

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**Independent Final Evaluation
of the Combating Exploitive
Child Labor Through Education
in Colombia Project:
*Edúcame Primero Colombia***

Partners of the Americas

Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16574-07-75-K



2010

This page intentionally left blank.

**FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

**Independent Final Evaluation of the
Combating Exploitive Child Labor
Through Education in Colombia
Project: *Edúcame Primero Colombia***

Partners of the Americas
Cooperative Agreement Number: IL-16574-07-75-K

2010

This page intentionally left blank.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report describes in detail the final evaluation, conducted during August 2010, of the *Edúcame Primero* project in Colombia. The report was prepared by ICF Macro, according to agreements specified in its contract with the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL) Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT). The evaluation of the *Edúcame Primero* project in Colombia was conducted and documented by Julia Hasbún, an independent evaluator in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the *Edúcame Primero* project team, and stakeholders in Colombia. ICF Macro would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator, Partners of the Americas and its partners, and USDOL.



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number USDOLB089K28215. Points of view or opinions in this evaluation report do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the United States Department of Labor, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the United States Government.

THANKS

The evaluator wishes to express her gratitude to the following persons:

- To Mary Anne Anderson and Jamie Timmons, of ICF Macro, for the collaboration and support during the evaluation.
- To USDOL for the support and guidelines provided in the evaluation process.
- To the staff of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project, for their excellent coordination and unconditional support to carry out this evaluation.
- To the staff of Mercy Corp, DevTech, CINDE and Partners of the Americas for their support and dedication to orient, explain, and respond to all the questions that arose during this evaluation.
- To the subcontractors' personnel involved in this project, for their assistance.
- To all government officials interviewed for the valuable information provided.

- To all the persons interviewed in the communities we visited: beneficiaries, parents, teachers, school principals, and other private individuals who pertinently shared with the evaluator their insight and opinions and made it possible to achieve the objectives of this final evaluation.

Note: The wording of this report is strictly governed by the grammar rules of the Spanish language. Thus, many times the beneficiaries are named in plural, including feminine and masculine genders. This report does not intend to use a vocabulary exempted of gender equity, but to respect the grammar rules of the language.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY	1
1.1 Final Evaluation Objectives	1
1.2 Evaluation Methodology	2
1.3 Limitations	3
II DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	5
III RESULTS: RELEVANCE	9
3.1 Findings	9
3.2 Good Practices	14
IV RESULTS: EFFECTIVENESS	15
4.1 Findings	15
4.2 Lessons Learned	23
4.3 Good Practices	24
V RESULTS: EFFICIENCY	25
5.1 Findings	25
5.2 Lessons Learned	26
5.3 Good Practices	26
VI RESULTS: IMPACT	27
6.1 Findings	27
VII RESULTS: SUSTAINABILITY	31
7.1 Findings	31
VIII CONCLUSIONS	35
IX KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROJECT	39
ANNEXES	
Annex A: Logical Framework	
Annex B: Information on September 2010 Performance	
Annex C: Methodological Master Plan of Questions of the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> Project	
Annex D: Guidelines for the Population To Be Interviewed	
Annex E: Sustainability Master Plan	
Annex F: Terms of Reference	

This page intentionally left blank.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ANDI	<i>Asociación Nacional de Empresarios de Colombia</i> (National Association of Entrepreneurs of Colombia)
CEDECUR	<i>Centro de Educación e Investigación para el desarrollo Comunitario Urbano y Rural</i> (Education and Research Center for the Development of Urban and Rural Communities)
CINDE	<i>Centro Internacional de Educación y Desarrollo Humano</i> (International Center of Education and Human Development)
COETI	<i>Cooperación Internacional para la Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil</i> (International Cooperation for the Eradication of Child Labor)
CSEC	Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children
DANE	<i>Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística</i> (National Administrative Department of Statistics)
EpC	<i>Espacios para Crecer</i> (Spaces for Growth)
EpE	<i>Espacios para Emprender</i> (Spaces for Entrepreneurship)
ICBF	<i>Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar</i> (Colombian Institute of Family Well-being)
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Nongovernmental Organization
NNA	<i>Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes</i> (Children and Adolescents)
QL	Quantum Learning
SENA	<i>Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje</i> (National Learning Service)
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNINORTE	<i>Universidad del Norte</i> (North University)
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WFCL	Worst Forms of Child Labor

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The primary objective of this final evaluation of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project was to review and analyze the actions implemented by the project, as established by cooperation agreement IL-16574-07-75K entered into with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) on September 30, 2007. It should identify aspects related to relevance, efficacy, efficiency, impact, and sustainability indicators. Furthermore, it must analyze whether the project had achieved its final goals and provide recommendations required for possible further achievements.

The project aimed to prevent *Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes* (children and adolescents, or NNA) from becoming involved in the worst forms of child labor (WFCL); to provide the required direct assistance for their social rehabilitation and integration; and to ensure access to free primary education and vocational training for all NNA withdrawn from WFCL, whenever possible and appropriate. The goals also included identifying and reaching NNAs at special risk of entering exploitive child labor, and taking into account the special situation of female children.

The project's goals were (1) to establish models of *Espacio para Crecer* (Spaces for Growth, or EpC) and *Espacio para Emprender* (Spaces for Entrepreneurship, or EpE) to prevent and withdraw children from child labor, (2) to adopt and monitor actions against child labor by the municipalities, and (3) to increase the awareness of parents, teachers, and leaders in communities regarding exploitive child labor. The project also aimed to increase the awareness of its policymakers and stakeholders regarding child labor problems and their possible solutions, and to seek project sustainability.

The first stage in this methodology consisted of the identification and preparation of key questions to be answered in the evaluation. This task was performed by ICF Macro, an institution hired by the USDOL to head and recruit pertinent personnel to evaluate the project.

The project management staff prepared a schedule of visits and interviews with the different actors and at the different venues, with the supervision of ICF Macro. The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project submitted a list of possible geographical areas to visit to the evaluator, from which the evaluator made selections.

Based on the timeline prepared and accurately coordinated by the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project, all the visits set out within the timeline were conducted and all qualitative techniques concerning fieldwork were applied within a 2-week working period.

The qualitative techniques used were—

- Group focus sessions in cases where there was a group of six persons or more. Twenty-one sessions were performed as follows: nine with beneficiary parents, eight with project beneficiaries, two with government officials, one with project personnel, and one with project educational personnel.
- Group interviews in cases where more than one and less than six persons were interviewed. Fifteen interviews were performed as follows: 10 with project educational personnel and 5 with government officials.

- Individual interviews with 15 members of project personnel, 6 with government officials, 13 with educational personnel of the project, 10 with direct beneficiaries of the project, 1 with diplomatic personnel, 1 with a beneficiary's mother—46 individual interviews in all.
- Personnel from eight EpCs and three EpEs were visited or interviewed in Barbosa, Barranquilla, Bogotá, Cali, Cartagena, Samacá, and Santa Marta.
- As calculated, approximately 250 individuals furnished information for this evaluation.
- The fieldwork was performed from August 8 to 23, 2010.

Once all the required information had been obtained, it was qualitatively analyzed using the triangulation technique to answer the evaluative questions.

FINDINGS

The existing evidence obtained from the 2001, 2003, and 2005 Child Labor Surveys and National Household Surveys were used to design the *Educame Primero Colombia* project. The supporting grounds of the project came from rigorous scientific measuring. The assumptions that provided a framework for the goals and activities of the project and the contents in its logical framework were relevant and realistic, and were mainly possible, except for the assumption that presumed economic stability, which broke down with the world crisis in 2009.

The fundamental strategy the project used to fight child labor was education. Children enrolled in any kind of exploitive labor were withdrawn from such labor and those at risk of getting involved in any kind of WFCL were prevented from entering into it. To this effect, EpCs and EpEs were created together with the Quantum Learning methodology that facilitates greater learning for NNAs and greater personal growing according to qualitative and quantitative evidences. This strategy responded to Goal 1 of the project, which was achieved.

The use of the space models (EpC and EpE) fit within the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education, which has not only supported the project but has made important decisions based on project experience—for example, the inclusion of supplementary school activities. This was one of the successful aspects of the project's Goal 4 achievements, which aimed to raise the awareness of policymakers and other stakeholders involved regarding child labor problems. This project is one of the instruments on which the country relies to support the National Strategy for Preventing and Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor and Protecting the Young Workers.

Colombia has 120 identified activities that are forbidden as WFCL. Given the preponderance of such activities, many stakeholders interviewed in the evaluation showed their disagreement with the inclusion of almost all the labor activities that children may perform as synonymous with exploitive labor, which constitutes a national scope of zero tolerance toward child labor.

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project was able to identify the geographical areas where WFCL were occurring based on the child labor surveys and home surveys at the time the project was designed, which continued to be valid. Additionally, the selection of beneficiaries to be favored by the project has been very realistic and has managed to withdraw children enrolled in exploitive

labor and prevent NNAs at risk from getting involved in such activities. With this, the project achieved Goal 4—to identify and reach NNAs at special risk.

The project worked with beneficiaries withdrawn from sexual exploitation, from zones of sexual exploitation, and from domestic service outside their own homes, beneficiaries in extreme poverty and social exclusion, and beneficiaries in mining and agricultural areas. The project was present through its subcontractors in areas with high rates of violence, poverty, and delinquency.

EpCs and EpEs not only provided shelter, educated, provided care, and encouraged children's healthy growth, but also generated accurate and valuable information for the Government of Colombia through their database of project beneficiaries, which they shared with the governmental agencies. This favors establishing a surveillance system, which is basic in the fight against exploitive child labor. This aspect contributed to the achievement of Goal 2 for the adoption and monitoring of actions against child labor by the municipalities.

Because of other stakeholders' perception in the areas of effectiveness and efficiency, the project has managed to enter into governmental counterpart agreements—such as *Acción Social* in Samacá—besides having other counterpart proposals should the project evolve to a second phase.

At the time of evaluation, before closing of the project's activities in February 2011, the actions and results inserted in the logical framework will be fulfilled in many of the cases. The targeted amount of children to be withdrawn and prevented from exploitive child labor will be achieved.

Indicators referring to attendance, improvement of academic performance, and passing grades in formal school were achieved to full satisfaction; sometimes these goals were even exceeded. This ensures access and continuance of NNAs in school just as it was proposed in Goal 3. The awareness of the beneficiaries' parents measured through knowledge, attitude, and practice surveys (one in 2008, and two each in 2009 and 2010) still cannot be analyzed for results, as the last 2010 measurement is still missing. To date, it has been observed that there was very little cohort variation; that knowledge was the area that increased the most, although not significantly.

The *Universidad del Norte* (North University, or UNINORTE) Foundation performed a study with its beneficiaries in Barranquilla to measure possible changes in academic performance and obtained positive results for the project, with significant changes in the academic performance in mathematics, Spanish language, and in the behavior of project beneficiaries. This indicates that the beneficiaries' capacities and skills are being improved (the beneficiaries' parents and teachers also validated this information through the evaluation interviews); however, the impact on the real abandonment or withdrawal of the children from work cannot be proven. To achieve this, two collaboration studies were proposed, to clarify a correlation between the project strategy and the expected final conduct of non-inclusion in the labor force. These studies, which were not the responsibility of the project (collaboration), had not been performed at the time of the evaluation, or the results were not ready, similar to the 2009 National Household Survey, for which data has already been collected but no report has been published, thus causing the conclusion on whether strategy works in withdrawing and preventing NNAs from child labor to remain pending.

The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system of the project currently provides a quite organized and automated data system. The system is provided with integrated programs that allow output charts, so that each nongovernmental organization (NGO) may have its own analysis in a decentralized form. The accuracy of the information registered in the database is ensured by two annual readings (every 6 months) and updates that prevent errors in the analysis. Also, the M&E personnel are the ones responsible for classifying the type of beneficiary, whether they should be prevented or withdrawn, and with whom the NGOs work. This occurs using an information analysis process and established criteria about the characteristics they should include.

The observed or measured impact of the project through verifiable indicators showed different types of beneficiaries. On one hand, we have the children who benefit by being withdrawn from exploitive labor or prevented from engaging in it; the improvement of their academic capacities and conduct, as well as the exercise of their rights, are very evident. Moreover, parents seem to show more positive attitudes toward their children's studies and less reluctance to engage them in child labor. Additionally, they demonstrate passing from embarrassing feelings to pride, from depreciation to appreciation of their children, from conformism of their living conditions to hope of a better life for their children.

The community benefited from the changes in the beneficiaries and was more aware of the risks of child labor and the advantages of study and recreational activities. Governmental agencies may perceive a sample of new strategies to prevent child labor and facilitate their own goals. Partners and subcontractors exercised joint work practices, preventing futile isolated efforts. Moreover, teachers internalized new alternative forms of teaching and learning.

Despite significant achievements in sustainability of the project, such as the agreement with *Acción Social* in Samacá to implement 12 EpCs, many of the actions performed have not been incorporated into the sustainability grid. This makes it difficult to have a general and organized view of the lines of action performed. For example, the project participated in related area public bids by considering the opportunities that had come up. The recommendations to improve the sustainability grid provided by the midterm evaluation have not been complied with. The incorporation of *Centro de Educación e Investigación para el desarrollo Comunitario Urbano y Rural* (Education and Research Center for the Development of Urban and Rural Communities), *Fundación Mamonal*, the Quantum Learning methodology, and training of teachers in the official educational system are some elements, among others, that enrich sustainability, as they imply a continuation of the project elements. In Goal 5 of the project, on sustainability, some important efforts have been achieved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. More intensive work is required to raise the awareness of the beneficiaries' parents. In October 2009, the project prepared a strategy to raise the awareness of the beneficiaries' parents, provided in the document *Espacios de Sensibilización con Padres* (Awareness-Raising Spaces with Parents), which constitutes a systematization effort of the work to be performed. This was part of the midterm evaluation recommendations performed that year. However, more efforts should be invested in raising parents' awareness to encourage their commitment toward withdrawing their children from child labor.

2. Longitudinal studies must be performed to show the impact of the project on the beneficiaries' labor conduct upon completion of the programmed cycle of the project. This is to verify whether the beneficiaries have been effectively withdrawn from the labor force once they are out of the project. An adequate budget is required to achieve this effect. It must be considered that scientific proof or evidences are part of a project's sustainability, since they demonstrate the need for continuity.
3. The actions to access project sustainability should have been better organized and more exercised as the responsibility of a consortium instead of individual partners or of a specific person of the project. In this respect, we reiterate the need and suggestion of a midterm evaluation to examine the allocation of the responsibilities, which should have been assigned by agreement.
4. While specific efforts were made, such as an offprint in the countrywide circulation newspaper, the project should have been announced with a massive campaign, whether with its own resources or through contributions, to support its activities and objectives. That would probably have helped to increase sustainability.
5. Beneficiaries who have not been completely withdrawn from child labor must be reported as partially withdrawn. It is required that these beneficiaries are reported as such. While it is true that the objective is to withdraw them completely, as provided by the National Policy and Strategy, the cases of children who have notably improved their labor condition must not be underestimated, even though they have not managed to completely withdraw yet, except for inclusion of dangerous activities that the project may define as non-eligible.
6. It would be important to perform studies comparing different methodologies or strategies within child labor eradication. The evaluator recommends using designs that include the educational strategy used by the project compared with others that pursue the same purpose, including a control group. In addition, the study to be performed by UNINORTE in Barranquilla should be conducted with a *representative sample of all the places where the project has intervened*, not only Barranquilla.
7. It would be beneficial for the project (always in line with the National Strategy) to help define what will be understood, for the project as a whole, by *progressive reduction* of child labor in Colombia. The operationalization of the term *progressive* would clarify the remaining doubts of the area stakeholders and, most of all, of the project personnel.

This page intentionally left blank.

I EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 FINAL EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of this final evaluation was to review and analyze the actions implemented by the project, as established by cooperative agreement IL-16574-07-75K entered into with the United States Department of Labor (USDOL). It had to identify aspects concerning the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability indicators. Furthermore, it had to analyze whether the project had reached its final goals and provide recommendations required for possible further achievements.

The project had the following five goals to meet as part of a fixed-period program:

- Prevent *Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes* (children and adolescents, or NNAs) from getting involved in the worst forms of child labor (WFCL).
- Provide direct necessary and appropriate assistance for the withdrawal of NNAs from WFCL and for rehabilitation and social integration.
- Ensure access to free primary education and vocational training for all NNAs withdrawn from WFCL when possible and appropriate.
- Identify and reach NNAs at risk.
- Consider the special situation of female children.

This evaluation also responds to the following objectives:

1. Establish *Espacios para Crecer* (Spaces for Growth, or EpC) and *Espacios para Emprender* (Spaces for Entrepreneurship, or EpE) models to prevent and withdraw children from child labor.
2. Adopt and monitor the actions against child labor by the municipalities.
3. Raise the awareness of community parents, teachers, and leaders about exploitive child labor.
4. Increase the knowledge of policymakers and stakeholders of the project regarding child labor problems and their possible solutions.
5. Grant sustainability to the project.

The project's expected results, indicators, and verifiable means are shown in the logical framework available in Annex A.

1.2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The first stage in this methodology consisted of the identification and preparation of key questions to be answered in the evaluation. This task was performed by ICF Macro, an institution hired by USDOL to head and recruit pertinent personnel to execute evaluations of the project.

Once the evaluator's services were engaged with a specific and clear description of tasks to be performed, the evaluator designed a grid of questions based on the terms of reference, identifying for each question who would be the most suitable interviewees.

The project management staff prepared a schedule of visits and interviews to the different actors and venues with the supervision of ICF Macro. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project submitted to the evaluator a list of possible geographical areas to visit, from which the evaluator made selections. The management staff of the project, who are more knowledgeable of the territory, expanded the coverage of visits and submitted to ICF Macro and the evaluator a proposal that was accepted and fulfilled.

Once the necessary documents were gathered, the evaluator examined them and prepared a summary of the most relevant aspects. Among the documents requested were statistics pertinent to the project and reports, as well as material it produced. This stage began before the evaluator's physical visit and lasted up to the time this report was prepared.

Based on the timeline prepared and accurately coordinated by the *Educame Primero Colombia* project all the visits set out in the timeline were performed and all the qualitative techniques concerning fieldwork were applied within a 2-week working period.

The qualitative techniques used were—

- Group focus sessions in cases where there was a group of six persons or more. Twenty-one sessions as follows: nine with beneficiaries' parents, one with the project personnel, one with the project educational personnel, eight with the project beneficiaries, and two with government officials.
- Group interviews in cases where more than one and less than six persons were interviewed. Fifteen interviews were performed as follows: 10 with the project's educational personnel and 5 with government officials.
- Individual interviews with 15 members of the project personnel, 13 with educational personnel of the project, 10 with direct beneficiaries of the project, 6 with government officials, 1 with diplomatic personnel, and 1 with a beneficiary's mother—46 individual interviews in all.
- Personnel from eight EpCs and three EpEs were visited or interviewed in Barbosa, Barranquilla, Bogotá, Cali, Cartagena, Samacá, and Santa Marta.
- As calculated, approximately 250 persons furnished information for this evaluation.

- The fieldwork was performed August 8 to 23, 2010.

Interviews were recorded using a digital recorder and with the prior authorization of the interviewed persons. All recorded interviews were verbally authorized, and the evaluator promised to interviewees to keep their information and identity confidential. Therefore, this report does not include the name of persons interviewed or descriptive data that might disclose the informants' identities (such as their positions). What is most important for this evaluation is the content of the information collected and the promise not to reveal the identity of those interviewed.

Once all the required information was obtained, it was qualitatively analyzed using the triangulation technique in order to answer the evaluative questions.

The following principles were considered during the evaluation process:

- Triangulation of the different informants' perspective and data collection methods.
- The voice of beneficiaries and their parents were included, always using sensitive approach techniques and interviews to children that would not damage them in any way, according to the International Labour Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (ILO-IPEC) research guidelines concerning children involved in WFCL.
- The evaluation was always addressed with a cultural and gender equality perspective.
- Questions not defined in the evaluation terms of reference (TOR), however pertinent, considering different situations and respondents, were made in a flexible form.
- The methodology followed in the different places of the project was consistent; however, pertinent and necessary adaptations were made because of the different scenarios visited.

1.3 LIMITATIONS

Although all efforts were made for the evaluator to visit a wide sample of implemented spaces, the short time assigned to this type of evaluation and the broadness of the Colombian territory presented challenges for the possible generalization of results analyzed along the visited places.

Nevertheless, special emphasis was made on the revisions and analyses of national documents, as well as on obtaining interviews with key informants that could give an overall view of the complete project, instead of only at the regional level. The accuracy of the results was closely related to the analysis of rigorous scientific research work and of the interpretation of available statistics of the existing databases.

This page intentionally left blank.

II DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

USDOL has, on multiple occasions, supported the fight for eradication of child labor in Colombia. After a public solicitation process sponsored by USDOL in 2007, the Partners of the Americas, in association with DevTech Systems, Mercy Corps, and *Centro Internacional de Educación y Desarrollo Humano* (International Center of Education and Human Development, or CINDE), entered into a cooperative agreement for a period of 3 years and 3 months for the implementation of a timebound program aimed at reducing WFCL, leading to the design of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project discussed in this final evaluation. The time limit or life period provided in the project agreement was from September 30, 2007 to December 31, 2010; it was extended to February 2011 by a project revision. The cooperative agreement provided for the execution of a final evaluation in 2010.

The mandate of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project is to support the National Strategy for Preventing and Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor and Protecting the Young Workers. The goal of both the project and the National Strategy is the progressive elimination of the WFCL in Colombia. The organizational structure of the project is constituted by four partners, as previously mentioned. Partners of the Americas heads the association and subcontracts other organizations for program interventions. Mercy Corps, as well, has the responsibility for subcontracting, implementing, and managing organizations. DevTech contributes with technical resources and accompanying elements of the project's educational component and CINDE contributes with the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems of the project. Below is a more detailed description of the partners and subcontractors.

In the course of four decades, Partners of the Americas has worked in the achievement of different objectives toward the enhancement of living conditions. It has undertaken a number of activities, such as the improvement of nutritional products, provision of health services, provision of work training for young people, protection of the natural resources of the region, safeguard of the rights of women and children, and promotion of exchange and understanding between cultures. Among the many activities carried out in favor of children are the initiatives to reduce WFCL in Colombia.

In the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project, this partner managed to involve seven organizations, known as subcontractors since they were contracted for the implementation of general actions and strategies of the project in specific areas of intervention. Partners of the Americas subcontracted to the *Asociación Cristiana de Jóvenes* (Christian Youth Association) in Bogotá that operates and works with beneficiaries in neighborhoods of sexual tolerance, many of whom are relatives of sexual workers, as well as children engaged in street vending, construction, transportation, and services in general. *Asociación Cristiana de Jóvenes* has 9 EpCs and 10 EpEs, and their functions are described later in this report. In this way, Partners of the Americas also involved *Fundación Mamonal* in the project, a private nonprofit entity operating for over 35 years, funded by *Asociación Nacional de Empresarios de Colombia* (National Association of Entrepreneurs of Colombia, or ANDI) in Cartagena. ANDI develops different social management mechanisms and concrete actions of entrepreneurial social responsibility with the community of Cartagena. This foundation manages 10 EpCs.

Another Partners of the Americas subcontractor is the *Universidad del Norte* (North University, or UNINORTE) Foundation, an organization located within the prestigious *Universidad del Norte* in Barranquilla and part of the academic structure of the psychology doctorate and magister area. This foundation manages 15 EpCs in Barranquilla. In Santa Marta, Partners of the Americas involved the *Fundación para el desarrollo del Niño, la Familia y la Comunidad* (Foundation for the Development of the Child, the Family and the Community), which has eight EpCs in operation and is closely connected to UNINORTE.

In Cali, a Partners of the Americas subcontractor operating nine EpEs is *Fe y Alegría*, a nonprofit organization operating since 1973 in Colombia that works with adolescents in secondary schools of very populated, impoverished, and socially excluded neighborhoods. Also in Cali, Partners of the Americas coordinated with *Centro de Educación e Investigación para el desarrollo Comunitario Urbano y Rural* (Education and Research Center for the Development of Urban and Rural Communities, or CEDECUR), which has 25 years of experience and currently operates nine EpCs for the project. They also work with children in areas of extreme poverty, who are involved in street vending, services, and in the construction sector.

Partners of the Americas managed to enter into an agreement with a governmental counterpart through *Acción Social* in Bogotá, in Samacá, basically a mining area (coal mines) with agricultural and livestock production, where 12 EpCs were created with the support of *Fundación Colombianos Apoyando a Colombianos* (Colombian Foundation Supporting Colombians). This foundation develops activities for the improvement of living conditions of Colombian citizens, supporting intercultural relations and offering projects and programs to generate sustainable income and employment. It applies equity, solidarity, and citizen participation principles. Through this counterpart, two EpCs operate in Bogotá, besides those in Samacá.

DevTech Systems is the contributing partner with educational technology that the project implements as strategy. This organization, created in 1984, has developed types of alternative education for vulnerable populations, such as the case of underage workers. One such type of alternative education is the Quantum Learning (QL) methodology, a set of active and participatory methodology techniques focusing on the needs of children to be educated through recreational and dynamic activities, positive thinking, and emotional development. QL operates in two types of space that may be inserted in the traditional school or the community. EpCs are venues that recruit children between age 6 and 14 with specific characteristics and include them in the project, whether they are to be withdrawn or prevented from exploitive labor. EpEs recruit adolescents of both genders between age 15 and 18. The difference between both types of groups is the focus on the age of the children and the educational needs for the different age groups. They have different educational dynamics and materials. EpCs' contents include three main components: academic capacities, personal growth, and recreation. EpEs have leading, vocational, and undertaking components. It is in the vocational component where the preparation and training are provided to learn the trades pertinent to the different geographical areas. The EpC model has been recognized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization as an effective educational methodology.

The academic capacities component reinforces areas that are featured in the official program of the Ministry of National Education, including recovering areas with deficiencies and assisting children with their school homework. In the personal growth component, the curriculum provides and helps internalize principles, values, and rights that will enable the children to develop comprehensively. In the recreational component, the curriculum provides dynamics, games, and sports activities that allow and facilitate an adequate physical and mental health for the beneficiaries.

Mercy Corps is the third partner in the *Educame Primero Colombia* project. Their strong point and mission is the strengthening of local nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) helping and providing them with technical assistance in required areas. They work in very economically depressed areas and are the partners that contribute with interventions for the withdrawal and prevention of one of WFCL—the commercial sexual exploitation of children (CSEC)—which should be taken as a priority abolishment. The subcontractor in Cartagena is the Renacer Foundation, which in addition to working in withdrawing children from street vending and recycling (collection of waste), withdraws and prevents CSEC, for which they have pertinent spaces and strategies available. This foundation operates with 16 EpCs. In Bogotá, the Renacer Foundation is also implementing 24 EpCs, especially in very peripheral areas.

Another Mercy Corps subcontractor is the *El Camino* Foundation, which is traditionally engaged in offering secondary education in Barbosa, Bolivar, Puente Nacional, and Vélez. They joined the project operating 20 EpCs that work in basically agricultural and livestock areas, where many persons who are victims of displacement are found.

The CINDE foundation is a social organization within the project that promotes comprehensive human development for NNAs through research processes and in the search for alternative and innovative solutions for the existing challenges. Among the services offered at this center are training of personnel, dissemination of information, participation in networks, and the incidence of policymaking. CINDE contributes to the project with M&E efforts and provides support to general research processes. Staff includes research professionals of different fields, among them, educational and social fields, in addition to professional personnel specialized in statistics.

Altogether, the project operated approximately 125 EpCs and 19 EpEs in 2010, though there have been 407 EpCs and 19 EpEs operated during the project's lifetime. While there are many natural differences in the activities implemented by each area (cultural, economic production, poverty levels, and education), the project implemented a unified model with the QL space and methodology strategy, on which the space educators were trained (in addition to some official school teachers).

This page intentionally left blank.

III RESULTS: RELEVANCE

3.1 FINDINGS

3.1.1 Analysis of Project Assumptions and Strategy Foundations

The project used the existing evidence provided by research results, such as the 2001, 2003, and 2005 National Surveys of Child Labor and National Household Surveys. When creating the indicators for the project in 2007, the home survey results for 2007 were not yet ready, although the information had already been collected; therefore, the project had to work with the results obtained in 2005.

According to the 2005 National Household Survey, approximately 999,895 NNAs were estimated to be involved in child labor in Colombia.¹ The question asked during the study to measure this indicator was whether a child had participated in a paid job during the week previous to the survey. This limitation of time to the previous week contained in the question might result in an underestimation, as a working child that had not worked the week previous to the survey, would be left outside such estimates. Once the 2007 National Household Survey results were ready, a still lower estimate was observed compared to that of 2005—786,567 working NNAs.²

The information collected during the 2005 and 2007 surveys revealed some important aspects of the project, which are listed below:

- Fewer children were working in urban areas than in rural ones, which means there is more child labor in rural areas.
- Working children were mostly male. In 2005, there were 68.2% male and 31.8% female working children; in 2007, 70.8% of working children were male and 29.2% were female. The one exception was for Bogotá, which reported 53% male and 46.8% female children workers for 2007.
- In 2005, a countrywide survey reported that only 23.1% of the sample were only studying and not working; in 2007, 24% was reported. The age group mostly contributing to these percentages was those children age 5 to 9.
- Children age 15 to 17 had the lowest school attendance rate.
- In 2005, agriculture and trade were the most reported sectors for child labor participation—68.8%, and 66.8% in 2007.
- The reason to work reported by most children was to contribute to the household's economic activities (need).

¹ National Household Survey of Colombia. 2005.

² National Household Survey of Colombia. 2007.

- The children who worked and performed domestic duties at home were more likely to attend school, in a proportion above 74%.
- Out of the 13 metropolitan areas included in the survey sampling, Bogotá, Cali, and Medellín were the ones that reported the highest percentage of child labor.

If there is a criterion to consider the non-compensated domestic work at home as additional work when it is 15 or more hours per week, the figures for the two previous years increase: 1,800,640 working NNAs for 2005 and 1,628,300 working NNAs for 2007. This implies that even with the possible underestimates, the amount of working NNAs in Colombia is very significant. The goals and actions proposed for the project are still relevant and realistic. Currently, the publication of a countrywide survey that measured the dimensions of child labor is being prepared; however, at the time of this evaluation the most updated information available was for 2007. No scientific consideration may be provided as to whether child labor has decreased. The assumptions contained in the logical framework of the project are mostly realistic; however, one assumption might have varied the situation, the one pertaining to a supposedly stable economy in the country, but the world crisis in 2009 also affected Colombia. Despite this, the project was developed as planned.

3.1.2 Main Strategies of the Project

The project uses education as its basic strategy to fight child labor. It seeks to recover NNAs who have abandoned school or never attended school and instead enrolled in some type of exploitive work, and prevent those who are at risk of becoming involved in any WFCL. The spaces created by the project not only offer the possibility of improving the education and personal growth of underage children, but also offer a safe structure to stay in while their parents work, without the risks associated with the lack of good supervision, staying home alone, or wandering freely out in the streets. The use of the space model (EpC and EpE) fits within the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education. The ministry is currently preparing to implement supplementary school activities that will be financed by the Family Compensation Funds. This decision was taken in great part because of the experience of the project with the implementation of spaces. When interviewed, an employee from the central government of Colombia analyzed the situation as follows: “While there are currently regions where pilot plans for supplementary school activities are being executed, the *Educame Primero Colombia* project undoubtedly showed the advantages of a system that complements traditional educational activities. Managing to keep children within an educational and healthy environment prevents them from getting involved in exploitive work.”

From the perspective of the beneficiaries’ parents, the perception is also positive. Once the project provided adequate information regarding child labor risks, most of the parents interviewed not only felt great satisfaction regarding the project because of the personal changes their children had experienced, but they also felt that “they [the project] have helped us to be better parents. I feel I am a more responsible father after my son stopped working with me in agriculture and goes to school. I feel I am a better person. I am not doing what they did to me” (Parent interviewed in Samacá).

The QL methodology is a “rescue” methodology; it helps children to overcome several adverse conditions they are experiencing or have experienced, enabling particular changes described by most of the interviewers as “miraculous.” The evidence of this efficacy shall be analyzed in more depth further on in this report.

3.1.3 Identification of the Main Obstacles or Important Barriers in the Fight Against WFCL in the Country

Poverty is still the most reported cause for exploitive child labor. Persons interviewed in the course of this evaluation pointed out that NNAs work because their families are in great need of contributions from all its members to maintain their household. This has also been confirmed by previous surveys.³ The *Educame Primero Colombia* project does not affect the reduction of poverty directly. This goal is beyond their efforts, although, some of the project partners have other projects funded by other donors that try to provide counseling and resources for microenterprise initiatives, for example. However, the project was not created to act particularly on that situation. But it is also true that the project has an indirect effect on this situation, as it enhances the overall quality of life of its direct beneficiaries and a great number of the indirect beneficiaries (parents, educational personnel, and communities), which may help to reduce the severe damages and consequences derived from poverty. *Red Juntos* is the government program that, together with other governmental entities, aims to reduce poverty in Colombia.

Colombia has made a significant effort to provide sufficient school coverage for the school-age population. Regarding family displacement, for example, Colombia has mandates for schools that quickly insert displaced school students into the closest school or any other if no space is available at the closest. It is the educational system’s responsibility to insert these students without much problem so that they do not have to lose the term or school year, or simply abandon school because of carelessness. School space availability is not an obstacle.

- One of the *lessons learned* in reducing WFCL is described by the *Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística* (National Administrative Department of Statistics, or DANE). “In short, although school coverage there reaches almost 100%, child abuse will continue while current poverty conditions persist” (In-depth analysis and comparative terms for years 2001, 2003, 2005, and 2007 regarding child labor, DANE, Bogotá, 2008).

What the interviewers did point out, particularly at the governmental level, was that it was necessary to improve the physical infrastructure of schools. It was noticed that some of the EpCs visited were located within new school premises, built for education purposes under excellent architecture criteria, and that these new schools were located in zones of extreme poverty. According to information provided by key informants, this responds to government’s initiatives, as well as some NGOs operating in the country, in an effort to rescue and improve schools.

Another obstacle identified was the increase of single-parent households where it is the mother who very frequently is responsible for raising the children on her own without the presence of the father, who has usually abandoned them. This situation was reported in most of the places visited. This situation causes mothers to work to cover household expenses and also to work for an

³ 2005 and 2007 National Household Surveys.

extended time or in double shifts to cover basic family needs. When basic needs cannot be covered, children must start working to contribute to the household economy. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project does not consider changing this condition among its goals.

Cultural aspects, such as the tendency to make children start working in order to *learn*, is inherent in the Colombian society, and in Latin America in general. Most of the parents interviewed rationalized the logic behind this practice as follows: “I started working when I was 10 years old and took the money to my mother. I grew up and nothing bad happened to me. So, I did the same thing with my children. Nobody had really analyzed me before as the project did, showing me I had been careless with my children’s education and that I was improving our household income by putting them to work, but I was preventing them from developing in order to overcome poverty” (Beneficiaries’ mother in Cartagena).

The armed conflict that affected Colombia, which was closely related to the forced displacement suffered by the communities that were caught between strategic territories by paramilitaries, guerrillas, State Armed Forces, drug-traffickers, emerald-traffickers, and others,⁴ is frequently associated as a phenomenon that worsens poverty and increases unemployment and begging. According to existing studies,⁵ internal migration in Colombia is particular to three sections of the country, Bogotá, Atlántico, and Valle, as the perspective is to look for better opportunities. Those displaced are mostly women, children, natives, and Negroes—33% of those displaced are of Negro origin (Codhes, 2003).⁶ The indigenous population represents 5% of the total displaced; 48% of the population suffering forced displacement are women, most of whom are heads of their families because of the death or recruitment of their partners into the armed conflict. This situation generates conditions of great vulnerability for the families that do not earn enough income to survive and must involve their children in the labor force. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project works with displaced beneficiaries, which, to a certain extent, improves the hard situation of uprooting and exclusion of these migrants.

Another situation that intensifies child labor is that some parents, such as the recyclers (waste collectors), take their children along so that they do not stay home alone and to protect them from the hazards that await them in the communities. If they collect trash at night, they take the children and in one way or another, the children get involved in their parent’s work, even if it is only to run errands for them. While it is true that, for example, the District Secretariat of Social Integration in Bogotá has created childcare places for this purpose, there are not enough of them to cover all the needs. The hazard perceived by parents regarding leaving their children at home in dangerous neighborhoods is real. In Barbosa (Santander), the evaluator had the opportunity to meet a girl that had been burnt when drug-traffickers in the streets argued with her father when he tried to move them away from his home front. When her parents were at work, they burned down the house with the child inside. The girl was saved, despite suffering a number of different grade burns as well as natural trauma of the experience. The girl, who was a beneficiary of an EpC, had not yet physically recovered.

⁴ Martha Nuria Bello quoted in the book: *Colombia: Migration, transnationalism and displacement*. UN (National University of Colombia) Faculty of Human Sciences. Collection CES, 2006.

⁵ Martínez (2001) quoted in the book: *Colombia: Migration, transnationalism and displacement*. UN (National University of Colombia) Faculty of Human Sciences. Collection CES. 2006.

⁶ Ibid.

Irresponsible male parenting, as well as the complicity of some mothers that force their children to work, was also reported as a challenge to the achievement of child labor eradication. Irresponsible male parenting, which as previously discussed, creates single-parent homes where mothers have to take on all the roles, causes the mothers to allow or encourage their children to enroll in child labor. On the other side, in the case of begging, some interviewees stated that parents were more responsible for exposing their children to this exploitive and dangerous situation because they forced their children to beg in the streets or to steal, evading their responsibility to effectively protect and support their children.

3.1.4 Suitability of the Project to Fit Government Initiatives

The goal the project shares with the National Strategy is the progressive elimination of child labor. The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project, while inserted in the national policy, has been mostly designed to support the strategy. The project is one of the instruments available to support the National Strategy.

However, in the identification of WFCL in Colombia, 120 activities were exposed, which were prohibited and marked for elimination. While it is true that child labor in general should be thoroughly analyzed in all its particular cases after the identification exercise performed regarding WFCL, any child labor could be mistaken as exploitive work. DANE⁷ exhibits this situation as follows: “In the first place, the high sensitivity that this issue causes, as well as the moral burden imposed on it, meant the demonization of child labor and thus, any activity involving infants and work should be eliminated. Since the discussion focused in the moral field, the terms *work* and *exploitation* started to be considered as equivalent, and consequently, an NNA who is working is being exploited.” However, the idea of identifying WFCL is to give priority to those activities that, for their intrinsic nature, should be eliminated, because of their dangerous nature or their degradation of the children’s rights. The different actors interviewed stated that the lack of distinction between child labor and WFCL makes their work difficult as both should be given priority. Some government informants also stated the need to review WFCL in Colombia.

The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project is complying with all the National Strategy and Policy guidelines. It goes hand-in-hand with all the aspects the government points out as important and participates in the Inter-Institutional Committee for the Prevention and Eradication of Child Labor and the Protection of Young Workers. It contributes to the strategy with the inclusion of beneficiaries in the educational system, identifying them so that they may be subject to the provision of social services by government agencies, as done by the National Program *Juntos* of the *Acción Social* and International Cooperation Presidential Agency and other organizations, such as the Ministry of National Education and the Ministry for Social Protection, the work of which will soon be divided between two ministries, one of them, Labor.

EpCs and EpEs not only shelter, educate, provide care, and encourage the healthy growth of children, but they also generate accurate and valuable information for the government through their beneficiaries’ database, which is shared with governmental agencies. For example, coordinators or supervisors in the areas of the *Red Juntos* program work very closely with the educational staff or

⁷ In-depth analysis and comparative terms for years 2001, 2003, 2005, and 2007 regarding child labor. DANE, Bogota, 2008.

spaces coordinator to validate or simply include new possible candidates to recruit beneficiaries for social services.

EpCs have the most frequently implemented spaces, while only 19 EpEs were operating in 2010 (and during the project's lifetime). Only Partners of the Americas has subcontractors operating EpEs. The experience of this model has been quite satisfactory according to the comments of both implementing agencies (*Fe y Alegría* and *Asociación Cristiana de Jóvenes*) and each of the beneficiaries interviewed. The vocational component has been accompanied by the governmental agency *Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje* (National Learning Service, or SENA) in Cali and *Fe y Alegría*. One of SENA's mandates was to work and provide vocational education to vulnerable populations that fit with the populations identified by the project for the elimination of exploitive child labor. Furthermore, SENA is directly involved in the existing committees regarding child labor; the association with *Fe y Alegría*, therefore, complies strictly with its objectives.

The *Asociación Cristiana de Jóvenes*, in turn, through the EpEs it operates, offers its beneficiaries vocational education using its own resources, which they have developed and strengthened in the course of their long experience as an NGO. However, this NGO is also connected to governmental agencies that recognize its strengths and validate its work and inclusion in the project and in the national objectives, as stated by government officials interviewed.

3.2 GOOD PRACTICES

The space models, particularly the EpCs, have furnished the Ministry of National Education with evidence regarding the relevance of creating and supporting spaces that may act as supplementary educational activities, facilitating the healthy growth of children that may keep them away from exploitive child labor dangers. While supplementary activities are not inserted yet in the government educational system; there is a ministry resolution that favors their creation. This is an example of how the project's experience has shown the benefits that the educational system may obtain by using educational methodologies to fight against child labor.

In Cali, it was observed that the project keeps an excellent relationship and maintains coordination with SENA through *Fe y Alegría*. This relationship was established within a cooperation framework. It is necessary that SENA recognizes that this organization spares no effort in the observance of its mandates to achieve its goals. For example, it is a usual practice that the vocational learning beneficiaries attend the different SENA structures. However, in Cali, if there are difficulties with the transportation of the project beneficiaries, the SENA staff go to the neighborhoods, regardless of whether they are dangerous or perceived as such and tailor their service offer to the conditions of each community with which they work. The clear understanding of personnel regarding the nature of their mission and its fulfillment is very positive.

Another good relevance practice is the agreement between *Acción Social* and the project in Samacá, Boyacá, where the project contributes with its methodology strategy and the government finances a great part of the activities; it also delivers social services to the inhabitants. Samacá is a mining and agricultural area. In the visit performed for this evaluation, no children were observed working in the mines.

IV RESULTS: EFFECTIVENESS

4.1 FINDINGS

4.1.1 Achievement of Objectives and Goals

According to statistics provided by the project, some of the results established in the project's logical framework may be advanced in September 2010 (see Annex A) covering Periods 1 to 6 (from October 2007 to August 2010) without forgetting that the data for Period 7, which corresponds with September 2010 to February 2011, are not yet available. That is, the final statistics are not ready yet as this evaluation was performed before the end of the project was set for next year.

Result 1 was the establishment of EpC and EpE models to prevent and withdraw children from child labor. The numerical goals of the logical framework indicate that 10,200 NNAs in EpCs and EpEs would be prevented or withdrawn from child labor during the life period of the project. According to the September 2010 statistics, there were 8,616 beneficiaries in EpCs, with a target of 9,643 (as provided by the September 2010 Technical Progress Report, included in Annex B), which indicates that there are approximately 1,000 beneficiaries missing from EpCs that will probably be reached during the remaining period of the project. The numerical goal to be achieved in EpEs, according to this revision, is 557 beneficiaries, 486 of whom are already inserted, meaning that targeted number of EpE beneficiaries may be achieved. The general goal to reach 10,200 beneficiaries might be achieved at the end of the project without difficulty.

On the other hand, according to the September 2010 Technical Progress Report submitted to USDOL, 4,212 beneficiaries had been withdrawn and 5,134 had been prevented as of August 2010, indicating that 45% of the beneficiaries reached had been withdrawn and 55% prevented. With the revisions made by the project's monitoring system where the number of withdrawn beneficiaries is updated upon verifying they have not returned to work, 50% of withdrawn beneficiaries will probably be achieved, as forecasted. Also, the current figures indicate that the work has been done equally with both genders, although with small differences, as 51% of the EpC beneficiaries were male and 54% of the EpE beneficiaries were female. However, this could change by the end of the project.

The current information for September 2010 indicates that 78% of the beneficiaries attend EpCs at least 80% of the time; the figures for EpEs indicate 88% attendance. The goal for both spaces is 80%. This means there is little more needed to reach the EpCs goal and the numerical goal for EpEs was exceeded.

The goal to be reached with beneficiaries in both types of space with regard to improvement of their academic performance is 60%. Currently EpCs indicate 84% improvement, and EpEs 97%. Currently, both spaces have significantly exceeded the targeted goal for the improvement of their academic performance.

Sixty percent of EpC and EpE beneficiaries needed to enroll in formal schools. September 2010 figures indicate enrollments of 63% in EpC and 13% in EpE. EpCs exceeded the expected figures, and EpEs will not be able to meet the goal. Achievement to this date is very low in the EpEs.

Result 1 corresponds to Objective 1, which indicated that EpCs and EpEs would be established to prevent and withdraw NNAs from child labor. There are 125 EpCs and 19 EpEs. As observed in the foregoing results detailed, the creation of spaces has helped in the prevention and withdrawal of NNAs from child labor.

Result 2 indicates that three municipalities would be implementing monitoring actions for the support of the National Strategy. There are currently two objectives. However, it was also stipulated that three municipalities would be implementing actions in line with the National Strategy with project assistance, and there are currently 12, evidently exceeding the numerical goal. This result points at Objective 2, which indicated the adoption and monitoring of actions against child labor by the municipalities; this objective was achieved.

Result 3 established a 75% rate of knowledge and awareness of beneficiaries' parents with whom the project intervened (including practice and attitude) with regard to child labor. This indicator was created considering the data collected by the knowledge, attitude, and practice (KAP) surveys carried out—one survey in 2008, two in 2009, and two in 2010. The analysis for the second period of 2010 is still pending. Current results indicate that the rates for all measurements have always been equal to or more than 75%, even for the first cohorts. It must be added that the breakdown of the results of the survey by fields (knowledge, attitude, and practice) produce hardly categorical results regarding an increase in such fields.

While the project considers attitude to be the field that increased the most, this evaluation considers it to be knowledge, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of the CAP Study Performed by the Project, by Field

Years and Periods	2008	2009-1	2009-2	2010-1	EpE
Knowledge	77%	76%	81%	78%	76%
Attitudes	85%	82%	84%	76%	85%
Practices	74%	71%	73%	68%	75%

In 2008, there was only one measurement performed; thus, it was not possible to compare or observe any change concerning this period. Another problem observed in 2008 was that the sample was characterized by the inclusion of the population of urban zones in Bogotá, while the measurements for the remaining years of the sample were represented by province zones in the country outside the capital. This might be the answer for the high rate obtained in these fields for 2008. It could mean that there is greater knowledge, and better attitude and practice regarding child labor in Bogotá than in the inland geographical areas.

For 2009, two measurements were obtained with hardly significant changes. In the first period, the knowledge rate obtained for parents was 76%. In the second half, this rate increased 5 percentage points, up to 81%. Regarding attitude, there is an increase of 2 percentage points, as in the practice

field. For this reason, the analysis indicates a greater increase in knowledge, which is reasonable, as knowledge is the first step to behavior modification, although this is not so for attitudes that are rather an intermediary between knowledge and practice. It must also be clarified that an economic crisis was suffered in 2009, and it might not be the best year for analysis. Therefore, the project should wait until the 2010 results are ready before drawing any conclusion in this regard. Nevertheless, the educational work with beneficiaries' parents is required as a priority. The midterm evaluation recommended the creation of an educational component for parents. The project does work with parents, as proved by interviews performed among members of the population and with the creation of the Spaces for Parents' Awareness; however, in the spaces visited, no standardization was observed in the intervened areas regarding periodicity of educational interventions with this population. The frequency of interventions varies by field and implementing organizations.

Result 3 also stipulated that the logical framework would have 12 announcements in the media regarding child labor issues. There are currently 16, which exceeds the target number. As for the extended use of technology, such as Facebook, websites, and YouTube, there should be 15 information dissemination media targets and there are currently 6, indicating that maybe the target number might not be achieved.

Result 3 is inserted in Objective 3 of the project aimed at increasing the awareness of community parents, teachers, and leaders concerning exploitive child labor. In regard to parents' awareness, it seems it has not been achieved at this time. While teachers interviewed expressed good acceptance toward the project tasks, there are no quantitative parameters to measure a possible increase of the educational staff. The announcements made through the targeted communications media, which were more than the number planned, may provide a vague approximation that awareness by the general population may have increased. This evaluation had no opportunity to measure this, nor is it quantified by any tool used by the project.

Result 4 of the logical framework indicates that there would be two collaborating studies measuring the impact of the methodology in the reduction of child labor. The project reports that neither of the studies has been performed. The study performed is one that measured the impact of the EpCs' methodology on the personal growth and academic performance in mathematics and Spanish language of the project beneficiaries in a *before and after* evaluation model. However, it is pertinent to point out that this study measured the methodology impact on the beneficiaries, but not particularly on the reduction of child labor.

Another achievement stipulated in Result 4 was the existence of three political decisions influenced by the project or the studies. The project does not report having achieved any of them; however, during the evaluation, it was observed and evidenced that the decision of the Ministry of National Education to implement supplementary activities had considered the results of the spaces methodology implemented by the project. Finally, it was foreseen in Result 4 that three EpC models would be validated in Colombia, but the project only reported one during Period 5. That means that currently, Result 4 has barely been achieved.

The foregoing results imply that Objective 4 to increase the knowledge about child labor issues and possible solutions by the policymakers and stakeholders of the project was not satisfactorily achieved, even though efforts had been made, some of them successful.

Result 5 indicates that five entities would be extending the use of the QL methodology, and currently only one has been reported in the Samacá project.

This result fit under Objective 5 regarding sustainability of the project. Efforts have been made to achieve this objective, not only by spreading the use of educational models, but also by training 72 school teachers in Bogotá, in addition to other actions that will be detailed in the section on sustainability later in this report.

As for the evaluation of the scope of the project goals, this evaluation prefers to present them in the conclusions, as their measurement presumes a combination of objectives and results that will be easier to understand once the exposition of findings is concluded.

4.1.2 Efficacy of EpCs and EpEs

There was a study performed by the UNINORTE Foundation, with the support of CINDE, in January 2010 regarding the impact of the methodology used by the project on academic performance in the subjects of mathematics, Spanish language, and conduct in Barranquilla. An intentional sample of 116 beneficiaries of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project was obtained. There were 50 female beneficiaries and 66 male beneficiaries. Overall, 55 participants in the sample had been withdrawn from some labor activity, and 61 were being prevented. The data collection instrument used was the school reports of the subjects under study. The results indicated significant changes in the EpCs' beneficiaries in those three subjects, particularly in conduct, followed by mathematics, and finally by Spanish. Changes were given in withdrawn and in prevented beneficiaries. Significant differences were observed in the female beneficiaries in the three subjects, in the following order: Spanish grammar, mathematics, and conduct. In the male gender, differences were observed in conduct (particularly) and mathematics.

This study shows the personal changes of beneficiaries in Barranquilla with respect to conduct and academic performance. While it is true that this is not evidence that they will not succumb to child labor, it might be interpreted as an academic success that will encourage their approach and attachment to schools, reducing the risk of abandoning school.

In addition to this quantitative study, in the interviews performed by this evaluation, qualitative perceptions could be obtained from key actors that could assess whether changes occurred to the beneficiaries. Parents expressed their satisfaction with the project and indicated that their children have presented “miraculous” changes in their conduct and school capacities. They reported having perceived in their children qualities they had never noticed before they joined the project: “I have my son here. Before, when I had to come to school, I felt very embarrassed because my son would not behave well and was a bad student. He used to be known for his bad grades. He was very violent and kept quarrelling. For that reason I felt embarrassed to come to school, because they would point at me saying that is the mother of so-and-so and I covered the face with my hands so that they would not recognize me. Now, my son is a different child, he is doing well at school and behaves very well. He abandoned his bad behavior. I don't have to hide any more when I come to school” (Testimony of an EpC beneficiary's mother in Barranquilla). Another mother in Cartagena added: “I am surprised to see the change operated in my daughter. She looks more self-assured, she doesn't argue with me as she used to. She is more affectionate with her brothers and with me. It's a

great change that has occurred. She is doing very well at school; she has excellent grades, which I never expected to see.”

A beneficiary’s father from the rural area of Samacá expressed: “I have my two daughters here. One of them almost didn’t talk before. Now she speaks a lot and very well. They are doing very well at school and they love coming to the EpC. They used to help with farming. Now, we have decided they must only study so that they can look forward to a better future than ours. Life is very hard here, but we are decided to make a sacrifice for them.”

The school personnel also showed their satisfaction with the spaces and their methodology. “EpCs are simply a success,” expressed a teacher in Bogotá. Another secondary teacher in Bogotá said, referring to EpEs: “I have also changed my attitude with this strategy. I have brought down the wall between my students and me.” A teacher in Cali showed his surprise and admiration: “The change is amazing. Several children attending the EpC had been expelled from school for being violent and now they are good students.” Another teacher who did not know about the methodology applied in the EpC said: “I want to apply that methodology.”

The commentaries obtained from most of the teachers of urban and rural areas expressed great satisfaction with the project and the educational models and asked to extend them to more beneficiaries. A rural school principal said that the following year all students from another rural school would be transferred to his school in order to merge the two schools into the new one. His concern was how he would deal with those new students that were coming from very violent neighborhoods and had bad conduct, if the project ended in December: “It should not end. We require it to continue. The brevity of the project is frustrating.”

Other types of key actors interviewed were local authorities who agreed to support the project and the spaces. For example, in Samacá, total support was observed, with deep involvement from the authorities. It is true that the EpCs developed there are precisely the ones that have a governmental counterpart by *Acción Social*. Involvement exceeded the expected interest in these situations, and authorities proposed a series of measures to encourage residents of the area to not hire children to work in the mines or agricultural sector.

In Barranquilla, the Bureau of Education expressed its intention to work closer with the project methodology to analyze the feasibility of expanding in the area, given the information reported by its technical personnel on the results obtained. A clear opening to learn about the project in further depth and analyze future collaboration with it was evidenced.

4.1.3 Identification of Intervention Zones and Beneficiaries of the Project

The intervention zones selected to work in the project were targeted because of information gathered from the existing surveys. All the geographical areas chosen are classified as zones with a high prevalence of child labor and WFCL, according to the provisions set forth in the National Strategy for Preventing and Combating the Worst Forms of Child Labor and Protecting the Young Workers (2008–2015).

As previously mentioned, because there is no proper distinction between child labor and WFCL, as indicated by DANE, it is necessary to clarify that the project has selected its beneficiaries within the framework of 120 activities defined by the National Strategy as the worst. Furthermore, the project has given priority to the forms it finds to be the worst among the 120 activities, and continues to work with the National Strategy on this.

For example, several related projects from the different donors in Latin America hardly include an offer to victims of CSEC. Preventive talks are provided, but the beneficiaries are not victims of such activity. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project works with CSEC victims who are withdrawn from such activity. The Renacer Foundation is responsible for working with the population and with other types of beneficiaries who require assistance. They are using an attendance protocol for these particular cases, as recommended by the midterm evaluation. During the visits made in Bogotá and Cartagena, the professional staff from the foundation included, within the explanations offered to this evaluation, information concerning the treatment that female children received at the shelter and development homes and how to work with their families. The foundation also stated that it not only works with female children, victims of sexual exploitation, but also with male children. As for the prevention of this phenomenon, the evaluator was able to speak with a girl in Cartagena whose brothers had been victims of sexual exploitation; one of them had a tragic end. The beneficiary girl attended the EpC in prevention for CSEC, given the family history. Other information received was that different governmental agencies referred cases of CSEC victims to the foundation; this was confirmed by various key government informants who were interviewed.

Another positive action of the project was the work with resident beneficiaries in areas of sexual exploitation, many of whom are sexual workers' children. With the project assistance, a true CSEC prevention is made, a phenomenon that these children might be more exposed to than other children. The project is also working in one of the most economically depressed areas, such as the mining and agricultural zone of Samacá. The inhabitants' conditions are a sample of extreme lack of everything, even water. The project works in two areas of serious child labor, such as the mining and agricultural sector.

In Cali, the project works with CEDECUR in neighborhoods of extreme poverty, as well as in neighborhoods perceived as very dangerous because of delinquency and narcotics, where *Fe y Alegría* works. That is the same in the case of the UNINORTE Foundation in Barranquilla.

The project beneficiaries are selected based on profiles previously outlined in the activities that are clearly WFCL. Between ages 6 and 14, beneficiaries are selected and placed in EpCs; those between ages 15 and 17 are placed in EpE. The spaces' coordinators and teachers are trained by CINDE staff so that they may recognize the most suitable profiles. Although each subcontractor has an exact number of beneficiaries they must recruit (as specified in each contract), the number of selected children for the spaces is quite variable. Most subcontractors select more beneficiaries than they are supposed to have as a preventive measure in case of abandonment (which is less frequent, except when they migrate to another place) or in case they return to child labor, which causes them to be removed from the database as withdrawn beneficiaries. The CINDE staff at the central management of the project classifies whether beneficiaries should be withdrawn or prevented. This exercise is done based on the analysis of indicators measured by the project for

each beneficiary. The instructions provided to subcontractors regarding their quota indicates there should be 50% beneficiaries prevented and 50% withdrawn from child labor.

This situation is more frequent than it would appear to be. For example, in cohort three, 882 children were taken out from the database as withdrawn children and classified as children to be withdrawn (most of these children did reduce their working hours by 60%.) This action was recommended by the technical auditors who visited the project in 2009. It is important to point out that projects funded by USDOL adjust to the existing legal framework of each country and ILO Conventions 138 and 182.

The perception of all the persons interviewed during this evaluation regarding the suitability of the selection beneficiaries for the *Éducame Primero Colombia* project is that it was very satisfactory and adjusted to the reality and needs of the population. An employee expressed this respect in his comment: “You work with the most difficult population. They are really problematic people to work with, whether because access is very difficult or because there is no technical knowledge available to face a series of cases. However, the project faces them and they are very effective in their actions.”

4.1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation System

The project’s M&E system was changed from its original form, and a new database was created with all the indicators required by USDOL. The program used for the system is Access, and all the personnel in charge of data collection at a local level were trained to enter the corresponding forms.

According to the M&E personnel interviewed for this evaluation, there are no major problems with the operating system. Each year, two measurements are performed with a standardized questionnaire to collect data from the beneficiaries of the project. Even though this information is digitized, each year the database is updated, which allows validation of the information to determine whether there are typing or measurement errors in the beneficiaries’ data. This makes it possible for the information provided by the project to be very reliable.

The M&E personnel safeguard the accuracy of the data submitted by making frequent field visits, and through validation methods and onsite verification. The evaluator observed during visits that monitoring was quite strict and frequent, and there was a well-unified procedures system in the different subcontracted NGOs. While some NGOs are more advanced than others based on their experience in the educational and supervision systems, they must all meet a minimum of capabilities and activities. Even subcontractors with less experience in this type of project, such as the *El Camino* Foundation, presented a satisfactory process regarding routine registrations. The described conditions have been very important for the project to have a well organized and automated data system. The system has integrated programs that allow output charts, so that each NGO may obtain their own data analysis without expecting them to be delivered by the management. This means the system is decentralized.

The technical auditors recommended removal of partially withdrawn children from the database, which entailed a large transformation and demanded great effort; currently, all the recommended criteria have been included. This update of the beneficiaries’ database recommended by the auditors was made because beneficiaries that were still working, although their working schedule

had been drastically reduced (60%), were included in the database as withdrawn. In accordance with the National Policy, these beneficiaries may not be considered as withdrawn.

The project database is shared with governmental agencies, and the CINDE staff working on the project tries to assist in the creation of other databases.

4.1.5 Innovations in the Project

The methodology or educational strategy used by the project is the QL methodology, which consists of a set of techniques that recovers beneficiaries using alternative tools different from traditional ones. During the evaluation visits, the evaluator observed that, in addition to QL methodology, some partners were implementing other techniques to introduce new elements to beneficiaries' routines.

For example, Mercy Corps' *Vivo Jugando* program is supported by a guide for the teacher and another one for supplementary activities for children. This educational material was prepared and validated by a consultant. This program is funded by Nike and the educational materials are produced by the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration. *Vivo Jugando* provides a series of values and principles through short reflection sessions of not more than 5 minutes before playing football and games with low levels of competitiveness. The beneficiaries of Mercy Corps participate in this initiative on Saturdays as not to interfere with QL methodology activities. To this effect, they are provided with uniforms and sports supplies. A female beneficiary interviewed said, "Saturdays are my favorite days because I play football." Most of the children interviewed showed a very positive attitude toward this innovated activity.

In addition to the advantage of a recreational activity, it is perceived that this innovation also affects gender equality. It was observed in the spaces visited that EpC beneficiaries of this program had a different opinion than those not in the program as to whether girls should or should not play football. Those favored by the program did not make any distinction by sex in the game skills; furthermore, they mentioned that some girls were better players than the boys. However, in other EpCs that did not have this innovation, the boys were not quite comfortable with the girls playing this sport.

Upon implementing this project, Mercy Corps implemented qualitative evaluation techniques to measure results with before and after observations obtaining improved results in different aspects, as mentioned in the documents submitted for this evaluation.

Other project innovations are generated by QL methodology, when beneficiaries create new songs or new dynamics and activities within their routines. For example, the evaluator observed in Cali that, in some EpEs visited, the lyrics of space songs had changed as a result of the beneficiaries' initiative, and they also integrated new dynamics and activities, such as visits to specific places that they chose. Also, in some of the EpCs visited in different regions, we were able to verify the encouragement of spaces toward the creative processes of activities, such as poetry, training in regional dessert recipes, and participation in different community festive activities.

4.1.6 Management Strengths of the Project

Among the strengths perceived by the different key actors and informants interviewed, the most significant were indications that the project had very good technical personnel and high levels of responsibility and commitment to the mission.

Another project strength recognized was a very well organized administrative financial system that responded satisfactorily to USDOL requirements in the management of all types of funds and resources.

The periodic meetings of partners and the monthly meetings of regional subcontractors were also considered a success. These are led by the M&E specialist and the education specialist. Their roles are perceived as an efficient way to keep an open communication and a possible space to look for solutions to the problems the project has to face. The meetings with local subcontractors have implemented activities through electronic technology, such as the internet, online chats, Skype, and Facebook, to avoid the high cost of periodic meetings with participants that would involve air travel, given the long distance between the different regions involved. At the same time, NGOs hold meetings with their facilitators on a monthly basis, and they have created a system where all the actors are involved in the communication.

The M&E system only takes 5% of the total budget. With this system, which is very complete, great efforts have been made to lower implementation costs. This situation has been highlighted as a strength, but also as a challenge to be improved, as some people consider that the allocated budget for this area is insufficient to cover all the responsibilities.

In the spaces, project teachers show high involvement levels in the eradication of exploitive child labor. The project does not conceal its intention to eradicate child labor in its educational offer. All parents interviewed for this evaluation were aware of the project rationale. “This project is to prevent children from working, and they do it by educating them in these spaces” (A beneficiary’s mother in Bogotá). This remark is important as there is evidence that in other countries with similar projects and QL methodology activities, the final goal of eradication of child labor is disguised through offering educational activities, which is just a strategy for the projects, but is perceived by many of the actors as the final goal. The project in Colombia offers these educational activities, however it makes it clear that the final goal is the eradication of child labor and not the improvement of education, although the project does have an effect on educational quality.

4.2 LESSONS LEARNED

The *Educame Primero Colombia* project has a profile of greater awareness in government relations with the different regions with which they work than at a central level. This may be because of the Colombian decentralization process. While it is true that it was required to consolidate regional government relations to be able to work, the project staff understands the need to increase the relationship at a central level because of the relevance it entails.

4.3 GOOD PRACTICES

The selection of the project beneficiaries is very good. The project has children that need to be withdrawn from recycling work, full day street vending, commercial sexual exploitation, and domestic work in other homes, particularly with female children. Furthermore, it works in the prevention of NNAs from work and the problems of forced displacement, extreme poverty, and excluded groups. These are not only activities included for the eradication of child labor and WFCL in the National Strategy, but also concerns key actors have expressed during the interviews, that the project has been recognized for recruiting populations difficult to access or work with, besides being recognized as the worst forms of work, which should be given priority, and they were reported as the best strengths of the project.

A study was performed by the UNINORTE Foundation to verify the efficacy of the QL methodology in the beneficiaries' academic performance and attitude. This is a good example of the scientific work that projects should always provide to verify the efficacy with respect to their donors as well as to the society in general, as it is a good strategy for the promotion of sustainability of actions and strategies.

The *Vivo Jugando* program funded by Nike and other agencies is an initiative that enriches QL methodology. It is a program beneficiaries like, and it lays out equality lines of gender in sports.

V RESULTS: EFFICIENCY

5.1 FINDINGS

5.1.1 Cost-efficiency of the Project

The cost ratio of the project implies the investment of US\$350 per beneficiary. According to a report submitted in 2009 by the Ministry of National Education, the investment of the Government of Colombia per student, per year amounts to approximately US\$500.

When interviewing various government officials, many of them were aware of the advantages of hiring the services of the project instead of investing money to conduct the same activities through their organization. An example of this was the response from the district Social Integration Department in Bogotá, in a focus group session that took place for this evaluation. The participants indicated that the department had programs similar to the project and, among others, one of the most feasible decisions to make was to hire the services of the project, which would be significantly cheaper than to use their own resources. Some of the reasons given were cost of food, staff, and use of locales. In Samacá, where the government participates together with the project, the government contributes money and assigns technical staff to supervise. This formula has given good results, in cost-efficiency terms, according to government and *Acción Social* actors.

5.1.2 Human and Financial Resource Adequacy

For the project subcontractors, financial resources are not enough to cover all the necessary activities, and the budgets should be revised to update and include costs that may have come up during the project.

Nevertheless, what was observed was that the partners have tried to complement the shortages that arise from special circumstances with other projects and programs. In many cases, just a little financing could complete the needs that they may have. Moreover, in the case of *Fundación Mamonal* and CEDECUR subcontractors, since they are foundations sustained by private local financing, resources are shared with the project activities. For example, *Fundación Mamonal* offers businessmen a sort of activities menu to be financed, in which they can choose freely where and what to invest in. In Cartagena, businessmen have financed the construction and remodeling of the school facilities that have benefited the project.

A symbiosis has been established between the project resources and other private and international donors, which prevents all of the parties from being forced to pay the full resources necessary for adequate action.

On the other hand, human resources, such as the project staff interviewed, seem to be sufficient and properly chosen. Most of them are dynamic and very capable in their jobs. They carry out their routines with pride, since they feel they are helping to shape the country. “I fight for my Colombia” (A young educator’s comments from an EpE in Cali).

The management staff of the project is provided by each partner and everybody, from the director to the area technicians, carries out their duties with responsibility. During the evaluation visits, the evaluator observed that the central staff was well known by the implementing parties and they systematically accompanied project staff conducting the different aspects of the job. In particular, the education specialist from DevTech and the M&E specialist from CINDE, both of whom provided the technical assistance necessary for effective project functioning.

The implementing parties' staff or subcontractors are also highly qualified. They are people with a high degree of scientific training, as well as professionals from different social areas. Moreover, the staff members are seriously focused on carrying out their duty and keeping good relations with other parties, among them the government. Every day coordinators and educators are challenged by some physical phenomena (such as in the case of Barranquilla with its *arroyos*, which are water currents formed by rain that drag people and objects in their path), and the dangers of the neighborhoods in which they work. It is a team that could be described as a brave army of children's rights rescuers.

5.1.3 The Efficiency of the M&E System

As previously mentioned, the M&E system of the *Educame Primero Colombia* project is highly efficient. It is prepared to receive information and carry out an in-depth analysis. It allows for the decentralization of data analysis, so that partners and subcontractors can carry out their own individual performance analysis, without having to wait for the central system to do so.

As with any other system, it has undergone changes to improve the records and data authentication controls, delivering a very reliable product.

According to the CINDE staff in the evaluation area, greater efforts could have been made to measure the impact and efficiency of the project, but as previously mentioned, the budget for these duties had not been established.

5.2 LESSONS LEARNED

The project staff and other parties feel that less than a year of activity is not enough to complete the withdrawal of NNAs from exploitive work, which means that the period should be extended. Once the cycle is completed, the interviewees feel that their ex-beneficiaries could once more be enrolled in dangerous lines of work because of necessity and poor living conditions.

5.3 GOOD PRACTICES

The subcontractors and the partners, as well as the government staff involved closely with the project, are highly capable and efficient. Outstanding young men and women, who stand out in their duties, take responsibilities seriously, and make the defense of minors their personal fight.

VI RESULTS: IMPACT

6.1 FINDINGS

Through the interviews and visits conducted in this evaluation, some evidence of apparent impact has been observed. These impacts have been divided according to the different sectors or benefited subjects.

6.1.1 Impact on the NNAs

- Withdrawal of NNAs from exploitive child labor
- Increase of school enrollment
- Prevention of enrollment in exploitive work
- Prevention of school dropout because of learning difficulties or work
- Increase in the beneficiaries' rate of retention in school
- Increase in the beneficiaries' pass rate
- Prevention of enrollment in work because of learning difficulties or because they feel they cannot study
- Increase in their awareness about their rights to education and to not be forced to work
- Increase in self esteem and confidence in their learning skills
- Learning of artistic expressions
- Learning of vocational skills for teenagers
- Increase in the quality of communications between beneficiaries and their relatives
- Increase in the socialization skills of NNAs with other people—beneficiaries have more friends
- Positive behavioral changes in discipline and family obedience
- NNAs that continue to work do so in non-exploitive jobs, with schedules and conditions that protect minors—for example, reducing working hours to 1 or 2 hours a day

6.1.2 Impact on the Beneficiaries' Parents

- Their awareness of education being a priority in their children's lives increased considerably
- Pride toward their kids doing something that they were not able to do
- Less concerned about their children dropping out of school
- More involved in school activities
- Paying more attention to their children

6.1.3 Impact on the Community

- The importance of education is better understood
- The community is more closely involved with children and teenagers and their problems
- The community has gained access to government social services through the project

6.1.4 Impact on the Partners and Subcontractors

- Increase of strengths to achieve better teamwork with shared goals and objectives
- Greater capacity to work with governmental institutions in a respectful environment
- Some acquired new skills and are able to manage more complex projects
- Acquired and improved their skills in the monitoring system

6.1.5 Governmental Impact

- NNAs withdrawn from exploitive work through the project, as established by the Colombian National Strategy and Policy
- Increase in school enrollment
- Help in locating and convincing minors outside the school system for educational rescues
- Reduction in incidence of dropouts and repeaters
- Training for teaching staff and promotion of different alternatives to be freely used by teachers
- Establishment of good relations with local authorities because of the project's involvement

- Exemplifies what could be complementary work shifts so that they may be adopted by the official educational system—even if they are not the same as the project’s EpC and EpE

Even though there are no studies that could gather the necessary measurements to establish impact levels, the above impacts can be verified in documents with testimony from key actors.

This page intentionally left blank.

VII RESULTS: SUSTAINABILITY

7.1 FINDINGS

7.1.1 Exit and Sustainability of the Project Plan

The project has a sustainability master plan that stipulates actions toward establishing an exit plan upon its completion. This master plan was initially created in 2008 and updated in 2009. Most actions proposed in the plan require the dissemination of the model of the implemented spaces—that is, the project strategy—and to systematically inform the monitoring activities of the actions to the government committees and agencies as a mandatory and systematic practice. These actions have been conducted throughout the project’s lifetime, in public and private presentations of the project and in periodic data reports and monitoring actions.

The master plan also contemplates the creation of a network between the project and ILO-IPEC, *Fundación Telefónica*, World Vision, and Save the Children Foundation, which joined this group recently. This was carried out and the grouping of the five agencies was determined by the *Cooperación Internacional para la Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil* (International Cooperation for the Eradication of Child Labor, or COETI), through which efforts are being coordinated; it has also planned to create a national communication strategy about child labor.

The midterm evaluation included recommendations to add to the master plan the actors responsible for the execution of the assignments, and to try to set a timeframe to achieve them. It was also recommended that a sustainability commission be created by the partners. None of this was achieved. The invitations to the partners were made, according to the project management, but were not answered. The project management has proper documentation showing that the invitations were made in writing.

Nevertheless, some progress has been made in this component, some of which have been successful. Some successes have not been collectively achieved by the project consortium, but the partners have been prominent individually. The partners incorporated their other donors, which punctually provided the necessary resources for the project.

7.1.2 Initiatives to Incorporate Foreign Resources to the Project

The individual initiatives of the partners and from the project management must be identified here, as well as those who have been the key players in obtaining resources.

7.1.3 Coordination with the Government

The project entered into an agreement with the Presidential Agency for Social Action and the International Cooperation and its *Red Juntos* program, with US\$75,000 in financing from the governmental agency. This agreement took place in Samacá in Boyacá, with prioritized families from the previously mentioned mining and agricultural area. The agreement was carried out because of the interest that agency showed in the project.

Although it has not been able to participate in public bidding processes for hiring of services because of the lack of counterpart funds, the project, with the Ministry of Social Protection and through the *Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar* (Colombian Institute of Family Well-being, or ICBF), has offered counseling to this institution by identifying potential beneficiaries (working NNAs) in a format created by ICBF. The *Educame Primero Colombia* project identified the required information, which was handed over to ICBF.

Through the Ministry of National Education, the project has shared the experiences of the EpCs, which were taken into account in the guidelines it established for the implementation of complementary school hours financed by the Family Benefit Fund (*Comfenalco*), and which were established by this ministry in May 2009. A pilot plan is currently being conducted in some areas for the creation of such school hours. As a result of this, the Family Benefit Fund informed the project of their interest to provide support with counterpart funds for a possible second stage of the project. Moreover, in some places, the ministry provides snacks for the beneficiaries of the project.

This is also the case with the District Agency for Social Integration, which, during the interviews of this evaluation and even in writing, has reiterated its interest to work with the project in a second stage. This agency assessed the performance of the project and believes that a partnership with it can reduce costs.

The Samacá Municipal Government has been very involved in the project activities, as well as those of *Acción Social* in this geographical area. It has provided snacks for the beneficiaries of the project and has shown at all times its interest in collaborating with the project. Efforts are being made to help the district compile a list of working NNAs in the area. There have also been joint actions in raising parents' awareness to prevent them from sending the NNAs to work, as well as landlords and mine administrators, to get them to commit not to employ minors in these labors. This Municipal Government has the intention to work and furnish counterpart funds in a second stage of the project.

The project has established itself as a relevant member of the fight against exploitive child labor in the National Inter-Institutional Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor. It attends the meetings and reports its breakthroughs to this committee.

With the Education Office of Bogotá, 72 teachers were trained in QL methodology. For this evaluation, the Education Office of Barranquilla expressed its interest in participating more closely with the project in a second stage, having a high opinion of the methodology used by the project.

On its website, the Municipal Government of Chiquinquirá published its interest in working with the project, but up to the time when this evaluation was made, nothing had materialized. Neither has there been an answer from the Municipal Government of Cajicá, to which the project was presented. In the case of the Municipal Government of Facatativa, there was interest, but their answer was that they did not have the resources to finance a partnership.

Regarding SENA, it was possible to achieve their contribution to the offer of vocational training for the beneficiaries of the EpE in Cali. SENA covers all expenses for these training courses, which are offered free of charge to the beneficiaries. The close relationship between this agency and *Fe y Alegría* has been previously discussed.

7.1.4 Coordination with International Agencies Other Than USDOL

The project participated in a funding solicitation from the Government of Australia through Australian AID, to support projects to promote and defend human rights, but was not selected. It also participated in the bidding process with the United States Agency for International Development in conjunction with World Learning, but unfortunately was not eligible because it was already receiving funds from the United States Government through USDOL.

The Partners for the Americas have other financing sources that benefit the project beneficiaries. This is the case of Nike and of the United States Department of State with Mercy Corps, as previously discussed.

7.1.5 Coordination with Local Private Agencies

The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project along with the *Telefónica* Foundation published a 15-page offset in *El Tiempo* newspaper on June 12, 2008 with information about child labor. This offset commemorated World Day Against Child Labor. The foundation also asked the project for a proposal to improve the quality of its program and the results of the NGOs it finances as subcontractors. Up until the evaluation, there were plans for *Telefónica* to finance spaces where attention could be given to *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project beneficiaries, who would have completed their time in it, as a sort of follow-up.

The project delivered an economic proposal to the Restrepo Barco Foundation to obtain counterpart funds; no answer has been received yet.

7.1.6 Special Cases

Two of the foundations that work as subcontractors for the project are also, in part, examples of sustainability for the project because of the nature of their external funding. This is the case of *Fundación Mamonal* and CEDECUR. Regarding CEDECUR, the administration of this entity complements, with their own resources, the offer of other services (such as medical and dental care) for their beneficiaries.

In *Fundación Mamonal* the case is the same, only broader, since its beneficiaries benefit from the donations that the foundation receives from *Asociación de Empresarios de la Costa Atlántica* (Atlantic Coast Entrepreneurs Association) in Cartagena. Whether the project continues or not, the foundation and CEDECUR have already internalized the methodology of the project and can still carry it out with different resources. This is also applicable to the teachers of the public education system that were trained in QL methodology.

While many efforts have been engaged toward achieving the sustainability of the project, it is necessary to mention that the sustainability master plan of the project does not correspond with all the efforts and attempts made. The previously mentioned efforts did not meet the guidelines of the sustainability master plan. This may be because the exercises recommended by the midterm evaluation were not achieved, therefore missing a good opportunity to revise and include more detail in the activities taking place then, or in the future, concerning sustainability. Participation of the project in public bidding processes every time the opportunity came up could have been

included, for example, in the sustainability master plan, indicating that it would participate in the public bidding processes related to the work of the project, as these came up.

Regarding other recommendations offered in the midterm evaluation in terms of sustainability, we observed two aspects which could not be achieved; one of them being the collaboration of the project management with the subcontractors for sustainability purposes and to provide support and direction to them to achieve solid efforts in this area. The main reason offered by the project management was the lack of time to be able to accomplish all the responsibilities.

VIII CONCLUSIONS

For the design of the *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project, existing evidence was used, compiled from the results of the 2001, 2003, and 2005 Child Labor Surveys and Household Surveys. In other words, the basis on which the project rested was given by scientific measurements. The assumptions that generated the objectives and activities of the project, which were stated in its logical framework, were relevant and realistic, and were mostly possible, except for the assumption that established economic stability, which was crushed during the 2009 world recession crisis.

The main strategy of the project is education. Minors who have been enrolled in any kind of exploitative labor are rescued, and those at risk of getting involved in such labor are prevented from doing so. This is why the EpCs and EpEs are created, along with QL methodology, which facilitates better learning for NNAs and greater personal growth, according to evidence, both qualitative and quantitative.

The use of the space model (EpC and EpE) fits within the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education, which has not only supported the project, but also taken important decisions based on the experiences of the project, such as adding supplementary school hours. The project is one of the instruments on which the country relies to support the National Strategy in the fight against one of WFCL.

Colombia has 120 defined activities that are forbidden and singled out as WFCL. Facing a problem of such magnitude, many of the key members interviewed during the evaluation expressed their disagreement with categorizing almost all the labor activities that minors could perform as exploitative labor, constituting a national situation of zero tolerance toward child labor.

The *Edúcame Primero Colombia* project correctly detected the geographical areas in which WFCL occurred on the basis of the results of existing studies at the time of planning that are still currently valid. Likewise, the selection of beneficiaries for the project has been very realistic; the project succeeded in rescuing minors enrolled in truly exploitative labor and in preventing NNAs at risk of being involved in such activities from doing so.

The project works with beneficiaries withdrawn from commercial sexual exploitation (who are often hard to locate in similar projects in Latin America). The project works in areas with sexual exploitation, extreme poverty, social exclusion, as well as mining and agricultural areas. The project is present through its subcontractors in areas with high levels of violence and crime.

The 407 EpCs created throughout the life of the project, plus the 125 EpCs and 19 EpEs created in 2010 do not only shelter, educate, provide care, and encourage the healthy growth of children, but they also provide precise and valuable information to the Government of Colombia, through the beneficiaries' database, which is shared with government agencies. This helps establish a fundamental monitoring system to fight exploitive child labor. The monitoring of project activities in the districts where the project works feeds broader systems at a national level. The second objective of the project is, therefore, achieved—to have the targeted local governments adopt and monitor actions against child labor.

Because of the perception of other key actors in the area about the efficacy and efficiency of the project, it has been able to achieve government counterpart agreements such as the Samacá *Acción Social*, along with other counterpart proposals if the project should continue on a second stage.

At the time of the evaluation, which anticipates the project's activities to end in February 2011, the actions and objectives inserted in the logical framework will be fulfilled in most cases. The total quantitative goals regarding the amount of minors to be withdrawn and prevented may be completely achieved.

The indicators related to assistance, academic performance improvement, and grade passing in formal schools were satisfactorily achieved, in some cases surpassing the goals. All these results indicate that the first objective of the project regarding establishing EpC and EpE models to prevent and withdraw NNAs from child labor was achieved.

With regard to raising awareness among the parents of the beneficiaries, although measurement has been taken from surveys on knowledge, attitude, and practices (one in 2008 and two per year in 2009 and 2010), there is no conclusive analysis up to now—since the last measurement of 2010 has not yet been analyzed. What has been observed so far is that there is very little variation in the cohorts and that knowledge evidenced the largest increase. These findings are part of the third objective of the project, which showed an increase in the awareness of parents (as well as others). So far, the evidence indicates that this objective has not been satisfactorily achieved with respect to parents, and it could not be quantified with respect to teachers and community leaders, even though the qualitative results of the interviews in the evaluation indicate that the project has sensitized teachers. There is increased awareness among the teachers, but the increment specified in the objective cannot be measured.

The UNINORTE Foundation conducted a study with its beneficiaries in Barranquilla to measure possible changes in academic performance. It obtained very positive results for the project regarding significant variations in math and Spanish performance, and in the behavior of the beneficiaries of the project. This indicates that the beneficiaries' abilities and skills have improved, which is also corroborated in the evaluation interviews with the parents and teachers of the beneficiaries. Nevertheless, this is not enough to prove the project's impact on the actual withdrawal from child labor. To this effect, two collaboration studies were established to clarify a connection between the strategy of the project and the final expected behavior of children's exclusion from the workforce. These studies, at the time of the evaluation, had either not taken place or the results were not ready, which means that the conclusion about the efficacy of the strategy in withdrawing and preventing NNAs from participating in child labor is still pending.

The M&E of the project currently has in place a very organized and automated database system. The system has integrated programs that allow for output charts, so that each NGO can have its own, decentralized reports. The accuracy of the database is given by two measurements taken twice yearly (every 6 months) and updates that prevent errors in the information for analysis. The M&E staff are in charge of classifying the type of beneficiary to be referred to the NGOs, whether prevented or withdrawn. This is achieved through an established information and criteria analysis process about which characteristics should be included.

The project is renewed with the insertion of innovations that benefit the beneficiaries of the project, such as the *Vivo Jugando* program implemented by all the NGOs subcontracted by Mercy Corps. The same spaces serve also as a place for new technical and dynamic creations by the beneficiaries.

The impact of the project, observed or measured through verifiable indicators, shows different kinds of beneficiaries. There are the children who benefit by being withdrawn from exploitive labor or being prevented from being involved in it; improvement in their academic skills, more disciplined behavior, and more assertiveness in the exercise of their rights are very evident. The parents seem to show more positive attitudes toward their children's studies and are less interested in child labor involvement. Moreover, there is a transition of parents from shame to pride, from under appreciating their children to valuing them, from accepting their life as is to hoping for a better future for their children.

The community benefits from the other changes in the beneficiaries, besides being more aware of the risks of child labor and the advantages of studying and recreational activities. The governmental agencies can acquire new strategies that prevent child labor, thus reaching their own goals. The partners and subcontractors carry out coordinated practices, avoiding isolated efforts. The teaching staff internalizes new alternative forms of teaching and learning.

The fourth objective of the project proposed an increased awareness of child labor and its possible solutions from policymakers and interested parties. The findings reported a poor achievement of this objective, except in its role in the decision of the Ministry of National Education to adopt supplementary school hours through the Family Compensation Funds.

While there are significant achievements in the sustainability of the project—such as the agreement with *Acción Social* in Samacá that implements 12 EpCs—many of the activities carried out have not been incorporated into the sustainability master plan, which makes it more difficult to have a general idea of the activities that have taken place. For example, the participation of the project in public bidding processes for proposals in similar areas was carried out taking into account the opportunities that arose. However, this does not exclude the possibility that a course of action could have been included in the plan to seize these kind of opportunities in which the project could participate. The recommendations, offered by the midterm evaluation to improve the sustainability master plan and its results have not been fulfilled. The fifth objective of the project to provide sustainability shows that many efforts have been made to achieve that objective.

The inclusion of CEDECUR and *Fundación Mamonal*—implementing agencies that expressed their intention to continue operating spaces, even without the financial support of the project—in addition to the QL methodology training of the teachers from the official educational system are some of the elements that enrich the sustainability, since they imply a continuation of the project elements.

Lastly, the conclusions try to analyze the achievement of the project goals. Goal 1 established the prevention of NNAs from getting involved in the WFCL. The project has presented diverse evidence of its achievements in its intervention areas. It has also provided necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the withdrawal of NNAs from WFCL, and for their rehabilitation and social integration (Goal 2) and to targeted communities vulnerable to, for example,

commercial sexual exploitation and has offered specialized attention necessary for these cases. The project has secured the access to free primary education, both in enrolling NNAs in the school system (especially the EpCs) and in its efforts to keep them in the system, as well as offering vocational education through its 19 EpEs (Goal 3). The findings show evidence that the project identifies and reaches NNAs at special risk (Goal 4), an achievement that was much appreciated in the evaluation by other key actors outside of the project. Last, Goal 5, which indicated taking into account the special situation of the female minors, was also achieved through the project's interventions in commercial sexual exploitation, not only in the withdrawal and follow-up of the cases, but also in the prevention of this phenomenon. In this regard, the project also intervened in cases of female minors working in domestic service.

IX KEY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROJECT

Even though this is a final evaluation, the following short- and long-term recommendations are pertinent to the project:

1. It is necessary to work more intensely in raising the awareness of the beneficiaries' parents. The project elaborated, in October 2009, an awareness-raising strategy for the parents of the beneficiaries that is described in the document *Espacios de Sensibilización con Padres*, (Parents' Awareness-Raising Spaces) and constitutes a set of standard procedures for the work to be done. This was partly taken from the recommendations made in the midterm evaluation performed that year. Nonetheless, more effort must be put into parents' awareness to be able to obtain a commitment from them to keep their children away from child labor.
2. Longitudinal (follow-up) studies must be carried out to demonstrate the impact of the project in the labor conduct of the beneficiaries upon completion of the programmatic cycle of the project—that is, to confirm if children really stay away from the work force once they are out of the project. An adequate budget is necessary to this effect. It must be taken into account that scientific proof and evidence are part of the sustainability of a project, since they confirm its necessity.
3. The measures to attain the sustainability of the project should have been more organized and carried out as a partnership, and not by individual members or a specific person within the project. With this in mind, the need expressed in the midterm evaluation is that the responsibilities of the partners for sustainability should have been assigned by agreement of all the parties.
4. Even though there were specific efforts, such as the offprint in a countrywide circulation newspaper, the project should have undertaken—either with its own resources or with collaborations—a massive campaign supporting its objectives and activities. This would probably also have helped to increase sustainability.
5. The beneficiaries not completely withdrawn from child labor must be reported in the products as being partially withdrawn. It is necessary for these beneficiaries to be identified. While the goal is to withdraw them completely according to the National Policy and Strategy, the cases involving children whose labor conditions have greatly improved should not be underestimated—even if these children have not managed to withdraw completely—except in very dangerous activities that the project could define as not eligible to be included.
6. It would be important to conduct studies that compare different methodologies or strategies within the eradication of child labor. It is recommended to use designs that include the educational strategy employed by the project in comparison with others that pursue the same goals and include a control group as well. Likewise, the study conducted by UNINORTE in Barranquilla should be carried out with *a representative sample of all the places where the project intervened*, not only in Barranquilla.

7. It would be beneficial for the project (always in accordance with the National Strategy) to help define what it understands as *progressive reduction* of child labor in Colombia. Giving the term *progressive* an operational definition would help clarify the doubts that currently remain in the actors of the area and, especially, in the project staff.

ANNEXES

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX A: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Logical Framework Master Plan-Fighting Against Child Labor Through Education in Colombia

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Verification Means	Critical Assumptions																						
<p>Goal: Exploitation and WFCL in Colombia were progressively reduced by the end of 2010 as provided by the National Strategy and its program.</p>	<p>Number of 6 to 17 year old NNAs identified as workers in the WFCL (by gender, age, region and type of work).</p> <p>Number of NNA identified as workers attending formal schools.</p>	<p>Registration System of the Colombian Ministry for the Protection against Child Labor. National Department of Statistics. National Survey on Child Labor DANE (2007). Related studies or documents.</p>	<p>Not applicable</p>																						
<p>Purpose: NNA withdrawn (R) and prevented (P) from exploitive child labor through attendance to <i>Espacios para Crecer</i> (EpC) or <i>Espacios para Emprender</i> (EpE) and through formal education.</p>	<p>QL methodology/EpC-for R/P NNAs from child labor.</p> <p>1. Number of R/P NNAs in EpCs and EpEs.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Programs:</td> <td>EpC</td> <td>EpE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Goals Cohort 1:</td> <td></td> <td>2,500</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cohort 2:</td> <td></td> <td>4,293</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cohort 3:</td> <td>1,050</td> <td>2,357</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Subtotal:</td> <td>7, 843</td> <td>2,357</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total:</td> <td></td> <td>10, 200</td> </tr> </table> <p>2. % of R/P NNAs in EpCs and EpEs. Goal: 80%</p> <p>3. % of R/P NNAs that have completed the EpC—EpE. Goal: 80%</p> <p>4. % of R/P NNAs in EpCs—EpCs by gender from 6 to 17 years enrolled in formal schools. Goal:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>6–14 years old</td> <td>90% enrollment in formal schools.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15–17 years old</td> <td>70 % enrollment in formal schools.</td> </tr> </table> <p>5. % of R/P NNAs from EpCs—EpEs retained in formal schools. Goal: 80%</p> <p>6. % of R/P NNAs from EpCs that have completed the school grade they were enrolled in. Goal: 90%</p>	Programs:	EpC	EpE	Goals Cohort 1:		2,500	Cohort 2:		4,293	Cohort 3:	1,050	2,357	Subtotal:	7, 843	2,357	Total:		10, 200	6–14 years old	90% enrollment in formal schools.	15–17 years old	70 % enrollment in formal schools.	<p>Elementary schools identifying educational and labor status, time and activities and conditions under which NNAs work, and gender, according to ILO Convention 182.</p> <p>Two annual censuses per cohort, identifying labor and educational status.</p> <p>Retention rate shall be defined by midterm surveys per cohort and school year.</p> <p>The final study of the cohort or school year will reveal the rate for school grade completion.</p>	<p>Violence and lack of safety issues in Colombia have not increased in the target areas.</p>
Programs:	EpC	EpE																							
Goals Cohort 1:		2,500																							
Cohort 2:		4,293																							
Cohort 3:	1,050	2,357																							
Subtotal:	7, 843	2,357																							
Total:		10, 200																							
6–14 years old	90% enrollment in formal schools.																								
15–17 years old	70 % enrollment in formal schools.																								

Results

Result 1. Models of EpCs and EpEs Effective in Withdrawing and Preventing NNAs from Established jobs

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Verification Means	Critical Assumptions
1.1 EpC and EpE effective programs established in target areas.	1.1.1 % of R/P NNAs enrolled in EpCs and EpE with at least 80% attendance. Goal: 80% R/P NNAs that showed improvement in school performance. Goal: 60%	Baseline studies, Grade-specific studies, Attendance reports. Sampling study of 5% NNAs enrolled in cohort 2.	The Macro-economic factors have not deteriorated. Social barriers have not increased beyond that already identified.
1.2 Reduced barriers for access to formal school of a working NNA or at risk of being one.	1.2.1 % of R/P NNAs enrolled in EpCs or EpEs who had not accessed formal school in the baseline study, who were enrolled in formal education as a result of Project actions. Goal: 60%	Spaces' registration cards. School enrollment cards. Barrier reduction services.	EpCs financed with private and public funds at the beginning of the third year.

Result 2. Actions Taken Against Child Labor and Monitored by Municipal Governments

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Verification Means	Critical Assumptions
2.1 Efficacy increase of National Strategy implementation monitoring at local level.	2.1.1 Number of municipalities implementing monitoring actions to support National Strategy. Goal: 3	Organizational plans, budgets and reports.	n/a
2.2 Municipal policies for the eradication of child labor implemented to support the National Strategy.	2.2.1 Number of municipalities implementing actions in line with the National Strategy with Project assistance. Goal: 3	Technical documents and Project reports. Policy documents.	n/a

Result 3. Increase of Parents', Teachers', and Community Leaders' Awareness Concerning Eradication of Child Labor

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Verification Means	Critical Assumptions
3.1. Greater knowledge and better attitude amongst parents concerning importance of NNAs' education, the laws and the cost and danger of child labor.	3.1.1 Rate of degree of awareness and knowledge amongst parents interviewed concerning the benefits of reaching NNAs who are working or at risk of doing so. Goal: 75	Study with random sampling of parents and guardians in homes participating in the Project services.	n/a
3.2. Child labor issues released in target communities through the use of innovative technologies of mass communication.	3.2.1 Number of announcements in the media regarding child labor and the Project educational intervention. Goal: 12 3.2.2 Expanded use of communication technologies through Websites, Facebook and YouTube for the distribution of messages against child labor.	Monitoring records of the Project/verification. Photographs and reports of the Project actions. Video and sound recording. List of web pages were messages appear. Users' feedback.	n/a

**Result 4. Increased Awareness Concerning Eradication of Child Labor and Possible Solutions
Proposed by Policymakers and Stakeholders**

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Verification Means	Critical Assumptions
4.1 Increased awareness of Project related to child labor and possible solutions provided by studies.	4.1.1 Number of collaboration studies to measure methodology impact on child labor reduction. Goal: 2 4.1.2 Number of political decisions influenced by the Project or studies. 4.1.3 EpC program validated in Colombia.	Final reports. Official reports of policies, programs and interviews. Final report from the Ministry of National Education, education departments in target regions, teachers' associations and other relevant persons involved.	The Project will select studies to support the efforts of the Government of Colombia and will consult with USDOL, IPEC, OMI, and UNICEF.

Result 5. Sustainable and expanded Project programs

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Verification Means	Critical Assumptions
5.1 EpC, EpE and QL methodology models effectively supported and implemented by national and local entities.	5.1.1 Number of entities funding expansion or usage of QL methodology. Goal: 5	Number of EpCs and EpEs funded by contract or agreement.	Private and public EpCs and EpE funded at the beginning of the third year.

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX B: INFORMATION ON SEPTEMBER 2010 PERFORMANCE

III. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION AND EVALUATION

For EpCs only

III.A. Measurement Against Project Objectives

Development Objective (Goal): Exploitative and worst forms of child labor (ECL) in Colombia progressively reduced at the end of 2010 as stated in the National Strategy and its Timebound Program.

Narrative Evaluation of the contribution of the project/program to development objective (describe the ways in which the project has specifically resulted in outcomes that have or will contribute to the achievement of the development objective):

During Period 6, the Project has withdrawn 1,132 (44%) and prevented 1,436 (56%) children as part of Cohort 3A and 3B.⁸ Because they continued working in spite of receiving services and being enrolled in EpCs, **882 children of Cohort 3B were classified as To Be Withdrawn** and were not included as Withdrawn or Prevented. This category remains as a challenge to the program in order to reach the target.

Immediate Objective (Project Purpose): Targeted children withdrawn or prevented (W/P) from Exploitive Child Labor (ECL) through attendance in *Espacios para Crecer* (EpC) in combination with formal education.

Indicators (by educational program type if more than one and relevant)	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008		Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008		Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009		Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009		Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010		Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010		Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010		Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy		Total	
		Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
1. Number of W/P children enrolled in EpC program	Target	n/a	n/a	1,250	1,250	1,143	1,143	1,143	1,143	193	193	193	192	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3,922	3,921
	Actual	n/a	n/a	1,032	1,059	426	391	1,458	1,680	156	149	1,122	1,143	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4,194	4,422
2. % of W/P children retained in EpC programs	Target	n/a	n/a	88%	84%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	87%	82%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	88%	84%	81%	81%	87%	87%	100%	99%	97%	96%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	90%	89%
3. % of children completing EpC program	Target	n/a	n/a	80%	75%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	82%	77%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85%	81%	71%	71%	86%	85%	92%	92%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	84%	82%

⁸ Cohort 3A refers only to Cali. Cohort 2B refers to the entire country except Cali.

Indicators (by educational program type if more than one and relevant)	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008		Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008		Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009		Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009		Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010		Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010		Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010		Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy		Total	
		Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
4. % of W/P EpC children (by gender) from 6 to 14 years enrolled in formal schooling	Target	n/a	n/a	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85%	80%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	95%	95%	93%	92%	98%	98%	90%	93%	98%	98%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97%	96%
5. % of W/P EpC children retained in formal education	Target	n/a	n/a	90%	88%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	90%	88%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	97%	97%	97%	95%	99%	99%	96%	99%	99%	99%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	98%	98%
6. % of W/P EpC children who complete the formal education grade in which they were enrolled	Target	n/a	n/a	85%	83%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	85%	83%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97%	96%	97%	97%	97%	97%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97%	97%

*Data will be collected over time in this table. "Period" refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered.

III. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION AND EVALUATION

For EpEs only (This table was added in
March 2009 to track youth attending EpEs)

III.A. Measurement Against Project Objectives

(Reporting will start during Period 5)

Development Objective (Goal): Exploitative and worst forms of child labor (ECL) in Colombia progressively reduced at the end of 2010 as stated in the National Strategy and its Time Bound Program.

Narrative Evaluation of the contribution of the project/program to development objective (describe the ways in which the project has specifically resulted in outcomes that have or will contribute to the achievement of the development objective):

During Period 6, the Project enrolled 321 youth in EpEs being implemented by ACJ in Bogotá. The project has withdrawn 119 (45%) and prevented 143 (55%) youth from Cohort 3A and 3B.⁹ 50 youth of Cohort 3A and 3B were classified as To Be Withdrawn and were not included as W/P. 9 youth left the Project.

Immediate Objective (Project Purpose): Targeted youth (ages 15–17) withdrawn or prevented (W/P) from Exploitive Child Labor (ECL) and participating in EpE Programs (*Espacios para Empezar*) in combination with formal education.

⁹ Cohort 3A refers only to Cali.

Indicators (by educational program type if more than one and relevant)	Target/ Actual	Period 1*		Period 2		Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009		Period 4 Mar. 2009– August 2009		Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010		Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010		Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010		Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy		Total	
		Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys
1. Number of W/P children enrolled in EpE program	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	590	590	589	588	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,179	1,178
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	132	92	128	134	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	260	226
2. % of W/P children retained in EpE programs	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	95%	94%	99%	96%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	97%	95%
3. % of children completing EpE program	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	93%	89%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	93%	89%
4. % of W/P EpE children (by gender) from 15–17 years enrolled in formal schooling	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70%	70%	70%	70%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70%	70%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	71%	99%	99%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	89%	88%
5. % of W/P EpE children retained in formal education	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79%	73%	99%	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	89%	89%
6. % of W/P EpE children who complete the formal education grade in which they were enrolled	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	90%	90%	90%	90%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	90%	90%
	Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

*Data will be collected over time in this table. “Period” refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data.

For Period 6 the Project reports information related to the enrollment of 321 children in EpE of Cohort 3A in Bogotá.

The Project requested authorization to USDOL to reduce the number of children targeted in EpEs and increase the number of children targeted in EpCs.

Total percents of the table were calculated by taking the amount of children instead of a simple average of percentages.

- Indicator No. 1 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 262 W/P children were enrolled in the EpE.
- Indicator No. 2 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 312 (97%) children in this cohort are retained in the EpE Program. The reason argued by the children to continue attending the EpE is because they found on this, a very good environment for their personal development and school skills improvement.
- Indicator No. 3 refers to Cohort 3A Cali: 288 (91%) children has completed the Program.
- Indicator No. 4 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 260 (99%) of the children are enrolled in formal education.
- Indicator No. 5 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 261 (99%) of the children are retained in formal education.
- Indicator No. 6 refers to Cohort 3A Cali: n/a is the answer since the information about Completion for Cohort 3A is not available yet. The Ministry of Education, Department of Valle and the Municipality of Cali are gradually implementing a process in order to fit Cali’s calendar with the Colombian calendar, so in 2010, Cali’s calendar will finish on October 2010. In that moment the information will be available. Data related with school educational completion of Cali’s cohort 3A children will be reported on Final TPR.

For EpCs only—Age 6–14
Output 1: Effective Educational EpC Model to Withdraw and Prevent Children from Child Labor Established

Indicators	Baseline	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008	Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008	Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009	Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009	Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010	Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010	Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010	Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy	Total
1.1.1. % of ECL W/P children enrolled in EpC attending at least 80% of the time.	0%	Target	n/a	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	80%
		Actual	n/a	89%	77%	77%	91%	72%	n/a	n/a	78%
1.1.2. % of ECL W/P children show improved school performance.	0%	Target	n/a	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	n/a	n/a	60%
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	78%	80%	94%	n/a	n/a	84%
1.2.1. % of W/P children enrolled in EpC, but not enrolled in school at baseline, subsequently enroll in formal education by a result of project action.	0%	Target	n/a	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	n/a	n/a	60%
		Actual	n/a	n/a	55%	59%	77%	71%	n/a	n/a	63%

*Data will be collected over time in this table. “Period” refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: **March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx**. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered. Targets should be established at the beginning of the project implementation and should not be changed unless agreed to by the donor as required.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data. According to the latest Cohorts results, the project implemented a strategy to maintain the average number of 25 children in each EpC. Each EpC has enrolled an additional 31% of children.

- Indicator No.1.1.1 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 2,265 (72%) of children from Cohort 3A attended at least 80% of the time to the EpC.
- Indicator No. 1.1.2 refers to Cohorts 3B Colombia: Due to enrollment and attendance to the EpC, 2,127 (94%) children show improved school performance.
- Indicator No. 1.2.1 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 30 children of the 42 (71%) who were not enrolled in school at baseline, subsequently where enrolled in formal education as a result of a project action performed by subcontractors.

**For EpEs only—Age 15–17 (This table was added in March 2009 to track youth attending EpEs)
(Reporting will start during Period 5)**

Output 1: Effective Educational EpE Model to Withdraw and Prevent Children from Child Labor Established

Indicators	Baseline	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008	Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008	Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009	Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009	Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010	Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010	Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010	Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy	Total
1.1.1. % of ECL W/P children enrolled in EpE attending at least 80% of the time.	0%	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	80%	80%	n/a	n/a	80%
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	98%	82%	n/a	n/a	88%
1.1.2. % of ECL W/P children show improved school performance.	0%	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	60%	60%	n/a	n/a	60%
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	99%	95%	n/a	n/a	97%
1.2.1. % of W/P children enrolled in EpE, but not enrolled in school at baseline, subsequently enroll in formal education by a result of program action.	0%	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	60%	60%	n/a	n/a	60%
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11%	50%	n/a	n/a	13%

*Data will be collected over time in this table. "Period" refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: **March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx**. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered. Targets should be established at the beginning of the project implementation and should not be changed unless agreed to by the donor as required.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data.

- Indicator No.1.1.1 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 262 (82%) children from Cohort 3B attended at least 80% of the time to the EpE.
- Indicator No. 1.1.2 refers to Cohorts 3B Colombia: due to enrollment and attendance to the EpE 95% of children show improved school performance.
- Indicator No. 1.2.1 refers to Cohort 3B Colombia: 1 child, out of the 2 who were not enrolled in school at baseline, subsequently, were enrolled in formal education as a result of a project action performed by subcontractors.

Output 2: Actions Against Child Labor Undertaken and Monitored by the Municipal Government

Indicators	Baseline	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008	Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008	Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009	Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009	Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010	Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010	Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010	Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy	Total
2.1.1. Number of municipalities implementing monitoring actions in support of National Strategy.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	1	0	1	0	1	n/a	3
		Actual	n/a	n/a	0	1	0	1	n/a	n/a	2
2.2.1. Number of municipalities implementing actions in accordance with the National Strategy, with project assistance.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	0	1	1	n/a	3
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	10	1	1	n/a	n/a	12

*Data will be collected over time in this table. "Period" refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered. Targets should be established at the beginning of the project implementation and should not be changed unless agreed to by the donor as required.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data.

1. The Project in coordination with the municipal authorities and the Regional Office of Ministry of Social Protection is establishing a monitoring action, in the Department of Boyacá supporting the National Strategy. The action would be acquired by 123 municipalities of Boyacá Department. The Project presented the M&E system in the regional committee of CLE in Tunja (Boyacá) and has brought technical assistance to officials of Boyacá Department.
2. The Project is helping the municipality of Samacá in Boyacá through the Municipal Ombudsman Office with actions of awareness in the rural area to commit small land owners against the practice of hiring children in harvest activities.

Output 3: Awareness of Parents, Educators, and Community Leaders Regarding ECL Raised

Indicators	Baseline	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008	Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008	Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009	Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009	Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010	Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010	Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010	Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy	Total
3.1.1. Index of level of awareness and knowledge among targeted parents about the benefits of reaching, with educational services, child laborers or children at risk of working.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	50	n/a	65	n/a	n/a	n/a	75
		Actual	n/a	n/a	78	n/a	78.05	75.4	n/a	n/a	77.1
3.2.1. Number of media announcements about child labor issues and project educational interventions.	0	Target	n/a	2	2	2	2	2	2	n/a	12
		Actual	n/a	2	1	6	2	5	n/a	n/a	16
3.2.2. Expanded use of communication technologies through web sites, Facebook, and YouTube to deliver anti-child labor messages.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	3	3	3	3	3	n/a	15
		Actual	n/a	n/a	0	2	1	3	n/a	n/a	6

*Data will be collected over time in this table. "Period" refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered. Targets should be established at the beginning of the project implementation and should not be changed unless agreed to by the donor as required.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data.

1. Indicator No. 3.1.1. The KAP survey was administrated to 5% of EpCs parents of children during the period. The weighted index shows a high result regarding knowledge, attitudes and practices in regard to ECL. This index reaches 75.4% of the total expected (100%). The highest results were obtained in the attitude indicator (80.5%), followed by the indicator of knowledge (77%) and in practice (71.5%). The project is developing a parent's strategy in order to improve the performance of these indicators.
2. Indicator No. 3.2.1. During the Period 6, the Project has participated in 4 broadcast programs in Radio *El Porvenir* of Samacá. In this radio station the Project addressed child labor laws and the project role of support to the municipality.
3. Indicator No. 3.2.2. The Web page of the Project, is working as a way to promote exchange with other institutions in the country and in the Latin-American region www.educameprimero.org.

Output 4: Increased Understanding of ECL Problem and Possible Solutions by Policy Makers and Project Stakeholders

Indicators	Baseline	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008	Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008	Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009	Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009	Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010	Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010	Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010	Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy	Total
4.1.1. Number of collaborative studies that measure impact of methodologies for reducing child labor.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	0	1	0	n/a	2
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	0
4.1.2. Number of policy decisions influenced by project actions or studies.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	1	1	n/a	3
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	n/a	n/a	0
4.1.3. EpC program is validated for Colombia.	n/a	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	n/a	n/a	n/a	3
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	1

*Data will be collected over time in this table. “Period” refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: **March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx**. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered. Targets should be established at the beginning of the project implementation and should not be changed unless agreed to by the donor as required.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data. The Project completed the data collection of the 13,706 enrolled beneficiaries. This data will be the core of the research developed by the Project. Cinde has started the activities stated in Output 4, and will present the report at the end of December 2010. The research information is being analyzed by M&E.

Output 5: Project Programs Sustained and Expanded

Indicators	Baseline	Target/ Actual	Period 1* Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008	Period 2 Mar. 2008– Aug. 2008	Period 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009	Period 4 Mar. 2009– Aug. 2009	Period 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010	Period 6 Mar. 2010– Aug. 2010	Period 7 Sept. 2010– Dec. 2010	Period 8 mm.yy– mm.yy	Total
5.1.1. Number of entities financing the expansion or using Quantum Learning methodology.	0	Target	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	1	1	2	n/a	5
		Actual	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	1	0	n/a	n/a	1

*Data will be collected over time in this table. “Period” refers to the reporting period and should correspond to the following time periods: **March 1, 20xx to August 31, 20xx and September 1, 20xx to February 28, 20xx**. Please insert dates below the period to be clear on the period of time covered. Targets should be established at the beginning of the project implementation and should not be changed unless agreed to by the donor as required.

Narrative Evaluation: Explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends over time and depth and context to understand the performance as evidenced by the above data.

III.B. Aggregate Performance Report on USDOL OCFT Common Indicators—Direct Tracking

Reporting Period: 10/01/07 to 12/31/10

III.B.1. REPORT FOR ALL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES

Withdrawn/Prevented: Children prevented or withdrawn from exploitive child labor and provided education/training opportunities as a result of USDOL-funded projects.

Actual	Project Cohort 1 Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008			Project Cohort 2 March 2008– August 2008			Project Cohort 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009			Project Cohort 4 March 2009– August 2009			Project Cohort 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010			Project Cohort 6 March 2010– August 2010			Life of Project Oct. 2007– Dec. 2010		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Withdrawn	n/a	n/a	n/a	268	217	485	270	218	488	868	737	1,605	236	266	502	587	545	1,132	2,229	1,983	4,212
Prevented	n/a	n/a	n/a	791	815	1,606	207	257	464	767	669	1,436	69	123	192	712	724	1,436	2,546	2,588	5,134
Total	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,059	1,032	2,091	477	475	952	1,635	1,406	3,041	305	389	694	1,299	1,269	2,568	4,775	4,571	9,346

Male (M); Female (F); Total (T).

Retention: Percent of children retained in educational programs as a result of USDOL-funded projects.

Actual*	Project Cohort 1	Project Cohort 2	Project Cohort 3	Project Cohort 4	Project Cohort 5	Project Cohort 6	Life of Project
Numerator	n/a	121	77	13	39	2,517	2,767
Denominator	n/a	122	133	158	39	2,522	2,974
Percent	n/a	99%	58%	8%	100%	99%	93%

* Not broken down by gender or w/p.

Completion: Percent of children completing educational programs as a result of USDOL-funded projects.

Actual*	Project Cohort 1	Project Cohort 2	Project Cohort 3	Project Cohort 4	Project Cohort 5	Project Cohort 6	Life of Project
Numerator	n/a	1,969	819	2,883	655	46	6,372
Denominator	n/a	2,091	952	3,041	694	2,568	9,346
Percent	n/a	94%	86%	95%	94%	2%	68%

* Not broken down by gender or w/p.

Narrative Evaluation: Please explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends within and across cohorts and any issues that will provide depth and context in the interpretation of the above data. If data have changed for previously reported fiscal years please describe a) changes in the withdrawn and prevented figures, b) the reason for the change, and c) corrective action to ensure that the erroneous reporting does not occur in the future.

2,568 children of Cohort 6 where W/P. The Retention rate of the Cohort is 99%. The Completion rate is 2%.

The following two tables represent a subset of the data reported in Table III.B.1 above. Grantees are required to fill out the tables below if their project has direct beneficiaries that are victims of trafficking and/or commercial sexual exploitation (CSE) or direct beneficiaries that are at risk of being trafficked or entering CSE. After calculating the overall numbers for all direct beneficiaries (including trafficking and CSE) and reporting them above, grantees should then disaggregate the trafficking and CSE beneficiaries and report them below. Note that a beneficiary cannot be counted as both trafficked and in CSE—they should only be included once the tables below. Please see Annex A for examples and instructions on reporting these data. If the tables do not apply to your project, please type “n/a” in the tables below.

III.B.2. CHILD TRAFFICKING

INCLUDE ALL THE BENEFICIARIES THAT HAVE BEEN PREVENTED OR WITHDRAWN FROM TRAFFICKING, INCLUDING CHILDREN TRAFFICKED INTO COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

Withdrawn/Prevented: Children prevented or withdrawn from commercial sexual exploitation and provided education/training opportunities as a result of USDOL-funded projects.

Actual	Project Cohort 1 Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008			Project Cohort 2 March 2008– August 2008			Project Cohort 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009			Project Cohort 4 March 2009– August 2009			Project Cohort 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010			Project Cohort 6 March 2010– August 2010			Life of Project Oct. 2007– Dec. 2010			
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	
Withdrawn	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Prevented	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Male (M); Female (F); Total (T).

Narrative Evaluation: Please explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends within and across cohorts and any issues that will provide depth and context in the interpretation of the above data. If data have changed for previously reported fiscal years please describe a) changes in the withdrawn and prevented figures, b) the reason for the change, and c) corrective action to ensure that the erroneous reporting does not occur in the future.

n/a

III.B.3. COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

INCLUDE ONLY BENEFICIARIES THAT HAVE BEEN PREVENTED OR WITHDRAWN FROM COMMERCIAL SEXUAL EXPLOITATION AND THAT HAVE NOT BEEN TRAFFICKED. IF THEY HAVE BEEN TRAFFICKED INTO CSE, THEN REPORT THOSE BENEFICIARIES IN TABLE III.B.2 ABOVE.

Withdrawn/Prevented: Children prevented or withdrawn from commercial sexual exploitation and provided education/training opportunities as a result of USDOL-funded projects.

Actual	Project Cohort 1 Oct. 2007– Feb. 2008			Project Cohort 2 March 2008– August 2008			Project Cohort 3 Sept. 2008– Feb. 2009			Project Cohort 4 March 2009– August 2009			Project Cohort 5 Sept. 2009– Feb. 2010			Project Cohort 6 March 2010– August 2010			Life of Project Oct. 2007– Dec. 2010		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Withdrawn	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	9	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	9	11
Prevented	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	0	0
Total	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	9	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	9	11

Male (M); Female (F); Total (T).

Narrative Evaluation: Please explain any issues relating to the above data, including trends within and across cohorts and any issues that will provide depth and context in the interpretation of the above data. If data have changed for previously reported fiscal years please describe a) changes in the withdrawn and prevented figures, b) the reason for the change, and c) corrective action to ensure that the erroneous reporting does not occur in the future.

n/a

ANNEX C: METHODOLOGICAL MASTER PLAN OF QUESTIONS OF THE *EDÚCAME PRIMERO* COLOMBIA PROJECT

1. Relevance

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
1.1 Were the assumptions on which the project was based specific? Have these main assumptions changed in any way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners (DevTech, CINDE, Mercy Corps) 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
1.2 What are the main strategies and activities designed to reach the goals in the withdrawal and prevention of minors from the WFCL? What is the reasoning behind the use of these strategies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Government of Colombia (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.3 Has the project been successful facing the main obstacles or barriers to fight against child labor? (Example: poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.4 Does the EpC program model fit with the complementary day's work under the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education and of the Superintendence of Family Subsidy through the Family Clearance Houses?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners (DevTech, CINDE, Mercy Corps) Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.5 Discuss the challenges and gaps still pending in the fight against child labor at a local and national level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) Embassy representative 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives Guide 5 for Embassy representative

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
1.6 Did the design of the Project continue being adequate for the cultural, economic and political context in which work was developed, particularly concerning the model of <i>Espacios para Emprender</i> (EpEs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.7 How does the Project fit into existing government initiatives to fight against child labor and poverty, particularly with <i>Acción Social</i> and the <i>Red Juntos</i> ?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> Project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.8 How successful has the Project been in providing support to <i>Acción Social</i> and the <i>Red Juntos</i> and in what remains to be done in the last months of the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.9 How do the EpC and EpE models fit into the general design of the broadest programs with fixed terms? Specifically, what have the contributions been, if any?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.10 Has the design of the Project continued providing adequate support to the five great goals of the fixed term projects of the USDOL? If not, why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
1.11 What have the challenges and opportunities been for the implementing parties of the EpC and EpE models to work with government policies, including the 2008-2015 National Strategy for the Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
1.12 How has the Project provided assistance to beneficiaries (such as minors enrolled in commercial sexual exploitation, displaced, ex child soldiers and disabled NNAs) to access social services offered by the Government or by Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives
1.13 Since the midterm evaluation, has the Project established a protocol to assist beneficiaries previously involved in commercial sexual exploitation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Renacer Foundation 	Bogotá Cartagena	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
1.14 Did the Project make implementation and/or strategy adjustments based on the midterm evaluation results and recommendations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for partners and subcontractors
1.15 What other major aspects in design or implementation must be considered by the receivers of the Project and the USDOL?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives

2. Efficacy

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
2.1 Can the Project be expected to reach its goals and objectives as established in the project document? What were the factors that contributed to the success and/or failure of each of these objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors
2.2 Examine the efficacy of EpCs and EpEs to fight against child labor. Did the participation of children in EpC and EpE result in the withdrawal and prevention from exploitative child labor/commercial sexual exploitation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
<p>2.3 How effective has the Project been in increasing the knowledge about child labor and building capacities at a local level, including local governments and NGOs? To what extent did awareness raising campaigns and efforts reach “first line” personnel such as the police, social workers and educators, to change attitudes toward child work and promote reporting and intervention mechanisms in those cases?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • Local educators and community leaders • Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	<p>Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors • Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel • Guide 4 for Government representatives
<p>2.4 Examine the efficacy of services meeting the needs of the population, goal identified in the Project Document, including children prevented and withdrawn from labor and commercial sexual exploitation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • Local educators and community leaders • Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	<p>Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors • Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel • Guide 4 for Government representatives
<p>2.5 Examine the efficacy of the specific models (EpC, EpE and Quantum Learning) to increase educational opportunities, creating community identification, increasing community capacities and increasing knowledge and comprehension about the dangers of child labor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • Local educators and community leaders • Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	<p>Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors • Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel • Guide 4 for Government representatives
<p>2.6 Has the Project identified specifically and affected those enrolled or at risk of going to work in the target sectors identified in the strategies of the Project (commercial sexual exploitation of NNAs, housework, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling and agriculture)? In a broader sense, were the WFCL identified in the country?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • Local educators and community leaders • Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	<p>Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Educame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors • Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel • Guide 4 for Government representatives

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
2.7 Are there any lessons learned about specific sectors regarding the types and efficacy of the services offered?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • Local educators and community leaders • Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors • Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel • Guide 4 for Government representatives
2.8 What monitoring system does the Project use to follow up on the labor status of children? Was it feasible and effective? Why? Why not?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors
2.9 What were the managerial strengths of the Project, including technical and financial strengths? To what extent were the members of the consortium involved in planning and implementing the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • <i>Acción Social</i> 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors
2.10 The Project works at a national level in a country with difficult geographical areas, extreme violence, complex institutions with high degree of government structure decentralization and a strong presence of different international actors. Do relevant good practices exist in other countries where these characteristics are present?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors • Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors • Guide 4 for Government representatives
2.11 When the economy worsened, the Project increased the number of beneficiaries to reach prevention and withdrawal goals. Comment on this strategy and identify some of the lessons learned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors
2.12 What has been the value of the monthly meetings of regional partners or implementing parties? Have these meetings contributed to success and sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners • Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners • Guide 2 for subcontractors

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
2.13 While all Partners applied the EpE and EpC methodology, there are differences that depend on the experience of each local implementing party, as well as of the partners. Which of these methodologies or activities were more effective in preventing and withdrawing children and in promoting an impact on the communities, on local governments and among parents?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel
2.14 Examine the efficacy of the use of the material from Nike.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Mercy Corps 	Bogotá, Cartagena, Santander	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors

3. Efficiency

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
3.1 Is the Project cost-efficient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives
3.2 Are the Project strategies efficient in terms of financial and human resources used when compared to the results? What are the alternatives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives
3.3 Is the monitoring system efficiently designed to cover the needs and requirements of the Project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives

4. Impact

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
4.1 What are the apparent impacts of the Project, particularly of the EpC and EpEs, on individual beneficiaries (NNAs, parents, teachers, etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) Embassy representative Parents Beneficiaries 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives Guide 5 for Embassy representative Guide 6 for parents Guide 7 for beneficiaries
4.2 Examine, to the extent possible, the impact of activities and strategies on the quality of education (both formal and informal interventions). How has the improvement in the quality of education been received by the Government and the communities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) Parents Beneficiaries 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel Guide 4 for Government representatives Guide 6 for parents Guide 7 for beneficiaries
4.3 What are the apparent impacts of the Project on Partners and other organizations engaged in the fight against child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, National Committees against Child Labor, etc.)?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives
4.4 What are the apparent impacts of the Project on government and policy structures, in terms of great changes in education and in child labor matters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) Embassy representative 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Éducame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives Guide 5 for Embassy representative

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
4.5 Following the midterm evaluation, how successful has the inclusion of parent education been in the EpC? What lessons learned can be observed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders Parents 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 6 for parents
4.6 What lessons learned can be mentioned in the implementation of EpCs and EpEs in rural and urban zones? How successful have EpCs been in rural areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Local educators and community leaders 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 3 for local educators and community personnel

5. Sustainability

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
5.1 Has the Project design comprised a withdrawal and sustainability strategy? Is it relevant and effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors
5.2 How successful has the Project been in accessing resources outside the Project? Is there any prospect for sustainable financing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors
5.3 What have been the main challenges and successes in keeping partnerships to provide support to the fixed term Project, including the private sector? Has the project developed inter-institutional contacts to set bases to sustain its work?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors
5.4 What have some of the challenges and opportunities, if any, in keeping the coordination with the host Government, in particular with the Inter-institutional Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor (CIETI), the Ministry of National Education, the Ministry of Social Security and the Colombian Institute of Family Well-being (ICBF) as well as other government agencies actively engaged in children-related issues? Is there an appropriation or identification process on the side of these actors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners Personnel from implementing partners or subcontractors Representatives from the Colombian Government (Ministry of National Education, Ministry of Social Protection, Colombian Institute of Family Well-being) 	Bogotá, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cali Santander Samacá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners Guide 2 for subcontractors Guide 4 for Government representatives

Subjects/questions	Key informants	Geographical area	Measuring instruments
5.5 What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in the coordination with ILO-IPEC, Telefónica Foundation, UNICEF and Save the Children?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
5.6 What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and multilateral agencies?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
5.7 What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and community-based associations in the country?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
5.8 What have some of the challenges and opportunities been, if any, in implementing associations to support the expansion of the fixed-term project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
5.9 Will the EpC and EpE educational models, the monitoring systems and other groups or associations created by the Project be sustainable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
5.10 What lessons have been learned through the implementation of the Project and what weaknesses in terms of sustainability of the interventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners
5.11 Has the sustainability committee suggested by the midterm evaluation taken shape and will it be capable of promoting sustainability?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Personnel from the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project, and from its partners 	Bogotá	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guide 1 for personnel of the <i>Edúcame Primero Colombia</i> project and its partners

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX D: GUIDELINES FOR THE POPULATION TO BE INTERVIEWED

GUIDE 1. GUIDE FOR PERSONNEL OF THE *EDÚCAME PRIMERO COLOMBIA* PROJECT AND ITS PARTNERS

Relevance

1. Were the assumptions on which the Project was originally based accurate?
2. What are the main strategies and activities designed to reach the goals in the withdrawal and prevention of minors from the worst forms of child labor? What is the reasoning behind the use of these strategies?
3. Has the Project been successful facing the main obstacles or barriers to fight against child labor? (example: poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc.)?
4. Does the EpC program model fit with the complementary days' work under the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education and of the Superintendence of Family Subsidy through the Family Clearance Houses?
5. Please discuss the challenges and gaps still pending in the fight against child labor at a local and national level.
6. Did the design of the Project continue being adequate for the cultural, economic and political context in which work was developed, particularly concerning the model of *Espacios para Emprender* (EpEs)?
7. How does the Project fit into existing government initiatives to fight against child labor and poverty, particularly with *Acción Social* and the *Red Juntos*?
8. How successful has the Project been in providing support to *Acción Social* and the *Red Juntos* and in what remains to be done in the last months of the Project?
9. How do the EpC and EpE models fit into the general design of the broadest programs with fixed terms? Specifically, what have the contributions been, if any?
10. Has the design of the Project continued providing adequate support to the five goals of USDOL? If not, why?
11. What have the challenges and opportunities been for the implementing parties of the EpC and EpE models to work with government policies, including the 2008–2015 National Strategy for the Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor?

12. How has the Project provided assistance to beneficiaries (such as minors involved in commercial sexual exploitation, displaced children, ex child soldiers and disabled NNAs) to access social services offered by the Government or by Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)?
13. Since the midterm evaluation, has the project established a protocol to assist beneficiaries previously involved in commercial sexual exploitation?
14. Did the project make implementation and/or strategy adjustments based on the midterm evaluation results and recommendations?
15. What other major aspects in design or implementation must be considered by the receivers of the project and USDOL?

Effectiveness

1. Can the Project be expected to reach its goals and objectives as established in the project document? What were the factors that contributed to the success and/or failure of each of these objectives?
2. Examine the effectiveness of EpCs and EpEs to fight against child labor. Did the participation of children in EpC and EpE result in the withdrawal and prevention from exploitive child labor/commercial sexual exploitation?
3. How effective has the Project been in increasing the knowledge about child labor and in building capacities at a local level, including local governments and NGOs? To what extent did awareness raising campaigns and efforts reach “first line” personnel such as the police, social workers and educators, to change attitudes toward child labor and promote reporting and intervention mechanisms in those cases?
4. Examine the effectiveness of services meeting the needs of the population, goal identified in the Project Document, including children prevented and withdrawn from labor and commercial sexual exploitation.
5. Examine the efficacy of the specific models (EpC, EpE and Quantum Learning) to increase educational opportunities, creating community identification, increasing community capacities and increasing knowledge and comprehension about the dangers of child labor.
6. Has the Project identified specifically and affected those enrolled or at risk of going to work in the target sectors identified in the strategies of the Project (commercial sexual exploitation of NNAs, domestic work, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling and agriculture)? In a broader sense, were the worst forms of child labor identified in the country?
7. Are there any lessons learned about specific sectors regarding the types and efficacy of the services offered?

8. What monitoring system does the Project use to follow up on the labor status of children? Was it feasible and effective? Why? Why not?
9. What were the managerial strengths of the Project, including technical and financial strengths? To what extent were the members of the consortium involved in planning and implementing the Project?
10. The Project works at a national level in a country with difficult geographical areas, extreme violence, complex institutions with high degree of government structure decentralization and a strong presence of different international actors. Do relevant good practices exist in other countries where these characteristics are present?
11. When the economy worsened, the Project increased the number of beneficiaries to reach prevention and withdrawal goals. Comment on this strategy and identify some of the lessons learned.
12. What has been the value of the monthly meetings of regional partners or implementing parties? Have these meetings contributed to success and sustainability?
13. While all Partners applied the EpE and EpC methodology, there are differences that depend on the experience of each local implementing party, as well as of the partners. Which of these methodologies or activities were more effective in preventing and withdrawing children and in promoting an impact on the communities, on local governments and among parents?
14. Examine the efficacy of using the material from Nike.

Efficiency

1. Is the Project cost-efficient?
2. Are the Project strategies efficient in terms of financial and human resources used when compared to the results? What are the alternatives?
3. Is the monitoring system efficiently designed to cover the needs and requirements of the Project?

Impact

1. What are the apparent impacts of the Project, particularly of the EpC and EpEs, on individual beneficiaries (NNAs, parents, teachers, etc.)?
2. Examine, to the extent possible, the impact of activities and strategies on the quality of education (both formal and informal interventions). How has the improvement in the quality of education been received by the Government and the communities?

3. What are the apparent impacts of the Project on Partners and other organizations engaged in the fight against child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, National Committees against Child Labor, etc.)?
4. What are the apparent impacts of the Project on government and policy structures, in terms of great changes in education and in child labor matters?
5. Following the midterm evaluation, how successful has the inclusion of parent education been in the EpC? What lessons learned can be observed?
6. What lessons learned can be mentioned in the implementation of EpCs and EpEs in rural and urban zones? How successful have EpCs been in rural areas?

Sustainability

1. Has the Project design comprised a withdrawal and sustainability strategy? Is it relevant and effective?
2. How successful has the Project been in accessing resources outside the Project? Is there any prospect for sustainable financing?
3. What have been the main challenges and successes in keeping partnerships to provide support to the fixed term Project, including the private sector? Has the project developed inter-institutional contacts to set bases to sustain its work?
4. What have some of the challenges and opportunities, if any, in keeping the coordination with the host Government, in particular with the Inter-institutional Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor (COETI), the Ministry of National Education, the Ministry of Social Protection and the Colombian Institute of Family Well-being (ICBF) as well as other government agencies actively engaged in children-related issues? Is there an appropriation or identification process on the side of these actors?
5. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in the coordination with ILO-IPEC, *Telefónica* Foundation, UNICEF, and Save the Children?
6. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and multilateral agencies?
7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and community-based associations in the country?
8. What have some of the challenges and opportunities been, if any, in implementing associations to support the expansion of the fixed-term project?
9. Will the EpC and EpE educational models, the monitoring systems and other groups or associations created by the Project be sustainable?

10. What lessons have been learned through the implementation of the Project and what weaknesses in terms of sustainability of the interventions?
11. Has the sustainability committee suggested by the midterm evaluation taken shape and will it be capable of promoting sustainability?

GUIDE 2. GUIDE FOR SUBCONTRACTORS

Relevance

1. Were the assumptions on which the Project was originally based specific?
2. What are the main strategies and activities designed to reach the goals in the withdrawal and prevention of minors from the worst forms of child labor? What is the reasoning behind the use of these strategies?
3. Has the Project been successful facing the main obstacles or barriers to fight against child labor? (Example: poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc.)?
4. Please discuss the challenges and gaps still pending in the fight against child labor at a local and national level
5. Did the design of the Project continue being adequate for the cultural, economic and political context in which work was developed, particularly concerning the model of *Espacios para Emprender* (EpEs)?
6. How does the Project fit into existing government initiatives to fight against child labor and poverty, particularly with *Acción Social* and the *Red Juntos*?
7. How do the EpC and EpE models fit into the general design of the broadest programs with fixed terms? Specifically, what have the contributions been, if any?
8. What have the challenges and opportunities been for the implementing parties of the EpC and EpE models to work with government policies, including the 2008–2015 National Strategy for the Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor?
9. How has the Project provided assistance to beneficiaries (such as minors enrolled in commercial sexual exploitation, displaced, ex child soldiers and disabled NNAs) to access social services offered by the Government or by Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)?
10. Since the midterm evaluation, has the project established a protocol to assist beneficiaries previously involved in commercial sexual exploitation?
11. Did the project make implementation and/or strategy adjustments based on the midterm evaluation results and recommendations?

Effectiveness

1. Can the Project be expected to reach its goals and objectives as established in the project document? What were the factors that contributed to the success and/or failure of each of these objectives?
2. Examine the efficacy of EpCs and EpEs to fight against child labor. Did the participation of children in EpC and EpE result in the withdrawal and prevention from exploitative child labor/commercial sexual exploitation?
3. How effective has the Project been in increasing the knowledge about child labor and in building capacities at a local level, including local governments and NGOs? To what extent did awareness raising campaigns and efforts reach “first line” personnel such as the police, social workers and educators, to change attitudes toward child labor and promote reporting and intervention mechanisms in those cases?
4. Examine the efficacy of services meeting the needs of the population, goal identified in the Project Document, including children prevented and withdrawn from labor and commercial sexual exploitation.
5. Examine the efficacy of the specific models (EpC, EpE and Quantum Learning) to increase educational opportunities, creating community identification, increasing community capacities and increasing knowledge and comprehension about the dangers of child labor.
6. Has the Project identified specifically and affected those enrolled or at risk of going to work in the target sectors identified in the strategies of the Project (commercial sexual exploitation of NNAs, housework, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling and agriculture)? In a broader sense, were the worst forms of child labor identified in the country?
7. Are there any lessons learned about specific sectors regarding the types and efficacy of the services offered?
8. What monitoring system does the Project use to follow up on the labor status of children? Was it feasible and effective? Why? Why not?
9. What were the managerial strengths of the Project, including technical and financial strengths? To what extent were the members of the consortium involved in planning and implementing the Project?
10. The Project works at a national level in a country with difficult geographical areas, extreme violence, complex institutions with high degree of government structure decentralization and a strong presence of different international actors. Do relevant good practices exist in other countries where these characteristics are present?

11. When the economy worsened, the Project increased the number of beneficiaries to reach prevention and withdrawal goals. Comment on this strategy and identify some of the lessons learned.
12. What has been the value of the monthly meetings of regional partners or implementing parties? Have these meetings contributed to success and sustainability?
13. While all Partners applied the EpE and EpC methodology, there are differences that depend on the experience of each local implementing party, as well as of the partners. Which of these methodologies or activities were more effective in preventing and withdrawing children and in promoting an impact on the communities, on local governments and among parents?
14. Examine the efficacy of using the material from Nike.

Efficiency

1. Is the Project cost-efficient?
2. Are the Project strategies efficient in terms of financial and human resources used when compared to the results? What are the alternatives?
3. Is the monitoring system efficiently designed to cover the needs and requirements of the Project?

Impact

1. What are the apparent impacts of the Project, particularly of the EpC and EpEs, on individual beneficiaries (NNAs, parents, teachers, etc.)?
2. Examine, to the extent possible, the impact of activities and strategies on the quality of education (both formal and informal interventions). How has the improvement in the quality of education been received by the Government and the communities?
3. What are the apparent impacts of the Project on Partners and other organizations engaged in the fight against child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, National Committees against Child Labor, etc.)?
4. What are the apparent impacts of the Project on government and policy structures, in terms of great changes in education and in child labor matters?
5. Following the midterm evaluation, how successful has the inclusion of parent education been in the EpC? What lessons learned can be observed?
6. What lessons learned can be mentioned in the implementation of EpCs and EpEs in rural and urban zones? How successful have EpCs been in rural areas?

Sustainability

1. Has the Project design comprised a withdrawal and sustainability strategy? Is it relevant and effective?
2. How successful has the Project been in accessing resources outside the Project? Is there any prospect for sustainable financing?
3. What have been the main challenges and successes in keeping partnerships to provide support to the fixed term Project, including the private sector? Has the project developed inter-institutional contacts to set bases to sustain its work?
4. What have some of the challenges and opportunities, if any, in keeping the coordination with the host Government, in particular with the Inter-institutional Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor (CIETI), the Ministry of National Education, the Ministry of Social Protection and ICBF, as well as other government agencies actively engaged in children-related issues? Is there an appropriation or identification process on the side of these actors?

GUIDE 3. GUIDE FOR LOCAL EDUCATORS AND COMMUNITY PERSONNEL

Relevance

1. What are the main strategies and activities designed to reach the goals in the withdrawal and prevention of minors from the worst forms of child labor? What is the reasoning behind the use of these strategies?
2. Has the Project been successful facing the main obstacles or barriers to fight against child labor? (Example: poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc.)?
3. Please discuss the challenges and gaps still pending in the fight against child labor at a local and national level
4. Did the design of the Project continue being adequate for the cultural, economic and political context in which work was developed, particularly concerning the model of *Espacios para Emprender* (EpEs)?
5. How do the EpC and EpE models fit into the general design of the broadest programs with fixed terms? Specifically, what have the contributions been, if any?
6. How has the Project provided assistance to beneficiaries (such as minors enrolled in commercial sexual exploitation, displaced, ex child soldiers and disabled NNAs) to access social services offered by the Government or by Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)?

Efficacy

1. How effective has the Project been in increasing the knowledge about child labor and in building capacities at a local level, including local governments and NGOs? To what extent did awareness raising campaigns and efforts reach “first line” personnel such as the police, social workers and educators, to change attitudes toward child labor and promote reporting and intervention mechanisms in those cases?
2. Examine the efficacy of services meeting the needs of the population, goal identified in the Project Document, including children prevented and withdrawn from labor and commercial sexual exploitation.
3. Examine the efficacy of the specific models (EpC, EpE and Quantum Learning) to increase educational opportunities, creating community identification, increasing community capacities and increasing knowledge and comprehension about the dangers of child labor.
4. Has the Project identified specifically and affected those enrolled or at risk of going to work in the target sectors identified in the strategies of the Project (commercial sexual exploitation of NNAs, housework, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling and agriculture)? In a broader sense, were the worst forms of child labor identified in the country?
5. Are there any lessons learned about specific sectors regarding the types and efficacy of the services offered?
6. While all Partners applied the EpE and EpC methodology, there are differences that depend on the experience of each local implementing party, as well as of the partners. Which of these methodologies or activities were more effective in preventing and withdrawing children and in promoting an impact on the communities, on local governments and among parents?

Impact

1. What are the apparent impacts of the Project, particularly of the EpC and EpEs, on individual beneficiaries (NNAs, parents, teachers, etc.)?
2. Examine, to the extent possible, the impact of activities and strategies on the quality of education (both formal and informal interventions). How has the improvement in the quality of education been received by the Government and the communities?
3. What lessons learned can be mentioned in the implementation of EpCs and EpEs in rural and urban zones? How successful have EpCs been in rural areas?

GUIDE 4. GUIDE FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COLOMBIAN GOVERNMENT

Relevance

1. What are the main strategies and activities designed to reach the goals in the withdrawal and prevention of minors from the worst forms of child labor? What is the reasoning behind the use of these strategies?
2. Does the EpC program model fit with the complementary days' work under the guidelines of the Ministry of National Education and of the Superintendence of Family Subsidy through the Family Clearance Houses?
3. Please discuss the challenges and gaps still pending in the fight against child labor at a local and national level
4. Did the design of the Project continue being adequate for the cultural, economic and political context in which work was developed, particularly concerning the model of *Espacios para Empezar* (EpEs)?
5. How does the Project fit into existing government initiatives to fight against child labor and poverty, particularly with *Acción Social* and the *Red Juntos*?
6. How successful has the Project been in providing support to *Acción Social* and the *Red Juntos* and in what remains to be done in the last months of the Project?
7. How do the EpC and EpE models fit into the general design of the broadest programs with fixed terms? Specifically, what have the contributions been, if any?
8. What have the challenges and opportunities been for the implementing parties of the EpC and EpE models to work with government policies, including the 2008–2015 National Strategy for the Eradication of the Worst Forms of Child Labor?
9. How has the Project provided assistance to beneficiaries (such as minors enrolled in commercial sexual exploitation, displaced, ex child soldiers and disabled NNAs) to access social services offered by the Government or by Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)?
10. What other major aspects in design or implementation must be considered by the receivers of the Project and the USDOL?

Efficacy

1. Examine the efficacy of EpCs and EpEs to fight against child labor. Did the participation of children in EpC and EpE result in the withdrawal and prevention from exploitative child labor/commercial sexual exploitation?

2. How effective has the Project been in increasing the knowledge about child labor and in building capacities at a local level, including local governments and NGOs? To what extent did awareness raising campaigns and efforts reach “first line” personnel such as the police, social workers and educators, to change attitudes toward child labor and promote reporting and intervention mechanisms in those cases?
3. Examine the efficacy of services meeting the needs of the population, goal identified in the Project Document, including children prevented and withdrawn from labor and commercial sexual exploitation.
4. Examine the efficacy of the specific models (EpC, EpE and Quantum Learning) to increase educational opportunities, creating community identification, increasing community capacities and increasing knowledge and comprehension about the dangers of child labor.
5. Has the Project identified specifically and affected those enrolled or at risk of going to work in the target sectors identified in the strategies of the Project (commercial sexual exploitation of NNAs, housework, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling and agriculture)? In a broader sense, were the worst forms of child labor identified in the country?
6. Are there any lessons learned about specific sectors regarding the types and efficacy of the services offered?
7. The Project works at a national level in a country with difficult geographical areas, extreme violence, complex institutions with high degree of government structure decentralization and a strong presence of different international actors. Do relevant good practices exist in other countries where these characteristics are present?
8. While all Partners applied the EpE and EpC methodology, there are differences that depend on the experience of each local implementing party, as well as of the partners. Which of these methodologies or activities were more effective in preventing and withdrawing children and in promoting an impact on the communities, on local governments and among parents?

Efficiency

1. Is the Project cost-efficient?
2. Are the Project strategies efficient in terms of financial and human resources used when compared to the results? What are the alternatives?
3. Is the monitoring system efficiently designed to cover the needs and requirements of the Project?

Impact

1. What are the apparent impacts of the Project, particularly of the EpC and EpEs, on individual beneficiaries (NNAs, parents, teachers, etc.)?
2. Examine, to the extent possible, the impact of activities and strategies on the quality of education (both formal and informal interventions). How has the improvement in the quality of education been received by the Government and the communities?
3. What are the apparent impacts of the Project on Partners and other organizations engaged in the fight against child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, National Committees against Child Labor, etc.)?
4. What are the apparent impacts of the Project on government and policy structures, in terms of great changes in education and in child labor matters?
5. Following the midterm evaluation, how successful has the inclusion of parent education been in the EpC? What lessons learned can be observed?
6. What lessons learned can be mentioned in the implementation of EpCs and EpEs in rural and urban zones? How successful have EpCs been in rural areas?

Sustainability

1. What have some of the challenges and opportunities, if any, in keeping the coordination with the host Government, in particular with the Inter-institutional Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor (CIETI), the Ministry of National Education, the Ministry of Social Security and ICBF, as well as other government agencies actively engaged in children-related issues? Is there an appropriation or identification process on the side of these actors?

GUIDE 5. GUIDE FOR THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY

1. Are you familiar with the *Educame Primero Colombia* project? Please elaborate on what you know about it.
2. What factors do you believe trigger child labor and their worst forms?
3. Do you believe that the Project design is appropriate for the cultural, economic and political context in which it operates? Why?
4. How would you say the Project fits with other government initiatives and those of other organizations with similar objectives?
5. Do you believe that the criteria used to select the scope of action of the Project, the geographical areas and the beneficiaries are adequate?

6. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
7. According to your perception, do you believe that the educational interventions of the Project, such as the creation of the EpC for boys and girls and the EpE for adolescents and the distribution of resources and educational material has been effective to prevent child labor and trafficking? Why?
8. With regard to the needs of the population to be intervened, do you think that the Project responds to all or most of these needs or only to some?
9. Do you believe that the Project has been able to identify accurately boys, girls and adolescents at risk or already enrolled in child labor in the areas of agriculture, domestic chores, drug trafficking and sales, illegal activities in tourist resorts in the country and sexual work?
10. What are the apparent impacts of the Project, particularly of the EpC and EpEs, on individual beneficiaries (NNAs, parents, teachers, communities, etc.)?
11. And on government structures?
12. Is there any aspect that you may have identified that the Project is missing?
13. Compared with other countries where you may have been, are the situations involving elimination of child labor and their triggering factors similar or not?

GUIDE 6. GUIDE FOR BENEFICIARIES' PARENTS

1. Are you familiar with the Project currently ongoing in your community *Espacios para Crecer* and *Espacios para Emprender*?
2. Have you had any active participation in this Project? Which?
3. Do you have a son or daughter who is beneficiary of the Project?
4. Was your child working before joining the Project? If yes, in what did he/she work? How many hours per day?
5. Does your son/daughter currently work? If yes, how many hours?
6. Please tell me how it was that your son/daughter joined the Project.
7. Do you know how they select the place and the children and adolescents to participate in this Project? How?
8. In your opinion, are these beneficiary selection criteria correct or not? Why?

9. Could you identify what other types of initiatives and/or methodologies should be included in the Project?
10. According to your perception, do you believe that the educational interventions of the Project, such as the creation of the EpCs for boys and girls and the EpEs for adolescents and the distribution of resources and educational material has been effective to prevent child labor and trafficking? Why do you think that EpCs have been effective? Or not? Why do you think that EpEs have been effective? Or not?
11. With regard to the needs of the population that participate in the Project, do you think that the Project responds to all or most of these needs or only to some? To which?
12. What benefits or good things do you see in the Project? How has it benefitted your son/daughter? Give examples.
13. What negative aspects you see in the Project? Give examples.
14. Do you believe that the children and adolescents that join this Project improve their learning in school? Give examples. Ask for grades.
15. Do you think that the Project helps children and adolescents who had abandoned school to go back to it? Give examples.
16. Do you think that the children and adolescents should work? In what conditions? Are these conditions possible? Are they real?
17. Have you attended any activity of the Project? Which? What did you think about it? How often do you attend these activities?
18. Does the community agree with the Project or not? Why?
19. And what about you? Are you pleased or not? Why?

GUIDE 7. GUIDE FOR PROJECT BENEFICIARIES (NNA)

1. Do you participate in these spaces?
2. Tell me how you participate. Elaborate.
3. Do you go to school? At what time?
4. At what time you begin here?
5. Do you come every day?
6. When you are unable to attend what are the reasons? Ask if it is due to an obligation.
7. Do you like being here? Why?

8. What do you like to do most?
9. What do you like to do the least?
10. What things would you like this space to have that it doesn't?
11. How are your grades at school?
12. Before coming here, how were your grades? Good, poor or fair?
13. Have you worked for money? That is, did you or your parents get paid for your work, for example as sowing or gathering harvests, cleaning houses, running errands or accompanying persons? (if he/she worked) tell me what you used to do and how much you were paid. How many hours?
14. (If he/she worked) Did you like to do that work? Why?
15. And now? Do you work? In what? How many hours?
16. (For those who have not worked yet) At what age do you think you will work?
17. (For all) At what age do you think one should start working? Why?
18. What do your parents say about at what age one should start working?
19. In what would you like to work? Why?
20. Does your teacher at school agree with your coming here? What does he/she say to you?
21. And do your parents like you to come here? What do they say to you?

The questions below are addressed only to EpE beneficiaries

22. Do you attend courses at the SENA/Young Christian Association?
23. What course have you taken or are taking?
24. Do you like those courses? Why?
25. What are the teachers like? Would you say you learn what they teach you or not?
26. What is the best part of the courses at the Vocational center? Why?
27. What do you like the least in the courses? Why?
28. Do you think that when you leave you will be able to work with something they taught you here?

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX E: SUSTAINABILITY MASTER PLAN

Sustainability Plan/Master Plan Sustainability Master Plan of the Project: Support for the Eradication of Child Labor Program in Colombia: *Edúcame Primero Colombia*

Initial date of preparation: 09/30/2008 Date of this version: 22/01/2009

Project Component	Sustainability Conditions	Future Actions by Institutions and Partners Involved	Process to Monitor the Sustainability Elements Progress	Elements Status
<p>Result 1. Effective EpC and EpE educational model to prevent and withdraw NNA from child labor.</p> <p>Effective EpC and EpE educational programs established in target areas.</p> <p>Reduced barriers for access to formal school for a working NNA or at risk to do so.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Strategy created to prevent child labor and protect young workers (2008–2015). Relevant actors convinced of EpC and EpE intervention benefits. Economic resources obtained from the Government and private sector. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other actions should be required as the National Strategy was created on February 7, 2008. The Project shows statistics related to changes operated in NNA labor status and in school retention. The Project is actively looking for economic support for EpCs and EpEs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A Follow-up and analysis of data produced by the Project and the socialization the Project performs with relevant actors. Follow-up and analysis of strategies for funds for expansion of EpCs and EpEs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Done. First year results were presented to the National Committee, USAID, Department of Education of Bogotá, the Ministry of Social Protection. Conversations are being held with the Telefónica foundation to convince them of supporting EpC with funds. Results will be presented and donors will be sought at the Sixth Inter-American Conference of Social Responsibility and at the Colombia-USA Bi-national Convention. The Project presented a non-solicited proposal to USAID, Department of Education of Bogotá, voluntary partners and municipalities of Zipaguirá, Funza, Factativá, and Chiquinquirá.

Project Component	Sustainability Conditions	Future Actions by Institutions and Partners Involved	Process to Monitor the Sustainability Elements Progress	Elements Status
<p>Result 2. Actions have been taken and monitored by the municipal governments against child labor.</p> <p>Increased efficacy of monitoring of the National Strategy to local levels. Municipal policies to eradicate child labor supporting the National Strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Committee requiring bi-annual reports and stakeholders requiring monitoring results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide technical assistance to the National Committee to set up as a regular practice the requirement of monitoring reports. Move NGOs involved in projects seeking the eradication of child labor to provide monitoring reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodical reviews of technical assistance interventions performed by the Project. Revision of municipal development plans and national development plans to verify they have included actions against child labor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project is committed to supporting actions led by the Ministry for Social Protection and IPEC. Departments and municipalities are provided with guidelines to include child labor in their development plans. To this effect, the Project will delegate to local subcontractors the responsibility to actively promote the inclusion of child labor and economic resources programs in their development plans.
<p>Result 3. Creation of awareness in parents, teachers and community leaders concerning child labor.</p> <p>Improved knowledge and attitudes amongst beneficiaries' parents regarding the importance of NNAs education, the laws and the cost and dangers of child labor. Child labor issues spread throughout the target communities through technology by innovative communication means.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parents convinced that their children should not work before legal working age. Critical persons informed by mass communication means. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educate parents on NNA withdrawal from work and the need to attend educational services. Intervention of selected personnel from the mass media and the Journalists Association to give them periodical information regarding child labor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administration of a baseline study and a second KAP study to take a parents sample to determine the degree of change in attitude and knowledge. Monitoring information provided by the Project regarding child labor and presented to the media. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline study regarding knowledge and attitudes of beneficiaries' parents designed and submitted to NGOs to be administrated in the last three months of 2008. An announcement by the Project in the media. Process of gathering the address of personnel from the media and Journalists Association, in progress.
<p>Result 4. Increased understanding of child labor issues and possible solutions by policymakers and Project stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That studies have an impact on policy programs or projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor the selection of studies that key policymakers consider necessary to formulate policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The PMP indicator requires that the Project studies have an impact on policy programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Committee for the Eradication of Child Labor was selected as the policymaker entity to be consulted. Consultations will be performed through a workshop with the Committee.

Project Component	Sustainability Conditions	Future Actions by Institutions and Partners Involved	Process to Monitor the Sustainability Elements Progress	Elements Status
<p>Result 5. Sustainable and expanded Project programs. EpC and EpE and/or QL methodology models effectively implemented and sustained by local and national entities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Project is to guarantee sustainable actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor the actions performed after the Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up and analysis of key actors' sustainability actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A network was created between ILO-IPEC, Fundación Telefónica, Visión Mundial and Edúcame Primero to work in a coordinated manner.

This page intentionally left blank.

ANNEX F: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference for the Independent Final Evaluation of *Edúcame Primero*: Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Colombia

Cooperative Agreement Number:	IL-16574-07-75-K
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Grantee Organization:	Partners of the Americas, in association with DevTech Systems, CINDE, and Mercy Corps
Dates of Project Implementation:	September 30, 2007 to December 31, 2010
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Final Evaluation
Evaluation Fieldwork Dates:	August 8-23, 2010
Preparation Date of TOR:	May 25, 2010
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US \$5,099,463 Matching funds: US\$1,066,901
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	ICF Macro, Headquarters 11785 Beltsville Drive Calverton, MD 20705 Tel: (301) 572-0200 Fax: (301) 572-0999

I BACKGROUND AND JUSTIFICATION

The Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking (OCFT) is an office within the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB), an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor (USDOL). OCFT activities include research on international child labor; supporting U.S. Government policy on international child labor; administering and overseeing cooperative agreements with organizations working to eliminate child labor around the world; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$780 million to USDOL for efforts to combat exploitive child labor internationally. This funding has been used to support technical cooperation projects to combat exploitive child labor in more than 80 countries around the world. Technical cooperation projects funded by USDOL range from targeted action programs in specific sectors of work to more comprehensive programs that support national efforts to eliminate the worst forms of child labor (WFCL) as defined by ILO Convention 182. USDOL-funded child labor elimination projects generally seek to achieve five major goals:

1. Withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor through the provision of direct educational services.
2. Strengthening policies on child labor and education, the capacity of national institutions to combat child labor, and formal and transitional education systems that encourage children engaged in or at risk of engaging in exploitive labor to attend school.

3. Raising awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilizing a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.
4. Supporting research and the collection of reliable data on child labor.
5. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects—decreasing the prevalence of exploitive child labor through increased access to education—is intended to nurture the development, health, safety, and enhanced future employability of children engaged in or at-risk of entering exploitive labor.

USDOL reports annually to Congress on the performance of its program. As these programs have developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on ensuring that the data collected by grantees are accurate, relevant, complete, reliable, timely, valid and verifiable.

In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the U.S. Congress directed the majority of the funds to support the two following programs:¹⁰

1 International Labour Organization’s International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC)

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated some \$450 million to support the International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO-IPEC), making the United States Government the leading donor to the program. USDOL-funded ILO-IPEC projects to combat child labor generally fall into one of several categories: comprehensive, national Timebound Programs (TBP) to eliminate the WFCL in a set time frame; less comprehensive Country Programs; sector-specific projects; data collection and research projects; and international awareness raising projects. In general, most projects include “direct action” components that are interventions to remove or prevent children from involvement in exploitative and hazardous work. One of the major strategies used by IPEC projects is to increase children’s access to and participation in formal and nonformal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a strong enabling environment for the long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

2 Child Labor Education Initiative

Since 2001, the US Congress has provided some \$269 million to USDOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the WFCL through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being implemented by a wide range of international and nongovernmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. USDOL typically awards EI cooperative agreements through a competitive bid process.

¹⁰ In 2007, the U.S. Congress did not direct USDOL’s appropriations for child labor elimination projects to either of these two programs. That year, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects through a competitive process.

EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn and integrated into educational settings, and that they persist in their education once enrolled. In parallel, the program seeks to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering child labor. The EI is based on the notion that the elimination of exploitative child labor depends, to a large extent, on improving access to, quality of, and relevance of education. Without improving educational quality and relevance, children withdrawn/prevented from child labor may not have viable alternatives and could resort to other forms of hazardous work. EI projects may focus on providing educational services to children removed from specific sectors of work and/or a specific region(s) or support a national Timebound Program that aims to eliminate the WFCL in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country.

Other Initiatives

Finally, USDOL has supported \$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO-IPEC program or the EI.

Project Context

In Colombia, children work in sectors such as agriculture, industry, commerce, and service. According to the Colombian Family Welfare Institute (ICBF), approximately 80% of working children work in the informal sector. For example, in urban areas, children work in domestic service in third-party homes, bakeries, automobile repair, and food preparation. Children are also involved in the cultivation of coca for illegal purposes and in the processing and transportation of illicit drugs. According to reports by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Ministry of Social Protection (MSP), an estimated 25,000 minors are exploited through the commercial sex trade in Colombia as of 2006.¹¹

USDOL has supported numerous initiatives in Colombia, having devoted approximately \$9.4 million since 2001 to combat child labor in the country. USDOL has devoted an additional \$17.17 million since 2000 to global and regional South American initiatives which included Colombia.¹² Among these projects is a \$3.5 million, four-year project implemented by World Vision to combat exploitive child labor by improving basic education. The project ended in 2008, and withdrew and prevented 6,517 children from hazardous agriculture and other forms of labor in the municipalities of Funza and Madrid, Cundinamarca. USDOL also funded a \$7 million, three-year inter-regional ILO-IPEC project, which ended in 2007, to combat the involvement of children within armed groups. This project withdrew 789 children from child soldiering and prevented an additional 673 children from becoming child soldiers in Colombia. A four-year regional project funded by USDOL at \$5.5 million, and implemented by ILO-IPEC in Colombia, Chile, Paraguay, and Peru, ended in 2007. This project withdrew and prevented 5,618 children from domestic work and commercial sexual exploitation in Colombia.¹³

¹¹ USDOL, “2008 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor,” Colombia Country Report, p. 80-81.

¹² USDOL, “Project Status—The Americas.” <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/programs/ocft/project-americas.htm>

¹³ USDOL, “2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor,” Colombia Country Report, p. 76.

USDOL-Funded Projects in Colombia

Years	Grantee	Project	Amount
2001–2004	ILO-IPEC	Prevention and Elimination of Child Labor in Small-Scale Mining in Colombia	\$800,000
2004–2008	World Vision	Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Colombia	\$3,500,000
2007–2010	Partners of the Americas	<i>Edúcame Primero</i> : Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in Colombia	\$5,099,463
2001–2005	ILO-IPEC	CDL The Prevention and Elimination of Child Labor Domestic Labor in South America (regional)	\$4,670,000
2004–2007	ILO-IPEC	Prevention and Elimination of Child Domestic Labor (CDL) and Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children (CSEC) in Chile, Colombia, Paraguay and Peru	\$5,500,000
2003–2007	ILO-IPEC	Prevention and Reintegration of Children Involved in Armed Conflict: An inter-Regional Program	\$7,000,000
TOTAL Colombia and Regional			\$26,569,463
Colombia Only Total			\$9,399,463
Global and regional Total			\$17,170,000

The Government of Colombia has ratified ILO Conventions 138 and 182 and is an ILO-IPEC participant country. The minimum age for employment in the country is 15, and all child workers are prohibited from working at night or performing work where there is a risk of bodily harm or exposure to excessive heat, cold, or noise. The MSP Resolution No. 01677 of 2008 identifies the WFCL that are prohibited for all minors under 18 years. Sexual exploitation of minors is also prohibited and penalties are provided for violations of these laws.¹⁴

The Colombian Institute for Family Welfare (ICBF), Family Commissioners, the Children and Adolescent Police, the Prosecutor General, and the National Ombudsman are responsible for enforcing laws related to children. The country has adopted national strategies, including The Plan for Childhood (2004–2015), which contains provisions related to child labor, and to specific WFCL, including trafficking, recruitment into armed groups, and commercial sexual exploitation. The National Strategy to Eradicate the Worst Forms of Child Labor 2008–2015, which identifies criteria for guiding future actions has also been adopted, as has the National Plan of Action for the Prevention and Eradication of Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Boys, Girls, and Adolescents Less than 18 Years of Age (2006–2011), which aims to introduce improved legislation, provide services to children, and encourage institutional capacity building.¹⁵ The National Strategy to Combat Trafficking (2007–2012) aims to reduce trafficking in persons, including children, through prevention programs, victim assistance services, prosecution of cases, and fostering international cooperation.¹⁶

¹⁴ USDOL, “2008 Findings,” p. 81–82.

¹⁵ USDOL, “2007 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor,” Colombia Country Report, p. 75.

¹⁶ USDOL, “2008 Findings,” p. 83.

Governmental entities carry out activities to combat child labor, and the Government of Colombia also participates in programs funded by other donors. For example, ICBF carries out an initiative to withdraw and prevent child labor in mining communities, and, along with the Departmental Government of Cesar and the Office of the Inspector General, implements a US\$300,000 project to eradicate child labor and commercial sexual exploitation of children in nine municipalities. With the support of USAID, MSP carried out an initiative “Complying and Improving,” which encourages employers and workers to eliminate child labor. The Government of Colombia is consolidating the National Plan for the Prevention and Elimination of Child Labor with support from the Government of Canada and technical assistance from ILO-IPEC, and also participated in a 4-year, US\$3.3 million ILO-IPEC regional initiative to eradicate child labor, funded by the Government of Spain.¹⁷

Edúcame Primero Colombia: Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Colombia

On October 1, 2007, Partners of the Americas, in association with DevTech Systems, CINDE, and Mercy Corps, received a four-year cooperative agreement worth approximately \$5.1 million from USDOL to implement a Timebound Program in Colombia, aimed at withdrawing and preventing children from exploitative child labor by expanding access to and improving the quality of basic education and supporting the original four goals of the USDOL project as outlined above. Partners of the Americas and its associates were awarded the project through a competitive bid process. As this is a Timebound Program, the project should aim to meet the specific Timebound Program goals:

1. Prevent the engagement of children in the *worst forms of child labor*.
2. Provide the necessary and appropriate direct assistance for the *withdrawal of children from the worst forms of child labor* and for their rehabilitation and social integration.
3. Ensure access to free basic education, and, wherever possible and appropriate, vocational training, for all children removed from the *worst forms of child labor*.
4. Identify and reach out to children at special risk.
5. Take account of the special situation of girls.

As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, this project targets 10,200 children ages 6–17 for withdrawal or prevention from exploitative child labor, focusing on victims of the worst forms of child labor, particularly commercial sexual exploitation of children and recruitment of child soldiers, and the sectors of domestic service, street work, construction, recycling, and agriculture. Targeted urban areas include Bogota, Cali, Yumbo Cartagena, Barranquilla and Santa Marta, as well as nearby rural areas and the departments of Boyacá, Cauca and Santander. The project uses approaches such as introducing alternative and transitional educational programming; strengthening policy, enforcement and engagement of municipal governments; and raising awareness to increase public knowledge about hazardous/exploitative child labor.

¹⁷ USDOL, “2008 Findings,” p. 83–84.

Specific project activities and strategies include—

- Provide support and improve monitoring of implementation of the National Strategy for the Elimination of Child Labor.
- In coordination with Local Committees for the Elimination of Child Labor, encourage local governments, community leaders, and civil society organizations to adopt mechanisms and tools to implement policies to eradicate child labor.
- Coordinate efforts with other child labor initiatives.
- Develop communication strategies and materials to raise awareness of parents, teachers, business associations, and trade unions about child labor.
- Conduct research on child labor.
- Establish educational models such as EpC (Spaces for Growth) and Quantum Learning to remove and prevent children from child labor.

Midterm Evaluation

A midterm evaluation was conducted in May 2008 by Michele González Arroyo, an independent international consultant. The evaluation consisted of document review; individual and group interviews with project staff, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders; site visits (observation) in Bogotá, Cali, and Cartagena to school- and community-based EpC activities; and a stakeholder workshop.

At midterm, the evaluator found that the *Edúcame Primero* project had supported and complemented the TBP goals, as well as the five goals of USDOL Education Initiative projects, as listed in the introduction to this TOR. The EpC educational intervention had successfully withdrawn and prevented children from WFCL and appeared to be on target to reach its goal by the end of the project. The evaluator found that the project had improved the participants' self-esteem, regular school conduct, and academic progress. The project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) specialist had also successfully designed and implemented a practical and effective system for tracking the work status of children while in the program.

Despite its strengths, some stakeholders in the evaluation expressed concerns regarding the sustainability of project efforts and the need to include or enhance certain activities, such as the short, 10-month duration of the educational intervention. Stakeholders suggested the following modifications to the EpC program: (1) a well-structured parental education component; (2) nutritious snacks for the children; (3) uniform training for EpC facilitators on children's psychosocial issues; and (4) a rigorous assessment of the Quantum Learning educational methodology, as well as other facets of the project, to accurately measure their true impact.

The key recommendations from the midterm evaluation were:

- Create a Sustainability Committee under the leadership of the project director to plan for resources needed to ensure the project's sustainability, especially the EpC programs.
- Create a Parent Education Committee under the leadership of the project's education specialist to develop a comprehensive program for parents.
- Create a committee, under the leadership of Mercy Corps, which can develop a clearly articulated and standardized plan for serving the specific needs of child victims of commercial sexual exploitation.
- Identify one or more individuals within the *Educame Primero Colombia* administration who will be responsible for leveraging the resources necessary to provide a pre-packaged nutritious snack to child beneficiaries.
- Ensure that direct beneficiaries have a longer educational intervention period in order to achieve permanent withdrawal or prevention from WFCL.

II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

OCFT-funded projects are subject to midterm and final evaluations. The fieldwork for final evaluations is generally scheduled three months before the end of the project. The *Educame Primero* project in Colombia went into implementation in September 2007 and is due for final evaluation in 2010.

Scope of Evaluation

The scope of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL cooperative agreement with Partners of the Americas. All activities that have been implemented from project launch through time of evaluation fieldwork should be considered. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project in reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document.

The evaluation should address issues of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned, replicability and provide recommendations for current and future projects. The questions to be addressed in the evaluation (provided below) are organized to provide an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and (to the extent possible) impact on the target population.

Final Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the final evaluation is to:

1. Assess whether the project has met its objectives and identify the challenges encountered in doing so.

2. Assess the relevance of the project in the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL.
3. Assess the intended and unintended outcomes and impacts of the project.
4. Provide lessons learned from the project design and experiences in implementation that can be applied in current or future child labor projects in the country and in projects designed under similar conditions or target sectors.
5. Assess whether project activities can be deemed sustainable at the local and national level and among implementing organizations.

The evaluation should also provide documented lessons learned, good practices, and models of intervention that will serve to inform future child labor projects and policies in Colombia and elsewhere, as appropriate. It will also serve as an important accountability function for USDOL and Partners of the Americas. Recommendations should focus around lessons learned and good practices from which future projects can glean when developing their strategies toward combating exploitive child labor.

Intended Users

This final evaluation should provide USDOL, Partners of the Americas, other project specific stakeholders, and stakeholders working to combat child labor more broadly, an assessment of the project's experience in implementation and its impact on project beneficiaries. Lessons learned and good practices should be used by stakeholders in the design and implementation of subsequent phases or future child labor projects in the country and elsewhere as appropriate. The final report will be published on the USDOL website, so the report should be written as a standalone document, providing the necessary background information for readers who are unfamiliar with the details of the project.

Evaluation Questions

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are found below, according to five categories of issue. Evaluators may add, remove, or shift evaluation questions, but the final list will be subject to approval by USDOL and ICF Macro.

Relevance

The evaluation should consider the relevance of the project to the cultural, economic, and political context in the country, as well as the extent to which it is suited to the priorities and policies of the host country government and USDOL. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Have the project assumptions been accurate?

2. What are the main project strategies/activities designed toward meeting objectives in withdrawing/preventing children from WFCL? What is the rationale behind using these strategies?
3. Has the project been successful in addressing the main obstacles or barriers to combat child labor (i.e., poverty, lack of educational infrastructure, lack of demand for education, etc.)?
4. Does the EpC model fit into the guidelines released by the Ministry of National Education and the Superintendent of Family Subsidy on after-school programs, which are carried out by Family Compensation Funds (*Cajas de Compensación Familiar*)?
5. Please discuss the gaps and challenges that remain in combating child labor at the national and local levels.
6. Has the project design continued to be appropriate for the cultural, economic, and political context in which it works, particularly regarding *Espacios para Emprender* (EpE) model?
7. How successful has the project been in supporting *Acción Social* and *Red Juntos*, and what remains to be done during the last months of the project?
8. How have the EpC and EpE models fit into the overall design of the broad TBP program? Specifically what has been their contribution, if any?
9. Has the project design continued to be adequately supporting goals of the broad TBP? If not, why not?
10. What have been the challenges and opportunities for the EpC and EpE implementers to work within the government policies, including the *National Strategy to Eradicate the Worst Forms of Child Labor 2008–2015*?
11. How has the project assisted programs beneficiaries (i.e., children engaged in commercial sexual exploitation, internally displaced children, former child soldiers, and children with disabilities) to access to social services provided by the government or nongovernmental organizations?
12. Since the midterm evaluation, has the project established a protocol to assist project beneficiaries who were involved in commercial sexual exploitation?
13. Did the project adjust implementation and/or strategy based on the findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation?
14. What other major design and/or implementation issues should be brought to the attention of the grantee and USDOL?

Effectiveness

The evaluation should assess whether the project has reached its objectives, and the effectiveness of project activities in contributing toward those objectives. Specifically, the evaluation should address the following questions:

1. Is it anticipated that the project will achieve its targets and objectives as stated in the project document? What factors contributed to the success and/or underachievement of each of the objectives?
2. Please provide an analysis of why dropout rates are high in this project and whether the project's response has been effective. Please consider both external factors (i.e., displacement, parental attitudes, children's desire to earn money for consumption) and factors related the project's interventions (i.e., awareness raising, relevance of educational services).
3. Assess the effectiveness of the *Espacios para Crecer* (EpCs) and *Espacios para Emprender* (EpEs), education models to combat child labor. Did participation in EpCs and EpEs result in children being withdrawn/prevented from exploitive child labor/commercial sexual exploitation?
4. How effective has the project been in raising awareness of child labor and building capacity at the local level, including local governments and nongovernmental organizations? To what extent has awareness raising campaigns and efforts reached "front line" officials, such as police, social workers, and educators, to change attitudes about child labor and promote mechanisms to report and intervene in such cases?
5. Assess the effectiveness of the services in meeting the needs of the target population identified in the project document including children *prevented* and *withdrawn* from labor and commercial sexual exploitation.
6. Assess the effectiveness of the specific models (EpC, EpE, and Quantum Learning) on increasing educational opportunities, creating community ownership, increasing the capacity of communities, and increasing awareness/understanding of the dangers of child labor.
7. Has the project accurately identified and targeted children engaged in, or at risk of working in, the target sectors identified in the project strategy (commercial sexual exploitation of children, domestic service, street work, construction, child soldiers, recycling, and agriculture)?
8. Are there any sector specific lessons learned regarding the types and effectiveness of the services provided?
9. What monitoring systems does the project use for tracking the work status of children? Were they feasible and effective? Why or why not?

10. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project? To what extent were all consortium members involved in planning and implementing the project?
11. This project works at a national scale in a country with a difficult geography, extreme violence, a complex network of government institutions, a highly decentralized governmental structure, and a strong and diverse presence of international actors. Are there relevant best practices from other countries where some of these characteristics are present?
12. As the economy worsened, the project enrolled increasing numbers of beneficiaries to reach its prevention and withdrawal goal. Comment on this strategy and identify any lessons learned.
13. What has been the value of the monthly meetings of the *socios regionales* (implementers)? Have these meetings contributed to success and sustainability?
14. Although all of the partners used the EpC/EpE methodology, there were various differences depending on the expertise of each implementing local partner, as well as the focus and expertise of the consortium partners. Which of these methodologies or activities was most effective in preventing and withdrawing children and in promoting impact with communities, local government, and with parents?
15. Assess the effectiveness of the use of the Nike materials (Project Match). Did this intervention effectively retain children in the EpCs, and did it promote a greater participation of parents, schools and community in the program?

Efficiency

The evaluation should provide analysis as to whether the strategies employed by the project were efficient in terms of the resources used (inputs) as compared to its qualitative and quantitative impact (outputs). Specifically, the evaluation should address the following questions:

1. Is the project cost-efficient?
2. Were the project strategies efficient in terms of the financial and human resources used, as compared to its outputs? What alternatives are there?
3. Was the monitoring system designed efficiently to meet the needs and requirements of the project?

Impact

The evaluation should assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project – intended and unintended, direct and indirect, as well as any changes in the social and economic environment in the country—as reported by respondents. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. What appears to be the project’s impact, particularly the EpCs and EpEs, if any, on individual beneficiaries (children, parents, teachers, etc)?

2. Assess the impact, to the extent possible, of project activities/strategies on education quality (both formal and nonformal interventions). How has the education quality improvement component been received by the government and the communities?
3. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on partners or other organizations working on child labor in the country (NGOs, community groups, schools, national child labor committee, etc)?
4. What appears to be the project's impact, if any, on government and policy structures in terms of system-wide change on education and child labor issues?
5. After the midterm evaluation, how successful has the project been in including a parental education component in the EpCs? What lessons can be drawn?
6. What lessons learned could be drawn from operating EpCs in rural and urban areas? How successful have the EpCs been in rural areas?

Sustainability

The evaluation should assess whether the project has taken steps to ensure the continuation of project activities after the completion of the program, including sources of funding and partnerships with other organizations and/or the government, and identify areas where this may be strengthened. Specifically, it should address the following questions:

1. Were the exit strategy and sustainability plan integrated into the project design? Will it likely be effective?
2. How successful has the project been in leveraging non-project resources? Are there prospects for sustainable funding?
3. What have been the major challenges and successes in maintaining partnerships in support of the TBP, including with the private sector? Has the project developed the inter-institutional contacts to lay the groundwork to sustain its work?
4. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of maintaining coordination with the host country government, particularly CIETI, the Ministry of National Education, the Ministry of Social Protection, and the ICBF, as well as other government agencies active in addressing related children's issues? Is there ownership on behalf of these actors?
5. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with the ILO-IPEC, *Telefonica* Foundation, UNICEF, and Save the Children?
6. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with international and/or multilateral organizations?
7. What have been some of the challenges and opportunities in working with other national NGOs and/or community-based organizations present in the country?

8. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing partnerships in support of the broad TBP?
9. Will the community and school-based EpC and EpE sites, monitoring systems, and other committees/groups and systems created by the project be sustainable?
10. What lessons can be learned of the project's accomplishments and weaknesses in terms of sustainability of interventions?
11. Has the sustainability committee suggested in the midterm evaluation taken shape and been able to promote sustainability?

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

The evaluation methodology will consist of the following activities and approaches:

A Approach

The evaluation approach will be primarily qualitative in terms of the data collection methods used as the timeframe does not allow for quantitative surveys to be conducted. Quantitative data will be drawn from project reports to the extent that it is available and incorporated in the analysis. The evaluation approach will be independent in terms of the membership of the evaluation team. Project staff and implementing partners will generally only be present in meetings with stakeholders, communities and beneficiaries to provide introductions. The following additional principles will be applied during the evaluation process:

1. Methods of data collection and stakeholder perspectives will be triangulated for as many as possible of the evaluation questions.
2. Efforts will be made to include parents' and children's voices and beneficiary participation generally, using child-sensitive approaches to interviewing children following the ILO-IPEC guidelines on research with children on the WFCL (<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=3026>) and UNICEF Principles for Ethical Reporting on Children (http://www.unicef.org/media/media_tools_guidelines.html).
3. Gender and cultural sensitivity will be integrated in the evaluation approach.
4. Consultations will incorporate a degree of flexibility to maintain a sense of ownership of the stakeholders and beneficiaries, allowing additional questions to be posed that are not included in the TOR, whilst ensuring that key information requirements are met.
5. As far as possible, a consistent approach will be followed in each project site, with adjustments to be made for the different actors involved and activities conducted and the progress of implementation in each locality.

B Final Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist solely of the international evaluator. One member of the project staff may travel with the team to make introductions. This person is not involved in the evaluation process

The international evaluator is Julia Hasbún. She will be responsible for developing the methodology in consultation with ICF Macro and the project staff; directly conducting interviews and facilitating other data collection processes; analysis of the evaluation material gathered; presenting feedback on the initial findings of the evaluation to the national stakeholder meeting and preparing the evaluation report.

C Data Collection Methodology

1 Document Review

- Pre-field visit preparation includes extensive review of relevant documents
- During fieldwork, documentation will be verified and additional documents may be collected
- Documents may include—
 - Project document and revisions
 - Cooperative Agreement
 - Technical Progress and Status Reports
 - Project Logical Frameworks and Monitoring Plans
 - Workplans
 - Correspondence related to Technical Progress Reports
 - Management Procedures and Guidelines
 - Research or other reports undertaken (baseline studies, etc.)
 - Project files (including school records) as appropriate

2 Question Matrix

Before beginning fieldwork, the evaluator will create a question matrix, which outlines the source of data from where the evaluator plans to collect information for each TOR question. This will help the evaluator make decisions as to how they are going to allocate their time in the field. It will also help the evaluator to ensure that they are exploring all possible avenues for data triangulation and to clearly note where their evaluation findings are coming from.

3 Interviews with stakeholders

Informational interviews will be held with as many project stakeholders as possible. Depending on the circumstances, these meetings will be one-on-one or group interviews. Technically, stakeholders are all those who have an interest in a project, for example, as implementers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, community leaders, donors, and government officials. Thus, it is anticipated that meetings will be held with—

- ILAB/OCFT Staff
- Headquarters, Country Director, Project Managers, and Field Staff of Grantee and Partner Organizations
- Government Ministry Officials and Local Government Officials
- Community leaders, members, and volunteers
- School teachers, assistants, school directors, education personnel
- Project beneficiaries (children withdrawn and prevented and their parents)
- International Organizations, NGOs and multilateral agencies working in the area
- Other child protection and/or education organizations, committees and experts in the area
- Labor Reporting Officer at U.S. Embassy and USAID representative

4 Field Visits

The evaluator will visit a selection of project sites. The final selection of field sites to be visited will be made by the evaluator. Every effort should be made to include some sites where the project experienced successes and others that encountered challenges, as well as a good cross section of sites across targeted child labor sectors. During the visits the evaluator will observe the activities and outputs developed by the project. Focus groups with children and parents will be held, and interviews will be conducted with representatives from local governments, NGOs, community leaders and teachers.

D Ethical Considerations and Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure a maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, stakeholders, communities, and beneficiaries, implementing partner staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, implementing partner staff may accompany the evaluator to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the evaluation process, make respondents feel comfortable, and to allow the evaluator to observe the interaction between the implementing partner staff and the interviewees.

E Stakeholder Meeting

Following the field visits, a stakeholders' meeting will be conducted by the evaluator that brings together a wide range of stakeholders, including the implementing partners and other interested parties. The list of participants to be invited will be drafted prior to the evaluator's visit and confirmed in consultation with project staff during fieldwork.

The meeting will be used to present the major preliminary finding and emerging issues, solicit recommendations, and obtain clarification or additional information from stakeholders, including those not interviewed earlier. The agenda of the meeting will be determined by the evaluator in consultation with project staff. Some specific questions for stakeholders will be prepared to guide the discussion and possibly a brief written feedback.

The agenda is expected to include some of the following items:

1. Presentation by the evaluator of the preliminary main findings
2. Feedback and questions from stakeholders on the findings
3. Opportunity for implementing partners not met to present their views on progress and challenges in their locality
4. Possible SWOT exercise on the project's performance
5. Discussion of recommendations to improve the implementation and ensure sustainability. Consideration will be given to the value of distributing a feedback form for participants to nominate their "action priorities" for the remainder of the project

F Limitations

Fieldwork for the evaluation will last two weeks, on average, and the evaluator will not have enough time to visit all project sites. As a result, the evaluator will not be able to take all sites into consideration when formulating their findings. All efforts will be made to ensure that the evaluator is visiting a representative sample of sites, including some that have performed well and some that have experienced challenges.

This is not a formal impact assessment. Findings for the evaluation will be based on information collected from background documents and in interviews with stakeholders, project staff, and beneficiaries. The accuracy of the evaluation findings will be determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

Furthermore, the ability of the evaluator to determine efficiency will be limited by the amount of financial data available. A cost-efficiency analysis is not included because it would require impact data which is not available.

G Timetable and Workplan

The tentative timetable is as follows. Actual dates may be adjusted as needs arise.

Activity	Responsible Party	Proposed Date(s)
Phone interview with USDOL and Grantee Staff/Headquarters	ICF Macro, USDOL, Grantee, Evaluator	May 2010
Desk Review	Evaluator	June–July 2010
Question Matrix and Instruments due to ICF Macro/USDOL	Evaluator	July 23
Finalize TOR and submit to Grantee and USDOL	USDOL/ICF Macro/Evaluator	July 7
International Travel		August 7
Introductory Meetings with Project Staff and National Stakeholders	Evaluator	August 8
Field Site Visits	Evaluator	August 9–20
National Stakeholder Meeting		August 23
International Travel		August 24
Post-evaluation debrief call with USDOL		August 30
Draft report to ICF Macro for QC review	Evaluator	September 7
Draft report to USDOL and Grantee for 48-hour review	ICF Macro	September 10
Draft report released to stakeholders	ICF Macro	September 13
Comments due to ICF Macro	USDOL/Grantee & Stakeholders	September 27
Report revised and sent to ICF Macro	Evaluator	October 4
Revised report sent to USDOL	ICF Macro	October 5
Final approval of report	USDOL	October 19
Finalization and distribution of report	ICF Macro	November 9

IV EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

Ten working days following the evaluator’s return from fieldwork, a first draft evaluation report will be submitted to ICF Macro. The report should have the following structure and content:

- I. Table of Contents
- II. List of Acronyms
- III. Executive Summary (providing an overview of the evaluation, summary of main findings/lessons learned/good practices, and three key recommendations)
- IV. Evaluation Objectives and Methodology

- V. Project Description
- VI. Relevance
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VII. Effectiveness
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- VIII. Efficiency
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- IX. Impact
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- X. Sustainability
 - A. Findings—answering the TOR questions
 - B. Lessons Learned/Good Practices
- XI. Recommendations and Conclusions
 - A. Key Recommendations—critical for successfully meeting project objectives
 - B. Other Recommendations—as needed
 - 1. Relevance
 - 2. Effectiveness
 - 3. Efficiency
 - 4. Impact
 - 5. Sustainability
- XII. Annexes—including list of documents reviewed; interviews/meetings/site visits; stakeholder workshop agenda and participants; TOR; etc.

The total length of the report should be a minimum of 30 pages and a maximum of 45 pages for the main report, excluding the executive summary and annexes.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to OCFT and key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the evaluator will provide a response to OCFT, in the form of a comment matrix, as to why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the evaluator, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

After returning from fieldwork, the first draft evaluation report is due to ICF Macro on September 7, 2010, as indicated in the above timetable. A final draft is due one week after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT and stakeholders and is anticipated to be due on October 4, 2010, as indicated in the above timetable. All reports including drafts will be written in Spanish. When finalized by USDOL, the report will be translated into English by a professional translation services firm, under contract with ICF Macro. Published versions in both languages will be made available.

V EVALUATION MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT

ICF Macro has contracted with Julia Hasbún to conduct this evaluation. Ms. Hasbún has more than 20 years' experience as a university professor, evaluation officer, researcher, and consultant. She has conducted two EI evaluations for USDOL, including last year's midterm evaluation in the Dominican Republic and the recently completed midterm evaluation of the ENTERATE project in Nicaragua. For 10 years she worked in research and information for the Dominican National Council on Drugs, doing quantitative and qualitative studies and designing a multisectoral strategic plan for drug abuse prevention. Since 2003 she has been an independent consultant conducting research and evaluating projects on government transparency, child labor, and public health. She has a bachelor's degree in educational psychology from the Universidad Nacional Pedro Henríquez Ureña in Santo Domingo and has completed post-graduate coursework in psycholinguistics social Research and health Research. The contractor/evaluator will work with OCFT, ICF Macro, and relevant Partners of the Americas staff to evaluate this project.

ICF Macro will provide all logistical and administrative support for their staff and subcontractors, including travel arrangements (e.g., plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables. ICF Macro will also be responsible for providing the management and technical oversight necessary to ensure consistency of methods and technical standards.

ICF Macro or its subcontractors should contact Carmen Sofia Peña, POA field operations officer (202.637.6233 or cpena@partners.net) to initiate contact with field staff. The primary point of contact for the project in Colombia is Clemencia Chiappe Hoyos, project director (571 6349835 or cchiappe@partners.net).