

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**Independent Final Evaluation of the
Primero Aprendo Project:
Combating Child Labor Through
Education in Central America and
the Dominican Republic**

CARE

Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-4-0045



2009

M INTERNATIONAL INC.
MACRO

This page left intentionally blank.

FUNDED BY THE UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

**Independent Final Evaluation of the
Primero Aprendo Project:
Combating Child Labor Through
Education in Central America and
the Dominican Republic**

CARE

Cooperative Agreement Number: E-9-K-4-0045

2009

This page left intentionally blank.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report describes in detail the final evaluation, conducted during February to March 2009, of the *Primero Aprendo* project. The report was prepared by Macro International Inc., 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 *Primero Aprendo* project in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic was conducted and documented by Michele González Arroyo (principal evaluator) and Dan O'Brien, both independent evaluators, in collaboration with USDOL/OCFT staff, the *Primero Aprendo* project team, and stakeholders in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. Macro International Inc. would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this evaluation: the independent evaluator, CARE and its partners, and U.S. Department of Labor.



Funding for this evaluation was provided by the United States Department of Labor under Task Order number DOLB089K28215. 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.

This page left intentionally blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
I PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND	1
II EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY	3
2.1 Evaluation Purpose	3
2.2 Methodology	3
III FINDINGS	7
3.1 Validity of the Project Strategy/Design	7
3.2 Impact of Project Implementation	12
3.3 Sustainability	32
3.4 Partnerships and Coordination	34
3.5 Management and Budget	36
IV LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES	41
V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43
5.1 Conclusions	43
5.2 Recommendations	47

ANNEXES

- Annex A: Evaluation Schedule
- Annex B: Terms of Reference/Evaluation Questions
- Annex C: Interview Tools
- Annex D: List of Publications Reviewed
- Annex E: List of Interviews Conducted by Country
- Annex F: Stakeholder Meeting Agenda and Participants
- Annex G: Performance Monitoring Plan
- Annex H: Sustainability Matrix

This page left intentionally blank.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CAFTA-DR	The Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement
CBO	Community-based Organization
CECC	<i>Coordinación Educativa y Cultural Centroamericana</i> (Central American Education and Culture Coordination)
COHEP	<i>Consejo Hondureño de la Empresa Privada</i> (Honduras Private Business Council)
COPARDOM	<i>Confederación Patronal de la República Dominicana</i> (Business Confederation of the Dominican Republic)
COSEP	<i>Consejo Superior de la Empresa Privada</i> (Nicaragua Private Business Council)
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
EI	Education Initiative
IDB	Inter-America Development Bank
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPEC	International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour
ISNA	<i>Instituto Salvadoreño de Atención Integral a la Niñez y la Adolescencia</i> (Integrated Services for Children and Adolescents)
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
PA	<i>Primero Aprendo</i>
PARE	<i>Programa para Estudiantes en Riesgo</i> (Students at Risk Program)
PREAL	<i>Programa de Promoción de la Reforma Educativa de América Latina</i> (Promoting Educational Reform in Latin America Program)
SEDAC	<i>Conferencia Episcopal de Centroamérica</i> (Conference of Bishops of Central America)
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
WB	World Bank

This page left intentionally blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Primero Aprendo* (PA) project in Central America and the Dominican Republic aimed to reduce and prevent child labor by enhancing access to education for working children in the targeted countries—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic. The project was funded by the Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking within the United States Department of Labor’s (USDOL) Bureau of International Labor Affairs and was awarded to CARE, working in partnership with Catholic Relief Services and DevTech Systems, Inc. The project was initially funded US\$5.5 million for a four-year period (August 2004 to August 2008), but an additional US\$230,000 was added to the award in September 2006, bringing the total amount to US\$5.73 million with a project end date of March 2009. The project was funded specifically to support USDOL’s Education Initiative (EI), which promotes education as a way of combating child labor in areas where there is a high incidence of children working or at risk of entering child labor.

The PA project’s purpose focused on reforming policy that defends and protects children’s right to education. Its objectives included: (1) raising awareness of the relationship between poverty, education, and child labor among key regional, national, and local institutional actors; (2) piloting educational interventions in order to identify best practices for withdrawing and preventing children from child labor; (3) providing a platform for sustained dialogue and knowledge sharing among key institutional actors; and (4) advocating for the adoption of policy reform options that defend and protect working children’s right to education among key institutional actors.

This final evaluation assesses the extent to which the project achieved its stated purpose and objectives. It also identifies the project’s strengths and weaknesses, presents the benefits accrued to the target groups, assesses the challenges and opportunities for ensuring sustainability of the initiatives begun with this project, and identifies lessons learned and best practices for future USDOL EI projects. Additionally, USDOL wanted to determine through the evaluation whether the project was more effective as one regional project as opposed to six country-level projects and whether the targeted countries benefited from having the opportunity to collaborate with each other.

Based on the data collected in this qualitative evaluation, the evaluation team concluded that the PA project supported and complemented the goals of USDOL EI projects and achieved its immediate objectives and its overall goal of policy reform (according to the project’s definition). The validation and promotion of 14 educational models to combat child labor and achieve policy reform represented one success of the project. The PA project piloted and validated these educational models in 51 schools in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, with approximately 4,600 children participating, 87% of which were withdrawn from child labor or prevented from engaging in child labor. When PA staff and other key actors were asked if the regional program was more effective than six separate country-level projects, the responses varied widely and depended on the perspective of the stakeholder.

One aspect of the project that key institutional actors were most satisfied with was the project’s ability to monitor data on withdrawal and retention rates, which helped them evaluate and guide

project activities. Another success was the project's collaboration and partnership with a multitude of local, national, and regional actors representing government, private sector, religious sector, nongovernmental organizations, and community-based organizations. This allowed the project to effectively mobilize a wide array of actors on issues of child labor and children's right to education. Of these collaborations and partnerships, those that worked directly with the national ministries of education had the most success in achieving policy reform impacting large numbers of children.

Despite the numerous achievements of the PA project, several specific concerns which emerged over the course of the evaluation regarding the limitations of the project's strategy and design, its definition of child labor policies, and the overall sustainability of the project's impact. For example, one limitation of the project's design was the project's inability to sufficiently promote efforts for addressing the main cause of child labor—poverty—through implementation of a multidimensional response to the problem. The project nonetheless sought to address the poverty issue by dovetailing educational interventions with other community-based organizations that could provide additional resources such as vocational training for adults and adolescents. In addition, not all key institutional actors agreed with the project's definition of policy reform. While the project achieved policy reform according to its own definition, there are differences of opinion regarding this definition and whether the project achieved actual policy reform in all six project countries. Another concern was the sustainability of policy initiatives implemented as well as the real impact of project activities on the beneficiaries. However, it must be acknowledged that an evaluation conducted so close to the project's end date cannot measure true impact or sustainability.

The PA project offers a wealth of lessons learned, based on both the project's achievements as well as its challenges, which can be applied to future USDOL EI projects. These include the following:

- The responses to child labor must be multidimensional and integrated because there are so many causes. An effective and sustainable response must incorporate education, health, promotion of education as a personal value, and skills training.
- Participation of key institutional actors in developing a policy reform agenda is critical in obtaining their buy-in and commitment to implementing key actions.
- Education programs have more impact when they are accompanied by a strong awareness raising program for parents and teachers, many of whom see child labor as a normal part of growing up.
- Improving educational quality through teacher training, parent involvement, and more attention to at-risk children contributes to higher child labor withdrawal and retention rates.
- Adopting a nationwide educational model is best achieved with the direct involvement of the Ministry of Education from the very inception of the project and at every stage throughout the project's implementation.
- Lasting change in an area as complex as child labor cannot be achieved by a project that is only four years long.

Based on the experiences, achievements and lessons learned through the *Primero Aprendo* project, the evaluation team recommends that USDOL continue to fund and promote Child Labor Education Initiatives in Central America and the Dominican Republic. Future projects should develop a broader approach that addresses the root cause of child labor—poverty—and includes occupational skills training for parents, literacy programs, and other formative training. In addition, projects that have policy reform as a goal, should be allowed sufficient time for planning, advocacy, implementation, and evaluation in order to be successful.

This page left intentionally blank.

I PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

In August 2004, CARE, working in partnership with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and DevTech Systems, Inc. (DevTech), received a four-year cooperative agreement from the United States Department of Labor (USDOL) to implement the regional *Primerio Aprendo* (PA) project in Central America and the Dominican Republic. The initial value of the grant was US\$5.5 million, but in September 2006, that amount was increased by US\$230,000, bringing the total awarded to US\$5.73 million. The project also received a seven-month extension to March 31, 2009, in order to accommodate the increased number of children targeted, as well as to allow for greater opportunity to carry out the project’s policy reform advocacy work.

As stipulated in the cooperative agreement, the project aimed to support the goals of the USDOL/Bureau of International Labor Affairs/Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor and Human Trafficking Child Labor Education Initiative (EI). The USDOL EI projects are designed to ensure that children in areas with a high incidence of child labor are withdrawn from work environments and integrated into educational settings and that they persist in their education once enrolled. These projects also seek to avert at-risk children from leaving school and entering into child labor.

In general terms, the goal of the PA project was to enhance access to education for working children in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. The purpose of the project was to support policy reform that defended working children’s right to education. The specific goal, purpose, and expected results of the PA project are described below in Table 1.

Table 1: *Primerio Aprendo*—Summary of Project Goal, Purpose, and Results

Goal:	To increase the number of child laborers enrolled and retained in, and completing, educational programs
Purpose:	To translate the right of child laborers to education into policies among key regional, national, and local actors
Expected Results:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raise general awareness among key regional, national, and local actors regarding the relationship between poverty, education, and child labor 2. Effectively test and validate best practices in select locations from participating “laboratory countries”—Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica 3. Create conditions for sustained dialogue and knowledge sharing among project countries 4. Promote a relevant policy options agenda among key institutional actors regionally and in selected participating countries.

The project piloted educational interventions (Result 2) in 51 communities in Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica, targeting 2,080 children for withdrawal and prevention from child labor. In El Salvador and the Dominican Republic, activities related to Results 1, 3, and 4 were implemented. The project was modified in September 2006 and received additional funding to withdraw/prevent an additional 904 children, for a total of 2,984 targeted children.

This page left intentionally blank.

II EVALUATION PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of the final evaluation of the PA project was to determine whether the project achieved its stated objectives, to assess the impact of the project in terms of sustained improvements achieved, and to identify factors related to the accomplishments and limitations. Specifically, USDOL wanted to evaluate whether the project—

- Was more effective as a regional project as opposed to six country-level projects
- Achieved its goal in the area of child labor policy reform
- Succeeded in having an impact through its direct educational interventions
- Accomplished knowledge generation and dissemination of information
- Created collaborations among and between country programs

2.2 METHODOLOGY

2.2.1 Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of two individuals with experience conducting evaluations for USDOL in Central America. The lead evaluator has a background in education as well as labor issues in Central America. The second evaluator has worked extensively on the Dominican Republic–Central America–United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR) labor and environmental issues.

The evaluation team began fieldwork on February 9, 2009 using a range of qualitative data collection methods and tools to gather and analyze data from PA staff, key institutional actors, teachers, parents, and students in all six *Primero Aprendo* countries in Central America and the Dominican Republic. The evaluators used USDOL’s core set of evaluation questions as the framework for developing the evaluation tools and methods. The team used the first days of interviews to adjust and refine the data collection tools and protocols. A final series of interviews was conducted with PA staff and key actors in El Salvador on March 4, 2009 and a stakeholder meeting was held in Managua on March 9, 2009. The complete evaluation schedule of activities is noted in Annex A.

2.2.2 Sampling Methodology

The evaluation team used a purposeful, nonrandom sampling methodology for the final evaluation data collection. During the evaluation period, the team conducted 99 individual interviews with project staff, implementing partners, and key actors. Group interviews—average size of 10 participants—were conducted with teachers, parents, and students at school sites. Table 2 summarizes the population interviewed, the interviewing methodology, the sample size, and characteristics of the sample.

Table 2: Interviews: Population, Interview Methods, Sample Size, and Characteristics of the Sample

Population	Method of Interview	Sample Size	Sample Characteristics
Project Staff and Consultants	Individual	16	Current and former PA staff including the project director, monitoring team, finance director, national coordinators, and field level supervisors
Implementing Partners	Individual	14	Local nongovernmental organization (NGO) partner staff including managers, project coordinators, and model facilitators
Local and National Government	Individual	28	Government representatives at local and national levels and <i>Coordinación Educativa y Cultural Centroamericana</i> (Central American Education and Culture Coordination or CECC) representatives
International Labour Organization (ILO)	Individual	5	ILO International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) representatives
Private Sector	Individual	13	Businesses, business associations, and private foundations
Religious Leaders	Individual	6	Catholic bishops and local pastoral staff
Community Leaders	Individual	1	Community organizers and leaders promoting children's right to education.
NGOs and Community-based Organizations (CBOs)	Individual	6	Nongovernmental or community-based organizations working on child labor or education issues
USDOL and U.S. Embassy	Individual	4	USDOL staff and U.S. Embassy labor attaches
Teachers/Education Specialists/School Staff	Individual Group	6 8 teacher groups	Directors of schools where PA models were piloted and teachers who either participated in the PA pilot or taught children who participated in a PA educational intervention
Parents	Group	8 parent groups	Parents of children who participated in the PA educational interventions
Students	Group	8 student groups	Male and female students between age 8 and 15 who participated in one of the PA educational interventions

2.2.3 Data Collection Tools

USDOL developed a master list of key evaluation questions that served as the basis for the PA final evaluation. The questions were used to develop guides and protocols in Spanish for the key informant interviews and group interviews. The final list of evaluation questions is incorporated into the terms of reference (Annex B) and a complete set of interview tools is listed in Annex C.

2.2.4 Data Collection Methods

Document Reviews

The evaluators read a variety of critical project documents and took notes for reference. These documents included the cooperative agreement and amendments, project work plans, midterm evaluation report, pilot models, technical progress reports, financial status reports, and a range of *Primero Aprendo* publications. Annex D shows the complete list of documents that the evaluation team reviewed.

Key Informant Interviews

The project aimed to work with and influence a range of institutional actors at the regional, national, and local levels to have an impact on child labor policies, programs, and practices. The evaluators conducted individual interviews with project staff, implementing partner staff, and as many key actors as possible. Key actors were representatives from *Red de Apoyo* (the project's regional support group that represents private, religious, and government sectors), ILO-IPEC, ministries of education and labor, private sector, religious organizations, NGOs, CBOs, local government, school officials, and community leaders. A complete list of key informant interviewees by country appears in Annex E.

Group Interviews

The evaluators conducted group interviews in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras, and Costa Rica where the educational interventions were piloted or replicated. A total of 24 group interviews was conducted with teachers, parents, and students. The size of the groups ranged from 6 to 14 people. The group interview population and numbers as well as the number of individual interviews conducted are provided in Table 2 above.

2.2.5 Data Analysis

The document reviews, key informant interviews, and group interviews generated a substantial amount of raw qualitative data. The evaluators used qualitative data analysis methods, including matrix analysis, to categorize, synthesize, and summarize the raw data captured from the interview notes. The data analysis process was driven by USDOL's key evaluation questions.

2.2.6 Stakeholders' Meeting/Workshop

At the conclusion of the evaluation fieldwork, the evaluation team conducted a workshop for 32 key stakeholders in Managua. The stakeholders included project staff, members of *Red de Apoyo*, and other key institutional actors. The evaluators used the meeting as an opportunity to present the preliminary findings from the fieldwork, solicit feedback, and obtain additional information. The stakeholders' workshop was an important step in the evaluation process as it provided an opportunity for the evaluation team to ensure that its preliminary findings and conclusions were well grounded. The stakeholder workshop agenda and a list of participants appear in Annex F.

2.2.7 Limitations

This final evaluation of the project has various limitations that warrant discussion. The first and most obvious limitation was the challenge of conducting a comprehensive evaluation of a sophisticated regional project in six countries in 28 days. The limited number of days spent in the targeted countries to interview the wide range of people involved in the project precluded a more extensive and rigorous sample. It also affected the evaluation team's plans to conduct more systematic focus group interviews and to conduct them in local languages, for example, in Guatemala.

III FINDINGS

The findings provided in this report are based on fieldwork performed in the six targeted countries, phone interviews conducted with USDOL and the *Programa de Promoción de la Reforma Educativa de América Latina* (Promoting Educational Reform in Latin America Program or PREAL), and the review of project documents and reports. The findings specifically seek to address the questions contained in the terms of reference provided by USDOL (Annex B). The findings reported here are more extensive than the preliminary findings presented at the stakeholder meeting on March 9, 2009.

3.1 VALIDITY OF THE PROJECT STRATEGY/DESIGN

The following section presents findings that address a range of issues associated with the PA project design and strategy. These include the advantages and disadvantages of a regional strategy, how well the project supported and complemented other government child labor programs as well as the four USDOL EI goals, how the monitoring system tracked program beneficiaries, and how PA adjusted its strategy to respond to the midterm evaluation recommendations.

3.1.1 Regional Versus Country Programs

PA was designed as a regional program with different countries playing specific roles. Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua have the highest incidence of child labor and served as the “laboratory” countries where PA educational interventions were piloted and validated (Result 2). Costa Rica was later added as the fourth laboratory country. The project director was located in Nicaragua and the technical coordinator for education was located in Costa Rica. Costa Rica was also responsible for the awareness strategy (Result 1). El Salvador was given the responsibility of producing a range of publications and studies (Result 3) to support the other project components, while the Dominican Republic was tasked with supporting policy advocacy (Result 4).

In general, PA staff and *Red de Apoyo* members felt the regional design was appropriate and that it worked reasonably well. A regional program, however, presents a number of management challenges discussed later in this section (see Section 3.5).

When PA staff and other key actors were asked if a regional program is more effective than six separate country-level projects, the responses varied widely and depended on the perspective of the stakeholder. For example, representatives from regional entities such as CECC, PREAL, and *Red de Apoyo* thought that regional programs were more useful than country-level programs. The PA management team also agreed that regional programs work better. On the other hand, the national coordinators and representatives from the PA implementing organizations, education and labor ministries, as well as the NGOs thought that country programs are more effective.

Nearly all of the key actors interviewed agreed that one of the primary benefits of a regional program is the platform it offers countries for sharing experiences and lessons. The proponents of a regional program also argued that when the relatively small CAFTA-DR countries work together, they can achieve more than when they operate separately. Those favoring country-

specific programs argued that the child labor environment varies considerably from country to country. A ministry of education official who supported country-level programs noted that child labor in the indigenous communities of Guatemala is quite different from child labor in the peri-urban areas of the Dominican Republic and that the educational policy environment in Costa Rica is very different from the one in Nicaragua.

3.1.2 Support of the USDOL EI and Other Government Child Labor Programs

The PA project was designed to support and complement USDOL’s EI. Table 3 shows the USDOL EI goals in the left column and the PA purpose and results that support the EI goals on the right. As indicated, the evaluation found that the PA project design both supported and complemented the four EI goals as demonstrated in the following table.

Table 3: USDOL EI Goals and *Primero Aprendo* Purpose and Results

USDOL Education Initiative Goals	PA Purpose and Results
1. Raise awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilize a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures.	<p>Project Purpose: The right to education of working children is translated into policies by key regional, national, and local institutional actors.</p> <p>Result 1: General awareness about the relationship between poverty, education, and child labor has been increased among key regional, national, and local institutional actors.</p> <p>Result 3: Conditions have been created to foster a sustained dialogue and knowledge sharing among key institutional actors.</p>
2. Strengthen formal and transitional education systems that encourage working children and those at risk of working to attend school.	<p>Result 1: General awareness about the relationship between poverty, education, and child labor has been increased among key regional, national, and local institutional actors.</p> <p>Result 2: Best educational practices have been effectively tested and validated in pilot form in selected localities of laboratory countries: Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala.</p>
3. Strengthen national institutions and policies on education and child labor.	<p>Project Purpose: The right to education of working children is translated into policies by key regional, national, and local institutional actors.</p> <p>Result 2: Best educational practices have been effectively tested and validated in pilot form in selected localities of laboratory countries: Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala.</p> <p>Result 4: An agenda of policy reform options has been developed and promoted among key institutional actors in selected countries and at the regional level.</p>

USDOL Education Initiative Goals	PA Purpose and Results
4. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.	<p>PA sustainability plan focuses on sustainable policy reform and its <i>Red de Apoyo</i>.</p> <p>Result 3: Conditions have been created to foster a sustained dialogue and knowledge sharing among key institutional actors.</p> <p>Result 4: An agenda of policy reform options has been developed and promoted among key institutional actors in selected countries and at the regional level.</p>

Section 3.2 contains a detailed discussion regarding the extent to which the PA purpose and results were achieved and provides rich insight into how effective PA was at contributing to the EI goals.

The evaluation also found that the PA purpose and results supported and complemented other government programs in Central America and the Dominican Republic. In recent years, all of the CAFTA-DR countries have enacted some form of legislation on the eradication of the worst forms of child labor. The challenge, according to the ILO and NGO child labor advocates, is to translate the legislation into concrete action.

Representatives of the education and labor ministries and ILO-IPEC told the evaluation team that the combination of PA educational models and advocacy efforts were well received and effective at helping to bring about policy change. For example, the PA advocacy effort in the Dominican Republic blended effectively with another USDOL-funded child labor project to help the Ministry of Education approve and fund the PARE program (*Programa para Estudiantes en Riesgo* [Students at Risk]). In El Salvador, PA joined the Ministry of Labor’s technical subcommittee for the eradication of child labor and used it as a platform to support several key policy initiatives, such as the Ministry of Education’s *Salas de Nivelación* and *Instituto Salvadoreño de Atención Integral a la Niñez y la Adolescencia* (Salvadoran Institute for Integrated Services for Children and Adolescents or ISNA) integrated services model. These are described in more detail in Section 3.2.1.

3.1.3 Use of Educational Interventions to Drive Policy Reform

One of the cornerstones of the PA project was the piloting and validation of educational interventions and their use in driving policy reform. The PA project identified 100 educational models in Latin America and selected 20 to implement and validate in 51 schools in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Approximately 4,600 children participated in the educational interventions.

The PA project promoted the use of various educational models to achieve policy reform in all six countries.

- In Honduras, the Ministry of Education has adopted the *Niño Tutor* model and plans to implement it in 6 of 18 departments (provinces) to reach approximately 65,000 children.

- The Ministry of Education in the Dominican Republic has created a new program targeting children at risk for dropping out of school and working and plans to use the *Espacios para Crecer* model in 100 schools by the end of 2009.
- The PA project supported the systemization of the *Salas de Nivelación* model that was introduced by ILO-IPEC in El Salvador. The Ministry of Education plans to implement the model in 134 schools by 2010.
- The *Alerta Temprana* early warning model, promoted by the PA project in Costa Rica, is being implemented in six schools in Puntarenas and is set to be replicated in another six schools in Limon with support from the Catholic Church's *Escuela Juan XXIII*.
- An NGO and a private sector foundation are implementing the *Educomun* and *Niño Tutor* models in seven community schools in Guatemala.
- The *Fundación Uno* (Uno Foundation) is funding the *Espacios para Crecer* model in three schools in Rivas, Nicaragua, with plans to expand coverage to other schools in Rivas over the next several years.

A more detailed analysis of the policy reforms achieved by the project in each of the countries is discussed in Section 3.2.1.

3.1.4 Adding an Income-Generation Component to Address Poverty

None of the models that PA piloted and validated included an income-generation component to help families compensate for income lost when children leave work to return to school. During the replication of the *Juntos Construimos una Educación para la Vida* and *Espacios para Crecer* models in Nicaragua, the implementing partners decided to add this component. During interviews, the implementing partners, teachers, and parents commented on the usefulness of the income-generation component. For example, at the Maryknoll Sisters elementary school in Leon, Nicaragua, teachers told the evaluation team that sewing classes given to mothers of child workers served two important functions: developing skills to replace lost income and serving as an incentive for parents to send their children to school.

In subsequent interviews, the evaluation team asked a range of stakeholders in each of the countries whether educational models should include an income-generation component. Nearly all stakeholders thought this would make the model more effective. Monsignor Manuel Estrada, former director of the Bluefields Apostolic Vicariate where the *Espacios para Crecer* model was piloted and later replicated, explained that children work because their families are poor. The income-generation component provides some income replacement to families so they can afford to send their children to school.

During the stakeholders meeting in March 2009, a group of participants recommended adding new elements to the model for families of working children, including income generation, literacy, money management, technical training, and promotion of educational values. They argued that in addition to income generation and technical training, the family needed more comprehensive support in the form of literacy to be able to assist their children with homework, basic financial literacy to better manage the family budget, and values training on the importance of education to their children.

3.1.5 Monitoring Program Beneficiaries

The PA project designed and implemented a direct beneficiary monitoring system that tracked and reported on the work and education status of those children benefiting from the project. The monitoring system also captured excessive hours for those of legal working age, hazardous, unsanitary, or illicit activities for children of all ages, the age at time of enrollment, and the gender of participants.

Verification was an important element of the monitoring process. It was used to ensure that staff were gathering reliable data and following project data collection protocols. In addition, the monitoring team conducted field visits to verify collected data and address any data quality concerns. The PA monitoring and evaluation system also required that the implementing partners maintained print copies of all data collection forms for examination and comparison with field observations.

According to the project director and the national coordinators, the project's monitoring system provided accurate and timely information on enrollment and retention rates that helped to make decisions and prepare technical reports for USDOL. Virtually all PA staff and implementing partners that were interviewed by the evaluation team commented that the monitoring system was one of the most successful components of the project.

When asked how well the monitoring system tracked the education and work status of children participating in the project, PA staff and implementing partners told the evaluation team that they had a high degree of confidence in the quality of the data. They referred to the monitoring system's manual that included definitions of terms, tools, and instructions on how to use the tools. Two of the former field coordinators said that the rigorous process of cross checking data and following up on data inconsistencies helped ensure data quality. In Guatemala, the PA monitoring system is currently serving as a model for another USDOL funded project that CRS is implementing.

3.1.6 Midterm Evaluation and Strategy Adjustment

The PA midterm evaluation contained 14 recommendations. Of these, the project management decided to address the eight that it considered most appropriate. The other six recommendations were considered invalid or irrelevant. Below is a summary of the midterm recommendations that PA management decided to address:

- Provide additional training for teachers implementing the educational interventions.
- Develop a strategic alliance with UNICEF and ILO-IPEC to focus on policy.
- Contract a team building expert to help with communication difficulties within the team.
- Develop a work plan and mechanisms to provide technical support to the project teams.
- Assess the capability of the national coordinators to carry out advocacy activities.
- Define the role of the national coordinators in El Salvador and the Dominican Republic.

- Identify the PA project’s best practices on institutional collaboration and replicate them.
- Review and determine clearer definitions for exploitive work, beneficiaries, and what constitutes *prevention of* and *withdrawal from* child labor.

The PA project staff implemented all eight recommendations, which led to changes in personnel, hiring an advocacy advisor, implementing a strategy to improve technical assistance to national coordinators, increasing teacher training, revising the project’s definition of terms, increasing the number of visits by PA staff to the different countries to become familiar with successful collaborations, and implementing a communications workshop for PA staff. A more thorough discussion of PA’s response to the midterm recommendations can be found in Annex J of the March to August 2008 Technical Progress Report.

3.2 IMPACT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

This section examines the impact of the project activities in relation to the project’s purpose and results, as specified in the performance monitoring plan (Annex G).

3.2.1 Impact on Child Labor Policies Among Regional, National, and Local Actors (Purpose)

The project’s purpose was to influence the policies of key regional, national, and local institutional actors with regard to the right to education of working children in the targeted countries. This section examines whether the project’s purpose was achieved. Specific issues that are addressed include the adoption of key policies, the effectiveness of the project strategies at achieving policy reform, and the impact of the policies on the educational systems of the participating countries.

Achievement of Sustainable Policy Reform

To achieve the purpose level objective, the PA project committed to achieving two certifiable policy reforms in the region by the end of the project. The project defined policy as guidelines, regulations, or directives adopted by the government, businesses, or other organizations to guide decisions, processes, and procedures. Based on the project’s definition of policy, 11 policies were adopted in the six countries. Table 4 shows the country, the adopted policy, level of adoption, and estimates of the anticipated impact on children.

Table 4: Policies Adopted by Country, Level of Adoption, Organization, and Anticipated Impact

Country	Adopted Policy	Level of Adoption	Organization(s)	Anticipated Impact
Costa Rica	• <i>Alerta Temprana</i>	• Local	• Puntarenas Schools • <i>Escuela Juan XXIII</i>	• 6 schools— 540 children • 6 schools— 600 children
Dominican Republic	• <i>Espacios para Crecer</i> within PARE	• National	• Ministry of Education	• 100 schools— 2,500 children

Country	Adopted Policy	Level of Adoption	Organization(s)	Anticipated Impact
El Salvador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Child Service • Diversity Policy • <i>Salas de Nivelación</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National • National • National 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISNA • Ministry of Education • Ministry of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not certain • Not certain • 134 schools—8,200 children
Guatemala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Educomun</i> • <i>Niño Tutor</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local • Local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Conrado de Cruz</i> • Minar Foundation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 schools—250 children • 3 schools—450 children
Honduras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Niño Tutor</i> • Municipal Ordinance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National • Local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Education • Municipality of Paraíso 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 of 18 departments—65,000 children
Nicaragua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Espacios para Crecer</i> • School Calendar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local • National 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fundación Uno</i> • Ministry of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100 children/year for 5 years • Not certain

The adopted policies are explained in more detail below.

Costa Rica

The PA project was successful at establishing the *Alerta Temprana* early warning model in six elementary schools in Barranca, Puntarenas, reaching approximately 540 children and adolescents. The *Alerta Temprana* model identifies children and adolescents at risk of leaving school for work and proposes concrete actions to reduce the risk. A replication of *Alerta Temprana* will be carried out by *Escuela Juan XXIII*, a Catholic institution dedicated to organizational solidarity between employers and workers. They have committed to implementing this model in six schools in Limon, reaching approximately 600 at-risk children.

Dominican Republic

DevTech has managed three USDOL projects in the Dominican Republic: “Eliminating the Worst Forms of Child Labor Through Education” (2003–2007), “*Primero Aprendo*” (2004–2008), and “Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic” (2007–2011). According to the DevTech country manager, the USDOL projects worked together to convince the Minister of Education to adopt the PARE program. PARE will use the *Espacios para Crecer* model that was developed in the Dominican Republic as the primary educational model. The Ministry of Education plans to initially implement PARE in 60 schools reaching approximately 5,000 children.

El Salvador

The PA project was involved in three important policy initiatives in El Salvador. The project hired a consultant that worked with ISNA to systematize a range of education activities for the organization to implement. The result was an integrated services model designed to systematize existing ISNA practices that prevent and eradicate child labor as well as facilitate a process of

reintegration of child workers into the educational system. ISNA managers told the evaluation team that they distributed this document to staff working with children and adolescents, but they were not sure how the model would be applied. There is currently no funding to train staff in the use of the model. Furthermore, it is anticipated that after the elections in March 2009, ISNA will be restructured, and it is not certain what impact the restructuring will have on the implementation of the integrated services model.

The second policy adoption was the *Salas de Nivelación* model, a model introduced by ILO-IPEC in 2001. The Ministry of Education promoted the model and requested technical assistance to systematize and expand it to more schools. The PA project hired a consultant who worked with the Ministry of Education and ILO-IPEC to systematize and publish the model. ILO estimates the model will be implemented in 134 schools in 2009, reaching approximately 8,200 children.

The project also worked with the Ministry of Education to revise its policy on diversity to include child labor. The PA project provided funds to hire a consultant to help the Ministry of Education review its policy and include language on the rights of working children and adolescents to receive an education. The director of the department at the Ministry of Education which is responsible for the educational needs of working children told the evaluation team that revising the policy was an important initial step, but she could not articulate the immediate impact it would have on children and adolescents who work.

Guatemala

In Guatemala, an NGO and a private sector foundation are implementing project models. *Conrado de la Cruz* is an NGO committed to children's education and child labor issues. It was interested in the project's *Educomun* bilingual model and signed an agreement with the PA project to implement it with its own funds. *Conrado de la Cruz* is currently implementing the model for a year, reaching 250 children. The director told the evaluation team that he is searching for more funding to continue implementing the model.

The Minar Foundation was established by the Minar Rubber Plantation to carry out education and other community development activities in the communities surrounding its plantation. The Minar Foundation director told the evaluation team that she was searching for innovative education models and learned about the models that the project was piloting and validating. She contacted the PA national coordinator and, after several discussions about the different models, decided to adopt the *Niño Tutor* model. Currently, the Minar Foundation is using *Niño Tutor* in three schools and reaching about 450 children.

Honduras

Possibly the most successful policy achievement was in Honduras. The PA project was able to have policies adopted at both the national and local levels. The project piloted and validated an original Honduran model known as *Niño Tutor*. The PA project worked closely with, and sought advice from, the Ministry of Education on how and where to pilot the model. Once the model was validated, the Minister of Education decided to adopt the model and implement it on a national level. Initially, the model will be implemented in 6 of the 18 Honduran departments (provinces), reaching approximately 65,000 children.

The project was also able to get a key policy adopted at the municipal government level. The project worked closely with the government in El Paraíso to sign an ordinance requiring school-age children to be in school and not at work. The ordinance gave instructions for auxiliary mayoral staff to conduct home visits to enforce this policy. This policy adoption was replicated in six neighboring municipalities.

Nicaragua

The *Fundación Uno* (Uno Foundation) contacted the PA national coordinator in Nicaragua to discuss education projects, a priority at *Fundación Uno*. After discussing the PA project and the various models, the *Fundación Uno* director agreed to fund the *Espacios para Crecer* model in the municipalities of Potosí and Buenos Aires in Rivas. Originally, *Fundación Uno* intended to support 100 children per year for five years. However, due to funding problems, the foundation was not able to fund the 100 children this year. The project also helped institutionalize the observance of World Day Against Child Labor (celebrated on June 12) within the Nicaragua Ministry of Education's school calendar.

The Meaning of Sustainable Policy Reform

As noted above, the PA project defines policy as guidelines, regulations, or directives adopted by the government, businesses, or other organizations to guide decisions, processes, and procedures. Using this definition, the project counted as policy the adoption of its educational models by NGOs, foundations, private sector, and ministries at national and local levels.

The evaluation team, however, noted during interviews with key actors, that there were differences of opinion regarding the definition of sustainable policy reform. The primary disagreement concerned whether PA models adopted at the community level by an NGO or private company, as opposed to by the government, constituted policy reform.

Although the project achieved policy reform at the national or local level in all countries, interviewees felt that more sustainable policy reform was achieved in Honduras, Dominican Republic, and El Salvador because the policies were institutionalized by the national government. Policy reform was not found by key actors and some PA staff to be sustainable in Guatemala or Nicaragua because the models were not institutionalized by the government. One of the PA implementing partners in Guatemala commented that what PA accomplished in Guatemala, given the instability of the government and other constraints, was impressive, but fell short of sustainable policy reform because it only involved the adoption of a model by an NGO and a foundation. A Ministry of Education representative interviewed in Costa Rica commented that the adoption of the *Alerta Temprana* model by the Ministry of Education in one school district is a good start, but it does not constitute true policy reform because it was not adopted at the national level.

PA Strategies and Sustainable Policy Reform

To achieve its purpose of translating the right to education of working children into policies by key regional, national, and local institutional actors, PA employed the following four strategies that correspond to its four results.

- **Strategy 1:** Create awareness about the relationship between poverty, education, and child labor among key regional, national, and local institutional actors.
- **Strategy 2:** Pilot and validate educational models in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.
- **Strategy 3:** Use special events, the PA website, action research, and strategic publications to generate dialogue and share knowledge among key actors.
- **Strategy 4:** Develop and advocate an agenda of policy reform options among key actors at the regional, national, and local levels.

Although the specific strategies are discussed in greater detail below, it is worth commenting on the strategic mix of strategies and their effectiveness in achieving policy reform. The piloting and validation of educational models (Strategy 2) provided the project with tangible and credible experience and products that were used to undertake advocacy initiatives (Strategy 4). In interviews, stakeholders commented that if the PA project had focused on policy alone, the project would not have been successful. It needed the experience of piloting and validating the educational models to lend it credibility in the eyes of key actors.

The publications, special events, research, and website (Strategy 3) were used to both advocate for policy reform and create awareness (Strategy 1). The country specific policy analyses, regional comparative analysis, and the reform agenda document were valuable for the project's advocacy efforts (Strategy 4). According to PA staff, the variety of studies and publications produced by the project were extremely helpful in initiating dialogue with key institutional actors. There was general agreement that no one strategy could have achieved the policy reforms alone. The four strategies, combined in an integrated manner, produced a range of policy reforms as discussed previously.

Factors that Facilitate and Inhibit Sustainable Policy Reform

The evaluation team asked the PA staff as well as key institutional actors what they thought were the major factors that either facilitated or inhibited the achievement of sustainable policy reform. The two factors most frequently mentioned were the stability or instability of governments and their ministries and the length of time it takes to advocate for and attain meaningful and sustainable policy reform.

The governments and their ministries in the region changed several times between 2004 and 2008. Honduras experienced two changes of government, four changes of education ministers, and three changes of labor ministers. In Guatemala, the government changed two times, but the vice minister to whom PA staff reported changed three times. The Costa Rican government changed twice with two changes in education ministers and a protracted reorganization process. There were two changes of government in Nicaragua and education ministers changed three times. Only the governments in the Dominican Republic and El Salvador did not change during this period.

Interestingly, there seems to be a correlation between the change of government—more importantly the number of times key personnel change in the ministries—and the achievement of policy reform. The more significant and sustainable policy reform took place in the Dominican

Republic and El Salvador, two of the more stable countries. The PA project did not achieve policy reform at the national ministry level in Costa Rica, Guatemala, or Nicaragua, where education ministries experienced relatively high turnover of key personnel or where there was an arduous reorganization as was the case in Costa Rica. Honduras, however, is the anomaly. Despite two changes of government and three changes of education ministers, PA staff in Honduras achieved one of the most significant and sustainable policy reforms—*Niño Tutor* adopted by the Ministry of Education and implemented on a national scale. PA staff credit the constant work with the Ministry of Education and the stable and supportive Ministry of Education counterpart throughout the project time period as a major reason for this success.

The national coordinators from Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Nicaragua confirmed this observation during interviews. They told the evaluation team that the frequent changes of key ministry personnel impeded advocacy initiatives and hampered the achievement of policy reform. The national coordinator in Costa Rica struggled with the reorganization process that took place in the Ministry of Education during much of the project life.

The length of the project was the other major factor that prevented the PA project from achieving more sustainable policy reform at the national level in each participating country. The evaluation team asked regional and national level policy experts how much time they thought a project needed to achieve national level sustainable policy reform. The answers ranged from 8 to 15 years at least. PREAL told the evaluation team that true public policy reform can take as long as 20 years. The national coordinators commented that they had planted the seeds of awareness and advocacy but needed another four years to truly harvest the fruits of their labor.

Impact of Sustainable Policy Reform on the Educational Systems

In theory, the adoption of educational models piloted and validated by the PA project should strengthen educational systems by providing alternative models specifically designed to withdraw children from exploitive work and retain them in school. All of the models contain the following key components:

- Educating parents, teachers, and local officials on the link between poverty, education, and child labor.
- Training teachers in innovative and participatory teaching methodologies.
- Using innovative and participatory methodologies in classes.
- Home visits to the parents of children who stop attending classes.
- Community surveys on child labor.

The PA project demonstrated that when these components are effectively applied, children decrease the number of hours they work and attend school regularly. All of the teachers interviewed commented that the children who participated in the educational models had improved self-confidence, study habits, and motivation to learn.

3.2.2 Impact of Public Awareness Efforts (Result 1)

A multifaceted approach was undertaken by the PA project to raise the awareness of key actors at the regional, national, and local levels. Ongoing awareness efforts at the local and national levels were considered to be more effective in leading actors from knowledge of the problem to action. However, even the more costly regional awareness effort was considered worthwhile. The following are some specific findings on the local, national, and regional awareness efforts.

Local Awareness Efforts

The *Primero Aprendo* project targeted local actors through direct contact with municipal governments, community leaders, educators, parents, and children in the following ways:

- **Municipal governments:** In Honduras and Guatemala, raising the awareness of municipal/local governments where the educational interventions took place resulted in concrete actions being taken by mayors and auxiliary staff to identify and talk with parents whose children were working and missing school. This effort resulted in many children returning to school.
- **Community leaders:** In Nicaragua and Guatemala, sensitizing and involving community leaders resulted in passionate campaigns to create a community consciousness about the importance of education for a better future.
- **Interdisciplinary:** In Costa Rica, a community effort to sensitize local government, school officials, teachers, and counselors resulted in an interdisciplinary and inter-institutional alliance focused on preventing child labor and promoting children's right to education.
- **Local Ministry of Labor:** In Honduras, local ministry of labor staff stated that, while they were aware of child labor issues, project efforts broadened their horizon to modify their primarily sanctioning role to include the promotion of education as a way to eradicate child labor.
- **Educators:** Teachers and school administrators interviewed in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala described a change in attitude among school staff as a result of awareness efforts. Teachers no longer accept child labor as simply being "part of the culture." Their standards are now zero tolerance for missing school because of work. With this high expectation, enrollment has had a marked increase, especially at the beginning of the year when harvest season is still underway in all four pilot countries.
- **Parents:** Parents who had children participating in the pilot interventions were interviewed in all four pilot countries. All parents stated that they had participated in at least one parent workshop on child labor and the importance of education. They agreed that raising their awareness resulted in a positive change in attitude. Before they saw child labor as a normal part of growing up, they now recognize the relationship between poverty, child labor, and education. In each group interview, parents stated they had been forced to abandon school in order to contribute to family income. They fully understand

that this has limited their choices and earning power. They stated that they want their children to study, not work, to break this cycle of poverty.

- **Children:** Children interviewed in the four pilot intervention countries confidently stated that they now realize that missing school for work will not allow them to achieve their goals. They cited aspirations of being doctors, lawyers, engineers, and teachers. Most importantly, they said their parents now have a new appreciation for education and no longer want them to miss school for work.

National Awareness Efforts

The *Primero Aprendo* project was successful at raising the awareness of key national actors in all six countries through meetings, seminars, conferences, and panel discussions targeting government, education, employer, religious sectors, and NGOs, as well as the general public. These efforts were key in starting the process of mobilizing actors in all six project countries.

- **Government Committees:** PA staff in all six project countries formed an integral part of government committees focusing on the eradication of child labor or other educational issues. Awareness-raising activities were mostly in the form of presentations on PA publications, which helped initiate dialogue.
- **Education Alliances:** PA staff were also part of national education alliances in their respective countries. This was particularly effective in raising awareness around the general issues of child labor and children's right to education. An educational alliance committee chair in Costa Rica stated that awareness efforts led to the University of Costa Rica's interest and involvement in providing technical assistance to pilot educational interventions.
- **Employer Associations:** PA staff in each of the project countries undertook concerted efforts to raise the awareness of employers through their respective employer associations. The project used "corporate social responsibility" as part of its strategy to reach the employer associations. Employer associations interviewed in the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and Nicaragua stated that awareness efforts served to sensitize their members on child labor issues and children's right to education. In Honduras, this further resulted in collaboration on the pilot educational intervention of *Niño Tutor* as well as promoting "corporate social responsibility" among its constituents.
- **Religious Sector:** The Catholic Church was approached in each project country at the level of the national bishops as well as the local pastoral level. Bishops interviewed in Nicaragua and Costa Rica confirmed that their awareness had been raised through the regional *Conferencia Episcopal de Centroamérica* (Conference of Bishops of Central America or SEDAC) in December 2006. This led to their formal commitment in signing a declaration that placed child labor and children's right to education as key points in their social doctrine.
- **NGOs:** Nicaragua was particularly effective at involving a group of NGOs to carry out the educational interventions. The involvement of these NGOs located in the pilot

communities served to raise the awareness of the entire institution—not just those individuals involved with the PA project. Staff of these NGOs in Leon, Nicaragua who interviewed stated that child labor is now a permanent part of their outreach agenda.

- **General Public:** Special awareness campaigns in celebration of June 12 (World Day Against Child Labor) and November 20 (International Children’s Day) were carried out in each country. In Nicaragua, these awareness efforts resulted in the institutionalization of the June 12 commemoration within the national school calendar.

Regional Awareness Efforts

PA staff agreed that the broad regional awareness campaign, undertaken during the first half of the project by McCann Erickson (one of the Interpublic Group of companies), served the important purpose of creating a professional project image with professional project materials and offering a variety of awareness strategies and products that could be adopted by each country. The central message promoted was the right of working children to an education. There was general agreement by PA staff that this regional awareness campaign was a necessary component. However, this particular undertaking was a costly endeavor.

3.2.3 Impact of Pilot Educational Interventions to Identify Best Practices (Result 2)

The purpose of the pilot educational interventions was to identify best practices among a pool of educational models that keep children in school and out of exploitive work (withdrawal and retention). From a pool of 100 educational models throughout Latin America, the project selected 20 to be piloted in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. While the purpose of the pilot interventions was to identify best practices, they also contributed to the strategic goal of withdrawing or preventing children from involvement in exploitive child labor. The project reported 4,601 children enrolled in one of the 20 educational interventions in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua, of which 4,105 (89%) were withdrawn from child labor or prevented from engaging in child labor.

Concurrently, there is a quantitative analysis being conducted to verify the statistical data related to withdrawal and prevention. In this evaluation, the findings relate to the overall impact of the pilot intervention process in order to identify these best practices. This includes a discussion of the validation process, internal and external factors contributing to the effectiveness of an educational intervention, factors contributing to improving the overall quality of education, commitment to replicating the educational models on a large scale, and the sustainable impact of the educational interventions on teachers, parents, and students.

Validation Process

An independent consulting firm (Gish, Paz and Associates of Guatemala) carried out the validation study of the educational models (see Table 5 below for a list of models validated). A model was validated based on two key criteria: retention in school and reduction of hours worked (or complete removal from work). While the validation study was universally recognized

as useful by PA project staff in all four pilot countries, the timing of when it occurred was found to be of particular concern.

PA regional and national staff interviewed in each of the pilot countries agreed that the validation study occurred too soon after the model’s implementation start date. At the same time, they recognized that the validation process was inevitably compacted in order to allow enough time to begin advocating for the adoption of validated educational models to key actors (ministries of education, NGOs, private donors, etc.) as part of its policy reform agenda. The PA project director cited the early timing of the validation study as a primary factor for some models being validated while others were not. The project director stated that if the pilot educational interventions had been allowed to run for at least two full years and then undergone a validation study, the results may have been different. PA project staff agreed with this assertion and felt strongly that perhaps all of the models could have been validated, given the time and feedback to make improvements. They cited the lack of time for a *revalidation* process as another weakness due to the overall short project timeline.

Table 5: Fourteen educational models deemed valid by *Primero Aprendo* project criteria

Name of Educational Model	Pilot Country
<i>Alianza Interinstitucional</i> (Interinstitutional Alliance)	Guatemala
<i>Aprendiendo desde la Solidaridad</i> (Learning Through Solidarity)	Costa Rica
<i>Aula Abierta</i> (Open Classroom)	Costa Rica
<i>Educación Básica para Todos—EDUCATODOS</i> (Basic Education for All)	Honduras
<i>Educación Maya Bilingüe Intercultural—EMBI</i> (Intercultural Maya Bilingual Education)	Guatemala
<i>Escuela Rural Activa (ERA) PROREPE</i> (Rural Active School)	Guatemala
<i>Espacios para Crecer</i> (Spaces for Growth)	Nicaragua
<i>Formación Ocupacional</i> (Occupational Formation)	Honduras
<i>Juntos Construimos una Educación para la Vida</i> (Together We Build an Education for Life)	Nicaragua
<i>Niño Tutor</i> (Child Tutor)	Honduras
<i>Nuevas Oportunidades</i> (New Opportunities)	Costa Rica
<i>Prevención y Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil</i> (Prevention and Eradication of Child Labor)	Nicaragua

Name of Educational Model	Pilot Country
<i>Propuesta Curricular de Educación Alternativa para Niñas y Niños Trabajadores: Semilla</i> (Alternative Educational Curriculum for Child Workers: Seed)	Guatemala
<i>Reporte Escolar</i> (School Report)	Nicaragua

Internal and External Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of the Interventions

The validation process (discussed above) was considered an objective way to identify the most successful characteristics in an educational model for keeping children in school and out of exploitive work. However, the technical education coordinator stated, “An educational model alone isn’t enough to eradicate child labor. There are many other factors that contribute to the overall success of an educational intervention.” The PA project director agreed with this statement and offered three concrete internal and external factors that contribute to the effectiveness of an educational intervention: (1) commitment by the project staff who is implementing the model, (2) community involvement, and (3) pilot project management.

PA national coordinators agreed with this assessment. They cited staff commitment as a key reason for the success of an educational intervention. This personal commitment—that goes beyond earning a salary—is obtained by first raising awareness and then working closely with the implementing staff and providing technical assistance as necessary. Involving the community to create a community consciousness and effectively managing a project were also considered important contributions. The technical education coordinator added a fourth important factor: conducting a needs assessment prior to implementing an educational intervention to determine the most appropriate model for any given site. This needs assessment, however, cannot always identify potential obstacles during the implementation phase.

The national coordinator of Costa Rica expanded on this last point. She explained that despite conducting a needs assessment in one of her pilot sites in a marginal urban area of the capital city, the educational intervention was relatively unsuccessful in terms of teacher and parental support and inconsistent participation by the students. The psychosocial issues facing this marginal urban community were vast: alcoholism, prostitution, and drug abuse, among others. She stated that the intervention lacked the time and resources to adequately address these serious psychosocial problems. She speculated that if she had had a longer intervention period that dedicated sufficient resources to these psychosocial issues, she may have achieved greater parental and teacher support for the educational intervention designed to help eradicate child labor.

Factors Contributing to Improving the Overall Quality of Education

Several PA staff commented that they felt USDOL was never interested in the quality of the education as a driving force for piloting and validating educational models. Rather, it was always the quantitative aspect of withdrawal and prevention rates that they felt were the primary focus of the funding agency. Nevertheless, the quality of the educational models themselves, as well as the impact on the overall quality of education in the schools, was taken very seriously by PA

staff. Unfortunately, there wasn't any systematic way the project measured the impact on the quality of education. An interview with an educational expert at the University of Costa Rica offered this assessment for measuring educational quality, "The key is to measure attitude—of teachers, parents, and students. Are the educators more dedicated? Have they changed their instruction to be more pertinent and relevant? Are the parents participating? What changes can be observed in the community as a whole? What are the kids sharing in the classroom? Do they believe in themselves? These are the measures of quality."

Despite the perception that USDOL was not interested in educational quality, the national coordinators in the pilot countries placed a great deal of emphasis on improving the quality of education, which in turn increased retention rates. In each of the PA pilot countries, workshops were conducted for teaching staff on child labor issues, psychosocial issues of working with at-risk children, and inclusive teaching methodologies. Teachers and PA staff considered working with parents equally important to improving educational quality.

In response to this finding, USDOL clarified that the 2004 Solicitation for Grants Application (from which the PA project was funded) specifically stated that one of its objectives was to raise educational quality.

Commitment to Replicating Models on a Large Scale

Replication of the educational models was a major goal in the project strategy. This involved taking a model that was piloted and validated in one country and replicating it in another site in the same country or in another country altogether. According to the project director, the hope was that the ministries of education in each country would commit to replicating at least one validated model nationwide, but there was no presumption that the ministries of education would be active leaders in the project. Several reasons were cited by national coordinators for not achieving replication on a large scale. These included the lack of time to promote replication, misalignment from the design phase between the PA project and the national ministries of education, changes in key positions within the ministries of education (ministers, vice-ministers, department heads), and need for cost analysis of the educational models to better promote their replication.

Time

As mentioned in the previous discussion on the validation process, the main work on promoting replication of the models did not occur until the results of the validation study were in. This occurred 18 months before the end of the project. The PA national coordinators stated that the project needed another two to four years to work on a widespread commitment to replicate the models.

Alignment with Ministries of Education

The involvement of the national and local ministries of education in the planning and implementation of the educational interventions was another factor affecting commitment to replication of the educational models on a national scale. In Honduras, where nationwide replication and adoption of the model *Niño Tutor* was achieved, the project made a concerted effort to work in conjunction with the Ministry of Education at both the national and local levels.

This alignment was described as a “partnership” to create project buy-in from beginning to end. This approach was verified by the Ministry of Education “counterpart” (appointed by the Minister of Education) who explained that working together throughout the pilot process made a significant difference in their commitment to replicate and adopt a validated model on a nationwide basis. The PA project in El Salvador also aligned itself closely with the Ministry of Education to promote the adoption of the educational model *Salas de Nivelación*.

This level of Ministry of Education cooperation was not possible in all of the project countries. In Costa Rica, a Ministry of Education representative stated that the national Ministry of Education was just finishing a major three-year restructuring and did not give the project the time or the attention that it perhaps deserved. In Guatemala, PA staff cited multiple changes of key personnel in the Ministry of Education and a general lack of interest on the government’s part regarding child labor issues as the primary obstacles.

Cost

Interviews with local and national Ministry of Education staff in Nicaragua cited cost as the major issue for not committing to widespread replication of the validated model, *Espacios para Crecer*. There was an assumption that the model cost too much to replicate. The PA project initially did not contemplate a cost analysis. However, according to the project director, this information was viewed as important halfway through the validation process. A cost analysis model is now available and can be applied to the educational models in order to determine their cost for future replications. Unfortunately, this information is just now available, and therefore could not be presented when promoting the educational models for replication during the four-year project timeline.

Sustainable Impact of the Educational Interventions on Teachers, Parents, and Students

The findings regarding the sustainable impact of the educational interventions are based on the comments gathered from approximately 240 teachers, parents, and students who participated in the group interviews in the four pilot countries (see Table 2). These interviews were conducted shortly after the educational intervention ended, which may be too soon to determine if there has been sustainable impact. Nevertheless, the interviews consistently revealed a positive immediate impact on teachers, parents, and students.

Teachers

The teachers interviewed stated that the positive changes in their teaching methodology can and will be sustained. The workshops on inclusive teaching helped initiate the process of transforming their teaching methodology from the more traditional “rote” learning to teaching in ways that communicate respect, fairness, and high expectations.

Parents

The evaluation team consistently heard parents say that the educational intervention had benefitted their child and that they hoped for its continuation. All of the parents who participated in the groups described how they appreciated even more the value of education and that they will

do everything they can so that their children will not have to work until their education is finished. Teachers, however, were more skeptical in terms of a sustained impact on parents without the continuation of parent workshops. For teachers carrying out these workshops directly, as was the case with the model *Juntos Construimos una Educación para la Vida*, there was some certainty that continued parent education would help sustain the parent impact. For programs that depended on an outside facilitator, such as *Espacios para Crecer*, teachers were less certain believing that without the workshops parents will be more likely to revert back to allowing their children to work again.

Religious leaders and NGOs in Nicaragua explained that sustaining parents' commitment to supporting their child's right to education is directly linked to poverty. Until parents can break their cycle of poverty and earn a living wage, child labor will exist. They believe that any educational intervention to combat child labor must be accompanied by parent and community development. Development strategies ranged from personal development, such as literacy programs, to occupational development—teaching parents business skills to better market their agricultural products or gaining new skills to increase family income.

Students

Student beneficiaries of the PA educational interventions all described hopeful futures and more importantly, parental support to reach their goals. As described in Section 3.2.2, students interviewed described bright futures that can only be obtained by staying in school and achieving their educational goals.

Other Concerns Related to the Educational Interventions

Interviews with implementing partners and pilot communities brought up concerns regarding the impact of testing a model on a school community without having a plan in place to sustain the model. Although PA staff explained to the pilot communities that the project would only last one academic cycle, the teachers and parents involved in the pilot interventions did not fully understand why the models could not be sustained in their particular school or community. In Guatemala and Honduras, PA staff and implementing partners told the evaluation team that they did not agree with the project term “laboratory,” because it implied that PA was experimenting with the children who were participating in one of the PA models. In group interviews at school sites in all four pilot countries, teachers and parents did not understand the purpose of “piloting” and why these educational interventions had to be discontinued.

3.2.4 Impact on Dissemination of Information Among Project Countries (Result 3)

This section looks at the achievements of Result 3, which was to create conditions to foster a sustained dialogue and share knowledge among key institutional actors. In particular, the effectiveness of generating information and disseminating it to key actors was examined, as well as how this information was used to engage the key actors in dialogue about the relationship between education, child labor, and poverty.

Creating and Disseminating Information

The intent of Result 3 was to generate information and new knowledge and to disseminate it to key actors to stimulate discussion about children’s right to education, child labor, and the relationship between education and the poverty cycle. Result 3 was designed to drive both awareness and advocacy initiatives (Results 1 and 4) and consisted of four main areas: publications, project website, research, and special events.

Publications

To generate information, knowledge, and discussion, the PA project produced a variety of publications, summarized in English in Table 6 below. The complete bibliography in Spanish appears in Annex D and the actual publications can be found on the PA website (www.primeroaprendo.org).

Table 6: Summary of Key Publications Produced Under Result 3

- *The Causes and Effects of Child Labor in Communities in Nicaragua and Costa Rica*
- *The Eradication of Child Labor through Education: Myth or Reality?*
- *Psychopedagogical and Social Profiles of Children and Adolescents Workers Participating in the PA Pilots*
- *Simulation System for Education Planning: The Experience of the First Six Models*
- *Salas de Nivelación: Una Experiencia para su Replicación y Sostenibilidad (Accelerated Learning: An Experience of its Replication and Sustainability)*
- *A Compilation of Educational Models in Latin America: Education and the Child Worker*
- *Ten Validated Educational Models in Rural and Peri-urban Communities in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala*
- *Eradicating Child Labor through Education: Six Successful Models and Their Methodologies*
- *Educational Models for the Child Worker: 14 Profiles*
- *Resolutions on Child Labor by the Central American Ministers of Education*
- *Six Country Level Studies and a Regional Comparative Study on Child Labor Policies by PREAL*
- *The Quality of Education and its Effect on Retention Rates of Child Laborers in Pilot Projects*

During interviews, PA staff, key institutional actors, and other stakeholders commented that the studies and other publications were an important contribution. The PA national coordinators told the evaluation team that the publications were instrumental in helping them organize special events such as meetings, workshops, and presentations. One national coordinator said that some of the publications were more helpful than others. The consensus among the national coordinators, however, was that the publications served as a theme and reason to meet with key institutional actors or to organize a workshop on the contents of the various publications.

Likewise, key institutional actors and stakeholders told the evaluation team that the PA project made an important contribution to the dialogue on education and child labor by producing and disseminating the range of publications noted above. At a time when child labor was receiving attention on national stages, the project provided timely and useful information on education and child labor and viable educational models to help eradicate the worst forms of child labor.

PA Website

In March 2006, PA established a project website (www.primeroaprendo.org) that served as an important source of information about the project and a repository of PA studies and publications, and other resources. Table 7 shows the number of hits on the PA website by country and year. It also shows hits on the website by the rest of the world (other than Central American countries and the Dominican Republic).

Table 7: Hits on the *Primero Aprendo* Website by Year and Country

Countries	Jun.–Dec. 2006	Jan.–Dec. 2007	Jan.–Dec.2008	Jan.–Feb. 2009	Total
Costa Rica	94	1,614	1,450	183	3,341
El Salvador	38	1,157	1,701	177	3,073
Guatemala	372	4,781	4,685	342	10,180
Honduras	89	532	1,062	91	1,774
Nicaragua	609	3,356	1,674	146	5,785
Dominican Republic	379	1,256	1,778	139	3,552
CA Total	1,581	12,696	12,350	1,078	27,705
Rest of World	17,954	64,361	97,740	11,891	191,946
Grand Total	19,535	77,057	110,090	12,969	219,651

Source: *Primero Aprendo* Achievement Presentation, 2008

The *Primero Aprendo* project started reporting data on website hits from June 2006 when the website was officially launched for public access and use. Monthly tracking of website hits continued through the time of the evaluation and until the end of the project. Table 7 summarizes partial and full year data available to the team by country and region for the period starting June 2006 and ending in February 2009.

Over the 33 month period from June 2006 through February 2009, the PA website recorded 219,651 hits. Of these, 191,946 hits (88%) were from countries other than the six PA targeted countries. It is an interesting phenomenon that such a large number of people outside of the region have visited the PA website. PA managers are not sure how to account for such a large number of hits from countries around the world.

The website had 27,705 visitors from Central America and the Dominican Republic—significant since PA was using the website as one of several mechanisms to disseminate information and knowledge to key institutional stakeholders about education and child labor issues. Guatemala accounted for nearly 37% of the hits, and Nicaragua accounted for another 21%. Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, and El Salvador were evenly spread at about 11–13% each. Approximately 7% of the hits came from Honduras.

It is difficult to say to what extent the website has helped PA increase awareness and promote policy reform. While the national coordinators thought the website was a convenient and useful way to store PA publications and information about the project, they did not mention it as a crucial tool in their awareness and advocacy efforts. Several of the key institutional actors and other stakeholders that the evaluation team interviewed said that they knew about the website

and had visited it to access information. However, they also stated that the PA publications and special events described below were more effective approaches at raising awareness and promoting policy reform.

Special Events

PA used a variety of public events to disseminate information to key institutional actors. These included meetings, workshops, conferences, and presentations. According to one national coordinator, the dissemination of PA publications at special events was highly effective. In particular, the national coordinators appreciated the presentations that PREAL did on the results of their country level policy studies. Another national coordinator commented that PREAL, a well respected regional policy organization, lent credibility to PA and its advocacy efforts.

3.2.5 Impact on the Promotion of Policy Options (Result 4)

Advocacy was the focus of Result 4. The aim was to develop an agenda of policy reform options and promote it to key institutional actors at the regional and national levels. The PA project defines key actors as organizations and institutions at the local, national, or regional levels that have the capacity to influence the adoption or modification of policies guaranteeing children's right to education, especially children and adolescents who work. This section discusses the project's efforts to inform key actors of education and child labor policy options and how helpful these options were in bringing about policy change.

It should be pointed out that the project strategy was to focus its efforts on awareness raising, pilot projects, validations, research, policy analyses, key actor contacts, integration into networks, and national and local conferences during the first two years of the project. These efforts were designed to pave the way for a focused advocacy approach related to the child workers' right to education in the final two years.

Five of the most significant initiatives to inform key actors on policy options were: the regional work done with the CECC and SEDAC, the Business Association Summit held in Honduras, a series of national and regional policy studies and analyses conducted by PREAL, the development of a policy reform agenda, and the PA regional advocacy strategy and country plans. The evaluation findings for these key initiatives are discussed below.

CECC and SEDAC

Some of the important early work on regional policy was conducted by CECC and SEDAC. In April 2006, the *Primero Aprendo* project introduced a resolution through CECC defending the child workers' right to education that was signed by all ministers from Central America and the Dominican Republic. The PA project approached SEDAC seeking its endorsement of the ministers' resolution, which it did in a declaration issued during a semiannual meeting in Tegucigalpa in November 2006. The project created a steering committee composed of CECC, ILO-IPEC, and the Bishops' Conference to follow up with concrete actions to implement priority articles in the ministers' resolution.

The work of the steering committee led to a summit of ministers and bishops held in August 2007. The summit was sponsored by the PA project, ILO-IPEC, SEDAC, and CECC and resulted in a declaration that spelled out a plan of action including the following steps:

- Develop flexible educational programs for child workers.
- Support ministries of education in their efforts to support child workers' right to education.
- Promote services targeted toward working children and adopt successful educational practices.
- Create a fund to support the elimination of child labor and the incorporation of former child laborers into the formal educational system.

The intention of the CECC and SEDAC resolution and declaration was to establish legitimate and recognized documents that the PA national coordinators could use to work with the education ministries and the Catholic Church in each country toward fulfilling the terms in the documents. This approach was most successful in Honduras where the Minister of Education referred to the CECC resolution when signing the letter that committed the Ministry of Education to adopt the *Niño Tutor* model.

Regional Business Association Summit

In November 2007, PA sponsored a summit for presidents of business associations from Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. The Honduras association hosted the summit, the objectives of which were to (1) discuss child labor and the educational needs of child workers, (2) explore current and future private sector efforts to reduce and eliminate child labor within the region, and (3) create a private sector network to support the PA policy reform agenda at the regional and country levels.

The participants agreed to form a network to support regional and national efforts to eradicate child labor through education. They also issued a declaration that committed the associations to intensify efforts to ensure that all working children enjoy their right to education, to exchange information and experiences in operating educational programs for working children, and to collaborate with governments and national and international organizations to ensure the effective implementation of ILO Convention 182.

The evaluation team interviewed business associations from Honduras (*Consejo Hondureño de la Empresa Privada* [Honduras Private Business Council or COHEP]), Nicaragua (*Consejo Superior de la Empresa Privada* [Nicaragua Private Business Council or COSEP]), and the Dominican Republic (*Confederación Patronal de la República Dominicana* [Business Confederation of the Dominican Republic or COPARDOM]). According to these associations, there has not been follow up to the summit, nor is there a functioning network. However, these associations have collaborated with PA at the country level.

The Honduras business association, COHEP, was active in supporting educational programs before the PA project. Beginning in 2003, COHEP supported the *Becarios Tutores* model which aimed to prevent children from dropping out of school. The *Niño Tutor* model, which was

piloted and validated by the PA project and will be adopted by the Honduras Ministry of Education, is based on the *Becarios Tutores* model. COHEP provided 50% of the funding in support of *Niño Tutor* during the pilot phase and will continue to fund the *Becarios Tutores* model as part of its corporate social responsibility initiatives.

The associations in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic have focused primarily on creating awareness among their members. In Nicaragua, COSEP published two child labor articles written by PA staff in its monthly news magazine. The COSEP technical advisor told the evaluation team that she does what she can to promote the PA educational models but is limited in what she can do since COSEP does not have a budget to support child labor activities. COPARDOM in the Dominican Republic has collaborated with the PA national coordinator to raise awareness among its members regarding child labor and the importance of education. COPARDOM hosts a weekly television program and has twice invited PA to be on its telecast to discuss child labor issues.

Policy Studies and the Reform Agenda

The third major policy initiative entailed a series of national and regional policy analyses, the creation of a regional advocacy network, and a regional meeting that established a policy reform agenda.

PREAL carried out policy studies (*Opciones educativas para la niñez trabajadora*) in each of the PA countries. These studies identified the critical issues facing child labor eradication in each country, analyzed the policy environment, and recommended critical policy reform areas. PREAL presented the results of the studies to key institutional actors and other stakeholders in each country. Once the country level studies were finished, PREAL developed a regional comparative study based on the results of each of the six country studies.

The six country studies and the regional comparative study served as the foundation for the PA project's creation of a regional reform agenda. To support the regional reform agenda, the project, with the help of PREAL, established a regional support group called *Red de Apoyo*. This group is composed of nine influential people that represent a range of sectors (business, religious, government, and union) from each country. During a regional meeting in Antigua, Guatemala in March 2007, *Red de Apoyo* and other key actors developed the "Agenda of Educational Options for Child Workers" that consisted of the following four objectives:

- Create policy conditions that fulfill child workers' right to education.
- Promote and strengthen policies that ensure inter-institutional coordination.
- Increase quality educational opportunities for child workers.
- Create alliances to meet the educational needs of child workers.

The policy studies and the reform agenda served as tools that the PA national coordinators used to raise awareness and advocate for policies to support child workers' right to education. During interviews, the national coordinators commented that the policy studies were helpful but did not provide new information. The same information, according to two coordinators, was available in ILO and Ministry of Education publications. The project director disagreed, stating that while the

information contained in the studies was based on secondary sources, the research and analyses were new and presented in a reader-friendly format.

There was a difference of opinion regarding the usefulness of the reform agenda. Representatives from *Red de Apoyo*, ILO-IPEC, and ministries of education and labor complimented the PA project for its effort in using a participatory process to create an important policy document. According to these key actors, the reform agenda was a valuable and timely contribution to the dialogue on child labor and children’s right to education. On the other hand, other key actors thought the reform agenda was too broad and did not apply to the situations in their countries. A Ministry of Education representative from El Salvador told the evaluation team that she would have preferred more of a focus on the child labor policy environment and recommendations for her country.

Regional Advocacy Strategy and National Plans

The PA project used the reform agenda to develop a regional advocacy strategy and plans for the six countries. The regional strategy laid out three priority areas for the final 18 months of the project:

- Adoption of policies by ministries and/or national organizations leading to the replication of validated practices among expanded populations.
- Development and implementation of policies tending toward the creation of a national early warning system to detect signs indicating that working children might drop out of school and counteract that outcome.
- Creation of conditions for an integrated approach to the eradication of child labor through multisectoral cooperation.

Guided by the regional advocacy strategy, the six national coordinators, through consultations with local partners and key actors, developed national implementation plans that mapped out actions, measures, resources, and a timeframe for achieving policy reform in one or more of the regional priority areas listed above. The policy areas that each country selected are listed in the table below.

Table 8: Policy Areas Selected by Country

Country	Policy Area Selected
Costa Rica	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early warning system
Dominican Republic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multisector participation
El Salvador	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational models • Multisector participation
Guatemala	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational models • Multisector participation

Country	Policy Area Selected
Honduras	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational models • Multisector participation
Nicaragua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational models • Multisector participation

In the case of Costa Rica, the national coordinator used the regional advocacy strategy to identify the *Alerta Temprana* early warning model as the most viable policy option. The national coordinator in Honduras told the evaluation team that although his team had a clear vision of validating the *Niño Tutor* model and collaborating with the Ministry of Education to adopt and implement it on a national level, he found the regional strategy useful in that it validated what the project had planned in Honduras and provided a timeframe for achieving it.

The relationship between the regional advocacy strategy and the policy achievements in the other countries is less clear. In Guatemala, the CRS education manager for Central America explained that it was always his understanding (before the regional strategy was developed) that the PA project in Guatemala would try to convince the Ministry of Education and other organizations to adopt and implement one of the PA educational models.

In the Dominican Republic, the national coordinator identified a need and opportunity to create a unit within the Ministry of Education to address child labor. She used her credibility as the director of a respected education NGO (Educa) and the PA platform to convince the Minister of Education to support a program for children at risk of dropping out of school to work (PARE Program). She felt that the regional advocacy strategy did not seem to play a major role in this policy achievement.

The situation in El Salvador was similar to the Dominican Republic. With a little more than a year remaining in the project, the national coordinator identified three opportunities to have an impact on policy. In each case, she used project funds to hire a consultant to work with existing initiatives in an effort to systematize the *Salas de Nivelación* and the ISNA Integrated Services models and insert child labor language into the Ministry of Education diversity policy.

3.3 SUSTAINABILITY

Important issues regarding sustainability of the PA project have been discussed throughout the previous section. One important general finding echoed by PA project staff is that four years is not a sufficient length of time to adequately follow-up on the sustainable elements that the project put into place. As reported in Section 3.2.1, educational experts from PREAL gave timeframes of up to 20 years to achieve sustainable policy reform. Other PA staff commented that the groundwork had been laid; they just needed four more years to make it sustainable. In comments subsequent to the draft evaluation report, the project director stated, “PA worked hard to create the conditions for sustainability, but it could not accept responsibility for lasting sustainability because that condition depended on conditions and circumstances well outside the purview and control of the project.”

During the final year of the project, sustainability matrix was developed outlining four elements in the project's sustainability strategy (see Annex H). The findings in this section are specifically related to those four elements.

3.3.1 Inclusion of Child Labor as a Permanent Part of the CECC Agenda

The Central American Education and Cultural Coordination is made up of the ministers of education and culture in Central America (the Dominican Republic is not part of CECC). The matrix specifically states that the theme of child labor and education will be included as a permanent part of the CECC agenda. The PA project director explained that the permanent placement of child labor on the CECC agenda will continually force the ministers of education to think about the child labor issue and the actions to implement toward its eradication through education. The current secretary general of CECC stated that the topic is not currently a permanent part of their agenda. However, further discussions regarding child labor and follow-up to the PA project initiatives may be included in the next CECC meeting agenda in August 2009.

3.3.2 Establishment of *Red de Apoyo* and Operating Under its Own Leadership

Red de Apoyo was formed halfway through the project timeline as a key strategy for sustaining the policy reform advocacy work begun by the PA project. Members of *Red de Apoyo* are influential individuals on child labor and education issues from each of the project countries. *Red de Apoyo* formally committed itself to continuing its advocacy work beyond the life of the project, and this commitment is documented in the minutes of the group's meeting held in Costa Rica in September 2008. Individual interviews with *Red de Apoyo* members in four of the project countries revealed that all of them are committed to the issues at hand, but each stated that it will be difficult to sustain *Red de Apoyo* without basic funding to meet as a group or without an organizational structure to sponsor it. The *Red de Apoyo* president stated that he has a meeting scheduled with the CECC secretary general on April 25, 2009 to discuss collaboration between CECC and *Red de Apoyo*, and hopes to present a plan at the next regional CECC meeting in August 2009.

3.3.3 Adoption and Implementation of Validated Educational Practices

Adoption of a validated educational practice on a nationwide basis only occurred in Honduras. On a smaller scale, validated practices were adopted by private foundations and NGOs in Guatemala and Nicaragua and by a local ministry of education in Costa Rica. See Section 3.2.1 for more detailed findings related to this effort.

3.3.4 Policies Protecting Child Workers and Their Right to Education

Specific policies to protect child workers and their right to education have been adopted and implemented in six municipalities in Honduras. In El Paraíso, site of the PA educational intervention, funds have been allocated to implement the ordinance. See Section 3.2.1 for more detailed findings related to this effort.

3.4 PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION

Partnerships formed the foundation of the PA project. These partnerships were found at the regional level—between CARE, CRS, and DevTech—as well as the community level, including the consortium of six NGOs and CBOs that implemented the educational interventions in Nicaragua. The national coordinators all agreed that the project strategy was to work collaboratively and to join forces with anyone who wanted to move the agenda forward at the national or local level. The following discussion highlights some of the major successes and challenges in establishing partnerships or collaboration and their impact on mobilizing key actors towards the eradication of child labor through educational interventions.

3.4.1 Successful Collaborations and Partnerships and Their Impact

Costa Rica

The most significant of the collaborative efforts achieved by the PA project in Costa Rica was the creation of a local alliance (*Alianza para la Construcción del Futuro de las Personas Menores de Edad*) made up of 26 institutions that work with children. This alliance was convened by the PA project to focus specifically on issues regarding child labor and children’s right to education. Members of the alliance interviewed in Puntarenas explained that all members worked on children’s issues within their own institutions (schools, local government, religious, and community-based organizations), but child labor was not a priority on their agendas. The *Primero Aprendo* project served as a driving force to unify their efforts toward policy reform. As an alliance, they worked on creating the *Alerta Temprana* early warning model. The fact that they were part of its initial development was key to their buy-in. Each member expressed great commitment to seeing the model adopted beyond their municipality. Since each member represents a larger institution, they talked of a “ripple effect” that might be achieved by presenting the model’s success to other municipalities and school districts, as well as in national forums.

Dominican Republic

The PA project in the Dominican Republic collaborated closely with the Secretary of Education and DevTech to establish the PARE program. The project worked with DevTech’s “Combating Exploitive Child Labor Through Education in the Dominican Republic” project, funded by USDOL, to advocate for the PARE program. The DevTech project provided experience in implementing the *Espacios para Crecer* model that complimented the PA project’s emphasis on policy reform. The combination of policy reform and operational experience (and success), along with a close working relationship with the Secretary of Education’s Department of Elementary Education, proved to be the winning formula in convincing the new education minister to establish and fund the PARE program.

El Salvador

In El Salvador, the PA project worked most collaboratively with the national Ministry of Education. The effort to systematize and promote the national education model *Salas de Nivelación* was a collaborative effort between the PA project and the Ministry of Education. The

key to its success was the PA project's search for ways to support efforts already underway by the national Ministry of Education on issues regarding child labor and children's right to education. The ILO-IPEC project in El Salvador had already piloted the model as an educational intervention, so a systematization of the model for national implementation was needed. The collaborative efforts between the PA project, the national ILO-IPEC office, and the national Ministry of Education resulted in a concrete product which helped to move the national plan of eradication of child labor through education forward.

Guatemala

The PA project collaborated with a wide array of actors in Guatemala including the ministries of education and labor, NGOs, private foundations, and department level networks advocating against child labor. The collaborative work with the Minar Foundation and the NGO *Conrado de la Cruz* resulted in the adoption of two educational models: *Niño Tutor* and *Educomun*.

Honduras

As discussed in the previous section, the PA project in Honduras approached the national Ministry of Education at the beginning of the project and asked for a commitment to work collaboratively. The national coordinator was assigned a stable (and influential) Ministry of Education counterpart to work with collaboratively throughout the project's implementation. This resulted in the achievement of sustainable policy reform with the nationwide adoption of *Niño Tutor*. Besides the Ministry of Education, the PA project in Honduras also formed a key partnership with the country's primary business association, COHEP, leveraging resources for implementing the *Niño Tutor* model. In addition to these national partners, they successfully partnered with the local government of El Paraíso, who assumed the cost of the local project facilitator during the pilot of the *Niño Tutor* model. In an interview with the municipal mayor, he commented that this created a sense of responsibility and commitment toward the project purpose and its outcome.

Nicaragua

The consortium of CBOs and NGOs—six total—that worked together to implement the educational interventions is a prime example of the PA project working in partnership. Staff from two of these CBOs stated that these partnerships led to an increased ability to mobilize all resources, not just money, and subsequently increase outputs. For example, in Leon, the CBO *Fundapadele* described how they were able to increase the impact of the educational interventions by providing parent training workshops. They also described how the partnership will have a lasting impact on the organization itself. Eradication of child labor and children's right to education had not been a major concern of the organization, but it is now a topic of great concern and one that they hope to continue supporting.

3.4.2 Major Challenges in Achieving Collaboration and Partnerships

The PA project director stated that it was his hope that each country would work collaboratively with their respective ministries of education. While this occurred in some countries, such as the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Honduras, it did not occur in Costa Rica or Guatemala. Reasons for this were discussed briefly in Section 3.2.1.

The business sector is another key actor that didn't meet the expectations of the PA partnership strategy. The hope was to engage the major business association in each country in the project and to use them to reach those who employ child laborers. In other words, use these associations as a "moral force" for adopting policies condemning child labor. Once again the foundation was laid for this type of policy work, but there was a lack of commitment in all countries besides Honduras.

Finally, the Catholic bishops had been targeted as key partners. While the project achieved the endorsement of the bishops (SEDAC resolution), there were varying degrees of success in getting the bishops in each country to promote the ideas contained in the declaration. Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Guatemala had the most success in collaborating with the Catholic Church to push child labor and the right to education as key points in the Church's social doctrine.

While there were obstacles in establishing some partnerships (especially with the national ministries of education), national coordinators described a process of working with a multitude of partners. If obstacles were encountered with government agencies or other key organizations, they looked for other partners who would allow them to keep the agenda moving forward.

3.5 MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

This section discusses the findings from a range of management and budget issues. These include how well the regional management structure worked, challenges in managing a regional program, leveraging non-project resources, and the management implications for the USDOL definitions of withdrawal and prevention and its impact on data quality.

3.5.1 Regional Management Structure

The PA regional management structure consisted of four primary functions spread over four countries. The project director and financial manager were based in Nicaragua, the education technical coordinator was based in Costa Rica, the advocacy and policy function was initially based in the Dominican Republic, and the monitoring and information specialist was based at the DevTech home office in the United States. In 2007, the advocacy and policy function shifted from the Dominican Republic to the project administration in Nicaragua. Under the supervision of the project director, a Costa Rican consultant was hired to advise national coordinators with the project's advocacy and policy work.

The midterm evaluation identified several weaknesses in the regional management structure and how it was functioning. There were communication problems within the project, between the project director and the national coordinators. The national coordinators were not satisfied with the technical support they were receiving, and there were performance issues related to the national coordinators in Guatemala, El Salvador, and the Dominican Republic.

As explained previously, PA management developed a plan to respond to many of the midterm evaluation recommendations. These included a workshop to improve communications, hiring a former Costa Rica Minister of Education to provide advocacy support, hiring an education advisor to assist the technical education coordinator, and replacing the national coordinators who resigned in El Salvador, Guatemala, and the Dominican Republic.

During interviews, PA staff told the evaluation team that the changes made in response to the midterm evaluation improved the performance of the project. They noted that communication had improved and the national coordinators possessed the right mix of skills and experiences to drive the advocacy strategy and achieve policy reform. However, several of the national coordinators said that they were still not satisfied with the level of technical support they received in the areas of education and advocacy. However, the national coordinator in Guatemala told the evaluation team that the support she received in advocacy was timely and effective. The other national coordinators recommended that in future regional projects, the technical support functions should be located in each country and filled with experts who are familiar with the education, policy, and political environment in that country.

Conversely, the project director and national coordinators told the evaluation team that the technical support they received on monitoring and information systems was excellent. This included the level of communication, training, problem solving, and general attention to data quality. The PA staff also complimented the financial management of the project noting that they had not noticed any major glitches in the budgeting process, allocation of funds, expense reporting, or general flows of cash to the project.

3.5.2 Challenges to Managing a Regional Program

There are any number of challenges in managing a regional program, especially one as ambitious and complex as the PA project in which the key management and technical support functions are spread across a range of locations. When PA staff were asked what the greatest challenge to a regional management structure was, they consistently answered that it was communication. One national coordinator explained that communication is more than sending e-mail messages or talking on the phone each day. She said that while e-mail messages and telephone conversations help, they cannot replace the richness of face-to-face encounters. In response to this finding, the project director explained that there were in fact at least three meetings per year that focused on problem solving and cross learning. In addition, there were individual encounters each year between the members of the management team and national coordinators.

Another challenge mentioned in the interviews was between articulating a vision of the project and translating it into actions. One of the PA partners commented that it was difficult for the project director to communicate his vision of the project to the technical and national coordinators when they were spread over a range of countries. The evaluation team observed this during interviews with PA staff. In several interviews with the project director, he laid out his vision of the project and policy change. In subsequent interviews with other PA staff, they articulated different visions of the project and its potential. The project director told the evaluation team that he went to extraordinary lengths to ensure a common vision that included regional staff meetings, memos, and circulating project policy statements. He commented that changes in national coordinators in four countries complicated his efforts.

These observations and comments question whether the regional management team should be located in the same office to facilitate communication and a shared vision of the project. A small minority of the interviewees did not believe the management team needed to be in the same office as long as effective communication mechanisms were established including periodic

meetings. The majority, however, thought future regional projects would be more effective if the team operated out of one office.

3.5.3 Strategies to Leverage Non-project Resources

Leveraging non-project resources was not part of the PA project design and strategy, although CARE and CRS, as part of the technical cooperation agreement signed with USDOL, agreed to provide matching funds in the amount of US\$660,000. CARE, who had committed to providing US\$360,000, contributed US\$420,000 in the end. These funds came from CARE unrestricted resources and donations from Starbucks and Boeing Foundations, totaling approximately US\$300,000.

The PA project did attempt to leverage non-project funds from World Bank (WB) and Inter-America Development Bank (IDB) in a way that complemented its advocacy efforts. As part of its strategy to convince the ministries to adopt PA educational models, the project approached WB and IDB with the goal of convincing them to provide an open line of credit through grants or concessionary loans to interested governments for educational programs, especially those that included the PA educational models.

Both WB and IDB expressed initial interest in the concept and were interested in taking it to scale to reach thousands of children. The PA project had developed a contingency plan to accommodate the expansion that would build the structural and institutional capacity of the education ministries to absorb the multilateral resources and program them in the educational models designed to educate child workers. Eventually, the negotiations with the multilaterals broke down when they insisted that the project demonstrate impact, requiring a sophisticated impact assessment including an established baseline. The multilaterals (particularly the IDB) pulled back when they found that the conditions for a reliable impact assessment could not be carried out.

Cash and in-kind resources were leveraged in some of the countries. The most successful effort was in Honduras. COHEP, through its foundation, had supported an educational model (*Becarios Tutores*) designed to keep children in school. The PA project borrowed key elements from the *Becarios Tutores* to develop the *Niño Tutor* model that it piloted and validated. COHEP provided 50% of the funding to help pilot and validate the *Niño Tutor* model. The COHEP cash contribution was US\$8,891, while its in-kind contributions (school supplies) were valued at US\$1,000.

Other countries leveraged small amounts of in-kind resources from companies for radio time, advertisements on television, and other types of support. For example, in Nicaragua, the project convinced movie theatres to donate advertising space to show an abbreviated video before the beginning of movies. These contributions, although important, do not add up to large amounts.

3.5.4 USDOL Definitions of Withdrawal and Prevention

In February 2006, Williams, Adley, and Company LLC conducted an independent examination (audit) of the PA project. The examination demonstrated a number of findings and recommendations to improve management and finance performance. The examination also found inaccuracies in the number of children counted as “prevented” from entering child labor in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.

During September and October 2006, a midterm evaluation was conducted. This evaluation also found inconsistencies on how children were being counted as withdrawn and prevented. The evaluation discovered that PA staff responsible for data collection did not fully understand how to collect data on the number of hours worked. PA staff interviewed in Guatemala and Costa Rica demonstrated different understandings of the hours worked concept. This finding called into question the validity of the data.

In response to the external examination and the midterm evaluation, the project revised its glossary of definitions with special attention to the definitions of withdrawal and prevention, and provided a series of trainings to field staff responsible for collecting data. The PA monitoring team also intensified its efforts to validate data and follow up on perceived inconsistencies. In addition, the project reviewed all data from previous years and made adjustments in the withdrawn and prevented numbers.

During this final evaluation, the evaluators examined the USDOL definitions of withdrawal and prevention and the definitions used in the PA glossary. The team also interviewed the project director, monitoring team, several of the former PA field coordinators, and four of the former implementing partners (subcontractors). The team could not interview the actual data collectors as they were working in other jobs and were not available.

The project management and the former field coordinators and implementing partners explained their understanding of withdrawal and prevention, as defined by USDOL. They explained that counting children as withdrawn and prevented can be complex and there are shades of gray that require judgment calls, for example in cases of domestic chores. Some of these minor nuances surfaced during the interviews with former field coordinators and implementing partners.

The evaluation team would like to point out the limitations of the findings concerning the definitions of withdrawal and prevention. The team interviewed a very small sample of former PA staff and partners, and the actual data collectors were not interviewed. Furthermore, demonstrating an understanding of the definitions does not necessarily translate into accurate data collection. There is a quantitative component to the final evaluation that will examine the consistency and quality of data. The quantitative evaluation should provide a clearer picture as to whether the project accurately measured withdrawal and prevention.

This page left intentionally blank.

IV LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES

The four-year *Primero Aprendo* project offers some broad lessons learned and best practices for developing future regional projects focusing on the eradication of child labor through education initiatives. The PA project staff, who are now leading experts in implementing USDOL EI projects, have compiled a series of lessons learned in the quarterly technical progress reports. In addition, each of the national coordinators was asked to highlight their major lessons learned during the evaluation interviews. The following lessons learned are based on their experiences, as well as additional observations from the evaluation team, as they relate to the specific aspects of this final evaluation.

Strategy and Design

- Because child labor has many causes, the responses to it must also be multidimensional and integrated. An effective and sustainable response must integrate education, health, personal strengthening, and skills training.¹
- The involvement of parents and the broader community is essential to withdraw children from work and retain them in school.

Policy Reform

- Participation of key institutional actors in developing a policy reform agenda is critical in receiving their buy-in and commitment to implement key actions.

Awareness

- Awareness raising as a component that should be seen as a process of social and cultural transformation, not just a series of isolated activities. While it is necessary to inform the people of the issues regarding child labor, a commitment to act is really needed. This requires a comprehensive and strategic approach.²
- Education programs have more impact when they are accompanied by a strong awareness-raising program for parents and teachers, many of whom see child labor as a normal part of growing up.³

Pilot Educational Interventions to Identify Best Practices

- Sustainability must be a key consideration when deciding which educational interventions to pilot in any given community.

¹ CARE. (2008, August). “Technical Progress Report: *Primero Aprendo*: Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Central America and the Dominican Republic.” Washington, DC.

² CARE. (2009, February). “Technical Progress Report: *Primero Aprendo*: Combating Exploitive Child Labor through Education in Central America and the Dominican Republic.” Washington, DC.

³ CARE. (2008, August).

- Improving educational quality through teacher training, parent involvement, and more attention to at-risk children contributes to higher withdrawal and retention rates.
- Leveraging resources with national or private programs that offer food assistance and other incentives—even small incentives, like pencils and notebooks—for children enrolled in educational interventions encourages attendance and retention, and can make the difference between success and failure.⁴

Sustainability

- Nationwide adoption of an educational model is best achieved with the direct involvement of the Ministry of Education from the very inception of the project and at every stage throughout the project's implementation. This early and constant involvement of the ministry is critical in securing buy-in and ownership.⁵
- Lasting change in something as complex as child labor cannot be achieved by a project that is only four years long. More time is needed to achieve true sustainability.⁶

Partnerships and Collaboration

- With short-term projects like the PA project, it is necessary to partner intelligently with other actors so that the strengths and resources of each partner are mutually leveraged.⁷
- Strengthening existing networks that work on child labor or children's education issues is important to unify services and programs and create critical mass supporting policy reform issues.⁸

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Monitoring and evaluation information that is made available throughout the project forms an integral part of the awareness-raising process. It provides evidence of progress and achievement of established goals. These are important elements to convince parents and community members of the importance and value of education.⁹

⁴ CARE. (2009, February).

⁵ CARE. (2008, August).

⁶ CARE. (2009, February).

⁷ CARE. (2009, February).

⁸ CARE. (2008, August).

⁹ CARE. (2009, February).

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

5.1.1 Validity of Project Design and Strategy

- Both regional and national programs have advantages. Regional programs can facilitate the sharing of important lessons and experiences that in turn benefit national program efforts, while national programs allow unique focus on the child labor operating and policy environment that varies from country to country.
- The PA project design supported and complemented the EI goals as well as other government programs that use education as a strategy to eradicate the worst forms of child labor.
- An income-generating component helped make two validated educational models more effective during the replication in at least three communities in Nicaragua.
- The strategy of piloting and validating educational interventions and using them to drive policy reform was effective. It led to at least one policy reform in each country.
- The PA monitoring system effectively tracked and reported the education and work status of the children in project. The monitoring system is considered by many of the stakeholders to be a model that could be used in similar child labor projects.
- The PA project implemented the most appropriate midterm evaluation recommendations. As a result, the project made several adjustments that improved its performance.

5.1.2 Impact on Child Labor Policies Among Regional, National, and Local Actors

- Based on the project definition of policy that was accepted by USDOL, the project achieved policy reform in each country and significantly exceeded its target of two policy reforms in the region. The PA project contributed to the adoption of 11 policies throughout the six countries, including at least one in each country.
- Some key institutional actors and stakeholders do not agree with the project's definition of policy nor do they believe that the project achieved sustainable policy reform in all countries.
- The strategic mix of project strategies was effective at achieving policy reform on education and child labor issues at the national and local levels. It was never the intention of the project to achieve policy reform at the regional level.
- The stability of governments and their ministries and the length of time allowed for project activities to take root are crucial factors that help or hinder the achievement of

sustainable policy reform. Frequent changes of governments and key ministry personnel hindered the project's policy reform efforts in Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. Stable governments and ministries helped efforts in the Dominican Republic and El Salvador. Four years is not sufficient time to achieve meaningful and sustainable policy reform in most countries.

- The educational systems will likely be strengthened in the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Honduras where educational models are adopted and implemented by the Ministry of Education on a national level. Local educational systems will likely be strengthened where the PA educational models have been adopted by the Church, NGOs, foundations, or schools as long as these organizations can sustain the models.

5.1.3 Impact on Awareness

- The project effectively carried out an on-going, multifaceted approach to awareness, resulting in an increase in knowledge and actions of key actors at the regional, national, and local levels regarding child labor and children's right to education.
- The *Primero Aprendo* project was most effective at raising awareness through direct contact with local government, community leaders, educators, parents, and children.
- The project successfully increased the awareness of parents and teachers regarding the relationship between poverty, child labor, and education through awareness efforts that accompanied educational interventions. Raising the awareness of parents was a key factor leading to a successful educational intervention.

5.1.4 Impact of Educational Interventions to Identify Best Practices

Validation Process

- The validation study helped determine the most important qualitative characteristics in a model that led to withdrawal, retention, and prevention of child labor. It lent objective credibility to the educational models that were promoted for national or local adoption.
- If the educational models had been allowed a greater length of time or had been given specific recommendations for improvements—using the validation criteria—before undergoing the actual validation study, the results may have been quite different; all 20 of the models piloted might have been validated.
- The validation criteria did not take into account the model's sustainability or cost. The models that may have been best in qualitative and quantitative terms were not necessarily models that could be sustained by the national ministries of education.

Internal and External Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of the Educational Interventions

- Staff commitment, parent and community involvement, effective project management, and the delivery of a thorough needs assessment are all factors that contribute to the effectiveness of an educational intervention.
- Allowing enough time and resources in an educational intervention to also address the greater psychosocial issues that affect a school community can lead to a more successful educational intervention, especially in marginal urban communities.

Factors Contributing to Improving the Overall Quality of Education

- Implementing comprehensive educational models that emphasize inclusive teaching methods, parent involvement, and specific strategies for working with at-risk children will improve the overall quality of education, which in turn will contribute to greater withdrawal and prevention rates.

Commitment to Replicating Models on a Large Scale

- A commitment to replicate the educational models on a large scale is best achieved when projects have more time to promote the models, align with the Ministry of Education from the design through the pilot phase, and have a cost benefit analysis in hand when discussing widespread replication.

Sustainable Impact of the Educational Interventions on Teachers, Parents, and Students

- Teachers benefitting from learning and implementing innovative teaching methods will most likely continue to use these methods and, in turn, better meet the needs of at-risk children. Without continual parental support—in terms of parent education, skills development, and access to a living wage—efforts to change parents’ attitudes towards child labor and the value of education may be difficult to sustain. It is too early to tell whether there has been true sustainable impact on teachers, parents, or students.

Other Concerns Related to the Educational Interventions

- Testing an educational intervention in a community can lead to misunderstandings on the part of project implementers, teachers, parents, and students who are involved in the pilot projects. Everyone involved wants to see a successful educational program remain. Closing a program because efforts to sustain them at the local level were not achieved is a difficult concept for the school community to understand.

5.1.5 Impact on Dissemination of Information Among Project Countries

- The PA project’s approach creating information and knowledge through its publications and using a range of special events to disseminate this information proved to be highly effective at raising awareness and generating dialogue with key institutional actors concerning child labor and education issues.

5.1.6 Impact on the Promotion of Policy Options

- The CECC and SEDAC resolutions and declarations served as important reference documents to create awareness and generate dialogue. The CECC resolution was instrumental in helping the project convince the Ministry of Education in Honduras to adopt and implement the *Niño Tutor* model on a national scale.
- The regional business summit helped raise awareness among the participating business associations but did not contribute to policy change. After the summit, three of the business associations continued to collaborate with the national coordinators on raising awareness of its members on child labor issues.
- The PREAL policy studies and reform agenda were useful documents and helped the national coordinators to increase awareness and engage their key institutional actors in dialogue on children's right to education and child labor. The reform agenda served as the foundation for developing the regional advocacy strategy.
- The regional advocacy strategy drove the early warning system policy reform in Costa Rica and provided a useful framework and timeline in Honduras for the Ministry of Education's adoption of the *Niño Tutor* model. The evaluation team, however, could not establish evidence that the regional advocacy strategy was responsible for bringing about policy reform in the other countries.

5.1.7 Sustainability

- The PA project has put into place sustainable elements that can serve to eradicate child labor and guarantee children's right to education. The short project timeline of four years did not allow for adequate follow-up of these elements. It is too early to conclude how long these elements will continue or to what degree they will impact efforts to combat child labor and promote children's right to education.
- The sustainability of *Red de Apoyo* in particular, will be difficult without basic funding to meet as a group or without a sponsoring organizational structure.

5.1.8 Partnerships and Collaboration

- The fact that the project did not depend on any single kind of partner to lend it support was an effective approach that allowed the project to move the agenda forward with key local and national actors interested in collaborating on efforts to eradicate child labor through education. However, not forming key partnerships with national ministries of education in each country might have contributed to the limited impact at the policy level.

5.1.9 Management and Budget

- The most successful PA management areas were beneficiary monitoring and the technical support the monitoring team provided to the project director and national coordinators. Financial management was also successful. The management area that could have been improved was the technical support to the national coordinators in the areas of education and advocacy.
- The primary challenges to effectively managing and coordinating a regional project in six countries is communication and fostering a common vision. The distances between countries and the separation of the management team hindered effective and interactive communication and the ability to create a common vision among all staff.
- Leveraging non-project resources was not part of the PA design or strategy. The project did, however, attempt to leverage resources to complement its advocacy strategy from WB and IDB but was unsuccessful. The project successfully leveraged small amounts of cash and in-kind resources from the private sector in Honduras and Nicaragua.
- PA staff and implementing partners demonstrated an adequate understanding of the terms withdrawal and prevention. However, the evaluators did not conduct a thorough and scientific investigation. The second phase of the evaluation consists of a quantitative evaluation that is much better suited to answer the question of whether the project accurately measured withdrawal and prevention.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

5.2.1 Project Strategy and Design

- Given the success that the *Primero Aprendo* project had in adding activities aimed at replacing lost income and at promoting the value of education, USDOL should incorporate income generating and broader family-formation criteria (skills training, literacy, money management, and values) into child labor/education solicitation for grant applications (SGA). The criteria will require applicants to incorporate thoughtful income-generation and family-formation strategies into their project designs and proposals. These strategies will make educational interventions, designed to withdraw children from work situations and prevent them from returning, more effective by addressing the root cause: poverty.

5.2.2 Child Labor Policies

- In USDOL-funded projects that have policy reform goals, USDOL should define exactly what policy means with clear illustrative examples of sustainable policy reform. A clear definition of sustainable policy reform along with several concrete examples, including the anticipated impact they have on children's right to education and the eradication of the worst forms of child labor, will provide clarity for future projects and help avoid uncertainty as to whether policy reform was truly achieved.

- To achieve sustainable policy reform, USDOL should structure its SGA and budgets to ensure that a policy reform project has at least two funding cycles of four years (eight total years). The evaluation team understands that USDOL is required to recompute the project once the funding cycle ends. Nevertheless, USDOL should ensure that, no matter who wins the project, the basic strategy and policy reform goals are maintained. While adjusting strategies may be necessary, completely changing goals and strategies defeats the purpose of dedicating two funding cycles to achieving policy reform.

5.2.3 Awareness

- In future USDOL-funded child labor projects that have an awareness component, USDOL should use the PA project model as an example: a multifaceted awareness approach that effectively reached key actors at regional, national, and local levels. USDOL should specifically recommend the integration of local governments and community leaders as part of the awareness team in an effort to promote a community consciousness regarding the eradication of child labor and children's right to education. Furthermore, direct awareness efforts should focus on parents and teachers to increase their understanding of the relationship between poverty, child labor, and education and to enhance the effectiveness of the educational model being implemented. For projects in Guatemala, it is essential to provide these direct awareness efforts using the local indigenous languages.

5.2.4 Educational Interventions

- Future USDOL EI projects should focus on implementing and sustaining educational models that improve the quality of education for at-risk children and adolescents. This includes models that promote inclusive teaching methods, teacher training and awareness, parent awareness and involvement, and community participation. Many of the models piloted and validated by the PA project contained most of these characteristics. Future USDOL EI projects should base their educational interventions on the best practices from the validated models that have been published and disseminated by the PA project. Sustainability must be a key factor in designing and implementing educational interventions.

5.2.5 Sustainability

- Given the project's scope, funding level, and timeframe, future USDOL-funded child labor projects should develop a realistic, written sustainability plan at the beginning of the project. USDOL should provide technical oversight for the periodic monitoring and adjustment of the sustainability plan as the project develops and should consider conducting periodic site visits—at least annually—to talk with project staff, partners, and beneficiaries. Site visits will allow USDOL to offer more specific guidance to projects regarding their sustainability plan, as well as other USDOL expectations and outcomes.

5.2.6 Partnerships

- Future USDOL EI projects whose aim is to achieve sustainable policy reform must establish key partnerships between the implementing organization and the national ministries of education. Buy-in and commitment is best achieved by involving the Ministry of Education partner in all aspects of the design, implementation, and evaluation phases. USDOL should also encourage partnerships/collaborations with a multitude of key actors at the local, national, and regional levels to build alliances and raise awareness.

5.2.7 Management and Budget

- In regional projects, USDOL should insist that the management team be located in the same office. While there are advantages to the management team being located in different countries, the evaluation team believes the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. Positioning the management team in the same physical space will promote effective communication, joint problem solving and decision making, and a common vision of the project.
- USDOL should consider incorporating a public–private partnership component in future SGAs. The public–private partnership component would require contractors to form alliances with key private sector actors that can leverage new and significant resources for the project. These resources could consist of cash and noncash contributions such as technologies, products, patents, training, and other assets that the private sector might possess. The United States Agency for International Development’s Global Development Alliance program has successfully formed partnerships with hundreds of private sector actors and leveraged millions of dollars of additional resources for the Agency. USDOL could and should do the same.

This page left intentionally blank.

ANNEXES

This page left intentionally blank.

ANNEX A: EVALUATION SCHEDULE

***Primerero Aprendo* Evaluation Field Site Visits**

February 8 to March 10, 2009

Evaluator 1 (lead evaluator): Michele Gonzalez Arroyo

Evaluator 2: Dan O'Brien

The team will meet together in Managua first, then travel to separate countries, and return to Managua on March 8th to prepare for final de-brief on March 9th. Please see individual itineraries below.

EVALUATION TEAM

Nicaragua

February 8—arrive in Managua from home base

February 9–11—joint meetings in Managua—project staff

February 12–19—visit rural site locations for Nicaragua evaluation

LEAD EVALUATOR

Costa Rica

February 20—travel to Costa Rica

February 21, 23–25—field work in Costa Rica

Honduras

February 26—travel to Honduras

February 27–March 3—Honduras field work

SECOND EVALUATOR

Guatemala

February 20—travel to Guatemala

February 23–27—Guatemala field work

Dominican Republic

February 28—travel to Dominican Republic

March 2–3—meetings in DR

EVALUATION TEAM

El Salvador

March 4—travel to El Salvador

March 4–6—meetings in El Salvador

March 7—prepare for debrief

Nicaragua

March 8—travel to Managua

March 9—debrief with project staff on findings

Both return home on March 10

ANNEX B: TERMS OF REFERENCE/EVALUATION QUESTIONS

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for the

Independent Final Evaluation of

Combating Child Labor Through Education in Central America and the Dominican Republic: *Primerero Aprendo*

Cooperative Agreement Number:	E-9-K-4-0045
Financing Agency:	U.S. Department of Labor
Type of Evaluation:	Independent Final Evaluation
Field Work Dates:	February 8, 2009–March 9, 2009
Preparation Date of TOR:	January 2009
Total Project Funds from USDOL Based on Cooperative Agreement:	US\$5,730,000
Vendor for Evaluation Contract:	Macro International Inc., 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 grant and contracts to organizations engaged in efforts to eliminate child labor; and raising awareness about child labor issues.

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has appropriated over \$693 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 as defined by ILO Convention 182. The *Primerero*

Aprendo project was funded in support of the following four major goals, as stated in the USDOL-CARE USA Cooperative Agreement:

1. Raise awareness of the importance of education for all children and mobilize a wide array of actors to improve and expand education infrastructures;
2. Strengthen formal and transitional education systems that encourage working children and those at risk of working to attend school;
3. Strengthen national institutions and policies on education and child labor; and
4. Ensure the long-term sustainability of these efforts.

USDOL reports annually to Congress the number of children withdrawn and prevented by the EI projects. As the EI program has developed, an increasing emphasis has been placed on this goal and ensuring that the data collected by EI grantees is accurate and reported according to USDOL definitions of “withdrawn” and “prevented”. Future EI projects will have an increasing focus on research and data collected on the issue of child labor, with particular emphasis on the quality of baseline data collected by grantees.

The approach of USDOL child labor elimination projects, to decrease the incidence of exploitive child labor through increasing 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. In the appropriations to USDOL for international child labor technical cooperation, the Congress directed most of the funds towards two specific programs (with the exception of fiscal year 2007):

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

Since 1995, the U.S. Congress has earmarked some \$371 million to support the International Labor Organization’s International Program on the Elimination of Child Labor (ILO/IPEC), making the U.S. 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 worst forms of child labor in a set time frame; 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 non-formal education. Most IPEC projects also have a capacity-building component to assist in building a sustainable base for long-term elimination of exploitive child labor.

Child Labor Education Initiative

Since 2001, the U.S. Congress has provided some \$230 million to DOL to support the Child Labor Education Initiative (EI), which focuses on the elimination of the worst forms of child labor through the provision of education opportunities. These projects are being implemented by

a wide range of international and non-governmental organizations as well as for-profit firms. The majority EI grants were awarded through a competitive bidding 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 worst forms of child labor in multiple sectors of work specific to a given country.

In addition to these two initiatives, in 2007, USDOL allocated \$60 million for child labor elimination projects not earmarked to ILO/IPEC or the EI program. As is the case with the EI, these funds were awarded through a competitive process. Finally, USDOL has supported \$2.5 million for awareness-raising and research activities not associated with the ILO/IPEC program or the EI.

Combating Child Labor Through Education in Central American and the Dominican Republic, “Primero Aprendo”

On August 16, 2004, CARE USA received a 4-year Cooperative Agreement worth \$5.5 million from USDOL to implement an EI regional project to be implemented in Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua aimed at improving access to quality education as a means of combating exploitive child labor in the region and strengthening government and civil society’s capacity to address the educational needs of working children. CARE USA was awarded the EI project through a competitive bid process. As stipulated in the Cooperative Agreement, the project aimed to support the goals of USDOL’s/ILAB’s Child Labor Education Initiative by designing and implementing creative and innovative approaches to 1) provide educational opportunities (enrollment) for children engaged in, at risk of, and/or removed from child labor, particularly the worst forms; 2) encourage retention in, and completion of educations programs; and 3) expand the successful transition of children in non-formal education into formal schools or vocational programs. The project was modified in September 2006 to receive an additional US\$ 230,000, withdraw or prevent a total of 2,984 children, and be extended to close on March 31, 2009.

II PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The **scope** of the evaluation includes a review and assessment of all activities carried out under the USDOL Cooperative Agreement with CARE USA. The evaluation should assess the achievements of the project toward reaching its targets and objectives as outlined in the cooperative agreement and project document. The evaluation should consider all activities that have been implemented over the life of the project, addressing issues of project design, implementation, lessons learned, reliability and recommendations for future projects.

All EI projects, which are funded through cooperative agreements, are subject to mid-term and final evaluations. The EI project in Central American and the Dominican Republic went into implementation in August 2004 and is due for final evaluation in 2009. The **goals** of the evaluation process are to:

1. Help individual organizations identify areas of good performance and areas where project implementation can be improved;
2. Assist OCFT to learn more about what is or is not working in terms of the overall conceptualization and design of EI projects within the broad OCFT technical cooperation program framework;
3. Assess the degree to which objectives relevant to the country-specific situation they address have been achieved; and
4. Assess progress in terms of children's working and educational status (i.e. withdrawal and prevention from the worst forms of child labor; enrollment, retention, completion of educational programs).

In addition to these overarching goals, the following project-specific goals and questions have been developed in consultation with CARE USA staff:

1. **Purpose of Evaluation.** Inform DOL about the value and effectiveness of regional child labor eradication projects like PA by identifying their accomplishments and limitations, and studying and understanding fully the reasons for those accomplishments and limitations.
2. **Specific Questions.**
To what extent did the project:
 - succeed in being a regional project as opposed to a sum of 6 national projects?
 - create synergies among country programs?
 - succeed in achieving economies of scale in direct interventions?
 - accomplish knowledge generation and dissemination?
 - achieve goals in the area of policy reform advocacy?

For the purpose of conducting this evaluation, Macro International, Inc. will provide highly skilled, independent Evaluation Team to conduct this evaluation to: a) determine if the project achieved its stated objectives and explain why or why not, b) assess the impact of the project in term of sustained improvements achieved, c) identify factors related to the accomplishments and limitations, and d) provide lessons learned to inform future USDOL projects.

The contractor/evaluation team will work with the staff of USDOL's OCFT and relevant CARE USA staff to evaluate the projects in question. The OCFT management and project staff will use the evaluation results to inform the relevance of the approach and strategy that has been undertaken. The evaluation should provide credible and reliable information in order to suggest how to ensure sustainability of the benefits that have been generated.

Specific questions that the evaluation should seek to answer are below, according to six categories of issue:

A. Validity of the Project Strategy/Design

- Was the regional project strategy more effective than having six separate country-level projects? Why or why not?
- Did the project design adequately support the four Education Initiative goals? If so, how? If not, why not?
- Was the project strategy of piloting educational interventions to drive policy reform effective? If so, how? If not, why not?
- How well did the project strategy complement other government programs that focus on combating child labor and ensuring that all children have the right/access to education?
- How well was the project able to effectively monitor its beneficiaries, specifically monitoring both education and work status of the children?
- Did the project adjust its strategy to address the recommendations highlighted in the Midterm Evaluation? Which recommendations were pursued and what were the results? If no action was taken, why not?

B. Impact of Project Implementation

Impact on child labor policies among regional, national and local actors (Purpose).

1. Were the project strategies effective at achieving sustainable policy reform on education and child labor issues? If so, which strategies were most effective at achieving these sustained results and at what levels – regional, national, local?
2. Have key actors advocated for the adoption of the good policies, programs and practices identified by the project?
3. Has the educational system in participating countries been strengthened by the adoption of good policies, programs and practices in order to be more effective in attracting and maintaining working children and adolescents or those at risk of working?

Impact of public awareness efforts (Result 1)

1. Did the public awareness strategies effectively mobilize key actors around the themes of poverty, child labor and education at the regional, national or local level? If so, which strategies were more effective than others and why?
2. Did the public awareness efforts effectively target local parents and teachers and increase their awareness about education and child labor? If so, which strategies were more effective than others and why?
3. Have any of the awareness materials or processes been institutionalized at a national level as part of ongoing efforts to educate the public on child labor issues? If so, which ones and how?

Impact of pilot educational interventions to identify best practices (Result 2)

- Which pilot educational interventions were more successful at keeping children in school and out of exploitive work, and why? Which interventions are promising areas of focus for future USDOL-funded projects?
- Was the “validation” process useful in determining which of those interventions were more effective than others?
- What key external or internal factors in the implementing environment contributed to the effectiveness of the educational interventions?
- How effective was the project in improving educational quality? Can educational quality be measured and what has been its impact, if any, on project common indicators (withdrawal and prevention)?
- Do key stakeholders, such as educators and staff from the Ministries of Education, indicate that the pilots demonstrated progress in educational attainment of the children and are they willing to replicate it on a larger scale?
- Similarly, do the parents believe that their children’s education in the interventions is of better quality and would they like their children to continue their studies?
- Were the educational strategies effective at achieving sustainable impacts on the individual level (e.g., child beneficiaries remain out of exploitive work and in school)?

Impact on dissemination of information among project countries (Result 3)

- How effective was the dissemination of information and lessons among key stakeholders in project countries at creating conditions for sustained dialogue and knowledge?

Impact on the promotion of policy options (Result 4)

- How effective was the project at informing key actors on child labor policy options and were these options helpful in bringing about policy change at the regional, national, and local levels?

C. Sustainability

1. Was the project's initial strategy for sustainability adequate and appropriate? Is sustainability realistic after 4 years of project implementation?
2. What steps have been taken so far to promote sustainability and continuation of education strategies for combating child labor beyond the life of the project? What project results appear likely to be sustained after the project and how?

D. Partnership and Coordination

1. What have been the major successes and challenges of initiating partnerships in support of the project and how have they contributed to supporting policy reform and addressing child labor issues?
2. What have been the major challenges and opportunities, if any, of implementing coordination with key actors from the government (e.g., Ministries of Education, Labor, and others), ILO/IPEC, and local organizations/NGOs that address children's issues?
3. What key elements from government agencies were needed to effectively support the goals of the project?
4. How effective was the project in mobilizing other actors, such as from the business sector, or religious and political leaders, to support policy reform and address child labor issues?

E. Management and Budget

1. Which management areas, including technical and financial, have been successful and which could have been improved?
2. What are the key management challenges in effectively managing and coordinating a regional project in six countries?
3. Did the implementing organization's legal presence and programs (or lack thereof) in the countries prior to award impact project implementation?
4. What are some of the strategies the project pursued to successfully leverage non-project resources?

5. Did the project staff and subcontractors understand DOL definitions of withdrawal and prevention? Was the project able to accurately measure results in terms of DOL common indicators (withdrawal and prevention)?

F. Lessons Learned

- What are the key lessons learned from this project that should be applied to future child labor eradication projects in terms of:
 - Project accomplishments
 - Project weaknesses
 - Sustainability of interventions.

III EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND TIMEFRAME

The following is the proposed evaluation methodology and timeframe. The evaluation will consist of a desk review of key project documents, interviews with project staff and key actors at the national and local levels in Primero Aprendo countries of Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, in addition to conducting focus group interviews with teachers, parents and children at the project sites. The following evaluation methodology is organized according to:

- Evaluation questions
- Data collection methods and tools
- Data analysis
- Key evaluation activities

1. Evaluation Questions

ILAB/OCFT developed a master list of key evaluation questions that is the driver of the Primero Aprendo final evaluation. The evaluation team reviewed the questions and added some of their own which are reflected in the purpose and scope section of this TOR. These questions will be used to develop the key informant interview and focus group guides and protocols.

2. Data Collection Methods and Tools

Document Reviews. During the desk review, the evaluators will read a variety of critical project documents and take notes for later reference during country level interviews. These documents include the following:

- Project document and logframe
- Cooperative Agreement and amendments
- Project work plan
- Midterm evaluation report

- Pilot models (20 models)
- Technical progress reports (Semi-annual reports)
- Project modifications

Key Informant Interviews. The project aimed to work with and influence a range of key actors at the regional, national, and local levels in order to have an impact on child labor policies, programs, and practices. The evaluation team will interview USDOL via phone as part of its key informant interviews. In addition, representatives from the following list are considered to be key informants and will be interviewed during visits to the Aprendo implementing countries.

- Project staff including the project director and national coordinators
- Grupo de Apoyo
- IPEC/ILO and the National Commissions
- Ministries of Education and Labor
- PREAL
- Private sector
- Religious organizations
- NGOs and CBOs, including those in the field of child labor and that were involved in the implementation of the project, such as the subcontractors.
- Project staff of other USDOL-funded child labor projects
- US Embassy officials
- Municipal government officials

Focus Group Interviews. At least one focus group interview will be conducted with parents, teachers, and, where possible, school children in each site visited. Each focus group interview will include between 6 and 12 participants who will be chosen randomly from the beneficiaries available at the time of the interview.

3. Data Analysis

The document reviews, key informant interviews, and focus group interviews will generate a myriad of raw qualitative data. The evaluators will use qualitative data analysis methods, including matrix analysis, to categorize, synthesize, and summarize the raw data captured from interview notes. The data analysis process will be driven and eventually framed by the set of key evaluation questions. The results of the data analysis process will be tangible blocks of information that the evaluation team will use to write the evaluation report.

4. Key Evaluation Activities

The evaluation will consist of the following major cluster areas.

Scheduling interviews. The evaluation team will develop a list of potential interviewees as well as criteria for selecting Aprendo schools and communities to visit. The team will communicate directly with the project director and national coordinators to schedule interviews and field visits.

Desk review. The team will review the list of key project documents noted in #2 above before traveling to the countries. Key issues will be noted and used to ask probing questions during the interviews with project staff and key actors in the project.

Country and Field Visits. The evaluation team will meet in Managua and work together to conduct key informant and focus group interviews in Managua as well as several field visits to schools. The team will use the opportunity to refine the data collection tools and protocols. After Managua, the team will split up. Michele Gonzalez will travel to Honduras and Costa Rica while Dan O'Brien travels to Guatemala and the Dominican Republic. The team will reunite in El Salvador to conduct a series of interviews and prepare for the stakeholder meeting.

The evaluators will visit at least two schools and communities in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Honduras and Costa Rica where Aprendo models were tested and validated. The evaluators will work with the Aprendo staff to select schools that offer the richest lessons regarding what worked well and what did not work as well. Data collection will include key informant interviews with municipal government officials and focus group interviews with parents, teachers, and students.

Stakeholders' Meeting. At the conclusion of the evaluation, the evaluation team will conduct a meeting for key stakeholders in Managua. The key stakeholders include project staff (e.g., the Project Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, and National Coordinators), members of the Grupo de Apoyo, and several other key actors, such as the Vice Ministers of Education in each project country. The evaluators will use the meeting as an opportunity to present the preliminary findings of the fieldwork and solicit feedback as well as obtain additional information from stakeholders. The stakeholders' meeting is an important step in the evaluation process, as it provides an opportunity for the evaluation team to ensure that its preliminary findings and conclusions are well grounded.

Confidentiality

The evaluation mission will observe utmost confidentiality related to information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. In order to ensure freedom of expression and to mitigate any bias during the data collection process, implementing partner staff will not be present during stakeholder interviews.

Timetable and Workplan:

The tentative timetable is as follows.

Tasks	Dates
Desk Review of Project Materials and Interviews with OCFT staff	January 2009
International Travel to Managua	February 8, 2009
Interviews and field visits in Nicaragua	February 8–19
Travel to and interviews and field visits in Guatemala	February 20–28
Travel to and interviews and field visits in Costa Rica	February 20–25
Travel to and interviews and field visits in Honduras	February 26–March 3
Travel to and interviews in the Dominican Republic	February 28–March 3
Travel to and interviews in El Salvador; preparation for the regional stakeholder meeting	March 4–7
Travel to Managua	March 8
Conduct stakeholders' meeting	March 9
Travel to home bases	March 10
Draft Report	Due to Macro: March 25, 2009 Due to USDOL: March 30, 2009
Draft Released to Stakeholders Comments Due from USDOL and Stakeholders	April 1, 2009
Revised Report	Due to Macro: May 1, 2009 Due to USDOL: May 6, 2009

IV EXPECTED OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES

The Evaluation Team will submit to ILAB/OCFT an evaluation report that incorporates the results of the Tasks (outlined in Section III) in the format prescribed by ILAB/OCFT, which includes at minimum the following sections:

- a. Table of Contents
- b. Executive Summary, providing an overview of the evaluation and summary of main findings and recommendations
- c. List of Acronyms
- d. Evaluation Objectives
- e. Methodology of Evaluation
- f. Findings
- g. Lessons Learned and Good Practices
- h. Conclusions

- i. Recommendations
- j. Annexes, including list of interviews/meetings, site visits, documents reviewed, stakeholder workshops' agendas and participants, TOR, etc.

The total length of the regional synthesis report should be no longer than 40 pages, excluding annexes. The organizational format for the presentation of findings, lessons learned, conclusions, recommendations etc. is at the discretion of the evaluation team.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to key stakeholders individually for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate and the evaluation team will provide a response to USDOL 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 evaluation team, the report is subject to final approval by ILAB/OCFT in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR. **The first draft of each report is due to Macro after return from an evaluation mission on March 25, 2009, as indicated in the above timetable, and a final draft is due to Macro on May 1, 2009, after receipt of comments from ILAB/OCFT. All reports including drafts will be written in English.**

V. INPUTS

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

Macro International Inc. or its subcontractors should contact CARE USA, John Trew, Senior Advisor, Education Unit, CARE/Atlanta, Phone: (404) 979-9481 and email: jtrew@care.org to initiate contact with field staff. The primary point of contact for the regional project in Central America and the Dominican Republic is Nick Mills, Project Director, Primero Aprendo, Phone 011 (505) 278-0018, email: Nick.Mills@ca.care.org.

ANNEX C: INTERVIEW TOOLS

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS

PERSONAL DE PRIMERO APRENDO (PA Staff)

A. Validez de la estrategia/diseño del proyecto

1. ¿Fue más eficaz tener un diseño regional en vez de seis proyectos separados por país? ¿Por qué sí o por qué no?
2. ¿Ajustaron la estrategia del proyecto para dirigirse a las recomendaciones mencionadas en la evaluación de medio término? ¿Cuáles recomendaciones tomaron y cuáles fueron los resultados? Si no tomaron acción, ¿por qué no?

B. Impacto de la implementación del proyecto

1. Impacto sobre las políticas del trabajo infantil (Propósito)
 - ¿Fueron eficaces las estrategias del proyecto para lograr reformas políticas sostenibles sobre los asuntos de educación y trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias fueron las más eficaces para lograr estos resultados sostenibles y a qué nivel – regional, nacional, local?
2. Impacto sobre los esfuerzos para sensibilizar al público y actores clave (Resultado 1)
 - ¿Tuvo un impacto las estrategias para sensibilizar a los actores nacionales sobre los temas de pobreza, trabajo infantil y educación? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias de sensibilización fueron más eficaces y por qué?
 - ¿Sirvieron los esfuerzos de sensibilización para aumentar el conocimiento de los actores locales sobre la educación y trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles esfuerzos fueron más eficaces y por qué?
 - ¿Han sido institucionalizados algunos de los materiales o métodos educativos a nivel local o nacional como parte de un esfuerzo continuo para educar al público sobre asuntos del trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles y cómo?
3. Impacto sobre las intervenciones educativas piloto para identificar las buenas prácticas (Resultado 2)
 - ¿Cuáles de las intervenciones educativas fueron las más exitosas para mantener a los niños en la escuela y fuera del trabajo explotador? ¿Por qué? ¿Cuáles intervenciones tienen más potencial de éxito para futuros proyectos financiados por USDOL?

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS—PERSONAL DE PRIMERO APRENDO (cont.)

- ¿Fue útil el proceso de validación para determinar cuáles de las intervenciones fueron las más eficaces? ¿Por qué?
 - ¿Cuáles son los factores clave, externos o internos, durante la implementación que contribuyeron a la eficacia de las intervenciones educativas?
 - ¿Qué tan eficaz fue el proyecto para mejorar la calidad de educación? ¿Se puede medir la calidad de educación? Si es que mejoró la calidad de educación, ¿cuál ha sido el impacto sobre el retiro y prevención del trabajo infantil?
4. Impacto sobre la divulgación de información entre los países participantes (Resultado 3)
- ¿Qué tan eficaz fue la divulgación de información y lecciones aprendidas entre las contrapartes clave del proyecto para crear condiciones que permitieron un diálogo y conocimiento sostenible?
5. Impacto sobre la promoción de opciones políticas (Resultado 4)
- ¿Qué tan eficaz fue el proyecto para informar a los actores clave sobre las opciones políticas del trabajo infantil? ¿Ayudaron a cambiar las políticas a nivel regional, nacional y local?
 - ¿Algunos de los actores clave han adoptado las buenas políticas, programas y prácticas identificadas por el proyecto? ¿Cuáles fueron adoptadas?

C. Sostenibilidad

- ¿Hubo una estrategia de sostenibilidad desde un principio? ¿Fue esta estrategia adecuada y apropiada? ¿Por qué? ¿Fue una meta realística para lograr la sostenibilidad después de 4 años de implementación del proyecto?
- ¿Cuáles pasos se tomaron para promover la sostenibilidad y continuación de las estrategias que fueron parte de este proyecto? ¿Cuáles resultados del proyecto pudieran mantenerse después de finalizar el proyecto? ¿Cómo?

D. Colaboración y coordinación

- ¿Cuáles colaboraciones fueron más importantes? (Ministerios, ONGs, Actores Regionales, sector empresarial, líderes religiosos etc.) ¿Cómo contribuyeron para apoyar la reforma política y dirigirse a los asuntos de trabajo infantil?
- ¿Cuáles fueron los mayores éxitos y desafíos con esta colaboración y coordinación?

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS—PERSONAL DE PRIMERO APRENDO (cont.)

E. Administración y presupuesto

- ¿Cuáles fueron los mayores desafíos para administrar y coordinar un proyecto regional en seis diferentes países?
- ¿Cuáles son algunas de las estrategias que usó el proyecto para lograr otros recursos de apoyo?
- ¿Entendieron el personal y subcontratistas las definiciones del USDOL de retiro y prevención? ¿Pudieron medir precisamente los resultados utilizando estos indicadores (retiro y prevención)?
- ¿Cómo describe el apoyo que recibió el proyecto del USDOL? ¿Cómo se podría mejorar este apoyo?

F. Lecciones aprendidas

1. ¿Cuáles fueron las lecciones aprendidas en este proyecto que pudieran ser aplicadas en futuros proyectos sobre la erradicación del trabajo infantil, incluyendo:
 - logros del proyecto, debilidades del proyecto, sostenibilidad de las intervenciones?

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS

ACTORES REGIONALES y NACIONALES (Regional and National Actors)

A. Validez de la estrategia/diseño del proyecto

- ¿Fue más eficaz tener un diseño regional en vez de seis proyectos separados por país? ¿Por qué sí o por qué no?

B. Impacto de la implementación del proyecto

1. Impacto sobre las políticas del trabajo infantil (Propósito)

- ¿Fueron eficaces las estrategias del proyecto para lograr reformas políticas sostenibles sobre los asuntos de educación y trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias fueron las más eficaces para lograr estos resultados sostenibles y a qué nivel – regional, nacional, local?

2. Impacto sobre los esfuerzos para sensibilizar al público y actores clave (Resultado 1)

- ¿Tuvo un impacto las estrategias para sensibilizar a los actores nacionales sobre los temas de pobreza, trabajo infantil y educación? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias de sensibilización fueron más eficaces y por qué?
- ¿Han sido institucionalizados algunos de los materiales o métodos educativos a nivel nacional como parte de un esfuerzo continuo para educar al público sobre asuntos del trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles y cómo?

3. Impacto sobre las intervenciones educativas piloto para identificar las buenas prácticas (Resultado 2)

- ¿Cree que las intervenciones educativas piloto demostraron progreso en el nivel de educación logrado por los niños? ¿Están dispuestos a replicar estas prácticas en otros lugares?

4. Impacto sobre la divulgación de información entre los países participantes (Resultado 3)

- ¿Qué tan eficaz fue la divulgación de información y lecciones aprendidas entre las contrapartes clave del proyecto para crear condiciones que permitieron un diálogo y conocimiento sostenible?

5. Impacto sobre la promoción de opciones políticas (Resultado 4)

- ¿Qué tan eficaz fue el proyecto para informar a los actores clave sobre las opciones políticas del trabajo infantil? ¿Ayudaron a cambiar las políticas a nivel regional, nacional y local?

C. Sostenibilidad

- ¿Cómo ve el futuro de esta práctica ya que no existe fondos de Primero Aprendo?
¿Existe una manera para mantener esta práctica?

D. Colaboración y coordinación

- ¿Cómo colaboraron con el proyecto? ¿Contribuyó para apoyar la reforma política o dirigirse a los asuntos de trabajo infantil?
- ¿Cuáles fueron los mayores éxitos y desafíos con esta colaboración y coordinación?

E. Lecciones aprendidas

- ¿Cuáles fueron las lecciones aprendidas en este proyecto que pudieran ser aplicadas en futuros proyectos sobre la erradicación del trabajo infantil, incluyendo:
 - logros del proyecto, debilidades del proyecto, sostenibilidad de las intervenciones?

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS—ACTORES LOCALES (Local Actors)

A. REPRESENTANTES DE ONGs/CBOs y GOBIERNOS LOCALES

1. Impacto sobre las políticas del trabajo infantil (Propósito)

Un propósito del proyecto fue promover reformas políticas sostenibles sobre asuntos de educación y trabajo infantil.

- ¿Hubo cambios en las leyes/políticas/reglas locales para combatir el trabajo infantil?
- ¿Piensa que las estrategias del proyecto ayudaron para lograr estas reformas políticas? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias fueron las más eficaces?

2. Impacto sobre los esfuerzos sobre la sensibilización (Resultado 1)

El proyecto implementó varias estrategias para sensibilizar al público.

- ¿Tuvieron algún impacto para promover acción sobre los temas de pobreza, trabajo infantil y educación? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias fueron las más exitosas y por qué?
- ¿Sirvieron para aumentar el conocimiento de los padres de familia y maestros/as sobre la educación y trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias de concientización fueron más eficaces y por qué?
- ¿Han sido institucionalizados algunos de los materiales o métodos educativos a nivel local como parte de un esfuerzo continuo para educar al público sobre asuntos del trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles y cómo?

3. Impacto sobre las intervenciones educativas piloto para identificar las buenas prácticas (Resultado 2)

- ¿Qué tan eficaz fue el proyecto para mejorar la calidad de educación? Si es que mejoró la calidad de educación, ¿cuál ha sido el impacto sobre el retiro y prevención del trabajo infantil?
- ¿Fueron eficaces las estrategias educativas para lograr impactos sostenibles a nivel individual? ¿Cuáles? (Ej: niños beneficiados se mantienen fuera del trabajo explotador y en la escuela.)

4. Impacto sobre la promoción de opciones políticas (Resultado 4)

- ¿Qué tan eficaz fue el proyecto para informarles sobre las opciones políticas del trabajo infantil? ¿Ayudaron a cambiar las políticas locales?

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS—ACTORES LOCALES (cont.)

5. Sostenibilidad

- ¿Cómo ve el futuro de esta práctica ya que no existe fondos de Primero Aprendo?
¿Existe una manera para mantener esta práctica?

B. MAESTROS/AS QUE IMPLEMENTARON LA PRÁCTICA

1. Preguntas generales

- ¿Cuáles fueron los aspectos más fuertes y débiles de la práctica?
- ¿Cree que la práctica brindó beneficios a los niños/as trabajadores y/o sus familias?
Si así fue, ¿cuáles beneficios? Si no, ¿por qué?
- ¿Cuál fue el interés/participación de madres, padres, otros familiares en esta clase?
- ¿Cuáles acciones han hecho los oficiales de escuela motivados por esta práctica?

2. Impacto sobre los esfuerzos para sensibilizar al público (Resultado 1)

- ¿Han sido institucionalizados algunos de los materiales o métodos educativos al nivel local como parte de un esfuerzo continuo para educar al público sobre asuntos del trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles y cómo?

3. Impacto sobre las intervenciones educativas piloto para identificar las buenas prácticas (Resultado 2)

- ¿Cuáles son los factores clave, externos o internos, durante la implementación del proyecto que ayudaron para que resultara más eficaz?
- ¿Fueron eficaces las estrategias educativas para lograr impactos sostenibles a nivel individual? ¿Cuáles? (Ej: niños beneficiados se mantienen fuera de trabajo explotador y dentro de la escuela.)

4. Sostenibilidad

- Ahora que no existe el apoyo de Primero Aprendo, ¿qué va a suceder con esta práctica?

C. MADRES/PADRES DE FAMILIA (cuyos niños/as participaron en el proyecto)

1. ¿Han obtenido beneficios sus hijos/hijas por participar en este proyecto? ¿Cuáles?
2. ¿Cuáles políticas/reglas ha establecido la comunidad o escuela para que sus hijos/as se mantengan en la escuela?

GUÍA DE PREGUNTAS—ACTORES LOCALES (cont.)

3. El proyecto implementó varias estrategias para sensibilizar al público.
4. ¿Sirvieron para aumentar su conocimiento sobre la educación y trabajo infantil? Si así fue, ¿cuáles estrategias tuvieron más impacto y por qué?
5. ¿Realizaron algunas acciones como madres y padres de familia para promover políticas que combaten el trabajo infantil?
6. ¿Piensan que la educación de su hijo/a fue de mejor o peor calidad como parte de este proyecto?
7. ¿Quieren que sus hijos continúen con sus estudios? ¿Por qué?

D. NIÑOS/NIÑAS PARTICIPANTES

1. ¿Qué hicieron en las clases de Primero Aprendo? ¿Les gustaron las actividades y tareas? ¿Por qué sí o no?
2. ¿Qué aprendieron?
3. ¿Cambiaron sus actitudes hacia el trabajo y la escuela después de participar en esta clase? ¿Cómo?
4. ¿Qué quieren ser cuando sean grandes? ¿Cómo van a lograr esta meta?
5. Sólo para los que trabajan: ¿Trabajan más horas, menos horas, o dejaron de trabajar después de su participación en el programa?

ANNEX D: LIST OF PUBLICATIONS REVIEWED

Primero Aprendo Project Publications, 2004–2009

1. Bernal Acevedo, Fabiola y Adriana Figueroa Gómez, “Serie de Investigaciones Aplicadas, El Trabajo Infantil: Sus Causas y Efectos en Comunidades de Nicaragua y Costa Rica”, Managua, 2006.
2. Mills, Nick D., “La Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil a través de la Educación: ¿Mito o Realidad?”, Serie de Investigaciones Aplicadas, Managua, 2008.
3. Pérez, Rafael Angel, “Perfil Psicopedagógico y Social de los Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes Trabajadores Participantes en el Proyecto Primero Aprendo en los Pilotos del Colegio Técnico Profesional de Acosta y en la Escuela de Los Guidos de Desamparados”, San José, junio 2008. (manuscrito)
4. Porta, Emilio, “Sistema de Simulación para la Planificación Educativa. La Experiencia con las Primeras 6 Prácticas”, 2007. (manuscrito)
5. Picardo Joao, Oscar “Salas de Nivelación: Una Experiencia para su Replicación y Sostenibilidad”, San Salvador, 2007.
6. Primero Aprendo, Compendio de Prácticas en América Latina: Educación y Niñez Trabajadora, El Salvador, marzo 2007.
7. Primero Aprendo, “Diez Modelos Educativos Validados en Comunidades Rurales y Periurbanas en Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras y Guatemala”, Managua, agosto 2007.
8. Primero Aprendo, Erradicando el Trabajo Infantil mediante la Educación: Seis Modelos Exitosos y su Guía Básica, enero 2008.
9. Primero Aprendo, “Memoria: 2004-2009”. San José, Costa Rica: 2009.
10. Primero Aprendo, “Modelos Educativos para la Niñez Trabajadora: 14 Perfiles,” Managua, 2008.
11. Primero Aprendo, “Resolución de los Ministros de Educación sobre Trabajo Infantil en Centroamérica; Comunicado de los Obispos: la Educación, un Derecho Inalienable de la Niñez,” Serie de Documentos Clave, Managua, agosto 2007, primera edición.
12. Primero Aprendo, “Resolución de los Ministros de Educación sobre Trabajo Infantil en Centroamérica; Comunicado de los Obispos: la Educación, un Derecho Inalienable de la Niñez; Declaración de Panamá: Trabajo Infantil, Estrategias para su Erradicación; Declaración Empresarial Regional, Serie de Documentos Clave, Managua, agosto 2008, segunda edición.

13. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora en Centroamérica y República Dominicana” (resumen regional), Santiago de Chile, julio 2007.
14. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: Costa Rica”, San José, 2006.
15. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: El Salvador”, San Salvador, 2006.
16. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: Guatemala”, Guatemala, 2006.
17. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: Honduras”, Tegucigalpa, 2006..
18. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: Nicaragua”, Managua, 2006.
19. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, “Opciones Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: República Dominicana”, Santo Domingo, 2006.
20. Primero Aprendo/PREAL, Políticas Educativas para la Niñez Trabajadora: Hacia la Erradicación del Trabajo Infantil en Centroamérica y República Dominicana (colección de análisis nacionales de políticas), Santiago de Chile, julio 2007.
21. Somarriba, Myrna, “La Calidad Educativa y su Efecto en la Retención Escolar de los Niños Trabajadores en los Proyectos Piloto”, Serie de Investigaciones Aplicadas, Managua, 2008.

This page left intentionally blank.

This page left intentionally blank.

ANNEX G: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

APRENDO—Central America and the Dominican Republic “Eradication of Child Labor” Project
Performance Monitoring Plan Last update: 8 February 2005

GOAL: Increased number of child laborers enrolled and retained in and completing educational programs
PURPOSE: The right to education of child laborers translated into policies among key regional, national and local actors.

Performance Indicator	Definition of Terms and Unit of Measurement	Data Source	Data Collection			Data Analysis		Cost
			Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	Type/Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	
Percent of key actors (public institutions, NGO's, private organizations etc.) that have incorporated policies fostered by the project.	<p>Key actors will be monitored at three levels:</p> <p>=><u>Regional</u>: (e.g., CECC)</p> <p>=><u>National</u>: (e.g., Child Labor Commissions, Ministries of Education, Producer Associations.)</p> <p>=><u>Local</u>: (e.g., Parent & teacher groups, municipal organizations, local NGO's)</p> <p><u>Units</u>: Number and percent of target institutions registering the following actions to be scored as:</p> <p>1= Informed 2= Adopted 3= Implementing</p>	Records of participating institutions including their approved resolutions, program activities and funding budgets	<p><u>Regional and National</u>: Baseline inventory of key institutions and annual review of their records, including resolutions and actions taken</p> <p><u>Local</u>: Baseline interviews with school principals and classroom teachers, community leaders and parent/teacher groups.</p>	Baseline survey followed by annual document reviews	<p>RC for regional institutions</p> <p>NCs for national and local institutions</p> <p>RC = Regional Coordinator</p> <p>NCs = National Coordinators</p>	<p><u>Type</u>: Each key actor will be given a policy adoption score as follows:</p> <p>1 Informed 2 Adopted 3 Implementing</p> <p>Key actors' individual scores will be totaled at the regional, national and local levels and compared as a percent to project targets at each of these levels.</p> <p><u>Frequency</u>: Annually for the August report.</p>	M&E Team	Moderate

RESULTS (OUTPUTS)

RESULT 1.0: General awareness is raised among key regional, national and local actors regarding the relationship between education and child labor.

Performance Indicator	Definition of Terms and Unit of Measurement	Data Source	Data Collection			Data Analysis		Cost
			Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	Type/Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	
1.1 Percent of target key actors with increased knowledge of child labor issues and of the need to reach all children with education services.	<p><u>National and local actors</u> include National Commissions, Ministries of Education, Professional Training Schools, Business Associations and NGOs</p> <p><u>Unit:</u> Number of these actors which demonstrate knowledge of the benefits of educating child workers where: No = 0 and Yes =1</p>	Records of participating institutions including their approved resolutions, and funding budgets supplemented by Project administrative records	<p>Verification visits by project staff to participating organizations</p> <p>Documents review of participating organizations annual reports, etc.</p>	Annually beginning one year after the baseline data are compiled for each country	National Coordinators and their organization's M&E staff	<p><u>Type:</u> Summary tables for the six project countries and compared with project targets</p> <p><u>Frequency:</u> Annually</p>	Core Mgt Team assisted as needed by private market research firm	Moderate
1.2 Percent of target key local parent & teacher organizations and community groups that understand the benefits of education efforts aimed at reaching child laborers or children at risk of working.	<p><u>Parent and teacher organizations and community leaders</u> are those with in project areas in participating countries conducting local activities for the benefit of child workers.</p> <p><u>Unit:</u> Number of PTA organizations and community leaders where: No = 0 and Yes =1</p>	Records of participating institutions including their approved resolutions, supplemented by Project administrative records	Knowledge, Attitude and Practices (KAP) surveys by project staff of members of participating organizations.	Annually beginning one year after the baseline data are compiled for each country	National Coordinators and their organization's M&E staff	<p><u>Type:</u> Summary tables for the six project countries and compared with project targets</p> <p><u>Frequency:</u> Annually.</p>	Core Mgt Team assisted as needed by private market research firm	High

RESULT 2.0: Best practices are effectively pilot tested and demonstrated in selected locations of participating “laboratory countries” - Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.

Performance Indicator	Definition of Terms and Unit of Measurement	Data Source	Data Collection			Data Analysis		Cost
			Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	Type/Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	
2.1 <u>Enrollment</u> of children 6-15 in project-sponsored pilot programs in the region.	<u>Enrollment</u> as defined by DoL core indicators to include students registered each year; <u>Units:</u> number of <u>student enrollees</u> in 6-15 age groups.	<u>To be determined during baseline data collection to be either: direct: student tacking or indirect</u> from official MOE statistics	Requests by ARPENDO to MOE for either: official data; or for permission to directly track and monitor individual student progress.	Whenever available from data sources	National Coordinators working with their implementing organization's M&E unit staffs in laboratory countries	<u>Type: Numbers of enrollees will be compared to baseline year.</u> <u>Frequency:</u> Annually	M&E Team	High
2.2 <u>Retention</u> of children 6-15 years in project-sponsored pilot programs in the region.	<u>Retention</u> as defined by DoL core indicators to include students who advance to the next grade level. <u>Units:</u> number of student retainees in 6-15 age groups.	<u>To be determined during baseline data collection to be either: direct: student tacking or indirect</u> from official MOE statistics	Requests by ARPENDO to MOE for either: official data; or for permission to directly track and monitor individual student progress.	Whenever available from data sources	National Coordinators working with their implementing organization's M&E unit staffs in laboratory countries	<u>Type: Numbers of retainees will be compared to baseline year.</u> <u>Frequency:</u> Annually.	M&E Team	High
2.3 <u>Completion</u> of children 6-15 years in project-sponsored pilot programs in the region.	<u>Completion</u> as defined by DoL core indicators to include students who graduate from primary and secondary education programs. <u>Units:</u> number of <u>student graduates</u> in 6-15 age groups.	<u>To be determined during baseline data collection to be either: direct: student tacking or indirect</u> from official MOE statistics	Requests by ARPENDO to MOE for either: official data; or for permission to directly track and monitor individual student progress.	Whenever available from data sources	National Coordinators working with their implementing organization's M&E unit staffs in laboratory countries	<u>Type: Numbers of graduates will be compared to Obaseline year.</u> <u>Frequency:</u> Annually	M&E Team	High

RESULT 3.0: Conditions are created for stimulating sustained dialogue and knowledge sharing among project countries.

Performance Indicator	Definition of Terms and Unit of Measurement	Data Source	Data Collection			Data Analysis		Cost
			Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	Type/Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	
3.1 Percent of key actors sharing information about ways to increase education opportunities for child laborers.	<u>Institutions</u> include those organizations that send or receive information more than once a year. <u>Unit:</u> Number of key actors at the regional, national and local levels as share of target number to be reached by the project.	Project records and M&E Team verification visits	Verification visits by project staff to participating institutions.	Annually in preparation for the August Technical Report	Regional Coordinator in cooperation with National Coordinators	<u>Type:</u> Tabulation of key institutional actors by type and country or region. <u>Frequency:</u> Annually for the August Report	Core Mgt Team	Moderate
3.2 Numbers of 'hits' on the project website.	<u>"Hits"</u> defined as electronically recorded visits by outside internet users to the project website homepage or other pages. <u>Unit:</u> Number of "hits" or visits to at least two website web pages	Project records	Web-based statistics on frequency of website hits.	Recorded at time a qualifying event (web site hit) occurs	National Coordinator responsible for implementing Result #3 activities related to information mgt and sharing	<u>Type:</u> Tabulation of events by type by country <u>Frequency:</u> Annually for the August Report	Core Mgt Team	Low
3.3 Number of participants in project-sponsored information sharing events.	<u>Participants</u> are those who register their name and affiliation at time of event. <u>Unit:</u> Number of individual participants registered at APRENDO- sponsored or supported events.	Project and sponsoring institution records	Review of records of registration of participants at project- sponsored and related events.	Collected at time a qualifying event occurs	Regional Coordinator in cooperation with National Coordinators	<u>Type:</u> Tabulation of key institutional actors by type and country or region. <u>Frequency:</u> Annually for the August Report	Core Mgt Team	Moderate

**RESULT 4.0: An appropriate policy options agenda is developed and promoted
among selected key institutional actors in each of the participating countries and regionally.**

Performance Indicator	Definition of Terms and Unit of Measurement	Data Source	Data Collection			Data Analysis		Cost
			Method of Data Collection	Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	Type/Frequency	Person or Entity Responsible	
4.1 Percent of key institutional actors with policy reforms on their agendas for decision-maker consideration.	<p><u>Key institutional actors</u> include those organizations involved in benefiting child laborers; <u>policy reform agenda</u> as defined by consultant and project core team.</p> <p><u>Unit:</u> Number of key institutional actors expressed as a share of the target number to be reached by the end of project implementation.</p>	Key actors' records and verification visits by M&E Team	Organizational assessment by outside consultant and utilization of project records and field visits	Annually in preparation for the August Technical Report	Outside consultant for baseline and Regional and National Coordinators for periodic updating.	<p><u>Type:</u> Consultant guided institutional policy analysis</p> <p><u>Frequency:</u> Tabulation every two years for each institution, scored on degree to which a policy agenda is in place</p>	Core Mgt Team	Moderate
4.2 Number of key institutional actors implementing reform policies.	<u>Unit:</u> Number of key institutional actors.	Key actors' records and verification visits by M&E Team	Review of project records and field visits	Annually in preparation for the August Technical Report	Regional and national coordinators.	Tabulation every year on degree to which policies are being implemented.	Core Mgt. Team	Low

This page left intentionally blank.

ANNEX H: SUSTAINABILITY MATRIX

Sustainability Matrix for Project Primero Aprendo, E-9-K-4-0045

Date initially prepared: 19 SEPT. 2008

Date of this version 19 SEPT. 2008

<i>Project Component</i>	<i>Conditions for Sustainability</i>	<i>Further action by institutions and partners involved</i>	<i>Process for monitoring progress on the sustainability elements</i>	<i>Status on the sustainability elements</i>
1. Theme of child labor and education included on the permanent agenda of the CECC.	Agenda with the theme included is formally approved by Ministers of Education.	Ministers actively pursue discussion and implementation of the agenda and work to improve educational conditions for child workers in accordance with Ministerial Resolution of April 2006.	Monitoring through direct contact with CECC leadership, and secondarily, with Ministers in individual countries.	CECC leadership has agreed to bringing the issue before the Ministers at the next CECC meeting.
2. Grupo de Apoyo (GdA) incorporated and operating under its own leadership.	GdA has adopted and approved a structure of operation that includes selection of leadership and means of replacing leaders.	PA continues to support and encourage till project end; afterwards, GdA leadership, which is made up of committed people, will assume responsibility for continuation of this activity.	Monitored through direct contact with GdA coordinator, and with individual members in the countries. The matter of GdA independence and continuance will be emphasized in correspondence with GdA members, and through a regional meeting at which the issue of sustainability will be the centrepiece.	Regular communication with GdA is maintained, informing them of project developments. CNs likewise engage country members of the GdA in activities related to the project in the individual countries. In other words, to date, the GdA still exists as an identifiable entity.

Project Component	Conditions for Sustainability	Further action by institutions and partners involved	Process for monitoring progress on the sustainability elements	Status on the sustainability elements
3. Validated PA educational practices adopted, funded, and being implemented.	Formal documentation (policy statement, decree, etc.) exists that enunciates the entity's intentions to implement and fund practices.	Ministries and/or private entities adopting practices proceed to plan, budget, and execute practices.	Monitored through written ministerial decrees or agreements with private agencies.	1. Min. of Education in Honduras has decreed the adoption of Niño Tutor nationwide for working children. 2. ONG Conrado de la Cruz in Guatemala, and private foundation Fundación Uno in Nicaragua have signed agreement to adopt and implement EDUCOMUN and Espacios para Crecer respectively.
4. Child worker monitoring and protection policies and guarantees of education are developed and implemented.	Formal decrees are issued and budgets assigned for policy implementation.	Municipal governments follow through with appropriate actions to ensure the proposed decree is deliberated and approved by the municipal council.	Monitored through direct and regular contact with target municipalities. The promulgated decree is the relevant document for determining sustainability.	Six municipalities in Honduras have issued ordinance requiring monitoring of child labor in their jurisdictions and have budgeted funds to implement the ordinances.