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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Description

In October 2008, COL and UNICEF formally agreed to collaborate on a project that aims at mainstreaming the CFS models and approaches into Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education Programmes of partner countries. The project covers ten countries: Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Mozambique (now replaced by Trinidad and Tobago), and Zambia on a two year capacity development partnership with COL. The overall goal of the CFS Project is to integrate the principles, modes and methods of the Child Friendly School into all aspects of children’s education and learning. The project aims to promote changes in educational practice that will create a friendly, rich and more qualitative learning environment in terms of its safety and security, sanitation, care and inclusiveness.

This independent evaluation of the CFS Projects in Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana and South Africa was commissioned by the Commonwealth of Learning to assess the effectiveness of the various strategies adopted in the partner countries in mainstreaming the CFS models and approaches and in developing expertise among teachers and other education actors relating to the use of child-centred-teaching methodologies. The focus was on improvements in teaching and learning, gender balancing and inclusiveness at the foundation phase of schooling, especially for vulnerable children and those at risk of not having access to education. The evaluation was conducted from 7th – 19th March, 2011 and involved visits to four out of the ten countries that were part of a two year capacity development partnership with COL aimed at mainstreaming CFS concepts and principles into Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education Programmes.

The visits to the four countries made it possible to gather data on the impact of the strategies adopted by the partner countries. A number of key evaluation questions were raised which provided the basis for the evaluation plan. The focus of the evaluation was on the impact of the CFS strategies on changes in school practices, on professional knowledge and classroom practices of teachers and on the development of expertise in CFS methods and approaches.
**Intended Outputs/Outcomes of the Evaluation**

A wide range of data gathering methods were used to assess how CFS models and approaches were implemented in the four countries; provide data on the extent to which the key objectives of the CFS Projects – materials development and development of expertise among teachers and resource centre personnel – were being achieved. These included surveys, focus group discussions and interviews with Project Officers, Head Teachers, Teacher Educators, Primary School Teachers and other stakeholders in education as well as visits to schools and classroom observations in schools that had participated in the CFS projects. These data gathering methods were aimed at assessing the impact of the CFS strategies in improving the CFS skills of the target beneficiaries across all groups of actors in education and, particularly, primary school teachers and Head Teachers who were in direct contact with school children in the classrooms.

The evaluation concentrated on core indicators that were most relevant and immediate to COL-UNICEF CFS Project in the 4 countries. It was designed to measure the input and outcome indicators of the CFS project as described below:

**Input indicators**: identification and description of COL-UNICEF investment in both materials development and training resources in the 4 partner countries for the mainstreaming work. The aim was to document and measure baseline inputs to the program, such as the number of master trainers trained and the number of teacher educators trained on CFS concepts, models and approaches, the number of women trained in the capacity building workshops, the training manuals developed and the learning resources that were associated with the program and the number of head teachers and resource centre personnel who received training. The evaluation employed surveys of sample of materials, project coordinators, head teachers, teachers and other implementers of the project to determine effective implementation of the project. Data collected from these surveys allowed for comparison of accomplishments with general goals contained in the project documents.

**Output indicators**: since the CFS project was designed as a model for professional growth, recognizing that teachers would provide more effective learning opportunities for children when they could draw upon a broad repertoire of teaching and assessment
strategies in an inclusive, child-centred, activity-based, group-oriented, and cooperative learning context, the input indicators were measured both as a baseline variable and as an outcome. The teacher impact was assessed directly through quantitative surveys, focus groups discussions, interviews and classroom observations. The assessment at this level focused on teacher outcomes such as development of teachers’ skills and knowledge and use of new pedagogical approaches, as well as improved mastery of content and attitudes toward CFS as a result of the training received. The implementation approaches used in the 4 countries were examined in terms of their efficacy to create teachers’ CFS preparedness in terms of increasing their pedagogical knowledge and improving their classroom practice.

In addition to the cognitive measures of learning, the evaluation also assessed the affective consequences of the capacity building programs in the 4 countries, including the value that the target beneficiaries placed on the training they received, their motivation and attitudes about the CFS initiatives, their satisfaction with the training programs, as well as, their self-perception on their capacity to implement the child-centred pedagogical approaches and instructional methods expected in a child-centred school as a result of the training they received. These indicators were assessed through surveys, focus group discussions with teachers and through surveying school administrators and education resource centre personnel.

Another aspect of the evaluation focused on the lessons learned from the experiences of the partner countries in the implementation of the projects. The main aim here was to identify the main strong points of the project activities and collaborative processes, as well as possible weaknesses which needed to be addressed. Both the project coordinators and the participants in the projects were involved in series of critical postmortem analyses of the projects, identifying strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats using the SWOT analysis technique.

**Purpose of the Evaluation**

The main purpose of the evaluation was to provide COL with evidence-based information about the effectiveness of the CFS strategies employed by partner countries in developing expertise relating to CFS concepts and principles. The focus was on identifying the key
elements that had been crucial to the success of the projects, which could serve as models for other countries intending to mainstream CFS into their teacher education curricula.

Implementation of the CFS Projects

Through a review of background documents and work plans for the CFS projects in the four countries, the main activities and strategies employed were identified. While the range of activities and the levels of implementation varied across the four countries, four main strands of the CFS projects were identified. The activities undertaken in the four countries visited included:

- vision building and advocacy
- review of both pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula,
- the development of Training-the-Trainer (TOT) Manuals,
- capacity building and training of key stakeholders.

The processes of implementation of the CFS projects in the four countries consisted of four main approaches/strategies that have been crucial to the success of the projects: the school as a fortress (Inqaba) approach, integrative approach, the life skills infusion approach and the direct infusion approach. The combination of these four approaches with high quality face-to-face training workshops had helped to create a highly effective strategy for mainstreaming the CFS concepts and approaches into the teacher education curricula of the partner countries and building the capacity of Head Teachers, Teacher Educators and other Education Personnel.

Findings

Taken together, there had been many notable achievements in all the four countries. These include:

- Completion of Work plans
- Availability of CFS literature for training teachers and for use as reference materials by them.
• Strengthened teacher educators’, head teachers, TRC managers and other education personnel’s CFS capacity. A total of 870 personnel comprising 369 teacher educators and 501 head teachers, TRC Managers and education officers were trained across the four countries.

• Increased and Broader Regional Participation in CFS

• Enhanced project ownership by partners

• Mainstreaming of CFS into country plans

• Increased awareness of the CFS principles and methods among school teachers and in schools

• Positive impact on Teachers’ professional knowledge and classroom practice.

• Attainment of good gender balancing in the development of CFS expertise.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The CFS Strategy is primarily about enhancing the capacity of existing teachers to meet the needs of all children. Capacity development is by its very nature a process of long duration. This evaluation has shown some of the modest achievements made in improving the knowledge, skills and practices of teachers who benefited from the CFS initiatives.

The recorded successes of the project in terms of wide provision of CFS training and reference materials; capacity building; the increased awareness of the CFS principles and methods among stakeholders; and the sense of project ownership that was engendered will ensure the sustainability of the CFS projects in the four countries. However, it is quite clear that more work needs to be done by the partners in the four countries. It will be important for the partner countries to maintain and replicate/scale up the key elements that have proved crucial to the success of the projects. In this regard, continued investment in building the capacity of more teachers, teacher educators, head teachers and TRC managers etc. is essential for the successful mainstreaming of CFS concepts, principles and models into pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula.
The combination of these two strategies in the implementation processes of the partner countries had been critical to the success of the projects. Classroom observations had shown that teachers were able to employ a variety of teaching approaches to address the diversity of students’ needs. Not only have school children benefited to a considerable degree from this approach as illustrated by the success of the “Local language Approach” at Kgafela Primary School in Botswana, but teachers’ professional knowledge and understanding of effective teaching practices has been significantly enhanced, and their classroom skills improved as indicated by their feedback on the relevance and utility of training they received.

Although this evidence emerged from limited observation of primary school teachers in action, the findings seem to point to the applicability of the Local Language Approach to all levels of education.

In addition, the ongoing cascading of the CFS training to cover hundreds of other stakeholders, especially head teachers and teachers in the four countries will be crucial to the sustainability of the Projects and to the future professional training of all teachers on the CFS principles and approaches. Continued investment in high quality professional development for classroom teachers and Head Teachers will be required.

The work of COL and UNICEF in bringing considerable technical expertise and financial support to the project teams in the four countries had contributed in very important ways to developing the capacity of the project officers in the 4 countries to work effectively with the consultants to develop relevant training materials. The maintenance of these levels of support will be important to the future of the CFS projects in these countries.

**Limitations**

The main limitation of the evaluation activity was linked to time constraint. A part from Botswana where the consultant had three full days to spend on the evaluation exercise, there was not enough time to devote to extensive fieldwork in the other three countries visited. Lack of adequate time for the evaluation thus affected the amount of data that could be gathered through the multiple methods outlined in the evaluation plan. It affected the size of the samples of teachers, teacher educators, head teachers and other education officers for the surveys, structured interviews, focus group discussions and
classroom observations and the amount of time that was spent on each of these evaluation activities. It also affected the number of schools that could be visited.

Nevertheless, the commitment, dedication, and resourcefulness of the project officers in mobilizing people, organizing meetings, and providing logistical support throughout the fieldwork period in each country made it possible to gather as much data as could possibly be gathered within the limited time available. They also helped in filling in some informational gaps that emerged from the surveys, interviews and focus group discussions.

II. PROJECT CONTEXT

The COL-UNICEF Child Friendly Schools Project is a holistic and far reaching undertaking. The pedagogic, environmental, social, legal, health and safety and security implications of the project are enormous and touch on all aspects of the educational life and experience of the child. The overall goal of the CFS Project is to integrate the principles, modes and methods of the Child Friendly School into all aspects of children’s education and learning. The project aims to promote changes in educational practice that will create a friendly, rich and more qualitative learning environment in terms of its safety and security, sanitation, care and inclusiveness. The main vision of the CFS Project is a school where every child has the opportunity to benefit from education and to develop his/her potential to its fullest through a right based, equitable and all inclusive educational experience.

In October 2008, COL and UNICEF formally agreed to collaborate on a project that aims at mainstreaming the CFS models and approaches into Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education Programmes of partner countries. The project covers ten countries: Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Mozambique (now replaced by Trinidad and Tobago), and Zambia on a two year capacity development partnership with COL. This partnership focuses on two main areas of cooperation:

1. “Integrating the CFS model into pre-service and in-service teacher training curricula, training of teachers and other educational personnel on CFS at the universities and teacher training institutions.”
2. “Strengthening the CFS capacity of Teacher Resource Centre Managers, Teacher Educators, Head Teachers and other education personnel.”

The overall goal of the project is the improvement of the quality of education in schools through the promotion of qualitative learning environment (safety and security, sanitation, care and inclusiveness) and child-centered learning-teaching methodologies that emphasize learner participation and inclusion. It is also aimed at enhancing the professional knowledge and classroom practice of teachers and other education personnel.

This evaluation is limited to only four out of the ten participating countries namely, Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana and South Africa. The main purpose of the evaluation was to provide the Commonwealth of Learning with information about the effectiveness of the various strategies adopted in the partner countries in mainstreaming the CFS models and approaches and in developing expertise among teachers relating to the use of child-centred—teaching methodologies.

The starting point for this evaluation was a desk review of project documents and work plans followed by a detailed review of the COL-UNICEF supported CFS projects in the four countries. Through a review of background documents and work plans for the CFS projects in the four countries, the main activities and strategies employed were identified. While the range of activities and the levels of implementation varied across the four countries, four main strands of the CFS projects were identified viz:

- vision building and advocacy
- review of both pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula.
- the development of Training of Trainers Manuals,
- training of teacher educators, ERC/TRC managers, head teachers, other education personnel and key stakeholders,
A. **Intended Outcomes/Outputs**

The evaluation concentrated on core indicators that were most relevant and immediate to COL-UNICEF CFS Project in the 4 countries. It was designed to measure the input and outcome indicators of the CFS project as described below:

**Input indicators**: identification and description of COL-UNICEF investment in both materials development and training resources in the 4 partner countries for the mainstreaming work. The aim was to document and measure baseline inputs to the program, such as:

- the number of master trainers trained and the number of teacher educators trained on CFS concepts, models and approaches,
- the number of women trained in the capacity building workshops,
- the training manuals developed and the learning resources that were associated with the program, and
- the number of head teachers and resource centre personnel who received training.

The evaluation included the analysis of materials developed in the 4 countries, and a survey of project coordinators, head teachers, teachers and other implementers of the project to determine effective implementation of the project. Data collected from these surveys allowed for comparison of accomplishments with general goals contained in the project documents.

**Output indicators**: since the CFS project was designed as a model for professional growth, recognizing that teachers would provide more effective learning opportunities for children when they could draw upon a broad repertoire of teaching and assessment strategies in a child-centred, activity-based, group-oriented, and cooperative learning context, the input indicators were measured both as a baseline variable and as an output. The teacher impact was assessed directly through quantitative surveys, focus groups discussions, interviews and classroom observations. The assessment at this level focused on teacher outcomes such as development of teachers’ skills and knowledge and use of new pedagogical approaches, as well as improved mastery of content and attitudes.
toward CFS as a result of the training received. The implementation approaches used in the 4 countries were examined in terms of their efficacy to create teachers’ CFS preparedness in terms of increasing their pedagogical knowledge and improving their classroom practice.

In addition to the cognitive measures of learning, the evaluation also assessed the affective consequences of the capacity building programs in the 4 countries, including the value that the target beneficiaries placed on the training they received, their motivation and attitudes about the CFS initiatives, their satisfaction with the training programs, as well as, their self-perception of their capacity to implement CFS approaches and models including the child-centred pedagogical approaches and instructional methods expected in a child-centred school as a result of the training they received. These indicators were assessed through surveys, focus group discussions with teachers and through surveying school administrators and education resource centre personnel.

Another aspect of the evaluation focused on the lessons learned from the experiences of the partner countries in the implementation of the projects. The main aim here was to identify the main strong points of the project activities and collaborative processes, as well as possible weaknesses which needed to be addressed. Both the project coordinators and the participants in the projects were involved in series of critical postmortem analyses of the projects, identifying strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats using the SWOT analysis technique.

B. The Evaluation Questions

The evaluation was guided by the following key questions:

1. To what extent have the participating countries mainstreamed Child-Friendly Schools models and approaches into their pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula?

2. How many master trainers are trained by each country?

3. How many teacher educators and ERC personnel are trained in each country on CFS concepts, models and approaches?
4. How many women are trained in the capacity building workshops in each country?

5. To what extent are the Work Plans developed by the 4 countries participating in the project implemented?

6. What are the processes of mainstreaming CFS in the teacher education curricula of the participating countries?

7. Which key elements of the implementation processes have proved effective?

8. What are the challenges encountered and the lessons learned from the experiences of each of the participating countries in the implementation of the project?

9. To what extent are the set goals and objectives of the CFS project attained in the participating countries?

10. What are the Project outcomes that were achieved in the four countries?

C. The Evaluation Plan

To address these key questions, an evaluation plan was developed based on a framework that linked the key questions to the core concepts and indicators that were most relevant and immediate to COL-UNICEF CFS Project in the 4 countries. The evaluation process used survey, key-informant interviewing, focus group discussion and classroom observation to gather data from diverse sources to measure the inputs and outputs of the CFS projects in terms of their efficiency, effectiveness and impact.

An evaluation matrix was developed to guide the evaluation process and clarify the key elements in the evaluation strategy.
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Indicator/Parameter</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of the resources available in terms of money, time, materials, training, etc. for the CFS project.</td>
<td>Desk review of CFS Project documents, internal reports and interviews with project officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process:</strong> Efficiency (mainly implementation efficiency)</td>
<td>Analysis of the implementation stages: processes of materials development and training of teachers and resource centre personnel, facilities in the pilot sites</td>
<td>Data on materials, training and trained teachers, ERC personnel and facilities available for CFS in the participating countries, workshop reports, focus group discussions, surveys and interviews.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Output:** Likely effectiveness | Assessment of Child Friendly Schools (CFS) projects in four selected countries in terms of attainment of set goals and objectives as well as the successes recorded. | • Meetings with government officials, Project Officers, Teachers, ERC Personnel, etc.  
• Classroom observations in selected schools under the CFS Project in the sampled countries.  
• Focus Group Discussion to identify implementation bottlenecks. |
| **Impact:**                    | Partly subjective analysis using without-project scenarios and comparable Child Friendly Schools (CFS) projects | • Review of internal documents  
• Interviews with stakeholders  
• Field study (focus group discussions, surveys, interviews and classroom observations). |
| **Likely sustainability**     | Analysis of mechanisms put in place for the sustainability of the project in the participating countries. | • Institutional analysis to assess sustainability potential.  
• Analysis of existing structures and policy networks that may influence sustainability of the CFS projects. |
D. Activities Implemented to Achieve Outputs/Outcomes

The following five main activities were implemented in mainstreaming the CFS models and approaches:

1. Development of CFS Training Materials

This activity consisted of the development of training manuals for both pre-service and in-service teacher educators. The objective of this activity was to adapt the UNICEF, New York CFS Manual by contextualizing its contents to reflect the local contexts within the participating countries without tempering with its real essence. The main goal of the adaptation was to domesticate the concepts and principles in a way that local users could readily understand and appreciate them. The adaptation exercise in the four countries followed a similar pattern: First, it started with the engagement of consultants who led the processes of adaptation and manual writing for both the pre-service and in-service groups. These consultants were appointed by COL to provide support to the country technical teams in developing materials such as training manuals, course modules, Standards and Indicators Frameworks etc.

While this arrangement worked very well in some countries (Botswana and Swaziland), Lesotho and South Africa experienced initial hitches which caused delays in the take off of the projects. In Lesotho for example, there was an initial problem of lack of control of the project by the project team at the Lesotho College of Education because the lead consultant was not reporting to the Academic Programmes Director who was the head of the project team. It was claimed that the consultant was appointed without consultation with the team. In South Africa, on the other hand, the consultant left the project midstream following her obtaining a better offer elsewhere. This stalled the progress of the project for quite some time before an appropriate replacement could be made.

The second step in the adaptation process entailed the identification and appointment of the facilitators for the development of the modules who were then invited to writers workshops for the actual manual writing. At the third and final step the draft manuals
were critiqued and revised by other experts at a workshop for the production of final drafts of the manuals. The consultants in collaboration with the projects’ technical teams did the final editing of the draft manuals before submitting copies to COL for comments. Once approved, the edited draft manuals were made ready for the capacity building workshops that followed.

In addition to the training manuals, other CFS materials including implementation standards (Botswana and Swaziland), M & E Tools (Lesotho) and course modules (South Africa) were developed through the same processes as part of the CFS initiatives in the four countries.

2. **Development of CFS Capacity**

The CFS initiatives were conceived as models for professional growth, for teacher educators, head teachers, teacher resource managers, classroom teachers and, indeed, all actors in education. From inception therefore, the initiatives were planned to develop teachers’ expertise in CFS principles and methods in order to improve the learning opportunities for all children. Capacity building of key stakeholders in education was a major activity in the CFS strategies of the four countries.

As a result of this emphasis, considerable CFS awareness raising and capacity building involving 1007 Teacher Resource Centre Managers, Education Officers, Head Teachers, Teacher Educators and other Education Officers across the four countries through over 41 workshops of 2 - 5 days duration spread across several weeks in some cases up to four weeks (Lesotho) had taken place over the period under review.

3. **Curricula Reviews**

Another major CFS strategy in the four countries was the review of both pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula to infuse the CFS concepts, principles and approaches into them. All four countries had embarked on this review and were at different stages of completion. Botswana, Swaziland and South Africa had completed the review of their curricula while Lesotho was about to start its own cycle of review of its pre-service teacher education curriculum.
4. **Advocacy**

Advocacy and sensitization workshops were a feature of the CFS strategy in the four countries. In Lesotho for example, a total of 50 participants attended a sensitization workshop organized for Heads of Departments of the Lesotho College of Education and the National University of Lesotho in June, 2010. In South Africa, the University of Limpopo held an advocacy meeting attended by 11 participants, including the representatives of six regional universities to sensitize them on the CFS initiatives in teacher education. Both Botswana and Swaziland held similar workshops at the onset of their projects with different stakeholders. The underlying aim of these advocacy meetings and workshops was to generate sufficient interest in and support for the CFS projects among the different groups of stakeholders.

5. **Baseline Studies**

All the four countries engaged in baseline studies involving close scrutiny of their existing teacher education curricula with a view to identifying gaps vis-à-vis CFS principles, concepts, and approaches. This was preparatory to embarking on the development of supplementary materials that both addressed the CFS gaps, as well as contextualized CFS concepts, models and principles in the respective countries.

E. **Partners Involved**

The key partners in the CFS projects were the Commonwealth of Learning, UNICEF, Ministries of Education of the partner countries, University of Limpopo and the Lesotho College of Education. In addition to these key players, the evaluation revealed increasing numbers of partners and partnerships for the CFS projects in the four countries. The project focal persons within each country had established links with a number of other relevant organizations and institutions dealing with basic education and other CFS related matters such as the Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Justice, Local Government Education Authorities, Universities, Teachers Unions, Parents Teachers Associations, NGOs, and other UN Agencies dealing with children’s issues. These linkages made regular communication and monitoring of the CFS activities easier and very effective.
F. Limitations of the Evaluation

The main limitation of the evaluation activity was linked to time constraint. Apart from Botswana where the consultant had three full days to spend on the evaluation exercise, there was not enough time to devote to extensive fieldwork in the other three countries visited. The visit to Swaziland was shortened by a day to avoid being caught up by the national holiday in Lesotho leaving a mere one and a half days for the fieldwork. Thus, much of the data from Swaziland had to be gathered on the day the consultant arrived the country. Fortunately, the consultant arrived early on the morning of 8th March, 2011 so the whole of that day was devoted to data gathering through interviews and focus group discussions with the in-service group at the William Pitcher College of Education and the Teacher Educators group drawn from three Colleges of Education across the regions and with a group of Education Specialists at the UNICEF Country Office.

This first day was thus spent shuttling back and forth between Manzini and Mbabane. The first half of the second day was spent in the same way punctuated intermittently by a meeting with the country’s CFS focal person, Mr. Peter Dlamini and his project staff at the Ministry of Education, focus group discussion with the Regional Coordinators of the project at the Castle Hotel and interviews with a lecturer in the Language Department of the Southern Africa Nazarene University and the Head Teacher of the Beaufort Nazarene Primary School. Due to time constraint, this last interview had to be conducted on phone because the consultant had to leave for the airport by 12 noon to catch the flight to Lesotho. As a result, many of the scheduled activities had to be rushed through and some shelved completely for lack of adequate time.

Similar scenarios played out in Lesotho and South Africa where, indeed, only a full day each was spent on the evaluation exercise. The consultant arrived in Lesotho in the evening of Wednesday 9th March, 2011, but because of a national holiday in the country on Friday 11th March, 2011, the evaluation exercise could only take place on Thursday, 10th March, 2011. South Africa was the last port of call for the fieldwork and was affected by the flight itinerary of the consultant which left only a full day to be spent at the Limpopo University.
Lack of adequate time for the evaluation thus affected the amount of data that could be gathered through the multiple methods outlined in the evaluation plan. It affected the size of the samples of teachers, teacher educators, head teachers and other education officers for the surveys, structured interviews, focus group discussions and classroom observations and the amount of time that was spent on each of these evaluation activities. It also affected the number of schools that could be visited.

Nevertheless, the commitment, dedication and resourcefulness of the project officers in mobilizing people, organizing meetings, and providing logistical support throughout the fieldwork period in each country made it possible to gather as much data as could possibly be gathered within the limited time available. They also helped in filling in some informational gaps that emerged from the surveys, interviews and focus group discussions.
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III. Monitoring and Evaluation Purposes

The main purpose of the evaluation was to provide COL with evidence-based information about the effectiveness of the CFS strategies employed by partner countries in developing expertise relating to CFS concepts and principles. The focus was on identifying the key elements that had been crucial to the success of the projects, which could serve as models for other countries intending to mainstream CFS into their teacher education curricula.
A. Monitoring and Evaluation Design and Implementation

1. The Fieldwork

The main fieldwork for this evaluation took place from 7th to 18th March, 2011. A wide range of data were collected through surveys, focus group discussions, interviews, school visits and classroom observations. Trends that emerged from the survey of Head Teachers, Teacher Educators, Teacher Resource Centre Managers and other education personnel were further investigated in the visits to selected schools through interviews with Primary School Teachers and classroom observations. Over the course of the evaluation, classroom observations were conducted in selected primary schools in at least four classrooms in Botswana. These observations were crucial in measuring the impact of the CFS projects on the teachers’ professional knowledge and practice. However, as the evaluation took place over a very short period, it was not possible to observe more teachers in action or sample the opinions of more classroom teachers on the CFS projects. Nevertheless, the limited data collected was used to corroborate the teachers’ responses obtained during interviews and focus group discussions. All data gathering methods were designed to take account of the main objective of the CFS Project to improve the CFS knowledge and skills of the different groups of education actors, especially classroom teachers who are in direct contact with young children on a daily basis.

Interviews with Education Officers of the UNICEF Country Offices in Swaziland and South Africa during the visits also provided further insights into the implementation of the CFS projects in the two countries.

2. Data Gathering

A wide range of data gathering methods were used to assess the implementation of the CFS project in the four countries and generate data on the extent to which the key objectives of the CFS Projects – materials development and capacity development of teacher educators, Resource Centre Managers and other education personnel – were being achieved. These included surveys, focus group discussions and interviews with Project officers, head teachers, teacher educators, primary school teachers and other stakeholders in
education as well as visits to schools and classroom observations in schools that had participated in the CFS projects.

At the commencement of the evaluation, a series of telephone conversations with the Education Specialist at COL and content analysis of the country work plans and project contract agreement documents enabled the evaluator to identify the main components of the CFS projects in the partner countries and the objectives they were meant to achieve. All data gathering methods were designed to take account of the main intention of the CFS projects to improve the CFS skills of the target beneficiaries across all groups of actors in education, particularly primary school teachers and Head Teachers who were in direct contact with school children in the classrooms.

As the evaluation took place over a very short period, it was impossible to collect data from many of the intended target beneficiaries of the projects, or over a long period of time. This necessitated the use of multiple data gathering methods to allow for triangulation of data. Hence, data collected from surveys were matched against responses elicited through focus group discussions, interviews, or classroom observations to check consistencies and or contradictions. The use of multiple data gathering methods also made it possible to gather more data than could possibly be gathered through the use of a single method. This further enriched the context from which conclusions were drawn about the CFS strategies in the four countries.

3. The survey

A major task in the evaluation was the administration of a structured survey questionnaire to gather evidence on the extent of project implementation and impact over time. The survey questionnaire was administered to teacher educators, Teacher Resource Centre Managers, head teachers and other Education Officers during the course of the fieldwork visits to each of the four countries. The same questionnaire was administered to all the different groups since many of the questions and scales contained in the instrument were common to all the groups.

The questionnaire had a mixture of multiple choice items and open ended questions designed to elicit insights into changes in knowledge and understanding as well as in
classroom practices, which the respondents could attribute to the training they received on CFS as part of the projects. The questionnaire included questions that probed into the respondents’ perceptions of the relevance and appropriateness of the CFS initiatives, of their level of understanding of CFS and on whether they felt the CFS training they received made any difference in the way they taught their subjects.

The questionnaire also included items for assessing the levels of use of teaching and learning methodologies promoted by the CFS initiatives as well as the challenges the respondents faced in applying such principles and methods in their schools and classrooms. In this regard, they were asked to list the new things they learned from the training and how they were applying their new knowledge in their classrooms. These questions were of particular interest in that they were designed to yield insights into changes in teaching practices resulting from the CFS initiatives.

4. Focus Group Discussions (FGD)

In order to gather first-hand data about the CFS initiatives and to compare their written with their oral responses in two different circumstances, the same groups of respondents were engaged in focus group discussions to track changes in practice as a result of the CFS initiatives. A sample of 41 Teacher Educators, 17 Head Teachers and 6 In-service Officers across the four countries participated in 7 focus group discussion sessions during the period of fieldwork.
A list of interview questions was developed for the FGDs with these categories of respondents. Each FGD session was designed to gather data relevant to the key evaluation questions, vis-à-vis the particular role of the group in respect to the CFS initiatives. The groups were sometimes exclusive of other categories as can be seen in the picture above of FGD session with teacher educators at the University of Limpopo, while at other times they were mixed. Where the groups were exclusive in composition only questions relating to their particular kind of involvement in the CFS initiatives were asked. Where the groups were mixed, efforts were made to ensure that questions relating to the particular concerns of the various groups present were included in the group discussions. All questions, however, were aimed at determining the extent to which their CFS capacity i.e. professional knowledge, confidence and classroom skills have been enhanced by the project.

5. **Structured Interviews and Classroom Observations**

In consultation with the Project Officers in Swaziland and Botswana, 10 primary school teachers (three were Head Teachers) were interviewed on their awareness of the CFS initiatives and their impact on their classroom practices. All the 10 respondents confirmed their awareness of the projects through their head teachers who conducted sensitization workshops on CFS for them. Assessment of impact at this level was conducted by means of in-depth interviewing of the teachers using the same set of questions the other categories of respondents were asked during the focus group discussions and observations of 4 of them in action in their classrooms. Classroom observations were conducted with the full consent of the head teachers and the Project officers.

As was the case with FGD sessions, each interview schedule was designed to gather information relevant to the key evaluation questions, taking account of the particular perspective of the interviewee. For example, the principal was a key informant on target setting, and school plans for institutionalizing CFS in their schools, while the classroom teachers were asked to provide information on their classroom practices, and the ways in which they engaged in collaborative planning with their colleagues, school management and the local community.
IV. Findings

A. The Implementation of the CFS Projects

Data collected through interviews and focus group discussions during the country visits about how the CFS projects were implemented in the four countries indicated that:

1. The four countries had elaborate and clearly identifiable CFS Work Plans and had made substantial progress in implementing them.
2. Focal points with reporting responsibilities had been appointed in each of the countries.
3. Three countries (Botswana, Swaziland and South Africa) had regional plans and strategies for cascading the CFS Projects.
4. All the four countries had almost accomplished the targets and expected outputs set out in their work plans.
5. The country project officers had worked collaboratively with relevant stakeholders and consultants in developing the training manuals and in the conduct of the training workshops.
6. Considerable CFS awareness raising and capacity building had taken place across the four countries. A total of 1007 Teacher Resource Centre Managers, Education Officers, Head Teachers, Teacher Educators and other Education Officers across the four countries through over 41 workshops of 2 - 5 days duration spread across several weeks in some cases up to four weeks (Lesotho) had taken place over the period under review.
7. 50% of the trained personnel in each of the four countries were women illustrating a satisfactory gender balance in the development of expertise relating to the CFS principles and methods.
8. In Swaziland, Botswana & South Africa, the trained Master Trainers had cascaded the training to well over 650 head teachers and teachers across the country.
9. The processes of implementation of the CFS projects in the four countries consisted of four main approaches/strategies that have been crucial to the success
of the projects: the “Inqaba” approach, integrative approach, the life skills infusion approach and the direct infusion approach. The combination of these four approaches with high quality face-to-face training workshops had helped to create a highly effective strategy for mainstreaming the CFS concepts and approaches into the teacher education curricula of the partner countries and building the capacity of Head Teachers, Teacher Educators and other Education Personnel.

B. Achievement of Intended Outputs/Outcomes

A number of successes had been recorded in the four countries. These include:

- completion of Work plans
- adequate provision of CFS training/reference materials to teacher educators, TRC managers, head teachers and teachers
- strengthened CFS capacity of teacher educators, teachers, TRC managers and other education personnel.
- increased and broader regional participation in CFS
- enhanced project ownership by partners
- mainstreaming of CFS into country plans
- increased awareness of the CFS principles and methods among school teachers and in schools
- positive impact on teachers’ professional knowledge and classroom practice.

Each of these achievements is discussed in turn.

1. Completion of Work Plans

The CFS Work Plans were jointly developed by the Ministries/partner institutions and the Commonwealth of Learning after a series of consultative meetings, conference calls, email communication etc. and the activities therein were based on each country’s experience of CFS implementation and its national and institutional realities and plans.
Although the ultimate goal of mainstreaming CFS into pre-service and In-service teacher education curricula remained the same for all the four countries visited, there are considerable variations in the activities articulated in the Plans. For example, while Botswana started with a review and refinement of existing CFS Standards and Indicators on Teacher Education, Lesotho embarked upon a baseline study of its teacher education curriculum to identify CFS gaps, which needed to be filled in the actual review of the curriculum. It should be noted that the implementation of the Work Plans commenced at different times in the 4 countries sampled for this evaluation. Thus there are variations in terms of progress made in the implementation of the Work Plans and the completion dates.

During the visits in March, 2011, Swaziland, Lesotho and Botswana had completed their materials development and the Training of Trainers (ToT) Workshops. Swaziland and Botswana had cascaded the training to Head Teachers and teachers across regions using additional local resources provided by their Ministries of Education. South Africa, on the other hand, had completed the review of the ACELO curriculum and development of course materials, but was yet to develop the training manuals for the ToT, let alone conduct the training. The project managers were seeking for an extension of time to August 2011 to complete the remaining activities in their work plan including two ToT Manuals (May, 2011), delivery of ToT Workshops (June, 2011) and conduct of the Colloquium (July, 2011).

The delay in the take off of the project in South Africa was attributed to a number of factors ranging from the abrupt exit of the first consultant appointed for the project to red tape-ism causing delays in getting the contract document signed; from delayed response from the appointed critical readers to other competing factors such as the 2010 World Cup competition and the nationwide strike that also affected university lecturers.

A striking feature of the South African work plan was its heavy concentration on materials development to the detriment of capacity building. Recognizing that CFS Strategy is primarily about enhancing the quality of education and the capacity of teachers to meet the needs of all children, it is important that more attention is given to capacity building of teacher educators in the other six regional universities.
2. **Availability of CFS Literature**

All the four countries visited had developed elaborate Manuals for the training of Master Trainers. The manuals are rich in contents and have sufficiently focused on the key principles and concepts of the Child Friendly School. The manuals contain equity-sensitive topics which could work towards promoting greater *inclusion* of women and girls within basic education. Efforts were made in each of the four countries to ensure equal representation of men’s and women’s voices and to rid the manuals of any gender bias either in the use of language or pictures and illustrations. The field study revealed that all the trained head teachers, Teacher Resource Centre managers, teacher educators and other Education Officers who participated in either the Master Trainers’ or the Head Teachers’ workshops organized in the four countries had copies of the training Manuals.

In addition, in Botswana and South Africa where the pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula were reviewed and CFS principles and concepts integrated into course materials (South Africa) both the teacher educators and the pre-service students were provided with rich CFS materials for use in their teaching and learning processes.

In order to gauge the respondents’ views on the manuals, they were asked to rate them in terms of their relevance and usefulness. As can be seen from Figures 1 and 2 below, majority of the respondents felt that the manuals were both relevant and very useful. As attested to by one of them in a focus group discussion:

*“The manuals are good and useful and enable one to reflect on how one operates in the school.”* (Head Teacher, Ikhutseng Primary School, Francistown).

![Fig.1: Respondents' Perception of the Relevance of the Training Manuals](image-url)
3. **Strengthened CFS Capacity**

The training of Master Trainers on CFS concepts and principles among pre-service and in-service teacher educators, head teachers, school inspectors and other education officers was also a common feature of the CFS projects in the four countries. Capacity building of these key stakeholders was included in all the four countries’ work plans reflecting a strong recognition of the central role they could play in the implementation of the CFS projects and the need to incorporate them as part of the strategic response to the challenge of transforming the schools into child friendly educational institutions.

As a consequence of this emphasis, considerable CFS awareness-raising and capacity building had taken place in all the four countries visited. As can be seen in Table 1 below, a total of 870 of these important key players were trained across the four countries. The demographic breakdown of the intervention sample by gender relative to the male population showed that much was being done to support a pro-equity approach to the CFS projects. Of the 870 personnel trained, 500 were females and 370 males. Even this limited data does suggest that the CFS projects in the four countries satisfied one of the primary goals for the CFS project as set out in the PCA in which both COL and UNICEF emphasize the balancing of gender through wider participation of women in all the project activities.
Table 1: Number of Trained Personnel by Country, Category & Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY/PARTNER</th>
<th>EXPECTED</th>
<th>TOTAL (Target was 1,000)</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educators (Pre-In-service)</td>
<td>TRC Personnel, Head Teachers, School Managers &amp; Education Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRC Personnel, Head Teachers, School Managers &amp; Education Officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ views were sought during the focus group discussions and interviews about the impact of the capacity building on their professional knowledge and practice. Their reactions attest to a general feeling of satisfaction with the training programmes. They admitted that the training had exposed them to new skills and strategies for teaching as can be gauged from excerpts from their feedback below:

“It makes me reflect back on the way I do things, in assisting teachers and in offering quality education.” (Teacher Educator in Lesotho).

“The training has revived our teaching skills” (Head Teacher in Botswana).

“We now have a school garden, a counseling room and a feeding programme in my school as a result of the training, which opened our eyes to new roles we can play as teachers.” (Head Teacher in Swaziland in an interview).

“The CFS training was a good step in responding to the needs of the child. It exposes the teacher to the other needs of the child that need to be addressed.” (Deputy Principal, Francistown College of Education).

“We now have better and more qualitative training materials and better insight into how they can be implemented. We were part of the process of developing these materials and have had our skills in module writing improved tremendously.” (Teacher Educator in South Africa).
4. Increased and Broader Regional Participation in CFS

The field study revealed increased and broader regional participation in the CFS activities. At the time of the visit, Botswana had trained 40 Master Trainers across the 10 regions in the country at the rate of 4 Master Trainers per region mostly drawn from Teacher Resource Centres, head teachers, inspectors and the National Curriculum Centre personnel. This crop of Master trainers had helped to cascade the CFS training to 69 head teachers and teachers in 8 regions of the country and 150 Master trainers for the pre-service group drawn from the three Colleges of Education in the country in the week of 21 – 24, March, 2011.

At the University of Limpopo, South Africa, an advocacy meeting involving 11 participants drawn from six universities across the provinces of Gauteng, Limpopo, KwaZulu Natal, Eastern Cape and the Free State was organized to sensitize teacher educators on the project and its objectives preparatory to their training. The aim was to generate sufficient interest in and support for the CFS project among these institutions. Previously, the University, in collaboration with the Provincial Department of Education and a Non-Governmental Organization - the Link Community Development - had conducted CFS training for the School Management Teams in 150 schools in the Limpopo Province using the Manual the University developed for schools.

In Swaziland, regional structures had been put in place in the four regions of Lubombo, Manzini, Shiselweni and Ithohhu each headed by a Coordinator. These regional structures had helped in extending the CFS training to more stakeholders in the regions through workshops and meetings. At the centre, a National Coordinating Unit in the Department of Guidance and Counseling of the Ministry of Education coordinates the participation of so many players including UN Agencies dealing with children’s issues, NGOs, the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Justice and the National Children’s Coordinating Unit (NCCU).

In Lesotho, however, no head teachers or principals had been trained as at the time of the visit. This could be explained by the initial conflict between the project coordinating College and the Ministry at the inception of the project which caused delay in the take off of the project. It was claimed that because of this initial hitch, the Ministry distanced
itself from the project. However, at the time of the visit the situation had normalized and already 25 District Resource Teachers and Education Officers from the Ministry of Education had been trained. In addition, 4 out of the 12 expected teacher educators from the National University of Lesotho attended the training.

Thus, generally, partners from a variety of fields that could contribute to the success of the CFS projects had been identified and were offered some training. In all the four countries, adequate capacity had been developed for cascading the training and sharing the concepts and principles effectively with other relevant stakeholders across the lengths and breadths of the countries.

5. **Enhanced Project Ownership**

Through the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in the projects ‘processes the four countries had witnessed enhanced ownership of the CFS projects and commitment of the participants to the projects in terms of their time and resources. Leadership and other inputs to the projects such as the provision of Project Management Offices, secretarial services, transportation and traveling allowances to participants as well as the provision of guidance materials and extension of the training to more stakeholders across regions and provinces not only demonstrated the strength and inclusiveness of the networks established among diverse stakeholders for the projects, but also their increased ownership of and commitment to the projects.

A further evidence of the ownership of the CFS projects was seen in the way teachers involved their pupils in the transformation of their schools into child friendly schools through the formation of environmental clubs, led by the teachers, which encouraged the young children to plant flowers in their schools and maintain very clean environments as can be seen in the pictures below of the Kgasela Primary School in Mochudi, Botswana.
6. **Mainstreaming of CFS into Other Government Plans**

Although the fieldwork revealed absence of elaborate national CFS policy frameworks to guide the envisioning processes, plans to mainstream the CFS projects into the national plans abound in the four countries. All the four countries recognized that creating child friendly schools was an issue of curricular contents and relevance. Hence, all the four country work plans included the review of the national pre-service and or in-service teacher education curricula. It was generally accepted that if pre-service and in-service teachers were able to weave the CFS principles and methods into the schools’ curricula and their practice, then they would be capable of imparting the quality education that all children were entitled to; and that through such infusion, the institutionalization of the CFS concepts and principles would be ensured.
In Swaziland, there was a deliberate attempt to link the CFS Project to an existing national policy aimed at transforming the schools in Swaziland into centres of care and support. The policy is known simply as “Schools as Centres of Care and Support (SCCS)” . Both the SCCS and CFS agree on the central importance of basic education and the need to provide care and support to all children. They share common key elements such as school community partnerships, safety and security, psychosocial support, food security, health and sanitation as well as gender and life skills. Thus, from inception, the CFS project in Swaziland was known as the SCCS project.

Further attempts to institutionalize the CFS concepts and principles were carried out through the revision of curricula (pre-service and in-service) and the standards, which at the time of the visit had been completed and adopted. Plans were also underway to integrate CFS into the general curriculum of the country’s Colleges of Education and the Ministry of Education has a well laid out plan to cascade the CFS training to more head teachers beyond the project’s life span.

Botswana, on the other hand, had reviewed its national “Colleges of Education Diploma in Primary Education Curriculum” and developed a Handbook for mainstreaming CFS models and approaches in its in-service teacher education programmes. Sustainability of the project is further supported by a comprehensive plan to roll out the CFS training in all the ten regions in the country using additional resources provided by the Ministry of Education and Skills Development. At the time of the visit, already eight regions have had their CFS training.

In South Africa, the University of Limpopo had completed the review of its Advanced Certificate in Education and Life Orientation (ACELO) curriculum with a stand alone CFS Framework to support the implementation of the new curriculum. In addition, the School of Education had developed complete course materials for the ACELO curriculum with technical assistance provided by COL during the March 1–15 Writers Workshop.

In particular, the University has plans to sustain the CFS project through its new 3 year (2011-2013) project for the development of B. Ed Foundation Phase being funded by the European Union, which includes the development of materials and training of 4
additional staff at master’s level. Lesotho, on the other hand, had at the time of the visit just contracted a Consultant and identified the Facilitators for integrating CFS concepts, principles, models and approaches into the pre-service teacher education curriculum and a meeting to finalise the details of the task was fixed for March 15, 2011.

7. **Achievements of Outcomes:**

a) **The effectiveness of the CFS capacity building workshops**

As can be seen in Figure 3 below, results based on surveys of head teachers, school inspectors and teachers in the four countries revealed a high degree of enthusiasm and acceptance of the CFS projects among these stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 3: Respondent's Perception of the Relevance of the CFS Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Majority of the sampled respondents from this group agreed that the CFS training they received had deepened their knowledge and understanding in a wide range of professional areas. They expressed their readiness for the project and admitted that a lot of progress had been achieved in their various countries in the implementation of the CFS projects, even as all of them complained about the lack of adequate facilities and resources for CFS in their respective schools. As can be seen from Figure 2 below, 91% of the respondents felt sufficiently prepared in the CFS contents and teaching.
However, although differences in perceptions between the different groups were for the most part minimal as can be seen in Figure 5 below, comparisons of the views expressed by head teachers and other education officers with those of teacher educators on the CFS projects during interviews and focus group discussions were quite revealing. The head teachers indicated more positive views, support and enthusiasm for the projects than the teacher educators and these positive views were often linked to the contexts in which the projects were domiciled.

Where the CFS projects were anchored by the teacher training institutions or a substantial number of the trainees were drawn from such institutions, as in Lesotho, South Africa and Swaziland, the views of the teacher educators were more positive and supportive than those expressed by their counterparts in Botswana where the extension of the CFS training to the pre-service group was just about to start at the time of the visit. Majority of these teacher educators both in Gaborone and Francistown expressed defensive attitudes during focus group discussions. Many of them felt there wasn’t anything new for them to learn about CFS.
The differences observed between the two groups in their perceptions on and impressions about the CFS projects strongly and urgently call for concerted efforts to engage this important segment of the key players. The effectiveness of the CFS project will depend on the strength and inclusiveness of the partnerships and networks that can be mobilized for its implementation. Fortunately, Botswana had at the time of visit concluded plans to extend the CFS training to the pre-service group starting from 21 March, 2011.

**b) Impact on Classroom Practices**

The respondents were further asked about the extent to which the CFS training they received had made any difference in the way they teach. Table 2 below summarizes the results showing examples of the improvements that the head teachers and teacher educators felt they had made on their classroom practices as a result of the CFS training they received.
Table 2: Ways in Which CFS Made a Difference (N= 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>I now use learner centred approach.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>I am now in a position to apply different methods when teaching to meet individual class needs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>I work closely with relevant stakeholders like parents, monitoring children’s homework, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>CFS principles and methods are what I always sensitize my students in my course area.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>More alert to the fact that my teaching will impact on how those I train turn out to be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Emphasis put on syllabus, methods and researches to make learning friendly.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>Treat students as individuals with different abilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>New teaching that emphasizes on learning for a purpose rather than lecturing.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>Good time management now.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with other sources of influence over their classroom practice such as the regular in-service training teachers they undergo, the respondents specified a number of ways in which the CFS training differed as listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3: How CFS Differed From Regular In-Service Training Programmes (N= 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>It is more activity based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Allowances given to the participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>It equips us with skills that are globally recognized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Children’s rights took a centre stage unlike in other trainings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>We were not certificated in the past hence the training was not really binding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>It encompasses relevant stakeholders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii</td>
<td>It focuses on improving schools to be child friendly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii</td>
<td>It emphasizes monitoring of learners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix</td>
<td>No much difference because the presentations were facilitator centred with very few activities/tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, Tables 2 & 3 above indicate that the head teachers, teacher educators as well as other education personnel reported that there had been positive impact of the CFS training on both their understanding and classroom practices. In order to complement the evidence of impact obtained from the surveys, interviews and focus group discussions with primary school teachers and classroom observations were conducted in selected CFS schools in Swaziland (Beaufort Nazarene Primary School) and Botswana (Kgafela & Ikhutseng Primary Schools). The primary school teachers were asked the same questions about the effect of the CFS training as those asked of the head teachers, teacher educators and other education officers. Similar responses were obtained from interviews and focus group discussions with primary school teachers in Swaziland and Botswana suggesting a strong endorsement of the CFS projects as confirmed by their statements in the inbox below.

The classroom teachers’ judgments about the impact of the CFS projects in the two countries corroborated the survey findings. All the teachers interviewed agreed that it had deepened their professional knowledge and enhanced their skills and practices. Although the contexts and the purpose of the interactive sessions would have, in a way, impressed the importance of the CFS Projects in the minds of the teachers, their responses were later found to be consistent with their actions in the classrooms under observation. All the four primary school teachers observed in Kgafela Primary School, Mochudi and Ikhutseng Primary School, Francistown in Botswana demonstrated a good understanding of the CFS principles and methods in their teaching. Their classrooms as can be seen in the following pictures, were arranged and conducted in a child friendly manner and were fully equipped with learning resources teaching aids and other materials.
‘The training has made me realize how far away I have moved from the learner-based approaches in my classroom practice.’
(Standard VI Teacher in Botswana).

“The Training opened up our eyes to the new roles that we have to combine with our teaching”.
(Head Teacher in Swaziland).
V. Emerging Approaches

A number of implementation approaches emerged from the experiences of the partner countries, which can provide valuable guidance to and insights for other countries planning to mainstream CFS.

A. The “INQABA” Approach

In Swaziland, the concept of “INQABA” (School as a Fortress) was a central component of the CFS Project. The concept was introduced as a response to the many demands and multiple threats including poverty, HIV/AIDS, drought, food insecurity and political instability. At the beginning in 2006, a total of 40 schools were established spread in the four regions of the country to pilot the “Schools as Centres of Care and Support” project. Selected head teachers and teachers in the “Inqaba Schools” were trained centrally as School Support Teams (SST) teachers to work alongside colleagues in their schools to create school environments that provide care and support to all children, as well as building the capacity of communities to establish and manage community structures that provide non-school going children with non-formal education and life skills.

The focus of collaboration between the SST teachers and their other colleagues is to provide a comprehensive range of services to children, ensuring that all children have access to qualitative basic education in a safe and secure school environment and the community. The concept of “Inqaba” was adopted as the main implementation approach for the CFS project. It represents the domestication and ownership of the CFS concepts and methods in Swaziland as the CFS schools are generally referred to as the “Inqaba schools.”

B. The Integrative/Adaptation Approach

Another implementation approach that featured in all the four countries is the Integrative Approach, which seeks to infuse/integrate the CFS concepts and methods into the teacher education curricula of the partner countries. This process of mainstreaming involved three main activities:
(i) review of the teacher education curricula to identify gaps vis-à-vis CFS principles, concepts, and approaches,

(ii) development of supplementary materials that both addressed the CFS gaps, as well as contextualized CFS in the respective countries, and

(iii) face-to-face training of both pre-service and in-service teacher educators, TRC managers, school heads, and other educational personnel.

Through this approach, the four countries were able to develop the critical mass of Master trainers who have a deep awareness and understanding of the concepts, principles and methods of CFS and who possess the requisite knowledge and skills that enable them to contribute towards the attainment of the CFS projects’ outcomes. Secondly, the mainstreaming of the CFS principles and methods into both the pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula has the potential of ensuring the successful transfer of these principles and methods to future generation of teachers in the four countries. Both these points are vital to the sustainability of the CFS projects.

C. Life Skills Infusion Approach

In Swaziland, Lesotho and Botswana efforts were concentrated on integrating CFS concepts and principles into the curricula for the Early Childhood and Primary School Teachers Development, in South Africa, the University of Limpopo had focused on the review of its Life skills programme for in-service teachers namely, the Advanced Certificate in Education and Life Orientation (ACELO). This programme is for in-service teachers and is aimed at upgrading the qualification of practicing teachers throughout the country.

Already, six other universities across the provinces in South Africa running similar programme had expressed interest in this approach being pioneered by the University of Limpopo. As mentioned earlier, the Universities of Venda, Witwatersrand, Tshwane University of Technology, Walter Sisulu University, Central University of Technology, and University of Pretoria had attended a sensitization meeting preparatory to their adoption of the approach. The University of Venda in particular, had written to both the
UNICEF Country Office in South Africa and the Commonwealth of Learning expressing its willingness to join the CFS project.

D. Direct Infusion Approach

Another distinct approach that emerged in only one out of the four countries i.e. South Africa is the direct mainstreaming of the CFS concepts, principles and approaches into the course materials used by student teachers. In this regard, the University of Limpopo had extended the infusion process beyond the curriculum level by mainstreaming the CFS concepts and principles into the course modules of the ACELO programme complete with a stand alone CFS Framework to support the implementation of the new curriculum. The implication of this is that CFS has become embedded within the regular modules that student teachers use in their training.

E. Local Languages Approach

Although none of the four countries visited had translated the CFS materials into their local languages for use by teachers in the schools, an interesting example of the effective use of the CFS methods and the local language to promote literacy learning was observed at Kgafela Primary School, Mochudi in Botswana. Here, a combination of the effective use of the CFS methods and approaches with the use of vernacular in teaching literacy to Standard 1 pupils had proved very successful. Both the head teacher and the Standard 1 teacher (shown in action in the picture below) reported that in just four months, the children were able to read and write in the vernacular as illustrated by a sample of the children’s written work below.
This example no doubt illustrates the potency of the local language in promoting quality basic education to children. If developed into a full strategy, it can be an effective way of improving learning opportunities for all students.

VI. Challenges

Despite considerable success of the CFS projects, a number of factors were observed to be affecting the advocacy efforts in all the four countries. These include:

- conflict in the time schedules of officers who had to combine their normal work schedules with participation in the CFS activities. Respondents reported collusion of time for meetings and over load of work.
- time allotted for the training not sufficiently adequate.
• delays caused by personnel/organisational changes in the partner institutions, bureaucratic red tape-ism, changes in consultants and critical readers.

• other unforeseen factors that affected the amount of time devoted to the project activities such as the 2010 World Cup competition and a nation wide strike by all sectors including the university lecturers in the case of South Africa. In the case of Botswana the CFS project was introduced at a time when the regional structures in the country were being created, while in Swaziland the start of the project coincided with the beginning of the academic year when head teachers were busy at school registering students and performing other school functions. All these affected the participation of the key stakeholders at workshops and project meetings.

VII. **Sustainability Factors**

The challenges enumerated above notwithstanding, the evaluation revealed a number of factors that have the potential of sustaining the projects.

• The development of a critical mass of Master Trainers in each of the four countries who are aware of and have an adequate understanding of the concepts, principles and methods of CFS and who have attained the knowledge and skills to contribute towards the success of the projects.

• The mainstreaming of the CFS principles and methods in both the pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula, which has the potential of ensuring the successful transfer of these principles and methods to future generation of teachers.

• The inclusion of CFS into national and or institutional plans (Botswana and Swaziland are good examples where the ministries of education provided additional funds to the projects).

• The forging of strong partnerships with ministries of education and teacher training institutions.
At the University of Limpopo in particular, funding from the European Union for the development of B. Ed Foundation Phase for 3 years from 2011 – 2013, which includes the development of materials and training of 4 additional staff at master’s level in the Foundation Phase has the prospects of sustaining the CFS project for another 3 years and beyond.

VIII. Conclusions (Judgments)

A. About the Appropriateness of the Intended Outputs/Outcomes

The findings of this evaluation provide a variety of relevant information about the appropriateness of the intended outputs of the project. The CFS initiatives were focused on the foundation phase of schooling – basic education. The findings of the evaluation suggest that the CFS strategy which is primarily about enhancing the quality of education by inter alia building the capacity of teachers to meet the diverse needs of children of all backgrounds is quite well suited and relevant to this level of education and has demonstrable applicability to all levels of schooling. The strategy coincides with efforts in which the partner countries are already engaged such as the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) process, the Education for ALL (EFA) and the Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme all of which have close links with aspects of the CFS strategy. All agree on the central importance of basic education and the need to enhance its quality and inclusiveness.

The two main strands of the CFS strategy focused on the development of expertise and training materials. The emphasis in both cases was on the need to improve professional knowledge and classroom practices of teachers. Quality improvement takes place in the classroom through the interactions of teachers and students. Effective teaching and learning must be at the core of the quality improvement efforts. Teachers are thus at the centre of any quality improvement strategy. However, for teachers to be effective in their work they need support in the form of professional development and high quality training.
materials. Increasing teachers’ CFS knowledge and improving their professional practices was an overt goal of the CFS capacity building program.

B. About the Project Context

Domiciling the CFS projects within Ministries of Education of partner countries, Colleges of Education and Universities was an appropriate choice of context for the projects. Education Ministries and Departments can provide national policy frameworks, budgets and resources for CFS, as well as integrate CFS into national plans; while the educational institutions can develop the appropriate training materials and also conduct the training.

Already, evidence from the evaluation points to how Education Ministries in Swaziland and Botswana are mobilizing additional resources for cascading CFS capacity building to more teachers at regional level and fostering public awareness on CFS through advocacy meetings and workshops. The Education Ministries and the Institutions are thus well placed to provide good platforms for the collaborative work on quality improvement in teacher education.

C. The Role of the Partners

All the major partners of the project have played important roles in the implementation of the project. COL and UNICEF have kept CFS high on the partner countries’ educational agendas and have assisted the countries with both financial resources and technical expertise in developing projects in support of CFS. All the four countries had integrated CFS planning into relevant work plans and initiatives. The partner countries, on their part, have accepted CFS as a priority and where possible (e.g. Swaziland) have incorporated it into their national plans (the Inqaba Approach); provided additional resources and logistics for the projects; enabled widespread awareness and understanding of CFS, organized regional training and capacity building on CFS, as well as developed relevant standards and monitoring indicators for CFS.
The educational institutions, on the other hand, have integrated CFS concepts and principles into their teacher education curricula and course materials and organized capacity building workshops and advocacy meetings to advance CFS.

In this way, all the different partners of the project have worked proactively to ensure efficiency and success of the projects.

**D. About the Effectiveness of COL’s Direct and Indirect Contributions to this Project**

COL’s work in bringing considerable technical expertise and financial support to the project teams in the four countries had contributed in very significant ways to build the capacity of the project officers to work effectively with the consultants to develop relevant training materials as well as conduct the training workshops. The effectiveness of COL’s direct and indirect contributions to the projects is exemplified by the successes recorded in the production of high quality training manuals and in developing a critical mass of CFS Master Trainers in each of the four countries. It is also evidenced by the growing number of partners and partnerships on CFS in the four countries.

**E. About the Quality of the Management & Implementation of the Activities**

Information collected about the implementation of the project indicated high level of efficiency in the management and implementation of the project activities. Both COL and the partner countries have worked proactively and collaboratively to demonstrate the strong leadership and coordination roles that ensured efficiency and success of the projects. As at the time of this evaluation, all the four countries had almost accomplished the targets and expected outputs set out in their work plans. The countries had established wide networks of partnerships and good structures both national and regional for managing the CFS initiatives.
F. Lessons Learned

A number of lessons could be drawn from the experiences of these four countries in the implementation of the CFS projects. First, evidence from this evaluation suggests that policymakers and project leaders planning to embark on any educational intervention should think in terms of combinations of input factors that can work together to influence impact. Experience in the four countries especially in Botswana and Swaziland (Inqaba Approach) showed that coordinating the introduction of the CFS projects with national policies and programs related to changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and teacher training is more likely to result in greater outcomes than the use of a single approach. The analysis of the survey data indicated that continued investment in building the capacity of all actors in education coupled with successful mainstreaming of the CFS principles and methods into pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula had been critical to the success of the CFS Strategy in the four countries.

Secondly, the analysis also showed that in the long run, the success of the CFS project would require a focus on schools and classroom teachers. Classroom observations in Kgafela and Ikhutseng primary schools in Botswana illustrated how extending the CFS training to classroom teachers and head teachers was more likely to lead to positive outcomes than limiting it to teacher educators and other education officers. Involvement of head teachers in the CFS training had led to increased innovativeness in schools and improved access of classroom teachers to CFS knowledge and awareness. The sensitization given to teachers on CFS concepts and principles in these two schools by their head teachers who attended the CFS training resulted in teachers not only learning new skills but also changing their classroom practices. These practices included conducting research projects on pupils’ late coming to school, gathering and analyzing information, coordinating the collaboration on projects of their students with students in other countries (e.g. Kgafela Primary School, Mochudi collaborating with schools in Wales and Zimbabwe on ICT and school gardening projects), and communicating with parents and other community members.

Classroom observations had shown that teachers exposed to some rudiments of CFS were able to employ a variety of teaching approaches to address the diversity of students’
needs. Not only have school children benefited to a considerable degree from this approach as illustrated by the success of the local language approach at Kgafela Primary School in Botswana, but teachers’ professional knowledge and understanding of effective teaching practices has been significantly enhanced, and their classroom skills improved as indicated by their feedback on the training they received. Although this evidence emerged from limited observation of primary school teachers in action, the findings seem to point to the applicability of the approach to all levels of education. Therefore, special attention needs to be given to ensuring that the ongoing cascading of the CFS training to cover hundreds of other stakeholders, especially Head Teachers and primary school teachers is sustained.

Thirdly, the emphasis on school development policy as a basis for funding schools in Swaziland has forced schools and teachers to focus on improved classroom practices and child-centred strategies. The “Inqaba” schools are funded through their school development plans, which must conform to the CFS concepts and principles. This approach while allowing for local autonomy in the operation of schools also enabled the Ministry of Education to direct and lead the schools towards the achievement of national educational goals and objectives. The approach had helped to strengthen school capacity to manage change and improvement programmes including the CFS project. It also allowed for local adaptation of improvement strategies while maintaining a clear focus on the overall national objective that proved very effective in the implementation of the CFS projects in Swaziland through the “Inqaba” approach.

Fourthly, advocacy and partnerships with relevant stakeholders are essential to mobilize the necessary resources and support for the project. The involvement of officials of key Ministries and Departments, head teachers, teacher educators and other education officers had helped to generate keen interest in and support for the CFS projects. The key issue therefore is how to mobilize these key players in such a way that they work collaboratively and effectively to achieve the goals of the CFS projects.

Finally, government direction and leadership are essential to the success and sustainability of the CFS projects. The examples of Swaziland and Botswana are very instructive in this regard. In both countries, the CFS strategy had been made part and
parcel of the national educational policies and additional resources were provided for the
cascading of the CFS training to more teachers across regions and provinces leading to
greater awareness, ownership and participation in the projects.

IX. Recommendations

The evidence gathered from this evaluation provided a positive picture of the
implementation of the CFS Strategy in the four countries. The effectiveness of the
strategy was clearly evident in the data collected from head teachers, teacher educators,
Teachers’ Resource Centre Managers, In-service officers and primary school teachers
through surveys, interviews, focus group discussions and classroom observations that
probed all aspects of the implementation of CFS in the four countries. However, if the
recorded successes of the CFS projects are to be sustained, special attention needs to be
given to ensuring that the key elements that have proved to be crucial to the success of
the projects are also maintained. This section of the report draws together the key
recommendations of the evaluation.

First, there is need to strengthen local, and in particular, school-level capacity to manage
change and improvement programmes. The committed involvement of head teachers and
teachers is required for any systemic change, large or small. Evidence from limited
classroom observations in Botswana demonstrably showed that the successful
introduction of CFS into schools depended largely on inspirational leadership and skillful
change management expertise at the school level. Involvement of head teachers in the
CFS training had led to increased innovativeness in schools and improved access of
classroom teachers to CFS knowledge and awareness. It also allowed for local adaptation
of the CFS strategies in the schools. But this can only happen where there are competent
local administrations that can focus teachers’ efforts on the project, mobilize resources
and stakeholder support (as in e.g. Kgafela & Ikhutseng Primary Schools). However,
although the field study revealed increased involvement of the head teachers in the CFS
training in all four countries, the vast majority of teachers in the schools in the four
countries were yet to be trained on CFS principles and methods.
Thus, as mentioned earlier, strengthening the capacity of local and school-level administrations and classroom teachers would be crucial to the successful decentralization and sustainability of the CFS projects in the four countries.

Secondly, there is the need for more advocacy among policy makers and officials of key ministries (e.g. Ministries of Education, Health, Finance, etc.) and community leaders to garner support and resources for the CFS projects. The evaluation revealed that the establishment of extensive networks of partnerships with relevant stakeholders had generated keen interest in and support for the CFS projects in each of the four countries. What is needed is to consolidate and expand these partnerships in such a way that the partners work collaboratively and effectively towards the achievement of the goals and objectives of the CFS strategy.

Thirdly, there is need for government direction and leadership to accelerate and sustain the progress so far recorded and ensure equity across schools, regions and provinces. This can be achieved through continued investment in high quality professional development for the head teachers, teachers and teacher educators. Evidence from Botswana and Swaziland showed that government involvement guaranteed the availability of resources needed for the successful implementation of the CFS projects.

Fourthly, the project can be sustained and scaled up through a school-based CFS CPD programme either in the traditional face-face training format using the well established networks of regional structures, or in an Open and Distance Learning (ODL) format using the national radio stations and other electronic media such as the national television stations.

Fifthly, there is need for closer collaboration between Col and the partner countries in the appointment of consultants for the projects. The experience of Lesotho with the consultant is a case in point here where disagreement between the consultant and the project officers at the Lesotho College of Education caused delay in the take-off of the project.

Finally, the work of COL and UNICEF in bringing considerable technical expertise and financial support to the project teams in the four countries had contributed in very important ways to build the capacity of the project officers to work effectively with the
consultants to develop relevant training materials. The maintenance of these levels of support will be important to the future of the CFS projects in these countries.
X. Annexures

A. Annexure 1: Survey Questionnaire for Head Teachers/Teacher Educators/ERC/TRC Managers & Education Officers

(Instructions: Please answer the following questions about the CFS Project as they relate to your role. Your responses will remain confidential and be used to improve on the project and inform future and training).

**Ratings of Project Quality and Content:**

A. Quality of the Training Manuals

1. How would you rate the quality of the training manuals used?
   a. Excellent
   b. Good
   c. Fair
   d. Poor

2. What is your perception of the relevance of the training manuals?
   a. Not at all relevant
   b. Not very relevant
   c. Relevant
   d. Very relevant

3. What is your rating of the usefulness of the contents of the training manuals?
   a. Not at all useful
   b. Not very useful
   c. Somewhat useful
   d. Very useful

4. What is your rating of the appropriateness of the training manuals?
   a. Not at all appropriate
   b. Not very appropriate
   c. Appropriate
   d. Very appropriate
Perception of the Training Programme

1. What did you like about the CFS training you received?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

2. How did it differ from other in-service training you had in the past?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

3. What is your overall rating of the CFS training?
   a. Excellent
   b. Good
   c. Fair
   d. Poor

4. What is your perception of the relevance of the CFS training?
   a. Not at all relevant
   b. Not very relevant
   c. Relevant
   d. Very relevant

5. What is your rating of the importance of the CFS methods and approaches?
   a. Not at all important
   b. Not very important
   c. Somewhat important
   d. Very important

6. What is your perception of the duration of the training?
   a. Not at all adequate
   b. Not very adequate
   c. Adequate
   d. Very adequate
7. How would you rate your preparedness in the CFS contents and teaching?
   a. Not at all prepared
   b. Not very well prepared
   c. Fairly well prepared
   d. Very well prepared

8. Did the training you received on CFS make any difference in the way you teach your subject?
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. If yes, in what ways?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………

10. Has it made you more interested in your job of teaching?
    a. Yes
    b. No

11. What new things did you learn from the training?
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………

12. What in your opinion are the greatest strengths of the training programme?
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………

13. What in your own opinion are the greatest weaknesses of the CFS programme?
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………………………………………………………………………………
14. Would you recommend the CFS training to other teachers in your country?
   a. Yes
   b. No

15. If yes, why?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

16. What are the challenges you faced in applying the CFS principles and methods in your school?

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

   ……………………………………………………………………………………………
B. Annexure 2: List of Questions for the Focus Group Discussions

1. What impact has the CFS capacity building programme had upon the professional knowledge and classroom practices of the head teachers, teacher educators, ERC/TRC managers and other education officers?

2. What are their views about the impact of CFS capacity building on the ability of teachers to apply the CFS principles and methods in their classrooms?

3. To what extent have the head teachers, teacher educators and other education officers accepted the CFS concepts and principles?

4. To what extent has the CFS strategy been connected to school plans such as the school development plans?

5. What changes if any has the CFS strategy brought about in educational practices?

6. To what extent have schools accepted and implemented these changes?

7. What factors are responsible for the improvement in teachers’ classroom practices?

8. What are the changes brought about by the introduction of the CFS initiatives?

9. What provisions have schools made to sustain the positive changes in classroom practices brought about by the CFS strategy?

10. What are the head teachers’s views on the impact of CFS on classroom practices?

11. To what extent are the CFS targets challenging to the head teachers?

12. What factors facilitated participation in the CFS initiatives?

13. What factors hindered participation in the CFS initiatives?

14. What are the greatest strengths of the CFS initiatives?

15. What are the greatest weaknesses of the CFS initiatives?
C. Annexure 3: List of Interview Questions for Primary School Teachers

1. Is your school a good place to work and learn?
2. Are you aware of the CFS initiatives being implemented in your country?
3. If yes, how did you come to know about it?
4. Do you know what CFS is all about?
5. Have you attended any of the sensitization workshops on CFS?
6. Have you participated in the CFS materials writing workshops organized in your country?
7. Have you attended a CFS training?
8. If yes, in what capacity did you participate, a trainer or trainee?
9. What have you learned from the training received?
10. How would you rate the training in terms of its quality, relevance and usefulness?
11. How satisfied were you with the training?
12. Has it made any difference in your:
   - pedagogical approaches and attitudes?
   - Knowledge and understanding of the principles and methods of CFS?
   - Classroom practices?
13. How would you rate your level of preparedness in CFS contents and teaching?
14. Have you learned any new things from your participation in the training?
15. Has it improved your understanding of your job as a teacher?
16. What would you say are the greatest strengths of the CFS initiatives?
17. What would you say are the greatest weaknesses of the CFS initiatives?
18. What are the changes that you think were brought about by the introduction of the CFS initiatives in your country?
19. What plans have you put in place in your schools/institutions to sustain these changes?
20. What factors facilitated your participation in the CFS initiatives?
21. What factors hindered your participation in the CFS initiatives?
22. Are there sufficient resources in your school to allow you to implement the CFS strategies?
23. Do you have reasonable class size to enable you meet the educational needs of all children?
24. Do you have sufficient access to appropriate instructional materials and resources?

25. Do you work in a school environment that is clean, well maintained and safe?

26. Has the training proved useful to you in your effort to improve students’ achievement?

27. Has the training provided you with knowledge and skills most needed to teach effectively?

28. Do the school administrators and teachers in your school have a shared vision for CFS?

29. Do you have time available to collaborate with other teachers in the school?

30. Are you happy being a teacher?

31. Is the teacher’s pay good?
D. Annexure 4: Contract Agreement Document

May 10, 2010

Professor Muhammad Bin Jumaid
Executive Secretary
National Commission for Colleges of Education
Central Area
Abuja
NIGERIA

E-mail: jumaidmu@yahoo.com

Dear Professor Jumaid:

Re: Monitoring and Evaluation of the COL-UNICEF Project on Child Friendly Schools

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) seeks to engage Professor Muhammad Bin Jumaid (the Consultant) to undertake monitoring and evaluation of the COL-UNICEF Project on Child Friendly Schools (CFS).

1.0 Statement of Work

1.1 The Consultant shall be responsible to:

1.1.1. develop a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan for the COL-UNICEF project on mainstreaming CFS models and approaches into pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula to cover the study period March 2010 to June 30, 2011; and obtain COL’s approval before the Consultant begins the work;

1.1.2. focus the consultancy on:

1.1.2.1. the UNICEF-COL Project Cooperation Agreement on mainstreaming Child Friendly Schools Models and Approaches into pre-service and in-service teacher education curricula;

1.1.2.2. the expected outputs and outcomes of the CFS project;

1.1.2.3. the number of master trainers trained and the number of teacher educators trained on CFS concepts, models and approaches;

1.1.2.4. the number of women trained in the capacity building workshops;

1.1.2.5. the implementation of the Work Plan developed by the 10 countries participating in the project;

1.1.2.6. the processes of mainstreaming CFS in the teacher education curricula of the 10 countries participating in the project, particularly the challenges encountered and the lessons learned;

1.1.2.7. a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan that includes performance indicators. In developing the Performance indicators for the M&E plan, consult key contacts in COL and a sample of the participating countries (Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland and Sri Lanka);

1.1.2.8. ensure that the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan developed for this study has formative and summative components;
E. Annexure 5: Project Cooperation Agreement between UNICEF and COL

A Proposal for a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between
The United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and
The Commonwealth of Learning (COL)

THIS PROJECT COOPERATION AGREEMENT and its annexes (this “Agreement”) is
made in October 2008.

international inter-governmental organization established by the
General Assembly of the United Nations, having its office in the
United States at 3 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017

AND: The COMMONWEALTH OF LEARNING (COL) based in Vancouver,
Canada, an organisation having its offices at 1055 West Hastings
Street, Suite 1200, Vancouver, BC V6E 2E9, Canada

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

A. UNICEF works with governments, civil society organisations and other partners
worldwide to advance children’s rights and is guided by the principles enshrined in
the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and in
the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination
of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. COL shares UNICEF’s commitment to
the principles enunciated in these documents.

B. Within these frameworks, UNICEF and COL will develop a capacity cultivation
initiative for improved quality of education through joint activities related to
Mainstreaming Child-Friendly School (CFS) Models and Approaches in National Pre-
service and In-service Teacher Education Programmes (the “Project”). The Project is
covered by this Agreement and is more fully described in the project document
attached to this agreement as Annex A (the “Project Proposal and Budget”).

C. Both UNICEF and COL are committed to the principles of participatory and
sustainable development and to providing assistance impartially. They are mindful of
culture and custom, and of building local capacity, and of their respective
accountabilities to their funding partners and to those whom they assist. They will not
expose intended beneficiaries, including children to any form of discrimination, abuse
or exploitation.

D. COL affirms that it is not profit-oriented and non-partisan, and that it has the
capacities to carry out the activities outlined in this Agreement.

E. UNICEF and COL have agreed to cooperate to implement the Project, in accordance
with the Project Proposal and Budget attached to this Agreement as Annex A. They
will carry out their respective responsibilities in the spirit of partnership and in
consultation.
GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. UNICEF and COL will work together in the implementation of the Project, and complete the tasks identified as their respective responsibility in conformity with the agreed Project Proposal and Budget.

2. UNICEF and COL will each designate a person who will be given authority for overseeing the Project on its behalf. UNICEF and COL will jointly designate the Project Manager, if any.

3. UNICEF and COL with other partners, as needed, will develop detailed Annual Work Plans, describing the specific activities to be carried out each quarter. The basis for the transfer of any resources will be the Annual Work Plan.

4. UNICEF and COL will keep each other informed on the progress of their work in relation to the Annual Work Plan. Consultation meetings will take place at least every three (3) months or more frequently as circumstances demand. UNICEF will make all relevant information and advice available to COL.

5. COL may use the UNICEF name, logo, and emblem, but only in connection with the Project and only with the prior written consent of UNICEF. The UNICEF name, logo, and emblem may only be reproduced in ways set out in UNICEF’s “Identification Standards Manual”.

6. In order to determine the most effective and efficient resource transfer procedures, COL may be subject to an assessment of its financial management capacity. UNICEF and COL will jointly conduct assurance activities to establish the good use of UNICEF provided resources. As an implementing partner of the UNICEF assisted programme, COL may also be subject to audits commissioned or requested by UNICEF.

SUPPORT TO THE PROJECT

7. The Project Budget identifies the inputs that will be funded by UNICEF. UNICEF will either meet the costs of those inputs through cash transfers to COL (“cash input”) or will provide the necessary supplies and equipment directly to COL.

CASH INPUT

8. The amount of cash input to be provided by UNICEF is set out in the Project Budget, and the Annual Work Plans. UNICEF will provide the agreed amount of cash input in a number of instalments. UNICEF will transfer the first instalment, covering three (3) months costs, to COL within two (2) weeks after both UNICEF and COL have signed this Agreement and the first Annual Work Plan, and COL has provided a written request for the funds in relation to the activities lines of the AWIP. Subsequent instalments will be made on a three (3) monthly basis after that, following a similar request. A request for payment of the applicable amount should be received at least one (1) month prior to the commencement of the activities planned for that period.

9. COL will account for each instalment of cash input within six (6) months from the date it is received. It will do so by providing UNICEF with a financial statement
certified by the COL official responsible for COL’s financial affairs. UNICEF may review the acceptability of the documents as proof of the use of the funds as agreed. Further transfer of funds will not normally be made if any installment of cash input has not been accounted for within six (6) months after the date when it should have been accounted for by submission of the accounting documents (receipts, bills of payment, etc.) that confirm the use of funds. UNICEF may review the acceptability of the documents as proof of the use of the funds as agreed. Further transfer of funds will not normally be made if any installment of cash input has not been accounted for within six (6) months after the date when it should have been.

10. COL can vary the budgeted cost of any single input in the Budget to be funded by UNICEF, provided that (a) the variation is no more than ten percent (10%); (b) the variations are within the scope of the Project Proposal and its expected results; and (c) the total Budget is not exceeded. Any variations exceeding ten percent (10%) require the prior written consent of UNICEF.

11. UNICEF will fund the COL’s Project Support Costs, but for no more than two (2) years from the day this Agreement becomes effective regardless of the term of this Agreement, unless this period is specifically extended by the Parties through written agreement. In any year, the total of COL’s Project Support Costs will not exceed twenty-five percent (25%) of the total funds provided by UNICEF that year.

12. Within three (3) months of either the termination of this Agreement or completion of the Project, whichever happens first, COL will return to UNICEF the balance of any funds provided by UNICEF to COL under this Agreement.

SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

13. The supplies and equipment (including vehicles, if any), to be provided by UNICEF to COL are listed in the Project Proposal and Budget attached to this Agreement as Annex A.

14. UNICEF and COL will each be responsible for meeting the costs of insurance on the supplies and equipment (including vehicles, if any) it uses in connection with the Project.

15. UNICEF reserves the option to provide any vehicle to COL by way of loan, in which case the vehicle loan agreement will specify the conditions of the use, insurance, maintenance and care of the vehicle. This agreement, where applicable, will be attached to this Agreement as a further Annex. At the end of the loan period the Parties will agree on whether or not title will be transferred to COL.

16. UNICEF will normally undertake all international, off-shore procurement of supplies and equipment to be provided under this Agreement.

17. When COL uses UNICEF funds for the local purchase of supplies and equipment it will select the supplier on the basis of competitive bids or quotations, unless otherwise agreed between the Parties on an exceptional basis (documented justification is then required), taking account of the principles of quality, economy and efficiency. Products will only be purchased from companies that meet the standards
that have been established by UNICEF in relation to the protection of children’s rights.

18. Within four (4) weeks of either the termination of this Agreement or completion of the Project, whichever happens first, COL will return to UNICEF any unused supplies which UNICEF provides to COL under this Agreement, and any usable equipment which UNICEF provided to COL under this Agreement. UNICEF may decide that these supplies and equipment are to be dealt with in a different way.

PERSONNEL

19. COL is responsible for all work and services which its personnel, and any contractors, perform. It affirms that its employees and any contractors, also technical experts and consultants, meet the standards of qualification and technical and professional competence necessary for the achievement of the Project objectives. COL will ensure that all relevant national labour laws are observed.

20. Employees of COL, its contractors or anyone else working for COL in the execution of the Project or otherwise, are not employees of UNICEF and are not covered by the privileges and immunities applying to UNICEF and its staff pursuant to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations or otherwise. UNICEF is not liable for any claims of death, bodily injury, disability, damage to property or any other hazards which an employee of COL may suffer in connection with the execution of the Project. Where legally required to do so, COL will obtain and maintain all appropriate workmen’s compensation and liability.

RECORD KEEPING and FINANCIAL REPORTING

21. COL agrees to keep separate records with respect to funds provided to it by UNICEF. They will be accurate, complete, and up-to-date in respect to funds received and expenditures incurred with funds provided by UNICEF, and show that all disbursements are made in conformity with the Project Proposal and Budget. Original bills, invoices, receipts and any other pertinent documentation should be kept by COL.

22. COL will maintain accurate records of supplies and equipment purchased with funds provided by UNICEF under this Agreement. Monthly inventories should be taken, documented and records kept for the duration of the Project.

23. In addition to the reports referred to in Clause 9 of this Agreement, COL will prepare acceptably certified annual statements of expenditure in the local currency and submit them to UNICEF within three (3) months of the end of each calendar year in which it receives or spends funds provided by UNICEF under this Agreement.

24. COL will retain all records relating to the funds and supplies and equipment provided by UNICEF under this Agreement for a period of at least four (4) years after either the termination of this Agreement or the completion of the Project, whichever happens first.

25. UNICEF staff, including auditors if so commissioned by UNICEF, may conduct on-site reviews of the financial records of COL pertaining to the activities funded by
UNICEF, upon mutual agreement on date and time. UNICEF staff, including internal auditors and operations officers, and its agents, or the United Nations Board of Auditors may review and/or copy the records of COL relating to the Project, upon mutual agreement on date and time.

PROGRAMMATIC REPORTING

26. Six (6) months after signature of this Agreement, and every six (6) months thereafter, except where otherwise agreed, COL will provide to UNICEF a narrative progress report on its work in connection with the Project. Since UNICEF will be taking responsibility for undertaking an external evaluation of the project, which will include impact for children, COLs programmatic reporting will focus on activities to date, an assessment of whether the Project is being implemented in accordance with the Project Proposal and Budget, and a description of any obstacles to full and timely implementation.

FINAL REPORTS

27. A final report on the outcome of the Project, which includes a financial report, will be submitted to UNICEF within three (3) months of either the termination of this Agreement or the completion of the Project, whichever happens first.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CLAIMS

28. UNICEF and COL are each responsible for their own acts or omissions, and those of their employees, contractors or any other personnel engaged by them in the execution of the Project. Each Party is responsible for its own grossly negligent or intentionally harmful actions.

TERM AND TERMINATION

29. This Agreement will become effective once it is signed by both UNICEF and COL. It will continue until the date identified in the Project Proposal, unless terminated before then by either Party in accordance with this Agreement or extended by written agreement between the Parties.

30. If either Party cannot meet its obligations and in the view of the other Party this would seriously endanger the achievement of the Project objectives, such other Party will have the right to terminate this Agreement. In addition, UNICEF reserves the right to terminate this Agreement at any time should it conclude that COL does not share its commitment to the principles referred to in the first Recital to this Agreement. Unless consultations have resolved the problem, this Agreement will terminate thirty (30) days after such other Party sends a written notice of termination. When such a notice of termination is received, the Party receiving it will immediately take all steps to terminate its activities so that expenses are kept to a minimum. Immediately upon sending or receiving, as the case may be, a notice of termination UNICEF will cease all disbursement of funds to COL, and COL will not make any forward commitments. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by UNICEF, all unspent funds and unused equipment will be returned to UNICEF within thirty (30) days of such notice of termination.
RESOLUTION OF DIFFERENCES

31. In the case of any dispute, controversy or claim, the Parties will attempt to reach agreement amicably by direct negotiations. If no agreement can be reached within thirty (30) days, the Parties will together refer the dispute to the United Nations Secretary-General for a final decision. The Parties will be bound by the Secretary-General's decision in this matter.

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES

32. Nothing in or related to this Agreement shall be deemed a waiver, either express or implied, of any of the privileges and immunities of the United Nations and UNICEF under the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations or otherwise.

GENERAL

33. This Agreement and its Annexes can only be modified by written agreement between the Parties.

34. Neither Party has the authority to make decisions for the other, or to enter into obligations on behalf of the other.

35. After the completion of the first year, the activities and budgets for year 2 and 3 will be re-negotiated between the two parties based on the review of year 1 evaluation.

UNICEF, the United Nations Children's Fund
By: [Signature]
Nicholas Alipui
Director, Programme Division

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL)
By: [Signature]
Sir John Daniel
President and Chief Executive Officer
The Commonwealth of Learning (COL)
Vancouver, BC, Canada
Mainstreaming Child-Friendly School (CFS) Models and Approaches in National Pre-service and In-service Teacher Education Programmes

A PROPOSAL FOR COLLABORATION BETWEEN UNICEF AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF LEARNING (COL)

1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

In the course of UNICEF’s work with countries over the past decade, Child-Friendly School (CFS) models have emerged as a “package solution” and a holistic instrument for pulling together a comprehensive range of quality interventions in education. As such CFS models are now the major means through which UNICEF advocates for and promotes quality in education.

CFS models are based on a concept of quality education that is multi-dimensional and concerned with the total needs of the child as the central focus and beneficiary of all education decisions. Quality in CFS therefore goes beyond good teaching methods and learning outcomes. It includes considerations of health and nutrition status of learners; adequacy of available facilities, services and supplies; as well as levels of safety and protection afforded by the learning environment. These are important not simply as means of supporting good teaching and promoting learning achievement, but also as goals in their own right and valid indicators of quality education from a child rights perspective. Quality in Child Friendly Schools comes not only from learners and teachers being set apart in special places as communities dedicated to the pursuit of learning, but also from their relevance and effectiveness as institutions linked to the wider community they serve. This is what makes education ‘real’ for children, families and communities.

Based on promising success with the CFS model in over sixty countries, UNICEF now seeks to mainstream Child Friendly Schools or similar models throughout the education systems in all 154 countries in which it operates. CFS models offer a comprehensive approach that is highly effective and efficient for improving quality of education. UNICEF advocates for this approach in preference to the current tendencies of investing sequentially in single factors like teacher training or textbooks provision as determinants of quality. Moreover a CFS approach supports an important ideological position that treats education as a right for all children and regards the child as the main beneficiary, whose interests should therefore be central to all key decisions made in education.

As the main proponent of this approach, UNICEF faces the challenge of pulling together a coherent account of what constitutes child friendly school models. Successful uptake and implementation of such models by countries requires understanding and skills that need to be cultivated. UNICEF has therefore prepared a capacity cultivation programme on CFS models, which will support countries in designing and implementing these models as may be most appropriate for their circumstances. It will also enable countries to incorporate CFS standards into their plans and priorities for education, so that the cost of achieving quality basic education for all through this approach can be realistically estimated with adequate attention to national...
standards. Through this capacity cultivation programme UNICEF hopes to address the current problem of fragmented information on CFS by identifying key principles, outlining common practices, as well as highlighting effective approaches, compiling lessons learned and documenting successful practices.

There are three main components to the current CFS Capacity Development programme:

a. Development of a CFS Manual for Decision Makers, Planners and Practitioners


c. The strategic Roll-Out of these two tools into selected countries and regions as part of a comprehensive effort to mainstream the CFS model and cultivate appropriate national capacity to accompany the process.

In all cases, the target audience includes not only UNICEF staff, but also national educators, teachers, policy makers, civil society organizations and academic institutions.

The CFS Manual

The manual is essentially a reference document designed to highlight key principles and outline practical methodologies of CFS as well as to serve as a practical guide book for achieving the following objectives

(a) Provide a comprehensive introduction to the child friendly concept through a review of its underlying ideology and key guiding principles.

(b) Outline, with supporting arguments, the multiple ways in which CFS models can consistently contribute to quality improvements from a rights perspective, in all aspects of education and under a wide variety of national contexts.

(c) Highlight the intrinsic value of CFS models for improving quality of education in any education system, by virtue of the fact that these models offer a universal tool that is Flexible, Heuristic and Reforming

(d) Provide practical guidance on the design, construction and maintenance of child friendly schools as safe, welcoming and sustainable learning environments for all children to achieve their potential.

(e) Provide practical guidance on the set up, operation and management of CFS; emphasizing the role of school heads, teachers, non-teaching staff, pupils, parents and communities; as well as education authorities at the local and national levels.

(f) Provide practical guidance on classroom processes in child friendly schools that respect the rights of all children, enhance active learning experiences and promote pedagogical excellence for improved learning achievement.

(g) Highlight the importance of the overall climate and institutional ethos of CFS in terms of cultivating a sense of community within schools as well as between schools and the communities they serve.

(h) Provide a rich menu of illustrative examples on these key principles and practices, drawn from actual child friendly schools in various country contexts.

The manual is now available in draft form and has been sent out for professional editing prior to its publication in the third quarter of 2008. There are also plans to compile an accompanying book of CFS Case Studies from the experiences of as many as twenty countries where UNICEF has implemented the model successfully.
CFS E-learning package
The CFS E-learning package will be a richly illustrated, self-paced interactive e-learning course, with exercises and case studies in each module, and a comprehensive test on completion of the course. It will be based on the content of the manual and will contain among others the modules on the CFS Concept, CFS as a learning environment, Designing and development Child Friendly Schools and child friendly learning spaces, CFS Cost and Budgeting, etc. The modules will stand alone for specific topics but link together to provide a comprehensive learning programme. The E-learning package will also include the Environmental Education Resource Pack for CFS and the resource package on Life Skills Based Education for CFS. The E-learning package will also make reference to and link in with other relevant UNICEF training packages, such as the Education in Emergencies Training Kit.

The Roll-out
The roll-out of this CFS Capacity Development programme has two main components:

a) Capacity Development Workshops for UNICEF staff, and partners. These will be organised during 2008, once the e-learning package has been made available to UNICEF staff and partners as a self-learning tool and the manual has also been made available for all to familiarise themselves with the CFS models. These workshops will provide an opportunity for more systematic and rigorous capacity development process for UNICEF staff as well as for partner agencies and national counterparts in Ministries of Education. The workshops will therefore involve use of the manual and the e-learning materials, as well as the other supplementary materials already mentioned.

b) Training of national counterparts as part of the capacity cultivation efforts.
This will be a comprehensive series of training provided at national and regional levels through different modes (including distance learning) to cover teacher training in particular, but also dealing with capacity building for school heads and other key education personnel. This is the challenging aspect of CFS roll out in which the selected partner, Commonwealth of Learning (COL), an intergovernmental organisation created by Commonwealth Heads of Government, will be involved as a partner under this PCA. An important dimension will be the use of distance learning methodology to support training of trainers and establish CFS courses in the key training institutions across many of the countries in which UNICEF works.

The main goal of these efforts is to build on the promise of CFS and successful advocacy efforts to date, in order to help countries mainstream CFS in their national education sector policies and plans as the instrument of choice for promoting quality in education. Amongst other things this would involve helping countries incorporate CFS training in their pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes as well as in capacity building programmes for other education actors such as school heads, administrators, supervisors, curriculum planners, physical planners, and local communities in the form of school committees and parent-teacher associations.

UNICEF believes that such a comprehensive support network is essential for imparting the CFS ideology and cultivating competencies for application of CFS approach within and across education systems. It is only through such an approach that CFS can become the key instrument and most sustainable investment for quality improvement in education. To achieve this, UNICEF will need strong partners with the experience, commitment and expertise to accompany its work with countries. The key challenge in supporting over 150 countries to mainstream CFS models therefore is not so much to contract out discrete tasks that can be accomplished through a finite
set of deliverables. Rather it is to secure the right partners who can best help not only with promoting a child-rights ideology in education, but also with the complex process of cultivating major competencies for planning and implementing CFS models. Such partners need to have the conviction and resilience to deal with the inevitable back-stopping and trouble shooting challenges that always emerge in any process of systemic change, particularly in a field like education.

On the basis of this rationale, the current proposal is for a Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) with a selected partner (The Commonwealth of Learning – COL) to work with UNICEF in helping to mainstream CFS models in a wide range of countries. The main focus of this PCA is on teacher education, which involves both pre-service and in-service training programmes. COL would not only help integrate CFS into teacher education pre-service and in-service programmes, but also promote CFS in training for other education personnel.

With its widely recognised technical expertise in the field of distance learning; its documented experience in supporting teacher education through various distance learning techniques; its convening power of education leaders in the fifty-two countries of the Commonwealth; and its worldwide network of national and regional partners in the field of distance learning, COL is well placed to accompany UNICEF as a key partner in the roll out of the CFS capacity cultivation programme. (See more details in the Single Source Trail note.)

2. STATEMENT OF OVERALL GOAL

The overall goal of the PCA is the CFS model successfully mainstreamed into the pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes of selected countries, and contributing to the improvement of quality education in schools throughout the countries concerned. The partnership will promote and improve a gender sensitive rights-based approach to schooling (essence of the CFS approach) and support child-centred learning-teaching methodologies that emphasise learner participation and inclusion. It will also strengthen and cultivate capacity for CFS of teachers and other education actors such as school heads, administrators, supervisors, curriculum planners, physical planners, and local communities in the form of school committees and parent-teacher associations.

2.1. Specific Objectives and Areas of Cooperation

In the roll out of the CFS Capacity Development Programme, UNICEF and COL would work with other (local) partners to make the e-learning course available through local universities and teacher training institutions. Through this strategy efforts would first focus on training of trainers (teacher educators, etc) and then organising training workshops to strengthen competencies in use of the manual and as well as the e-learning material for CFS capacity building. It is envisaged that this approach will enable national training institutions to rapidly become self sufficient in operating CFS courses as a standard part of their training programmes. With governments agreement, such courses can then become a part of the regular competencies that are certified in training programmes for teachers and other education personnel. Following are specific Areas of Cooperation (AOC) under this agreement:
AOC 1: Integrating the CFS model into pre-service and in-service teacher training curricula, training of teachers and other educational personnel on CFS at the universities and teacher training institutions (TTI).

COL will use its extensive network of partners on the ground, such as for example the National Teachers Institute in Nigeria, or UNISA in South Africa to integrate the CFS into their course offerings. COL will identify institutions/universities in the countries identified for this work and organise a series of training-of-trainers workshops through them to integrate CFS model related inputs into the pre-service and in-service teacher training curriculum. COL will also partner with a distance education institution in each country to develop and offer CFS integrated professional development courses for teacher educators, policy makers and administrators. The total number of teacher training institutions involved in each country will be five.

Out of 15 total countries proposed by UNICEF (see Section 2.2), in the first two-year phase, COL will select 10 countries to be targets of AOC 1 interventions. From this first group of ten countries, five (5) would be targeted in the first year by the AOC 1 interventions, and other five would be targeted with the AOC 2 interventions. In the second year, the countries would be “swapped”. This would ensure cross-fertilisation of lessons learned, integration of some cross-cutting activities under each AOC and more strategic usage of funds.

AOC 2: Strengthening the role of Teacher Resource Centers (TRC).
It is recognized that these centers have strong potential to use information technology (ICT) and distance learning methods to provide much better support for teachers and school heads. This can also be done in ways that can transform existing classroom practices and school management styles for the mainstreaming of the CFS approach. COL has experience in working with teacher resource centers and would assist UNICEF in utilizing them to promote CFS. CFS model will be integrated in strengthening activities in these centres as well as in networking with schools. Capacity building workshops under AOC 2 will target the TRC managers and school managers. We expect to see synergies created between activities taking place at TTIs and TRCs.

Under this AOC, COL will also support UNICEF’s work on CFS standards by helping develop appropriate indicators and standards which countries can use to measure progress and gauge success as they work to transform all schools into Child Friendly Schools. It is envisaged that one in-country workshop will be held per country to support countries in developing CFS standards.

Overall, Teacher Training Institutions and Teacher Resource Centers are targeted in this intervention because of their broad spheres of influence and their direct responsibility for the learning and skills development of pre- and in-service teachers. Therefore, COL employs a cascade methodology whereby each “trainer of teachers” workshop participant engages in CFS capacity development and is responsible for mainstreaming it into the curriculum in their institutions. For smaller countries, such as Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland, it will be feasible include all TTIs and most TRCs throughout the country in both AOC 1 and AOC 2. Whereas, in more populous countries, such as Nigeria, South Africa, and Sri Lanka, a proportionate number of TTIs and TRCs will be selected to ultimately reach a representative number of teachers during this two year programme.
2.2 Initial Target Countries in the Project Cooperation

It is proposed that the cooperation between UNICEF and COL initially focus on the following 10 countries reflected in the table below. The countries were selected based on COL’s strong in-country presence, past and present engagement with local TTIs and TRCs and its extensive network of national and regional partners. In addition, the initial roll out of the UNICEF’s Global Capacity Development Programme is planned in these countries. In addition, COL will bring together at a sub-regional level, the smaller countries in order to promote collaboration among them. This will lead to better exchange of experiences and cross fertilisation of ideas on training for capacity development. Specifically, the plan is for South Africa to host a sub-regional capacity development workshop for the Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Zambia. After the sub-regional training COL will then go on to conduct country level CFS capacity development in the local TTIs and TRCs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Swaziland, South Africa, Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the terms of this PCA, following the initial roll out, the cooperation between COL and UNICEF will extend to the another five countries (Bosnia Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, China, and North Sudan, refer to table below) and the experience from the roll out will be used to promote collaboration between countries at sub-regional levels. This will lead to better exchange of experiences and cross fertilisation of ideas on training for capacity development. In this regard, some of the initial roll out countries will become centres for sub-regional capacity development workshops. In addition, as the CFS Capacity Development programme becomes available in French and Spanish, the number of target countries will be expanded to include Latin America, Middle East and North Africa and most of West and Central Africa regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>Bosnia Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and the Pacific</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/ North Africa</td>
<td>North Sudan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshops and travel to the ten countries is a projection. Upon submission of receipts for travel, if the projection proves to be higher than the actual costs, adjustments will be made in subsequent payments to COL.

3. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

COL will carry out the required activities in the selected Commonwealth countries through a base CFS Unit created in its COL Vancouver office mainly for overall implementation and management of activities.

COL will work through partner institutions in the selected countries. These institutions will organise the required actions such as materials development, capacity building workshops etc. UNICEF Country offices will review instruments and materials developed by COL; participate
in curriculum development workshops and/or visit Teacher Resource Centers involved in the project.

**Specific activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>Duration *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop joint work plan for the AOC</td>
<td>UNICEF with COL</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate CFS model into pre-service and in-service teacher training curricula. Plan for training of teachers and other educational personnel on CFS at the universities and teacher training institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop template Materials/Curriculum for training of trainers</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and establish contacts with the country/regional level partner institutions</td>
<td>COL</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country level material development and implementation planning workshops (based on template materials)</td>
<td>COL/UNICEF</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize materials, translate, adapt and print locally</td>
<td>COL and other key country/regional partners</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organise Country level training workshop for selected groups of teachers</td>
<td>COL and UNICEF</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengthening the role of Teacher Resource Centers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>Duration *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify TRCs that are most appropriate for building CFS training and mentoring capacity through COL</td>
<td>COL, UNICEF</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and distribute information/training material on CFS to these TRCs</td>
<td>COL, UNICEF</td>
<td>2 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct workshop on developing CFS to be used to measure progress and gauge success as they work to transform all schools into Child Friendly Schools.</td>
<td>COL, UNICEF</td>
<td>9 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cross-cutting Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>Duration *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Strategy and Plan</td>
<td>UNICEF Education Section</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ M&amp;E strategy and plan note</td>
<td>Country Officer’s Education and M&amp;E Sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Consultancies to support the country M&amp;E</td>
<td>UNICEF Evaluation Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Overall evaluation (post-intervention)</td>
<td>NYHQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some activities are parallel.

Detailed timeline showing the project flow is provided separately.

4. **MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

Both COL and UNICEF share a result-based approach to project cooperation. They will agree on a monitoring framework and jointly participate at different levels in monitoring progress towards the project goals.

COL will be responsible for data collection and management, and conduct day to day monitoring of project activities described above and will provide periodic updates on progress to UNICEF Country Offices and the Education Section.
Country Offices will work in close contact with the COL teams and assist in the monitoring function at the country level. For example, they will review instruments and materials developed by COL; participate in curriculum development workshops and/or visit Teacher Resource Centers involved in the project.

The Education Section in New York will review quarterly financial reports from COL as part of their monitoring function. All the reports produced through the monitoring process in the COs and the HQ will serve to inform the final evaluation of the project.

Two months before the end of the project, UNICEF Education and Evaluation Sections will commission a final evaluation of the project to assess overall success of the cooperation. It will seek to assess how many teacher training institutions have included CFS in their curriculum or course offerings; how many Teacher Resource Centers have institutionalized training and mentoring for teachers that is based on the CFS models; and to provide overall assessment of whether the programme enabled national training institutions to rapidly become self-sufficient in operating CFS courses as a standard part of their training programmes.

**COL -specific M&E plan**
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan of CFS roll-out

Outcomes:
- Integration of CFS into teacher training curriculum of the TTIs.
- Enhancement of CFS resources in TRCs for planning, managing and assessing CFS.
- Formative evaluation to improve and fine tune the CFS vision and related materials based on the experience and knowledge arising from workshops and related activities.
- Performance indicators developed to measure long-term impact-related questions like community uptake of CFS, effects of CFS on beneficiaries, and sustainability of CFS.

Outputs:
- A total of 50 training workshops conducted in ten countries over two years to capacitate TOTs for CFS planning, implementation and quality assurance.
- Distance learning materials on CFS planning, implementation and quality assurance
- Standards and indicators for implementing CFS.

Monitoring process:
- Data collection process and tools will be created in capturing the experiences and deliverables of workshops planning and implementation and materials design, development and quality control.
  Due attention will be given to the gender and geographical representation in engaging participants. Materials will be developed to reflect the nuances of national culture and languages. Workshops are designed to be engaging and participatory with strong emphasis of ownership by local institutions and communities.
- Monitoring will be regular and systematic so that the completion of one workshop and/or one set of materials will inform the next activity of lessons learned.
- Monitoring will be done in a transparent way to cultivate best practices.

Evaluation reports:
- Formative evaluation reports will be provided periodically over the first two years based on field visits and other data collection strategies at various milestones to access the progress and effectiveness of national capacity building in delivering CFS.
• A summative report will be prepared based on the synthesis of findings and reports received from the formative evaluation process.

Roles and Responsibilities
The proposed initiative is envisaged as a partnership between UNICEF country offices and other in-country partners, UNICEF Regional Offices, UNICEF HQ (Education Section and ECD Unit) and the Commonwealth of Learning. The proposed roles and responsibilities for each of these partners are outlined below. This preliminary delineation of activities will be further refined and adjusted during the planning Phase.

A. UNICEF HQ: Education Section
• Develop the concept of the initiative
• Develop and design partnership with the Commonwealth of Learning (PCA)
• Define country selection criteria and select initial set of participating countries
• Develop the outcome framework
• Work closely with the Commonwealth of Learning on materials development.
• Prepare evaluation design, methods and tools in coordination with the Evaluation Section
• Provide overall management and co-ordination
• Work closely with selected countries in initiating and managing the roll out
• Develop Phase II replication strategy for roll out to a larger number of countries

B. Commonwealth of Learning:
• In cooperation with relevant government departments, select local implementing partners (universities and teacher training institutes)
• Help identify pilot communities teacher resource centres and schools
• Provide Technical Assistance:
  o Materials development based on the child outcome framework
  o Technical support to countries.
• Conduct material development trainings at country level (each selected country)
• Conduct teacher trainings after country specific materials have been developed
• Provide implementing partners with follow up support, supervision and monitoring
• Conduct monitoring of project progress and prepare relevant reports to UNICEF COs and HQ

C. UNICEF Regional Offices:
• Provide coordination, management and back-stopping for relevant pilot countries
• Manage technical support to countries as appropriate for piloting

D. UNICEF Country Offices
• Provide project management and coordination at country level
• Support replication and distribution of materials
• Support and help co-ordinate monitoring and evaluation efforts in collaboration with UNICEF HQ and the Evaluation office

E. National Governments
• Collaborate closely with UNICEF and COL at all stages of the project.
• Ensure timely integration of program and materials into the school curriculum
• Provide policy decisions and national strategies/resources to mainstream CFS.
• Support and collaborate with selected national Teacher Training Institutions

F. Implementing Partners
• Provide ongoing supervision and follow-up
• Implement program monitoring tools

5. DESIGNATED PROJECT MANAGERS

Prof. Asha Kanwar, Vice President and Programme Director of COL, has overall responsibility for the collaboration with UNICEF under the project. Frances Ferreira, Education Specialist, Basic Education and Open Schooling, and the Education Specialist, Teacher Education, will closely work with her on all aspects of the project.

In UNICEF, Cream Wright, Associate Director and Head of Education, has overall responsibility for the collaboration with COL. Changu Manuthoko, Senior Education Advisor and Maida Pasie, Education Specialist in the Education Section will closely work with him on all aspects of this project.

6. BUDGET

The total budget for this two year PCA is US$ 1,895,600. Details are contained in the attachment.
## Annex B

### Project Related Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Unit Cost</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>UNICEF Contribution per line</th>
<th>UNICEF Contribution per line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCI Salary</td>
<td>$20,000 per month</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist (salary per month + 30% benefits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager (salary per month + 30% benefits)</td>
<td>$6,000 per month</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Manager (salary cost of interim management time to oversee the project)</td>
<td>$1,000 per day</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Activity costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Materials Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office-Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Review, consultations and evaluations (M&amp;E - based on semi-annual evaluation and reporting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Other (including)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Project Related Costs | | | | | | | | | | 350,000

### Project Support Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Unit Cost</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>UNICEF Contribution per line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TCI Salary- (Monthly salary + 30% benefits of a half-time assistant which will be hired to support the Programme Manager in the delivery of the project)</td>
<td>$6,000 per month</td>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Financial Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI IRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCI Other (including)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Project Support Costs | | | | | | | | | | 40,000

### TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,895,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>237,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>272,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>232,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>293,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>263,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,819,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Support Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- All costs provided are in USD or equivalent.
- Salaries provided according to the time involved in the project.
- Costs provided are for a period of 2 years.
- Costs provided are for a period of 1 year.