1989 as primary and upgraded to lower secondary in 2009 and to secondary level in 2012 in Raku VDC of Kalikot. The school has ten teaching staff including three primary teachers from DEO for 350 students from grade one to 10. School has a good school premises with a nice playground and compound. SMC takes final decision on teachers' recruitment with inputs from students and child club.

The school starts at 630 am with remedial classes to grade 10 students. School runs parade and chants national anthem and ECA in each assembly by students. The school has adopted English medium of instruction on its own up to grade 5 with floor sitting arrangement. ECED center is established with parents support.

Learning achievement of each grade is above 60% with more than 90% pass rate. School has more than 90% results in SLC with distinction. Students are vocal, confidence and disciplined on their students and social work in communities.

In addition to SMC, PTA and child club engage in school management and governance functions including in school improvement plan, yearly education calendar and social audit of the school. With parents' active support, teachers' teamwork, HT's leadership and active involvement of child clubs and children, quality education is possible even in community schools of Karnali.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

education policies and plan including SSRP provisions and less aware about child friendly approaches and methodologies, as education authorities did not prioritize this.

The classroom's health and sanitation situation among the visited pre-primary/ECED and schools was poor. All primary schools in Karnali have mid-day meal provision that brings children regularly in classrooms. However, personal and environment health and hygiene of each student and school is not prioritized. Schools not focused by KIRDARC, children are playing in dusty rooms and playgrounds with dirty clothes. Children of ECED centers and early grades in all schools need more practical knowledge and skills for personal health, hygiene and environment sanitation.

There were almost all enrollments of children in 14 visited schools from its catchment areas. KIRDARC was instrumental that marginalized and girl children of school going age group were enrolled in primary schools. KIRDARC has initiated good sitting arrangement and few learning materials for early grade students though there is a need to maximize the facilities to create child friendly learning environment with learning materials and play toys in the classroom.

School based child club are formed linking them to the VDC level child club network with minimum orientation on their roles and responsibilities. There is an 11-15 member executive committee in each child club. Leaders of child club do not communicate with students of each grade about their work and issues. They conduct few extracurricular activities when they get support from KIRDARC. Most of the child clubs of working areas in both districts are affiliated to district child welfare board.

KIRDARC was able to maintain a cordial relationship with all the stakeholders in the education sector in Karnali. Coordination with the DEO and district stakeholders was praiseworthy. It was able to make the DEO a part of this project and they are now more responsible towards the development of education system. Regular meetings were found to be effective at district level. There is a need to have better communication, cooperation and collaboration between schools and DEO bridging by NGOs like KIRDARC.

Assessment of Project Outcomes

The Project had six outcomes to achieve during the Project period. The assessment of outcomes delivered by Project is shown in [Annexure 6 Progress Against Expected Results](#). The summary of target and achievement in each objective are as follows:

Expected Result 1: Establish Educational Data System

1. **Target:** Needs of the educational institutions and communities identified and CEMIS and baseline information established.
2. **Interventions:** Project carried out series of interventions in working areas. This includes: i) Development and periodic updating of CEMIS; ii) Needs assessment of school, teachers and school community; iii) School Self Assessment contributing to development of School Improvement Plans; iv) Establishment of base line information; and v) Establish education Database System at school and district level. Out of these, CEMIS and SSA were effective.
3. **Achievement:** Out of 176 school units in project areas, 82 schools carried out school self-assessment (SSA) and 82 schools are preparing school improvement plans (SIP). However, SSA and SIP has not been internalized in schools. Support

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

from education authorities and agencies like KIRDARC are based on SIP in selected schools. The age specific data of students was prepared in 137 schools and 50 ECED centers. This has led all five DEOs to make education mapping of district before taking any decisions related to schools such as allocation of building construction, teachers quota and approval of schools.

Expected Result 2: Increase Access to Quality ECED centers (3,848 against 7,000)

1. **Target:** 7,000 children of 3-4 years enrolled and experiencing conducive environment in community initiated ECDCs.
2. **Interventions:** Project carried out interventions like i) training to parental education facilitators; ii) parental education classes; iii) *enrollment campaigns*; iv) Training to ECDs Facilitators; v) Infrastructure support to ECDs including setting of class room with community participation; vi) Production of local materials and external material support to ECDs; vii) Training, orientation to ECDMC; and viii) Mobile meetings of ECD facilitators as a part of cross learning.
3. **Achievement:** 10 VDCs (out of total 25 Project VDCs) declared as 100% enrollment of 3-4 years age children in ECDCs. There are 137 ECED centers (11 new ECED centers established in project areas) for 3, 848 children (45% girls). Few ECDC facilitators were trained and learning materials were provided from KIRDARC. However, rote learning system prevails in most of the ECED centers as they follow the school practices and are not well trained and refreshed each year. Parenting education in ECED centers was introduced at the beginning from project but was not continued. However some ECED centers with the support from KIRDARC have six learning corners.

Expected Result 3: Mainstreaming OSC into schooling

1. **Target:** 1,000 out of school children (OSC) of 9-14 years mainstreamed in formal classes after completing AEP classes
2. **Interventions:** Activities under this result area includes: i) training AEP facilitators (especially girls and youths); ii) conduct AEP classes; iii) AEP graduates enrolled in appropriate grades; and iv) follow-up for AEP graduates in schools. There was less follow up and support mechanism when children were enrolled in schools.
3. **Achievement:** KIRDARC conducted 50 alternative education classes for 1,164 Children (9 to 14 years of age) in 2010 and 2011. Out of them, only 676 (50.7%) children completed the class and 517 (76%) of them enrolled in the formal grades in schools. There are still overage children studying in early primary grades. The continuous low pass rate of students from grade one to grade two is still a challenge for implementation of continuous assessment system.

Expected Result 4: Improve quality of learning (18,517 against 22,000)

1. **Target:** Increased participation of 22,000 children of 5-9 years and above including Dalits, ethnic and vulnerable groups resulted in increased NER, retention rate, learning achievement, promotion and primary cycle completion rate.
2. **Interventions:** The project carried out door-to-door campaigns, mass meetings, interactions, rallies, welcomes cards, training to teachers, exchange visit of teachers and SMC members into neighboring schools, infrastructure support including setting of class room with community participation, mobile meetings of teachers as cross learning and follow up of training in coordination with DEOs, SMC and head teachers and achievement test for measuring the improvements in the

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

learning. Enrollment and mobile meetings were noted as effective interventions of the project. There was less focus on quality improvements in schools.

3. **Achievement:** 10 VDCs have declared 100% schoolchildren of (5-9 years of age) enrolled VDCs, however there is a need to establish the regular out of children tracking mechanism. Schools are practicing to keep multiple records of the students and there is less practice of analyzing the education indicators i.e. NER, drop out and repetition because of the less number of teacher compared to the requirement. Head Teachers and SMC give more focus on infrastructure development and teacher recruitment, rather than the learning achievement. Flash report is for DEO, CEMIS for NGOs like KIRDARC, mid-day meal record for school expenditure. Thus, exam record gives a sound basis for measuring NER, drop out and repetition rate and promotion rate of each grade. Children and child clubs are a part of school enrollment campaign each year. Each lower secondary and secondary school has a child club and their representatives are in SMC meeting from a tokenistic perspective following a circular issued by DEO with an initiative of KIRDARC. Very few children and child club members are trained on their rights and roles in schools and communities, however none of them has annual plan and actions of their operation.

Expected Result 5: Children participation in school management

1. **Target:** Increased participation of children in school governance in creating safe and supportive environment.
2. **Interventions:** The project activities consist of formation/Strengthen child clubs/networks inclusively, school level advocacy through child clubs and declaring School as Zone of Peace. Formation of child club was effective and sustainable activity, which needs further support and follow up from project.
3. **Achievement:** KIRDARC reports 46 Schools declared as the school as zone of peace and the initiation has been taken positively by the stakeholders though there is need to strengthen mechanism and measuring progress regularly against national indicators as per the national guideline to sustain the movement. Out of 176 schools, 121 schools have functional code of conduct and updating it annually. Parents, teachers, SMC, PTA and school children have been following the code of conduct that they have updated for their school. Compulsory ID cards for students, no corporal punishment by teachers, schools visiting by parents are some of the

Box: 3

Child clubs for better schooling environment

Child clubs of Kanjirowa PS in Dolpa and Gadul Snani LSS in Kalikot give children access to put their issues and voices once a month, organize extracurricular activities, keep school clean, safe and disciplined, monitor regularity of students and teachers, conduct leadership and other training, provide scholarship to needy children. Team observed children engaged in child clubs are more active and confident.

One SMC chair said, "Child club is our eyes and ears on classroom issues". HT in Raku says, "These days, students speak politely to each other and also with teachers in school as child club inspired them to use such good practice. The upper grade children also support learning of lower grade children in friendly manner even in playgrounds". SMC chairperson of the same school recognizes value of child club in selecting teachers. He says, "we consult students and child club before taking any decision on appropriateness of teachers for appointment".

KIRDARC has formed and strengthened child clubs in selected LSS and secondary schools. Training and capacity building of few child club members to make their collective voices and claim their rights in schools and communities has brought some changes. Similarly in school, they are active for organizing extra-curricular activities such as quiz contest, spelling contest, poem, Deuda songs and essay writing competitions. Such activities are supporting children to be pro-active in learning.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

examples of functional code of conduct in the school that were exercised. It was noteworthy that DEO has issued circular to all schools in Kalikot as a local norm to represent child club members in SMC meeting as an invitee. Girls were almost half in child clubs' executive committees.

Expected Result 6: Improve school governance and management

1. **Target:** Enhanced capacity of school community for sustainable management with good governance practices for delivery of quality education with improved linkages with local government structures.
2. **Interventions:** The project activities included orientation to SMC members, teachers, head teachers on their accountability; Head teacher and SMC Training; coordination with DEOs and Joint monitoring with district stakeholders; and capacity building of DEO and education stakeholders. Local government was not prioritized as stakeholders for improving quality of education in project areas.
3. **Achievement:** In all working schools, social audits/ public hearings take place annually. Very few social audits include social, academic and economic aspects of schools. All 25 VDCs collaborated with KIRDARC for infrastructure development, which indicates the local authority giving focus to education. Through, there is a long way for making local body responsible for delivering education service more qualitative and responsive. The Project together with other stakeholders supported to declare 100% primary students' enrolment in 12 VDCs against its target of 10 exclusive of Jumla and Kalikot. Due to difficult topography and deeply rooted socio-cultural values, differently able children are out of school. Project does not have specific interventions to bring these children into education.

Overall Evaluation of Project

The team evaluated the project outcomes following the five elements of evaluation as defined by OECD/DAC. They include relevancy, efficiency, effectiveness, value of money, sustainability and outcomes/results of the Project to the wider society. The following section elaborates the findings of the team:

Relevancy

Relevancy is about usefulness and appropriateness of Project interventions to: i) Beneficiary like students, teachers, parents and education officials; ii) education system like school, VDC and DEO; iii) socio-cultural practices and values; iv) national and local policies including MDGs and EFA, SSRP; and, v) local skills, expertise and environment.

The beneficiaries and educational institutions appreciate the project interventions supporting to their daily activities and making more relevant to their learning. The project promotes access of marginalized children to education, which is a fundamental right of children as per interim constitution of Nepal 2007 (Article 17). Project supports to fulfill Nepal's commitment to MDGs and EFA as well as its own school sector reform program. In such, of-course this project is much relevant to make a local mechanism towards promoting space to those children in the Karnali region. It aims to empower SMC, teacher, student, and parents.

The Early Childhood Development /Pre-Primary Class (ECD/PPC) is regarded instrumental for the social, emotional, intellectual and physical development of children. As such it helps

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

to improve the internal efficiency of primary and basic education. In addition inclusiveness and equity are the prioritized aspect of education policy of Nepal. In section 35 (9) of the Constitution, it clearly states that the State will follow a policy of paying special attention to protect the interest of women, orphans, children, and differently able and endangered group. Thus this project rightly addresses this obligation.

Despite the education goal and legal provision achieving to improve the internal efficiency of primary and basic education the representation and participation of SMC member in the children learning process was minimal and could be improved a lot with encouragement to schools. Only head teacher and influential people of the society has been involved in decision making and monitoring of schools, especially from marginalized parents were rarely included and if included also they are only for tokenistic value to endorse those decision made by head teacher. During the evaluation team found that women participation was not satisfactory. One of the women member opined *“we come to the meeting, mostly the political and influential people make the decision, and we are just observer in the SMC meeting”*. In education rule there is provision to include one female member compulsorily in SMC and PTA.

It seems that SMC of the school is one of the crucial grassroots level structure formed nationwide and could be effective to deal with various issues of school especially in this region. As one of the outputs, ‘qualitative and quantitative changes’, if defined we found that after this program there is much quantitative changes took place. The interim report of the KIRDARC also stated that in Jumla and Kalikot the program has not achieved the target due to high number of children with disability in there two districts. Not only this reason but because of less parental involvement in school, less monitoring from DEO and SMC some due challenges to achieve the outcomes in Kalikot district. In the schools, we found furnished classroom with child friendly learning material and female ECD teacher, food for children and its management are good initiatives of this program.

Box: 4

Improvement in ECED Centers

Amarsingh Primary School in Likhu, Kalikot has also an ECED center for 17 children (9 boys). KIRDARC supported together with VDC a building construction and floor sitting arrangement with carpet. It also obtained kit box and other child centric learning materials. Parental education and facilitator training was also provided which was useful and effective.

Kasturi, a facilitator says, “we completely change our activities in ECED class from rote learning to games, plays and group works. No stick and punishment, but more materials and fun for children”. She further claims, “Children want to stay longer than 1 pm”. A mother said, “Children insist coming to school and I also feel safe and comfortable sending them as I can spend my quality time in household chores”. HT of that school says, “children from ECED are more active and better learner in early grades than non-ECED children”.

The team observed that support in ECED centers from KIRDARC relevant in three ways. First, parents had better time even for short time to household work and farming. Second, all small children got easy access to centers where children are more confident and learning, playing with materials. Thirdly, facilitators are better equipped to handle the classes easily, use varieties of techniques as per necessity, engage children for longer time, and treat children psychologically.

Interactions with parents and schools have brought changes on teachers' attitude; regularity of children once teacher changes the pedagogy and parents observed safety, security and development of children. There are about 10 ECED centers like this with 45% girl children.

The team also found there is need of frequent visit in the project area to energize and to support the school administration for sustaining the outcomes. The project mostly focused

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

in all schools with similar activities not focusing on results. Girls were prioritized in each project intervention as beneficiary.

Efficiency

This is about timely delivery of quality inputs including budget, staff and materials; delivery and quality of training, exposure, orientation, mobile meeting and technical support; frequency and quality of monitoring visit and support to schools and other stakeholders; and request and grievance handling mechanism and procedures.

It was found the project was able to uphold the association with VDC, DEO, SMC, PTA, child club, and teacher's organization and so on. There was a cordial relationship with DEO while formulating the plan and organizing different interventions. DEO Dolpa said, "*KIRDARC is a part of our office. We consult them even to make the regular government interventions more effective*". PC of DEO Kalikot said, "*KIRDARC FM in instrumental for making school and education stakeholders more responsive and accountable as we air out budget release and other educational policies*". The evaluation team surprised why media was not included in the project to promote participation and governance of stakeholders.

There was regular planning and coordination meeting between KIRDARC and DEO since 2009. KIRDARC coordinates with DEOs for all education interventions including training and orientation for ECED facilitators, SMC and teachers. Representatives from DEO (resource person), SMC members, head teacher and child clubs members claimed that they conduct monthly mobile meetings to discuss the challenges and problems encountered and ways to overcome them turn by turn in different schools. This mobile meeting is very efficient and effective for learning and sharing. A teacher claimed, "*We have many things to learn from each other. A mobile meeting in Raku changed my thinking and attitude, as early grade teachers are not good in Mathematics how can I get good students in grade six. Now we organize monthly meeting of math teachers to support each other*".

The team received a positive indication about KIRDARC from village and district level stakeholders in regard to their pro-activeness and timely delivery of materials and inputs based on its plan. DEO in Kalikot said coordination with KIRDARC would remain effective for the improvement of quality of education even the project is phased out. However, we found, KIRDARC and DEO need to consult more while offering teachers' training in most of the schools as same teachers got training from both side, but locally hired teachers got nothing. We noted head teacher in many schools got almost all trainings, which could be offered, to early grade

Box: 5

Active Teacher Makes Active Learning

Prior to this training, Rawat used to practice traditional lecturing methods reading textbooks and measuring memorization on contents. After the training, Rawat uses variety of tools and techniques in classroom including group work, peer teaching, project work, problem solving tools where most of students engage and participate in learning process.

"Despite poor infrastructure I have realized that we, teachers, can improve children's learning and quality of education by making it more practical and relevant to students on their day to day work". Rawat claims I am active after ATL training and has built confidence that I can be a good teacher. He further says, "to be a good teacher, I need to be a good learner, a life long learner".

While team interacted with students about who was their best teacher, students reacted him was the best one. A girl from grade 6 raised her hand and said, "He is regular in school and classroom. He listens us, asks reasons, supports us in difficult time and teaches us in a friendly manner". Another student said, "he never angry with us and gives good suggestions when we ask him". He thanks KIRDARC for providing such practical training, which is highly effective and useful in classroom.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

teachers to bring better performance of schools. It was noteworthy that stakeholders feel that KIRDARC is transparent and efficient in term of delivery of its annual plans and responding the needs of local schools. However there were very few female staff (less than 20%) in the field.

Effectiveness

Project effectiveness is measured in terms of increasing enrollment, improving quality of education, promoting safe and friendly environment to children, increasing internal efficiency and transparent management system of school and providing technical inputs and support to deliver outputs of the Project. Female friendly interventions were not found.

The team found Project has delivered its outputs thinly spreading to all ECED centers and schools. We observed many schools has developed CEMIS, SIP plan, offered training to AEP and ECD facilitators, supported teaching and learning materials, providing children educational materials and support, door to door campaign and infrastructural support. The limited number of teachers (permanent and relief) was trained on different topics, but qualitative changes in the classrooms were minimal as majority of teachers are locally hired without license and do not receive any training and coaching support.

Strengthening SMCs, PTAs, child clubs were some of the strategies where there is domination of head teacher/ teachers. There is good support from VDC for infrastructure development and teacher salary. Village education committees are formed but not functional. Most of the VEC, SMC and PTA members were not aware about their roles and mandates. Children are less aware as rights-holders on the rights and entitlements in schools and VDCs. A chairperson in a secondary school in Kalikot said, “*Our head teacher take decision of all the activities; we come school once in month if school head teacher calls us to sign the minutes*”. While going through the minutes of SMC and PTA, team noted less attendance of female members compare with male counterparts.

The transaction approach of project did not pay attention to improve quality of school education. Participation of children in classrooms and parents’ engagement in children’s learning was minimal. Mothers’ engagement in ECED was comparatively better than in schools due to parenting education at the beginning of Project. Thus, participation of the community so far in planning process, though initiated is still in its infancy. It seems that a vast majority belong to the lower end of participation ladder as defined by Hart (1992). A trend of school enrollment and promotion rate in five sampled schools is as follows:

Table 2: Overall Promotion Rate in 5 Sampled Schools

Years	2069		2070		2071		Total		Pass rate
	Enrolled	Passed	Enrolled	Passed	Enrolled	Attendee	Enrolled	Passed	
Surya Jyoti PS (G 1-3)	91	52	89	48	87	45	267	145	54.3%
Masto Saraswoti SS (G1-10)	344	259	351	281	342	252	1037	792	76.3%
Gadul Snani LSS (G 1-8)	127	84	128	86	133	90	388	260	67.0%
Shantikot PS (G 1-5)	126	80	132	81	118	82	376	243	64.6%
Badarukh LSS (G 1-8)	225	156	278	185	272	168	775	509	65.6%
Total	913	631	978	681	952	637	2,843	1,949	
Pass %	69.1%		69.6%		66.9%		68.5%		

Final Evaluation Report: **Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project**

From the above table there is no significant improvement in quality of education and learning achievements in sampled schools. The overall promotion rate is below 70% with an exception of a secondary school. The promotion rate of grade one in these five schools was below 50% in average. The average learning achievement of students in primary grade was also less than 50%. The team observed that all project activities were completed but there was less focus on result of those activities as interventions were thinly spread in all schools of working areas and learning achievement was not followed up.

Sustainability

The team used several dimensions of sustainability. They include: i) continuation of services and benefits at local levels; ii) internalizing the issues and local institutions into KIRDARC and DEO's interventions; iii) scaling up the learning and good practices by other schools and agencies; and iv) taking few project initiatives by neighboring non-project schools/VDCs.

The team found that training, orientation and interactions are self-sustaining in terms of continuing its benefits. Infrastructure development and renovation in schools will continue from local authorities. Classroom pedagogy and provisions of learning materials are less sustainable until RPs and DEOs include them in their budget and monitoring system. Functional local committees and institutions like effective SMCs, active PTAs and child clubs can sustain project interventions and benefits in collaboration with VDCs and DEOs. These institutions are put in place and few of them are trained, however, follow up is weak. Female population is high in the field due to male counterparts migrated to work abroad mainly Gulf countries; female participation was minimal in each activity.

Similarly, elite domination in planning, M&E, and other supervisory process, which meant to be participatory, reduces the chances of ownership feeling, a fundamental requisite to the sustainability. Project intervention created the environment collaborating with the VDC to construct the ECED and schools. However team could not find scaling up or spreading of few interventions in neighboring schools and VDCs.

There is good collaboration with the district level stakeholders who are committed to continue and replicate the good initiation of project. All the district education offices in Karnali initiated mapping out education service providers and analyzing CEMIS data for their budget allocation decision.

Value for Money

In absence of already defined criteria, we limit ourselves in measuring value of money to: i) analyze the total project cost into management and program; ii) compare annual expenditure of each year and in total of each district; iii) calculate the per capita funding to different cost centers (per child, per school and per teacher).

During the last 4.5 years, KIRDARC spent NPR 77.3 million in total in 25 VDCs of five districts of Karnali from EC funding. The project spent only NPR 2.8 million in the first year as a preparatory phase where as one third of the budget i.e. NPR 25.5 million (33%) was spent in the last six months of the project. The project spent NPR 14.7 million (19%) in 2011, NPR 18.9 million (24.55) in 2012 and NPR 15.3 million (19.8%) in 2013. This shows a last minute expenditure trend of the project.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Because of difficult topography and hardship of Karnali region, management cost of the project is higher than direct service delivery to children and schools in working areas. Comparatively Mugu was the most expensive district. Jumla and Kalikot districts could get more budget and reach more children comparing with other districts in terms of numbers of ECED, schools and students.

The following table shows that there was no any logic or criteria for annual budget allocation for each district. Kathmandu cost is about 43% of total budget. The project spent in general less than half of annual per child cost under SSRP during the entire project period. The per child cost as well as per school/ECED center cost is minimal which does not bring any substantial change in children's learning.

Table 3: Distribution of Cost in Working Districts

Particular/District	Jumla	Humla	Mugu	Kalikot	Dolpa	Kathmandu	Total
Expenditure	10,087,462	7,776,028	8,524,925	9,238,831	8,584,573	33,073,848	77,285,667
% Expenses	13.10%	10.10%	11%	11.90%	11.10%	42.80%	
ECED/Schools	29/41	19/32	29/27	32/48	28/28		137/176
Teachers	245	136	113	298	151		943
ECED kids	1,131	625	735	678	679		3,848
PS Children	5,849	2,407	2,156	6,260	1,899		18,571
Per school/ECED	144,107	152,471	152,231	115,485	153,296		246,919
Per child cost PS	1,725	3,231	3,954	1,476	4,521		4,162
Per teacher cost	41,173	57,177	75,442	31,003	56,851		81,957

The project less paid attention on value for money as budget allocation was not based on number of schools, ECED centers, teachers and students. The team felt that the Project could concentrate in few ECED centers or schools as role models rather spreading in all ECED center/schools of all working VDCs. The project could use baseline data of each ECED/school as a basis for resource allocation and staffing arrangement.

Implementation Status of Educational Policies in Karnali

The evaluation team has included the list of policies and guidelines related to children and education issued by central agencies for schools and local communities. During the field visits and interaction with the respondents, the situation of their implementation status was explored. This interpretation is based on the analysis of both primary and secondary information collected during the field study in Kalikot and Dolpa districts. The following table presents implementation status of educational policies in working schools/areas:

Table 4: Implementation status of educational policies

Educational Policies	Practices
Early childhood education and development	
1. GON will fund one year ECED program for 4 year age group children, other sources can be used to offer ECED services for below age 4 children	There are 3-5 years of age children in ECED which are not properly funded and supported. Rs. 1000 for materials per year in an ECED.
2. Equitable expansion of ECED services with a focus on quality services of caretaker &	ECED center just have a facilitator who is poorly paid and (un) trained. No materials from

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Educational Policies	Practices
facilitator.	DEO.
3. Priority to open ECED centers in disadvantaged and marginalized communities.	Not a single ECED is in community as all are in schools. Dalit community/school in Mehalmodi does not have ECED center.
4. Promote partnership with the governmental, local bodies and non-governmental organizations for quality ECED services	ECEDs are supported only from DEOs and few NGOs. VDCs are just supporting in infrastructure not on quality education.
5. Capacity development of ECED facilitator, Management Committee, Service Providers	Only 12 days basic training was provided for facilitator once in their tenure, but not for all
6. Focusing on children's all round development - holistic development rather than downward extension of primary education	Downward teaching like in school taking place in ECED. Rote learning is in practice.
7. Code of conduct for the integrity of children's development and ethics for the actors	Does not exist in all schools/ECED centers of the working VDCs
Improving Quality of School Education	
1. Build trust and confidence in the public school system by improving the delivery of education services to enhance quality and relevance.	Students learning and classroom teaching are yet to prioritize by SMCs and DEOs. There is no engagement of VDC for quality education.
2. Meet the threshold of minimum enabling conditions and ensuring equitable support.	100 primary, 60 lower secondary and 21 secondary schools in Kalikot not having a teacher quota
3. Adopt the National Curriculum framework (NCF) as the basis for core curricula and local curricula. Schools were encouraged for local curriculum.	Curriculum has not been used in school. Just textbook teaching takes place. English is being initiated as local curricula.
4. Introduce mother tongue as a medium of instruction in early grades.	Neither teachers are trained nor do schools introduce it.
5. Employ flexible learning approaches to respond to diverse needs and to address learners' individual pace of learning.	There is no individual child focus teaching and learning practices. Schools are rigid on their timing and lecturing. No flexible class.
6. Implement continuous assessment of students with the remedial support systems.	CAS was once discussed in RC but none of the schools practice remedial support/CAS.
7. Develop capacity of head teachers and members of School Management Committee	HTs are not appointed and trained as par with SSRP. SMCs do not know roles/mandates.
8. Provide demand driven training to teachers and improve instructional processes	TPD introduced only for Govt teachers but has not brought any changed in classrooms
9. Maintain student teacher and school teacher ratio (1:37 & 1:3 by 2013/14) with a view to increase female participation	Teachers' deployment did not take place as there is no enough teacher quota. A few female teachers are appointed as volunteers.
Child Participation	
1. Ensure children's participation while formulating policies and programs, their implementation	Child clubs are not part of formulating school improvement plan and education calendar
2. Form child club in each school and establish a network in each VDC/district	Child clubs are formed in each school but VDC network does not exist
3. Promote child participation in every aspects of public spheres including in local planning process	Not yet sensitized stakeholders and children are not invited in WCFs, CACs and IPFCs

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Educational Policies	Practices
4. Establish coordination mechanism among or between government and non-governmental agencies to promote children participation	Yet to ensure by DCWB. Child clubs are formed in each school but are not trained and linked with DCWB
5. Develop capacity of child clubs and system to promote children's rights	KIRDARC provided few materials and but does not train child club leaders/members
6. Advocacy and media mobilization for raising awareness and enforcement of legal instruments	Does not exist in schools and VDCs but Karnali FM raises children's issues periodically

The above table clearly shows that education related policies are not available and practiced at local level. The understanding and implementation of those policies among local level stakeholders was minimal. The role of KIRDARC is very instrumental for reducing the gaps between policies and practices at least in its working schools, communities and VDCs and making state mechanism accountable and responsive which is not taking place. The project should have more focus to make education authorities and local government more aware and responsible on child rights issues.

Governance and Accountability of Education Stakeholders

The evaluation team had studied roles, mandates and functions of different stakeholders on child rights in educational institutions. Stakeholders of each FGD were asked about their roles and mandates. Most of the stakeholders at local level were not aware about policies and norms of SSRP/education. These roles fulfilled by stakeholders were observed during the field visits and also verified in the focused group discussion and official records of schools. The team found the following practices among stakeholders including children in 14 schools that team visited in Kalikot and Dolpa districts:

Table 5: Functionalities of education stakeholders

Stakeholders	Roles/mandates/functions	Practices
Head Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appointed based on seniority and competency for school leadership Guardian of students Administrative and managerial functions Pedagogical leadership to teachers Community relations School leadership/management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HTs are not as per SSRP norms and standards Students are afraid of HTs Weak leadership and school management No confidence and support from teachers Less engagement of parents/VDCs Leadership conflict -SMC chair or HT
Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote child rights Actively engaged in learning process Participate in school activities Run extra-curricular activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children are not regular Students are passive learner/listeners Few take part in ECA Teachers facilitate the Friday program
Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate teaching learning process Classroom management and delivery Local material development and use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor preparation, lecturing in class Low motivation, confidence and learning/updating

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Stakeholders	Roles/mandates/functions	Practices
Parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build school –community relations • Get update on new curricula, policies and learning methods • Carry out action research for learning • Create/support learning environment for children at home and in school • Visit school frequently/discuss with teachers about children's learning • Participation in school meetings • Provide necessary materials to children • Support to improve quality of education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No lesson plans, curriculum, teacher guide and education materials in use • No accountability mechanism • Action research does not exist • Poor ownership, motivation and participation in schools • Unfamiliar with their roles and functions in schools • Not supporting children for their learning • No roles after sending children to school • Parents do not work for quality education
SMC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carry out management functions of schools • Support HTs on teaching learning • Take leadership of school management • Generate and mobilize resources and networks for quality improvement • Plan, approve and monitor SIP • Monitoring and review school operation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings are not regular and do not discuss on class room issues • Weak coordination among members, HTs and VDCs • Focus on infrastructure and teachers recruitment • Passive roles in school management, SIP and school budget do not exist
PTA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on quality improvement • More interaction between parents, students and teachers for learning • Carry out social audit • Monitor work of SMCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't understand their roles • No interaction in schools • Chair of PTA participate in SMC as observer, no meetings at all • Signs social audit made by HTs
RP/SS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide professional support to teachers • Provide managerial support to HT/SMC/PTA • Bridge between DEO/VDC/Schools • Orient new policies/guidelines/plans • Monitor and supervise school operation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RPs do not engage with teachers/learning • Messenger between HTs and DEOs • Collect data from HTs in HQs • Does not meet SMCs and PTAs • Verbally discusses in RC meeting • Visit school twice a year
VDC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve ECED centre • Form and mobilize VECs/SMCs • Improve quality of school education • Support SIP implementation • Allocate at least 10% budget to children and child clubs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide budget for infrastructures and teachers based on political influences • Hardly concentrated on school issues • Children's budget is mainly spent for infrastructures development • No SIP in most schools
DEO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve school quota and teachers • Provide grant and technical support to schools on time • Monitor and supervise HTs, SMCs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve schools without assessing the requirements • Late budget release what comes from DoE such as only 25% of PCF

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Stakeholders	Roles/mandates/functions	Practices
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and schools • Issue and orient new guidelines, policies, norms and manuals • Reallocate teachers, resources and schools • Ensure quality education for all children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> money. • Issues circulars but does not follow up • Weak monitoring/supervision • Political negotiation is the rule • Reallocation of teachers has not initiated • Focus on enrolment not in retention

The above table shows that education actors and stakeholders are less aware about their roles and mandates in each school. There is no proper follow up and monitoring mechanism from education authorities to reduce the gaps between assigned roles and performance of each stakeholder. The role of KIRDARC as the watchdog in providing quality education services works with multiple stakeholders. The project has initiated to educate them on their roles. KIRDARC has to work with education authorities to strengthen monitoring functions to ensure delivery of quality education to all children as entitlements following the rules, regulations, policies and plans of the government.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conclusion

The project “Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups in Karnali” has taken good initiatives bringing back warded, vulnerable and marginalized children to school and providing quality education. Due to this project there are few positive changes and almost all children were enrolled in schools that we visited. Also there is improved school infrastructure, continuity in providing education materials and support to vulnerable and marginalized children are the key factors to retain them in school. We also found the child clubs formation and their empowerment found one of the most important aspects enhancing co-curricular activities in school. Girl children were 45% in ECED centers and almost half in primary schools.

KIRDARC was a right partner for quality education project in Karnali having appropriate experiences, networking and internal management system. Project as such was relevant and appropriate in Karnali context with poor access of children to education, degrading quality of education and weak delivery of education services. Project was efficient and effective in term of improving education services in working areas from transactional approach and was less focused from transformational approach in producing and sustaining results. Girl friendly interventions were minimal.

The training to teacher is another important notable prospect however the participation of teacher in the training must be enhanced and increased. The training package was also well planned and conducted as per the guidelines of project implementation. Project has been able to bring all the stakeholders in education sector at district and community level together for the development of education system in district. And there is need of frequent mobile meeting with DEO officials, SMCs, PTA and HTs. Child clubs has been encouraging medium for learning from each other.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

The outputs and outcome of the programme seems relevant to promote the access to education but the interventions of the programme seem very spread not focusing to the particular schools developing as role model. The community people have still thought as teacher are responsible person for education. There is increasing trend of women and marginalized community in school education but the participation level is just for token of granted, their voices are not counted for decision making.

There are few ECED centers and schools functioning with minimum standards after getting the infrastructure, material, training, and orientation support from KIRDARC. Most of the ECDs are not functioning as per norms and guidelines issued by DOE to improve quality of learning process due to lack of sufficient facilities and technical support in the centers.

Most of the facilitators are female but they have not received minimum training and educational materials (most of them had 8 days against the norms of 16 days). However KIRDARC provides 3 days refresher training each year. There is no proper support and facilitation from school to make ECED effective and child friendly. ECED facilitators are taking classes in early grades in primary levels. There is no proper classroom and sitting arrangements except in some ECD centers supported by KIRDARC. There are few students of upper age and younger age than ECED age (4-5 years). ECED management committee has not been formed and mobilized separately.

Local communities and education authorities are focusing still on enrollment, not in improving classroom learning. SMC and HTs are paying attention for infrastructures development and teacher recruitment, but not on classroom pedagogy and learning materials. PTAs are formed but they are not functional to improve quality of education. PTA chair is generally invited in SMC meeting. National framework on child friendly school for quality education has not been understood and promoted by local education stakeholders.

Most of schools have curriculum up to grade three only. Curriculum and teacher guide are not in used. There was orientation on continuous assessment system, but not in practiced as most of schools do not have learning materials and appropriate teachers. Textbooks are available to all students. Scholarship is distributed to all students not only for eligible students. DEOs are not able to recruit HTs as per SSRP norms and HTs do not have competency and confidence to do monitoring the classes of teachers. There are very few female teachers in schools but almost 82% ECED facilitators (103/124) were female. Most of schools and teachers do not have school calendar and lesson plans. RP/SSs rarely visit schools and none of them are female.

There is mid-day meal in all ECED centers and in primary schools but school pays money to parents without monitoring the tiffin. ECED centers and schools have yet to build linkages with nearby health-post for making regular health check up and first aid training. School has to start making washing and cleaning classes every week with all students so that they have clean cloth, haircut and proper sanitation. Toilets are constructed in each school but are not clean and properly used.

Child protection has not yet been an issue in school, as HTs and teachers training under TPD do not cover these topics. School as zone of peace was entered into school as a slogan. Few schools have code of conduct put on the wall but have not followed up from child clubs and school management. Children's abuse, exploitation, discrimination and violence have not prioritized in the agenda of SMC and PTA meeting. Parenting education

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

in few project ECED and schools was introduced but has not been continued. Parents are called only for annual meeting in schools.

School based child club are formed linking them to the VDC level child club network with minimum orientation on their roles and responsibilities. There is an 11-15 member executive committee in each child club. Leaders of child club do not communicate with students of each grade about their work and issues. They conduct extracurricular activities when they get support from KIRDARC. Most of the child clubs of working areas in both districts are affiliated to district child welfare board. Child club representatives are not communicating with general students.

SMC and PTA do not know their roles and mandates. Social audit has done regularly but only focus on the financial matter rather than the quality of education. Children are not enough consulted by HTs and SMCs for making SIP, flash report and education calendar. VDCs are not concerned with quality improvement in child clubs, ECED and primary schools, but they are supporting for school construction and teachers salary.

Because of the less number of project staffs compared to the number VDCs and difficult topography inputs to schools and education stakeholders from KIRDARC on social mobilization, education service delivery and quality improvement in classroom pedagogy is minimal. There are many schools comparing its project interventions and budget. There is gap in documentation of base line in each sector of its interventions and also the good practices for learning and scaling up.

Overall Recommendation

There is a need of empowering communities (mobilization of parents) to raise thier voice and claim thier rights from authorities and education service providers. Children can be change agent with a provision of traning and exposure to them on their rights and duties of adults and their institutions towards children.

The strong M & E system in school could be another essential element for better planning and performance of schooling. Similarly, the M&E system in district level with clear role and responsibilities and required resources as well. There should be defined M&E system in school as well that promotes and strengthen reward and punishment system in place for duty bearers based on their performance.

Parental education training is essential dimension to empower to make parents more responsible towards their children and school. The student's promotion must be increased and also project should be more focused upon the retaining students and improving teaching learning processes in the classrooms.

The building and other infrastructure construction should be given special attention because in many school still there is need of classroom. In some of the schools two classes are found in one classroom. Fulfilling enabling conditions in each school is a prime concern for all education stakeholders.

The training provided by KIRDARC was found to be very effective fo teachers however rahat, per child fund and private quota teacher have not got any opportunity to participate in any form of training. It would be a major contribution of motivation to teachers in making

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

teaching-learning process more effective and providing quality education if these teachers could be provided with trainings. School based training targeting to all teachers and selected members of SMC and PTA to be prioritized.

Female member in SMC must be empowered and participation must be increased for better ECED class and learning improvement in early grades. This can be linked with ward citizen forum and citizen awareness centers of local government, especially at VDC.

The coordination of KIRDARC with DEO in implementation phase could be more better specially in teacher training, need assessment of the school, parental education and monitoring and supervision for quality education.

Donors like EC to continue supporting remote areas like Karnali focusing to marginalized and vulnerable children to improve quality of public education from ECED to grade 12 in line with SSRP and to strengthen internal efficiency and governance system of education institutions and local authorities.

Evaluation team would like to make its issue specific recommendation focusing on thematic areas of the Project, which are:

Early childhood development center

- Facilitate for implementation of minimum enabling conditions including play and learning materials in each ECED centers in collaboration with VDCs/ DEOs.
- Coordinate and support for facilitators' basic training for each facilitator and also provide refresher training at least once a year.
- Conduct periodic interactions with mothers groups and also between SMCs and ECED management committee.

Individual and environmental health and sanitation

- Initiate regular health-check up of ECED and early grade students in collaboration with VDCs and health posts for de-worming, immunization, weight measurement ...
- Improve mid-day meal distribution mechanism in cooperation with parents, local cooperatives, VDCs and forestry users groups so that children will have something to eat in schools
- Introduce practical knowledge and skills of health education, personal hygiene and sanitation and nutrition to children and parents regularly through teachers, women health volunteers and VDC social mobilizers

Improving quality of education

- Introduce practical implementation of national framework on child friendly schooling for quality education with proper orientation, teacher training and material support
- Train SMC and PTA on their roles and responsibilities to focus more on classroom activities, education materials and children's learning
- Provide training to teachers on child centric methodologies and continuous assessment system based on curriculum, teachers' guide, and also introduce English medium of instruction
- In addition to activating monitoring from RPs/SSs, engage child clubs and mother groups for preparation, implementation and review of school improvement plan in collaboration with VDCs and VECs

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Child protection and child participation

- Introduce school code of conduct for teachers, parents and students with quarterly reflection of its implementation
- Ensure minimum provisions of sitting arrangement, drinking water and sanitation facilities including separate toilet for girls, fencing walls and play grounds
- Appoint two teachers (one female) as a focal point for hearing and handling cases of abuse, exploitation, discrimination, bullying and violence in classrooms and school compounds
- Facilitate and strengthen child club in each school and continuously organize child rights training to students, parents and teachers
- Affiliate child clubs to DCWBs and make child club networks linking with VDCs and DDCs in cooperation with DCWB
- Support to carry out extracurricular activities including Friday programme in each school targeting for each grade students
- Engage child club members into SMC/PTA for SIP and school calendar preparation and implementation with proper communication mechanism to each grade students
- Start gradually making each school and VDC child friendly as outlined in the CFS framework and CFLG guidelines in collaboration with SMC and VDC

Project Partnership Management

- Review the staffing structure and existing CBOs to suit with its interventions in the field of ECED, quality education, child participation and school governance
- Promote tripartite partnership between KIRDARC, CBOs and government agencies like DEO, VDC for sustainability, local ownership and program impact
- Improve understanding and application of government policies, priorities and plans on education and child rights to reduce the gaps between policies and practices
- Joint monitoring visit (KIRDARC-EC-Education Authority) in project could improve accountability and responsiveness of service delivery agencies at local levels.

**Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project**

References

- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods* (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- DoE. (2013). *Consolidated Flash Report of 2012*. Department of Education, Sanathimi, Bhaktapur, Nepal
- Flick, U. (2012). *Introducing research methodology: A beginner's guide to doing a research project*. New Delhi: Sage.
- MoE. (2009). *School Sector Reform Programme (2009/10 to 2015/16)*. Ministry of Education, Singhadurbar, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- MoE. (2010). *National Framework of Child Friendly School for Quality Education*. Ministry of Education, Singhadurbar, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- MoE. (2011). *School as a Zone of Peace Operational Guidelines*. Ministry of Education, Singhadurbar, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- MoE. (2012). *Midterm Review Report of School Sector Reform Programme*. Ministry of Education, Singhadurbar, Kathmandu, Nepal.
- MoWCSW. (2012). *National Children's Policy, 2069*. Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare, singhadurbar, Kathmandu, Nepal
- KIRDARC. (2010). *Project Proposal: Access to quality education for marginalized children and girls of Karnali region*. Karnali Integrated Development and Research Center.
- KIRDARC. (2014). *Project Completion Report: Access to quality education for marginalized children and girls of Karnali region*. Karnali Integrated Development and Research Center.
- Dangal, M. (2012). *Mid-term review of access to quality education for marginalized children and girls of Karnali region*. Karnali Integrated Development and Research Center.
- DEO-Kalikot. (2012). *Kalikot ma Shikshya [Education in Kalikot]*. District Education Office, Manma, Kalikot.
- Koirala, B.N., Khadka, A., Joshi, M., Dulal, R.K., & Dhakal, S. (2014). *Documentation of good practices and learning of access to quality education in Karnali project*. Karnali Integrated Development and Research Center and Baikalpik Shikshya taha Bikas Pratishthan.
- UN. (2012). *United Nations Development Assistant Framework*. United Nations Country Management Team, UNDP, Pulchok, Kathmandu, Nepal

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Annexure
Annexure 1: Term of Reference for the Final Evaluation

European Commission Funded
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Name of Action:	Access to education for vulnerable and marginalized groups in Karnali
Contract No:	DCI-NSAPVD/2009/216-469
Total Budget of the Action:	EUR 696,363.00
Contribution from EU:	EUR 626,727.00
Working districts/VDCs	25 VDC of 5 Districts (Jumla, Kalikot, Mugu, Humla and Dolpa)
Project Start Date:	1 st Jan 2010
Expected Completion Date:	30 th June 2014

1. INTRODUCTION

Karnali Integrated Rural Development and Research Centre (KIRDARC Nepal) is an NGO registered at the District Administration Office, Jumla under the Society Registration Act, 1978, and is affiliated to the Social Welfare Council in Nepal. It has been working in six districts of Mid –Western region of Nepal (Jumla, Humla, Kalikot, Mugu and Dolpa and Surkhet). It started working in Karnali Zone since 1999. KIRDARC Nepal works in a right-based approach in the fields of human rights and peace building, education, health, water and sanitation, food security, livelihoods, media and climate change and DRR and Media. KIRDARC Nepal strives to enable people and communities to claim their human rights, including the right against poverty and neglect by way of educating, organizing and mobilizing primary right holders in human rights promoting action; research and policy based advocacy; economic empowerment and promoting social responsible investment and providing complimentary services.

KIRDARC Nepal has been implementing “*Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali*” programme in total 25 VDCs of five districts (Jumla, Humla, Mugu, Dolpa and Kalikot) of Karnali zone with a financial support from European Commission. KIRDARC has committed for an evaluation of the project which is agreed between the European Commission and KIRDARC Nepal, where it is stated that: “*at the end of the project final evaluation will be undertaken by independent consultant/firm.*”

The purpose of the Evaluation (entitled “Final Evaluation”) is to *evaluate the achievements of project results, record lessons learned, assess the sustainability of the project results and enable the dissemination of the lessons learned.* It is also envisaged that the evaluation will clearly recommend the *actions necessary to strengthen the capacities of target communities and other sector stakeholders* to assume responsibility, in partnership with local government, for essential education related services.

2. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND OF THE ASSIGNMENT

Literacy of Karnali zone was not that encouraging due to lack of access to a good relevant education. In comparison to 53.7% literacy rate¹ at national Karnali lags behind many districts such as Dolpa, Jumla, Kalikot, Humla and Mugu have only 34.6, 32.4, 37.5, 26.6 and 27.7 literacy percentage respectively. Similarly the literacy rate of women in districts is disappointing in comparison to 42.4 % at national level as it is 19.6, 16.7, 16.9, 11.5 and 9.1 respectively. Some students have to walk 2 hours a day to reach their nearest school because of difficult geographical terrain and the pressure of work at home prevents many students attending classes regularly. In addition the teachers in government schools often remain absent

¹District Demographic Profile of Nepal, Informal Sector Research and Study Center, 2002

²Department of Education

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

from their duties. At the outset of the project GER, NER, Repetition rate, Promotion rate² of primary level of the region was 169.2, 94.3, 24.4 and 59.6 respectively.

In this context, KIRDARC Nepal has implemented the project with the financial support of European Commission (herein after called EC) to *aware the community and to build the capacity of the school community* i.e. SMC, PTA, VEC, DEO for ensuring the quality education specially of the marginalized and vulnerable children. The project has also supported to develop the infrastructure of school and Early Childhood Development Centre (ECDC) creating the enabling environment for the better ECD and school education.

Despite the huge effort and investment of state and non-state actors some core group children (ultra-poor, children with disability, communities in remote access) are still not attracted to school education. The number of schools, students and teachers are increasing in the recent years with increased awareness on early childhood development and education there is still a great challenge to enroll 100% children in ECDs and schools and retrieve them through primary and basic education cycle. Since most of the primary teachers (according to Department of education 99% of the teachers have got training) are trained but not reached to classroom.

The project is at the verge of completion. In line with the provisions of the project agreement between EC and KIRDARC Nepal, the final project evaluation on the progress of the project is to be undertaken. The evaluation will *provide indicators on the extent of progress made across different results of the project, participation of target communities, economy and effectiveness of the results, as well as sustainability of project achievements.*

This ToR gives a detailed outline of activities required to fulfill the objectives of the evaluation of the Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali project in the selected VDCs and schools of five districts in the Karnali Zone.

3. THE GOAL OF THE PROJECT

The overall objective (general) of the project is to promote access to and quality education in Karnali zone contributing to ensure education for all-especially for vulnerable and marginalized groups, social inclusion and child protection. It is more specifically worded like to increase access of children to quality education at primary level of selected schools and ECDs of the Karnali Zone with meaningful participation of the school communities. This specific objective has been organized in to six (6) different project results that are:

- 1. Need of the educational institutions and communities identified and CEMIS and baseline information established*
- 2. 7,000 children of 3-4 years enrolled and experiencing conducive environment in community initiated ECDs.*
- 3. 1,000 children of 9-14 years mainstreamed in formal classes after completing AEP classes.*
- 4. Increased participation of 22,000 children of 5-9 years and above including Dalits, ethnic and vulnerable groups resulted in increased NER, retention rate, learning achievement, promotion and primary cycle completion rate*
- 5. Increased participation of children in school governance in creating safe and supportive environment.*
- 6. Enhanced capacity of school community for sustainable management with good governance practices for delivery of quality education with improved linkages with local government structures*

4. THE PROJECT INDICATIVE FACTS

- a. The project was launched in 2010 in selected 25 VDCs in five districts of Karnali zone. The total implementation period of the project was 54 months (January 2010 - Jun 2014).
- b. Total cost for the project was EUR 696,363. (90% from EC-EUR 626727 and 10% from KIRDARC Nepal.

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

- c. The project drew upon the technical experience of KIRDARC Nepal, RC and DEO for the each district which were associated with the project from the beginning: in capacity building of primary teachers, ECD facilitators, SMC, PTA, ECDMC and mobilization of community resources, lobby and advocacy for effective and just service delivery by local bodies of the government of Nepal.
- d. For Implementation of the project each district has an education officers and education supervisor (full time) and district coordinator and finance officers as part time. Along with them total 25 communities mobilizers were there in VDCs for providing messenger and arrangement support to the project team. There is education theme leader and M& E officers to provide managerial support to project team.
- e. This project has completed a mid-term review after completion of 2nd year in July 2012. The Review has generated a complete report and it need to be considered in final evaluation.

5. OBJECTIVES OF THE FINALEVALUATION

The overall objective of final evaluation is to *evaluate the achievement of the project results at impact level*. For that Interim reports including project completion report submitted to EC, annual progress reports (RBME) against the indicators of the project, mid-term evaluation and other assessments should be reviewed as reference documents.

6. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE FINALEVALUATION

Specific objectives of the final evaluation will be, but not limited to;

- 1. assess project outcomes with the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation as a supplement and complement to the education system and institutions; and
- 2. evaluate sustainability of project outcomes in terms of relevancy, synergy, replication and scaling up.

Objective1: To assess project outcome with the efficiency and effectiveness of the project implementation as a supplement and complement to education system and institutions

- a) Increase the enrollment rate of hard core group leading to the 100% enrollment in school
- b) Changes in teaching learning methodology leading to the child friendly learning environment to contribute for SSRP indicators.
- c) Capacitate school community (SMC, PTA, VEC, and DEO) for the better governance and management of school and their level of participation.
- d) Increase the present status of education indicators (decrease drop out and repetition rate, increase attendance rate of teachers and students, increase NER, GER, promotion and cycle completion rate and learning achievement for vulnerable and marginalized group of children
- e) Changes in policies and practices on participation of children in decision-making that affect children is school and community.
- f) Are activities cost effective (considering all costs in terms of funds and materials.)? What is the current expenditure to date? Is it in line with the budget line of the project? Has the money been used for intended objectives (value for money)?
- g) Does the collaboration of VDCs, DEO and communities exist? In what form? How the ownership developed in the communities?

Objective2: To evaluate sustainability of project outcomes in terms of relevancy, synergy, replication and scaling up

- a) Are the progress made across different result sufficient enough to meet the entire target of the project? Are they useful and beneficial for beneficiaries and stakeholders?
- b) Is the Capacity built of the school community i.e. teachers, child clubs, SMC, PTA, and DEO to sustain the result?
- c) Is there sufficient collaboration with like-minded organizations, local institutions and VDCs and DEOs to sustain the results and continuing the benefits of the project?
- d) Were the staff, community volunteers and consultants/ trainers competent, appropriate and

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

- useful? Were they mobilized effectively?
- e) What are the area and interventions of the projects that need to be replicated in other projects?
 - f) Are there gaps in project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluations and reporting? How those gaps could be addressed?
 - g) How effective are the approaches/tools being used to track the progress on project activities and financial progress during the implementation period?
 - h) To what extent the data/documentation system of the project is valid and reliable?

7. SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF CONSULTANT TEAM

The selected consultant will need to possess understanding and experience of evaluation methodology. They will need to demonstrate experience in evaluation of educational and capacity building program to school community. Also experience in evaluating development and collaborative programme implemented by local NGOs in rural areas, and in utilizing a range of approaches including synthesis evaluation and participatory evaluation, preferably with children and school community.

It will be necessary for the consultant(s) carrying out focus group discussions with children, young people and concern stakeholders of education.

8. DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY/TOOL

Review of documents:

A thorough review of documents will include two main types of documents: Project Documents (proposal including logical framework, monitoring plan) and interim reports submitted to EC. The review of the baseline data and the educational information from CEMIS will be done during the evaluation period. The most of the activities have been implemented in collaborative way with the local government and the document will be reviewed to draw the similar objective and plan.

Interviews with planners and organizations:

A very important source of information will be interviews with key planners and organizers of the central, regional, district and community levels as well as with donors, government officials, and issue based partner's staff. This information will be particularly important for the more general project assessment of methodology, approach, management, and implementation. Additionally, it will provide the opportunity to investigate in more depth, the successes of the institutional arrangements established for the implementation of the project. The interview will be taken with the trained teachers, ECD facilitators and school community i.e. SMC members, PTA members, child club members and AEP graduates which is important to draw the information that the project is reaching to the most vulnerable and marginalized group of children.

Photos:

The team will document their visits with photos and include selected photos in the PowerPoint presentation and final report

Field Visits and Site

While taking field visits areas of interventions, Early Childhood Development Centers (ECDs) primary schools, teachers of primary school, resource centers and DEO will be visited. ECD facilitators, school management committee, parent teachers Association, ECDMC, VDC secretary, Resource person, district education officers, child club members, students, and issue based partner members will be met for interaction.

Given the large geographical area covered by the project, it is important to limit the evaluation to a certain number of sites within five districts in Karnali region it will be useful to indicate how many districts and sites.

9. Deliverables

Presentation for feedback

The evaluation team will be responsible to organize the feedback session after finalizing the first draft of the

Final Evaluation Report: Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

report. A summary of the key findings and tentative recommendations will be presented in the meeting and the feedback from the implementing partner herewith KIRDARC Nepal and funding agencies herewith EC will be received to finalize the report as agreed time frame.

The Report

The evaluation team will be responsible for completing the report. The team leader (national consultant) will be responsible for bringing the separate chapters of the report together into a consolidated evaluation reporting and editing where necessary. The final draft of this report should be completed within two (2) weeks of the teams return from the field.

The consolidated report format will contain:

- An executive summary, which is no longer than five pages and includes the key recommendations
- Objectives of the evaluation.
- Methodologies used in evaluation.
- A chapter setting out the findings and specific recommendations on project using, but not limited to the 7 objectives of the project. Recommendations must be supported by a clear rationale and be viable in the lifetime of the project and designed to improve effectiveness and efficiency and address sustainability issues.
- Annexes to include Project plans and terms of reference, glossary of key terms, document reference list, with all tools used for the evaluation, people spoken to, communities consulted, and evaluation team members.

Presentation of Findings

The evaluation team will present their findings and recommendations to the partners at the close of the evaluation. Team will prepare a PowerPoint presentation including photos. This will ensure immediate feedback of the major conclusions of the evaluation and involve both teams in an assessment of their work.

KIRDARC Nepal will use this evaluation report for its official purpose. The report will serve as a learning experience for remaining project period, and to provide information for KIRDARC's Nepal future planning of this project and similar project in other area. It will also be used to inform European Commission (EC) and other donors and relevant institutions of the lessons learned and experiences gained throughout the implementation of the evaluation of programmes managed in KIRDARC Nepal. The report will also be given back to the districts for use in their future plans.

10. Team Composition

Team Members	No
Team Leader	1
Team Member	2

11. Tentative Schedule and workdays

Task/Activity	Timeline	Duration
Preliminary meeting for preparation	By 2 nd week of July	1 day
Desk study, literature review and preparing evaluation tools, questionnaire (preparation for field visit)	By End of July	5 days
Field Visit (at least 2 district/2-3 VDCs per district)	By 2 nd week of August	12 days
Draft report preparation and presentation for feedback, comments	By end of August	5 days
Final Report and Presentation in national workshop	By 2nd week of September	5 days
Total	Jun-July	28 days

12. Tentative Budget

The detailed cost calculation and proposition will be made by the consultant in proposal.

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Annexure 2: Evaluation Matrix for Access to Education Project in Karnali
Evaluation Matrix/parameters

Efficiency	Effectiveness	Relevancy	Value of Money	Sustainability
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the delivery of inputs on time • recruitment and mobilization of staff in time • Fund release and reporting to/from districts • Timely conduction of activities at schools and district levels • Frequency and quality of support to schools, teachers and education institutions • Frequency and quality of monitoring and supervision • Communication and understating among staff and stakeholder • Preparation and delivery of training, orientation, exchange visit, mobile meetings, • Supervision, and monitoring • Timely supply and distribution of materials 	<p>In terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing enrolment • Improving quality of education • Improving local governance and management • Improving protection of children • Input-output ratios • Relation between outputs and outcomes • Engaging parents and other stakeholders • Local markets and skills • Providing feedbacks, inputs and coaching • Providing technical support • Monitoring and supervision • Planning and reproting 	<p>In terms of usefulness and appropriateness of KIRDARC's interventions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiary like students, teachers, parents and education officials • Education system like school, VDC and DEO • Socio-cultural practices and values • National and local policies • MDGs and EFA, SSRP • Local skills, expertise and environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost estimation of each activity of the KIRDARC's educational program • Compare KIRDARC's work with other similar agencies • Comparing with contribution from beneficiary and local institutions • Comparing with market prices 	<p>In terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing services at local level by beneficiaries • Internalizing the issues into KIRDARC's interventions • Internalizing the interventions into DEO systems • Scaling up and learning by other agencies • Taking few initiatives in non-program schools and VDCs

On the basis of these parameters as suggested in ToR, the evaluation team will evaluate the progress of KIRDARC's education project of Dolpa and Kalikot.

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Annexure 3: Checklist for Interview with different stakeholders

ECED centers related checklist

1. How many ECED centers in your RC/district?
 - a. What were the roles of schools and VDCs for establishing ECED centers?
 - b. How are you monitoring and supervising these ECED centers?
 - c. What is roles in improving quality of ECED centers
 - d. How did you provide approval of ECED centers?
 - e. Do you disseminate ECED policy and guidelines?
2. How ECED centers are managed?
 - a. Do all ECED centers have management committee?
 - b. Who will select the facilitator and how?
 - c. Did they receive training? From where? How many days? How often?
 - d. What is your support to ECED? How often? How much? On what?
 - e. Do they submit you annual plan and income –expenditure report?
 - f. Do you monitor and visit ECED centers? How often and why?
 - g. Do you organize meeting and interaction between ECED centers and schools?
3. Availability and use of materials and funding:
 - a. What do you provide to ECED centers?
 - i. At the beginning of the ECED center
 - ii. Every year
 - b. What materials and support do you provide?
 - c. What are the materials available in ECED centers?
4. Benefits, linkages with schools and VDC
 - a. Why ECED centers are established? Any benefits for children, parents and society?
 - b. Do you organize meeting between ECED centers and schools? Why? How often?
5. Issues, challenges and problems
 - a. What are the three issues and challenges of ECED centers?
 - b. How can we make ECED centers more effective?
 - c. What would be the roles of schools, VDC and DEO?

Quality Education Related Checklist

1. Quality education,
 - a. What do you mean by quality education?
 - b. What do you do different than other district for quality improvement?
 - c. What is the difference between private and public schools?
 - d. How can you make public school better than private schools?
 - e. What can you do better within the existing resources and support?
 - f. How many school are child friendly in the district?
 - g. How are you following up the implementation of local curriculum and CAS? What? How?
2. Understanding roles of different stakeholders and policies on quality
 - a. Which educational rules and guidelines do you have? How did you get them? Are they reached to school?
 - b. Did you provide any training and orientation on those guidelines?
 - c. Why do we need SMC and PTA? Why two committees are needed? What are your roles to activate them?
 - d. Are HTs and RPs doing their pedagogical roles?
 - e. How often RPs/SSs visit in each school and what do they do?
 - f. How do you link educational issues with VDC and DDC?
 - g. How many schools have code of conduct for students, teachers and parents?
3. Adequacy and types of support to schools
 - a. How many schools have minimum enabling conditions as defined in SSRP?
 - b. How is the STR in your district and the resource center? What is the progress on teachers deployment?

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

- c. Do all schools have SIP? How was it prepared?
- d. How many VDCs have VEP/VEC?
- e. Do you have DEP? ASIP? Is there a district education calendar?
- f. Who are education actors and stakeholders in your district? Which areas? On which field?
- g. What is the district plan to improve quality of education?
- h. How is TPD implemented? Are teachers bringing changes in classroom?
- i. What would you like to improve quality of education in your district within 2 years time?
- 4. Relation between Children's rights and quality education,
 - a. How many schools have child clubs? Who formed it and why?
 - b. Do schools invite child clubs in SIP, Social Audit and Education Calendar preparation?
 - c. Do you interact with child clubs network?
 - d. What are the topics of regular RP meeting? What do you discuss in RC meeting?
 - e. How many schools in your district are child friendly?
 - f. How many schools have implemented school health nutrition?
 - g. How many schools have child protection policies? How children are counseled?
- 5. Issues, challenges and problems
 - a. What are the three issues and challenges of your district to improve quality of education?
 - b. Within the current funding and resources, what can we do to improve public schools?
 - c. What would be the roles of VDC and DDC for ECED and school management?
 - d. What are your three suggestions to improve quality of public education?
- 6. Roles of I/NGOs in public schools
 - a. What are the key educational stakeholders in the district?
 - b. Can you name few active I/NGOs working in education sector?
 - c. Where do you want to engage I/NGOs in your district? What would be their roles?
 - d. Is there a possibility of matching fund and collaboration with INGOs?
 - e. How would you assess the roles and contribution of KIRDARC? What would you like to see the improvement

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Annexure 4: Key Leading Question for FGD

Minimum Enabling Conditions

- Classroom/Toilet/water/textbook/play materials/ textbooks/curriculum/furniture

Teacher: Training/ Methodology

- Teachers: are they well qualified and trained particularly on CF teaching methodology, Active Teaching learning, grade teaching, child rights, trainings from TPD etc...

Assessment: CAS

- Learning Achievement: grade wise marks on Maths/Nepali and also average marks
- Understanding and application of CAS or other learning assessment tools if any;
- Who else are providing training to teachers? etc...

Supplementary reading and other materials:

- Textbooks delivered on time and in sufficient number? Who is buying books?
- Any extra books are in use in schools? which ones?
- Are there any supplementary material?
- Are there book corners in each grade?
- How is library? What types of books
- Posters, flip charts, classroom decorations
- Extra curricular activities

Governance: SMC, PTA, RP (Functioning level)

- Are SMC/PTA/VEC/DEC formed?
- Are they doing regular meeting?
- Have they carried out annual parents meeting, social auditing, financial auditing/
- Are they trained on their roles and duties?
- Class observation from HT, RP?
- Monthly teachers meeting?
- Interaction between child clubs, parents and schools?

Quality of Education

- Have a separate meeting with teachers, students and SMC/PTA on the following:
 - What do they think the best achievements and strengths of their school and why they are best/strengths?
 - Where they would like to see their school in 5 years time?
 - What do they want to do to improve the quality of education in their school comparing with other schools?

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Annexure 5: List of Schools and People Met

SN	Name of School	Grade	VDC	District	Total students	Counted students	Teachers	
01	Karnali Sencodary School Rengila	1-10	Badalkot-2	Kalikot	275	118	PS=3 LSS=0 SS=0	Local=7 No ECD
02	Suryajwoti PS (One ECED)	1-3	Raku-6	Kalikot	87	48	ECD=1	Local=2
03	Masto Saraswoti SS (No ECD from DEO, but school has)	1-10	Raku-5	Kalikot	303	194	PS=3 LSS=0 SS=0	Local=5 PCF=2
04	Gadul Snani LSS (one ECED)	1-8	Raku-7	Kalikot	133	85	PS=4 ECD=1	Local=4
05	Shantikot PS (one ECED)	1-5	Mehalmudi-2	Kalikot	118	67	PS=2	Local=2 ECD=1
06	Panchdewal HSS	1-12	Mehalmudi-8	Kalikot	NA	NA	NA	
07	Badrukh LSS (No ECED)	1-8	Mehalmudi-7	Kalikot	262	215	PS=4	Local=4
08	Kalika SS (one ECED)	1-10	Mehalmudi-3	Kalikot	303	220	PS=4 LSS=3	Local=2 ECD=1
09	Janjyoti LSS, Tikuwa	1-8	Mehalmudi	Kalikot	165	122	PS=4	Local=2
10	Bidyodaya PS (One ECED)	1-5	Likhu-4	Dolpa				
11	Kanjirowa PS	1-5	Likhu-5	Dolpa				
12	Amarsingh PS (one ECED)	1-5	Likhu-6	Dolpa				
13	Dhaulagiri PS (One ECED)	1-5	Pahada-7	Dolpa				
14	Kasturi LSS (one ECED)	1-8	Pahada-2	Dolpa				

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

Annexure 6: Expected Result, its indicators and achievement:

Result hierarchy	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI)	Unit	Target	Cumulative Progress	Remarks
Outcome: Access to and quality education increased at primary level of selected schools and ECDCs of the Karnali Zone with meaningful participation of the school communities.	At least 10 VDCs (2 VDCs per district) declared as 100% enrollment VDCs	No of VDCs	10	10	
	At least 60% out of school children enrolled in remaining 15 VDCs	Percent	60	99%	
	At least 70% of the teachers in working area trained and at least 80% of them practice	Percent	70 & 80	80% trained and 82% of them practice	
	At least 50% schools of working area declared as Zone of Peace	Percent	50	20%	
Result/Output 1: Needs of the educational institutions and communities identified, CEMIS and baseline information established	100 schools have updated age specific data of children (out of school and school going) available	No of School	100	163	
	100 schools with their needs reflected in SIP	No of School	100	87	
Result/Output 2: 7,000 children of 3-4 years enrolled and experiencing conducive environment in community initiated ECDCs.	At least 50% parents aware through parental education classes and send their children to schools/ECDCs	Percent	50	82%	Cumulative of 2010-2013
	10 VDCs declared as 100% ECDC age children enrollment VDCs	No of VDCs	10	10	
	60% of ECED children enrolled in ECDCs in remaining 15 VDCs	Percent	60	98.69	
Result/Output 3: 1,000 children of 9-14 years mainstreamed in formal classes after completing AEP classes.	At least 70% of AEP graduated join appropriate grades in school	Percent	70	76.47	
	At least 80% of the enrolled from AEP complete formal education cycle in primary level	Percent	80	15.28	
Result/Output 4: Increased participation of 22,000 children of 5-9 years and above including Dalits, ethnic and vulnerable groups resulted in increased NER, Retention rate, learning achievement, promotion and primary cycle completion rate	10 VDCs declared as 100% school age children enrollment VDCs	No of VDCs	10	10	
	At least 80 % increase enrollment of girls, Dalits, differently able, HIVAIDS and conflict affected out of school children	Percent	80		
	Net Enrollment Rate of program area in primary level increased by 60% from baseline	Percent	60	96.60%	

Final Evaluation Report:
Access to Education for Vulnerable and Marginalized Children in Karnali Project

	Retention Rate program area in primary level increased by 80% from baseline	Percent	80	96%	
	Pass rate of primary level students in program area increased by 20 %	Percent	20	94.27%	Mugu-77.78, Humla-55.00, Kalikot-11.76
	Learning achievement increased by 80%	Percent	80	46%	
Result/Output 5: Increased participation of children in school governance in creating safe and supportive environment	At least 60% of the SMCs will be inclusive of children as SMC members/children invitee in SMC meeting	Percent	60	76%	
	At least 50 schools declared as school/children as a zone of peace	No	50	36 schools	
	80% schools have functional code of conduct for safe, supportive and protective environment	Percent	80	68.75%	
	DEO in 5 districts developed local norms to represent children in SMCs	No of DEOs	5	5	
Result/Output 6: Enhanced Capacity of school communities for sustainable management with good governance practices for delivery of quality education with improved linkages with government structures	At least 50% schools in the working area practice social audit/public hearing in annual basis	Percent	50	76%	
	VDCs allocate resources for Educational activities	No of VDCs	25	25	
	At least 50% SMC, PTA are with proportional representation of women, Dalits, differently able, HIVAIDS and conflict affected children at decision making level	Percent	50	67% SMC and 65% PTA	
	Education related issues of Karnali zone identified, disseminated and recognized by national government	No of Issues	5	2	